

NiemanReports

3

April, 1956

TV NEWS: Reporting or Performing?

By John F. Day

A National Newspaper in Japan

Hisashi Maeda

Government Secrecy

Pat Munroe

The Telegraph Editor

John Dougherty

Crowded Cuban Journalism

Marvin Alisky

Prospectus for an Editorial Page

Julius Duscha

A Spot for the Individual

Ed Hale

*Crimes, Courts and Newspapers — A brief for
A Nieman Law Seminar — by Prof. Arthur Sutherland*

Reviews — Scrapbook — Nieman Notes — Letters

*"Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire" by Lawrence G. Weiss — The Camera Comes to
Court in Colorado — The Press and Senator Eastland.*

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Charlotte F. Robling, Darien, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$2 a year. Entered as second-class matter December 31, 1947, at the post office at Boston, Massachusetts, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. X; No. 2

APRIL, 1956

Worst Reported Institution

By Max Freedman

One hundred and twenty-seven years ago, near the end of his six-hour speech in the British House of Commons on law reform, Henry Brougham uttered an apostrophe to the spirit of liberty which has passed into the folk-lore of freedom. "It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it of Marble. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich and left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression and left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence." The Supreme Court of the United States is the world's greatest Court. No other Court can rival its range of judgment, its power of decision, its stature as a partner in government, its noble accumulation of creative precedents for the peaceful settlements of disputes in a federal system. Yet its work is often a puzzle to the editorial writer and a mystery to the citizen. Where so much could be said, I must satisfy myself with two simple yet fundamental points.

It seems to me simply inconceivable, in the first place, that the average American editor would ever dare to write on a debate in Congress or a decision by the President with the meager preparation which he often manifests in evaluating the judgments of the Supreme Court. Yet in politics "today's panacea is tomorrow's folly, and a politician's reputation is a mist enthroned on a rainbow." A decision by the Supreme Court, on the contrary, may shape America's destiny.

Let me begin with the most important point. It is absolutely impossible for any case to reach the Supreme Court unless it involves a competition between rights. That means that the case must be enormously complicated. How often is this complexity reflected in editorial comments? Almost never. The issues seem so clear and direct and immediate to the editorial writer. It never seems to cross his mind that if the case were that simple it would never have reached the Supreme Court in the first place. How many editors take the trouble to read the detailed legal briefs submitted to the Supreme Court or study the arguments presented before the high tribunal before they pass judgment on the findings of the Court? I must declare my conviction that the Supreme Court is the worst reported and worst judged institution in the American system of government.

My second comment turns on the criticism which is so often heard that the Supreme Court's decisions may be good sociology but bad law. It is impossible to misconceive the Court's function more grossly than in that glib phrase. It reflects a curious misunderstanding of the judicial process. One of the majestic virtues of the Supreme Court is that it can make the law a province of judicial statesmanship. Unlike the House of Lords, it is not bound by its own precedents and it can redeem its earlier mistakes by the wisdom of second thoughts. The Court would really be guilty of bad law if it anchored itself immovably and irrevocably to the decisions of a bygone era and refused to become contemporary with the changing needs of a changing society.

I know of only two editorial writers who have studied the Supreme Court with sufficient scholarship and respect to have earned the right to pass judgment on so complicated an institution. One is Merlo Pusey on the *Washington Post*; and the other is Irving Dilliard of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. At present the judges of the Supreme Court do not care what is said about them in the press. A judge's vanity may be ruffled for an hour or so by some indignant blast from somebody's editorial page but basically the *Court* is indifferent because it feels that the editor has failed to pay the intellectual dues of hard work which should precede the right to an opinion.

As a result, the task of judging the Supreme Court has been remitted to the learned quarterlies and legal journals. Now I have much respect for these learned lucubrations, but we of the press write better and we think better, I believe, on many aspects of national affairs than do these more remote commentators. I would like to see the American editorial page accept this responsibility.

Washington correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, Max Freedman spoke to the National Conference of Editorial Writers at their last meeting.

TV News: Reporting or Performing?

A Network Executive Takes a Candid Look At His Job To Separate News from Show Business

By John F. Day

I have noticed recently a tendency of certain television newsmen to endorse products and to permit their names and their faces to be associated with the promotion and sale of these products.

Personally, I feel embarrassed when I see these ads. And that it true despite the fact these persons do not work for CBS News and thus are actually no responsibility of mine. But I feel very strongly that newsmen should be newsmen; not pitchmen. And these men carry not only the nomenclature of newsmen, but of television newsmen.

Is television news going to destroy itself in commercialism before it gets out of its swaddling clothes?

Television as it exists today *is* show business. For that reason at least one branch of journalism is trying to adapt itself to a strange new world. In so doing it has taken on some of the elements of show business. Not all of these elements are new, of course, for TV news is in part an extension of radio news, and radio too is in show business. But television is show business with a capital S.

Television news has tried to fit into this glittering show world by a series of compromises which affect both the persons working in TV news and the product they put on the screen.

First, let's consider the effect on the individual.

Journalism has never known such a disparity in pay as exists at the network level in radio and television. The office boy, the news writer and the news editor make more than the average for their jobs on metropolitan newspapers. Enough more to make recruiting from newspapers practicable, but surely not enough more to make the jobs utopian. The reporter who works with a camera team and develops pictorial stories requires new skill, and his job cannot be compared exactly with a particular newspaper job. But his pay is comparable to what a news writer or editor makes.

John F. Day is director of news for CBS. Former newspaper reporter, correspondent and managing editor, he records here the impressions of his first year in Radio-TV. This was a talk at the University of Minnesota School of Journalism Feb. 10. *Nieman Reports* is doubly glad to publish it because an earlier talk to the Nieman Fellows was off the record, without manuscript. John Day was a Nieman Fellow in 1943.

It is when a newsman becomes a performer, a director or a producer that things get wild. Here it's what a man can command and what the traffic will bear. It's what he and his union and his agent can get.

To one who worked in newspapers as long as I did, it seems strange to have a news correspondent's *agent* making formal calls upon him to discuss better assignments and fatter contracts. But that's part of the element of show business, and that's the way the system works.

I should explain here that correspondents (men who are reporters but who also appear on mike and camera), as well as directors and producers, have basic contracts calling for staff salaries that are NOT in the high brackets. Thus persons who do not earn commercial fees are paid well but not fabulously. However, on top of the basic contract there is an elaborate fee system which makes it possible for some to soar into the upper five- and even six-figure annual pay brackets.

To state it mildly, this is not always fair. Too much depends on luck, agencies and the whim of the public instead of the competence and depth of the newsmen. With certain reservations—such as the fact that unions set some of the fees—it is indeed free enterprise. But the system sometimes results in a man making three or four times as much as another who is as good or better and who works just as hard in the same field. It results in some men making many times more than the persons to whom they are responsible. This doesn't make for the best in responsibility, loyalty and morale. There has been talk, of course, of abolishing the fee system or of pooling fees, but nothing has come of it. And I am not hopeful that anything will.

The wide-ranging pay; the fact a newsman may belong to the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists (note the word artists); the fact he may have one or more business agents; that he may even have a publicity agent; that he may get fan mail of the type no newspaper or magazine writer could get—all these are elements that identify television newsmen with show business.

Another element is the fact that television newsmen (and, to be sure, radio newsmen as well) are called upon to deliver commercials. Ever since it has had a news service, CBS, thank heavens, has tried to keep the news and the advertising separate by having persons other than the reporters

deliver the commercials. We are not simon pure in this respect. The pressure from advertising agencies, and sometimes from persons within the company, are strong and unrelenting. In the matter of "lead-ins"—introductions to commercials that may in themselves endorse the product—a couple of sponsors have gotten a foot in the door by pressing our newsmen into reading them.

This may lead to the question of whether one can be half a virgin. I'm not positive about the answer to that, but I do believe one can do some flirting around without becoming a prostitute.

Seriously, CBS News strives with continuing vigilance to protect its newsmen from the chore of doing commercials.

Please understand, I have nothing against advertising. I am in fact one of its strongest advocates, because I believe its effect has been immeasurably great in the expanding of economy. But in this field I believe in segregation. Let someone not associated with the news deliver the sales pitch. It is worse than unfair to ask a man to try to deliver an explanation of some world crisis in one breath and an appeal to his listeners to buy a certain remedy for aches and pains in the next.

Now that I have pointed out some elements of commercialism as they affect individuals in television and radio news, I think it is important that I make this observation: Big as is the money that floats around in electronic journalism, I personally know of not one single case where a newsman has deliberately slanted a story, omitted a story or added a story because his sponsor asked for it. I have no doubt there have been such cases. But they must be few, for talk of things like that travels fast. I'm happy to say that although electronic newsmen may become prima donnas, they don't become crooks.

I said earlier that because television today was show business, both the individuals and the product have made compromises to adjust that business. I have talked so far about the individuals. Now to the product.

Television news has been cut to a pattern that says, "Television is an entertainment medium; therefore television news must entertain."

Who says television HAS to be an entertainment medium? Some broadcasting officials act as though they have been handed holy writs saying, "This is your air and your electronic gadget; you're to use them solely for the purpose of making money and amusing the morons."

It's fortunate for all of us that the real leaders of the industry don't assume such an attitude and that the Federal Communications Commission keeps an eye cocked on the industry's obligation to operate in the public interest.

The men who created this modern miracle don't look upon it as merely an entertainment medium. For instance,

there is Dr. Vladimir Zworykin, who is an honorary vice president of R.C.A. and who invented or developed many of the electronic instruments that make today's TV set possible. He, I read, has always thought of television's chief service not as entertainment but as extending human sight to places where not every man can go.

And F.C.C. Chairman George McConaughy had this to say not long ago: "Television has got to be more than merely a means of entertainment. It is an unequalled medium for enlightenment and education. There is no significant difference of opinion on the validity of the proposition. The mechanics for implementation are a different story."

Still and all, virtually everything in television today is geared to the thought that TV has to entertain. On behalf of the program planners it must be said they are trying to raise the public's taste as well as cater to it. But primarily they're trying to raise standards of taste in the realm of entertainment. And this whole business of trying to uplift just a little while aiming mostly at a low common denominator is a bit like handing your wife a rose while whaling the daylights out of her.

Meanwhile electronic journalism must hew a path through the jungle if it is to achieve a goal of adding something to human knowledge. While recognizing that most people today regard television as an entertainment medium, electronic journalism must not forget this is a convenient assumption, not an unalterable law of the universe, or even a proved fact. While conceding that news must be presented interestingly if it is to compete and hold an audience, newsmen must not succumb to sensationalism. Just as it is true that a good newspaper doesn't have to be dull, television news can inform with liveliness and vividness. The point is that it must not forget that its primary purpose is to INFORM.

Radio news went through its formative stages in the 1930's; came of age during the 1940's. I am not particularly happy about the trend in radio toward a vast number of five-minute summaries, but the 15-minute programs such as our "World News Roundup," "News of America" and the Ed Murrow news have held their own, and I believe we will soon see the addition of some half-hour news-in-depth shows. So, basically, radio news has achieved stature; it knows what it can do and where it stands.

Television news, on the other hand, is in ferment. It is growing and it is improving—let there be no doubt about that. But it also is groping for answers.

No one on the outside has made criticisms of television news that we who are working in it haven't made. I have never known of any craft, trade or profession so thoroughly self-examining and so unceasingly self-critical; so willing to try to find ways to improve itself.

We at CBS News carry on a continuing study that amounts to intense introspection. We keep asking ourselves such questions as: "What IS television news?"; "What should it be?"; "How can we best present the news each day?"

We have not resolved the basic question of what the television news program should do. The argument revolves around the matter of whether television should use only that news the medium can do best, or whether it should undertake to report ALL the news that is of importance or interest. The news television can do best, of course, is (1) the event "live" as it actually happens, and (2) the strictly pictorial story on film. But a full report—one designed to make the viewer reasonably well informed by the TV medium alone—requires use of the "ideal" story that is difficult or close to impossible to illustrate well.

I am a strong advocate of the complete news report. I believe that television is a basic medium for conveying information and adding to human knowledge. If we don't use it in this way, we abdicate all claims to its being a basic news medium. I think we MUST not become obsessed with the pictorial and the merely entertaining at the expense of the meaningful. We must find ways to present difficult stories more effectively. None of us who work in news at CBS is satisfied that we are making the best possible use of the visual medium. Too much of what we present is superficial and unimaginative. But we are trying, and trying hard, for better technical and editorial quality. We try incessantly to find people who can THINK in visual terms, who can plan the best possible pictorial coverage of the story which lies in the realm of ideas. We carry on continuing experimentation with and discussion of new types of cameras, film sound recording devices and other equipment. We discuss the relative merits of sound film and silent film; of animation techniques; of showmanship—roughly comparable to "readability" in newspapering; of the length and type of film clips; of the balance between voice reporting and picture reporting.

And at the same time we must keep an eye on costs. Television news is an expensive product, no matter how you figure it. The viewer hears the newsman say, "Now we take you to San Francisco . . ." and presto: there is a film or a live picture of a California flood. But the picture doesn't just happen. It takes planning and it takes M-O-N-E-Y. In all probability we have had to install loops and connections in the San Francisco station. (When I first made my acquaintance with such figures as, "Installing loops and connections . . . \$1,800" I thought those loops must be made of platinum, studded with diamonds. But they're just cables.) Then there is the line charge for the cross-country switch. That runs to another \$1,500 or so. And these of course are more or less incidental costs to the

covering of the news and the producing of the show. We had to have cameramen and reporters on that as well as many other stories. For the same show that used the trans-continental switch, we may have sent a cameraman and his excess-baggage equipment from Tokyo to Hong Kong to cover a story that runs a minute or minute and a half. Is the show worth all these costs? Well, circulation must be counted here. Some 11,000,000 persons or more see it.

Mention of audience size brings up that bugaboo "ratings." This is a bugaboo the broadcasting industry very largely brought on itself. Certainly it is important to have as accurate a picture as possible of how many people are watching or listening to a given program. But I am appalled by the importance placed on decimal-point changes by the broadcasting industry, by advertising agencies and by companies who buy time. Rating systems are valuable as guides. Enslavement by them is tragic. Currently, because it's all part of the show-business system, electronic news can't ignore the rating obsession. If the news doesn't do well against certain competition, it is liable to be moved to another time period or to lose its sponsor. Those are the facts of life. Even so, electronic journalism must keep its balance and remember that a high rating is not the end to which all means must be subjected. There IS such a thing as a quality audience, and there IS such a thing as the growing sophistication of the American television viewer. The late Mr. Mencken notwithstanding, the American public is not uniformly the "booboisie."

And here I must say that while I am critical of some practices in the broadcasting industry, I have no sympathy whatever for the intellectual, pseudo-intellectual or would-be intellectual who declaims: "All television stinks; I wouldn't have a set in the house." In the first place, how does he know it stinks if he doesn't watch its development. He is mighty contemptuous of others who make judgments on so little evidence. It is more than irritating to have someone say, "Television news is nothing but poor quality news-reel," and to find upon questioning that this critic has seen exactly two television news shows in his life time.

It is the duty of the responsible intellectual not only to "have a television set in his house" but to be concerned with it. Television is one of the greatest social phenomena ever to hit any civilization. No other single factor has more impact on the political, social, economic, cultural and even moral life of this country. Is television then to be pooh-poohed and scoffed at by persons allegedly interested in values? On the contrary, those who are genuinely concerned with the quality of American life should be making their weight felt in applauding the good and making sharp but constructive criticism of the bad fare served up on television.

Earlier I asked whether television news was going to allow commercialism to destroy it before it really gets out

of its swaddling clothes. I have pointed out some of the dangers that make such a fate possible, but I am optimistic that the pitfalls will be circumvented and that television news will, in the not too distant future, achieve the stature of the good newspaper and the good radio program.

To do this it must improve both its editorial and its technical resources. It must overcome or at least lessen its logistical problem. Mobile units are a long way from being mobile. Films can't move with the freedom of words. The biggest newspaper goes to cover a national political convention with perhaps 15 persons. Television must go to cover a convention with a veritable army of men and machines. In fact, TV requires considerably more men behind scenes to get a man on camera than the army takes to get a man on the firing line. It must incorporate into its product the same sort of diligent, intelligent meaningful and objective reporting and writing and editing which has characterized the best in American newspapers and in radio and which has given American journalism its high place in the world. And then it must present this product with imagination and taste—yes, and, where suitable, with showmanship.

Certainly a large order; no doubt of that. But so unlimited is the horizon of television that I am reasonably confident these things will be achieved. Recently, in making an intramural estimate for future plans of CBS News, I hazarded a guess that our operation five years from now will have much greater scope and much higher quality in programming and will employ approximately twice as many people.

The technical people tell us that the following developments are here or on the way:

1. Color films, and live events in actual color.
2. Magnetic stripe on film for audio recording. Current sound-on-film quality is, as you know, generally pretty poor. The new process should approach high fidelity.
3. Magnetic tape for recording pictures. This is still some distance in the future, apparently; but eventually there will be a process that will permit recording and instant play-back.
4. Closed-circuit systems that will nearly eliminate moving film about the country by plane. An editor in New York will monitor film on video tape in Los Angeles, choose what he wants, record it in New York, edit it and use it on his next news show.
5. Facsimile machines instead of teletypes for the rapid movement of raw news copy and scripts.
6. Trans-Atlantic, and eventually worldwide, television networks through the scatter system of bouncing signals off the ionosphere.

All these, of course, are merely the tools. But what tools! Given brains, moral fibre and clearly-sighted goals (no small order!) where else can television news go except forward?

Government Secrecy

By Pat Munroe

Shortly after Mr. Eisenhower took office as President, I was attending a party at one of the glittering embassies in Washington. My dancing partner was the aging daughter of a former high official of the early New Deal days. Her dad was a man of humble origins and was dedicated to the goal of righting wrongs he felt had been made against underprivileged groups in this country.

So long had the daughter of this modern day St. Francis been accustomed to the many honors and preferences of her station that she cast a haughty look around the dance floor and asked me, "Who are all these people?"

Well, it just happened that "these people" were members of Mr. Eisenhower's official family, newcomers all.

But the reformer's daughter didn't know any of them and didn't really care to meet them. She had lost contact with the common folks. Her story is typical of what happens to many officials when they come to Washington, be they of high or low social origins. This is one of the patterns that doesn't change when one team goes out and the other comes in.

Another thing that doesn't change much is the effort on the part of officials and members of Congress to hide information from the press. There are some gains, some losses. I don't believe the situation is any more alarming now than in the past—in fact it may have improved some under President Eisenhower.

The House Government Information Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee held hearings in Washington November 7-11 on the problems of secrecy in the Federal government. It is headed by a new-comer to Congress, Rep. John E. Moss, Jr., of Sacramento, Calif. Most witnesses, who had no first-hand experience in covering Washington, insisted conditions are the worst ever.

Most suggested that if Congress can say to the Executive Branch what information should be kept secret (such as medical records of servicemen), then it also can say what could not be withheld.

I submit that members of Congress should clean up their own mess first. But first let me discuss briefly the current "secrecy situation" as I see it on my news beat around the Nation's Capitol.

We've lost yardage on some plays—gained it on others. I feel that the release of a generous amount of information on the President's illness is a solid gain. This contrasts

Pat Munroe is chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the Congressional Press Galleries. This is from a talk to the University of North Carolina's School of Journalism, November 18, 1955.

sharply with efforts to conceal the deteriorating condition of President Roosevelt during the War years.

At first I was highly dubious about the televising of the President's press conferences. After all, we reporters act as "unpaid staffers" for the networks during the performance. And I'll grant that through them the public gets large hunks of undigested news—some viewers probably should get it mashed up and "pre-chewed," with a liberal mixture of the "whys." But the informed viewers must get a great deal out of this process. As for the future, I can only hope that if TV does produce a "Big Brother" among us, he will be a fair-minded one.

Conditions in covering the Pentagon still are rigorous but slightly relaxed from the chilly days of World War II or even our Korean affair. They are more relaxed, that is, until you want some information on something dealing with members of Congress. Then there's no change. In fact, conditions may be worse in this direction.

One Cabinet member, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, has set an excellent example for other officials by holding numerous press conferences with the Washington press corps. I wish more top-level officials would do likewise—too few do. It is quite an advantage to "get at" the top man in an agency for answers to questions his subordinates may fear to give on their own authority.

No reporter in Washington has been a more outspoken critic of secrecy at the Atomic Energy Commission than I. The "Uranium Curtain" was lowered there in the last year or so of President Truman's Administration and has only begun to lift in the past year or so. Recently I was one of eight Washington reporters invited by AEC to plan a forthcoming seminar on non-military reactors—the atomic furnaces that can produce heat, power and radiation for peaceful uses. I hope it will be but the first of several of its kind. When we get a press room at AEC to hang up our hats in and rest our weary feet, that will be the final "poof" to the Curtain. And I think this will be given us soon.

Before ending my review of working conditions for Washington reporters, I'd like to mention one specific field in which we've made a tremendous gain. This is press coverage of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. Former Democratic Reclamation Commissioner Mike Straus had a far-flung news agency working under him. Some 25-30 persons gaily "fed-out" press releases, pamphlets—even books. Straus had his own "correspondents" at work in the Western states, while his "board of editors" in Washington handled the "big picture" for him.

The goal of this team was to glorify public power in an aggressive manner. At the same time, it carefully guarded from public view the unfavorable sides of the Bureau's

cube. This news service has been cut down to 3-5 persons. If I have any problem affecting that agency I now can reach the proper party with some speed, without having to fight my way through a mob of tacklers.

So, some people say the door to information has been slammed shut, bruising newsmen's fingers in the frame. Others, like me, say it's slightly more ajar. But all agree that things are *pas bon*—"not good."

And who is the culprit—who stole the cookies?

I would put a lot of the blame on the people whom you voters send to Congress. Traditionally, there's been a "live and let live" arrangement between Congress and the Executive Departments on this subject. Your elected representatives make the laws and "set the tenor" for bureaucrats to follow. It is grimly amusing, then, for Congress to yell "foul" when the Executive withholds information not only from the press but frequently from Congress itself.

To make my point—my first illustration is the furor earlier this year over a pay raise for members of Congress. The public thought they were being raised from \$15,000 to \$22,500—a whopping fifty per cent. This isn't so. Members already were getting the equivalent of about \$20,000. Some years ago they quietly had voted themselves a tax-free "living allowance" of \$2,500 in addition to their \$15,000 salaries. And, mind you, I think they deserve their new pay figure.

Further on this same point, I have in my hand copies of two pay raise bills passed in the last Session dealing with Congressional employees. They are Public Law 94, approved June 28, and Public Law 242, approved August 5. Now, we newsmen have very little luck convincing our bosses of this fact—but Washington is a very expensive city. I'd guess that it would take \$10,000 there to match an annual salary of \$7,000-\$8,000 in Chapel Hill.

Well, why doesn't Congress face this fact? No, instead it passes these two "hidden ball" bills. For ready understanding they require a person with a Certified Public Accountant degree, a law degree and a Doctorate in Sanskrit. And nobody on Capitol Hill will sit down and help a reporter find out what's in them. For example, I'll give you all day to discover the fact that the esteemed Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Lewis Deschler, was jumped to the highest non-member salary on the Hill—\$20,500.

Throughout the pages of these bills you will run across the happy term—"basic salary." This figure goes back some 20 years and is just about half of the amount actually being paid out now. For example, the salary limit for the staff of Senators or for committee clerks is \$14,800. But does the public know this? The limit of the second person in a Senator's office was raised from \$8,900 to \$14,300 and for the secretary of a Congressman from \$10,000 to \$12,132.

Back in 1933 some progress was made in getting Congress

to disclose its payroll information. An able Congressman from North Carolina, Lindsay C. Warren, who was later Comptroller General, sponsored a bill to open up the House payroll to the public. And yet the House now is defeating the spirit of Warren's bill by this hocus-pocus about "basic" salaries—with little mention of the current figures. The Senate has never seen fit to follow the example. Earlier this year a Senator was discovered, by accident, to have a large number of relatives and semi-employed friends on his payroll. The fact that he cleaned most if not all of them off pronto once the information was published back home indicates that the policy of secrecy in this matter is unhealthy.

Recently newspapers blossomed with headlines saying that two 66-passenger planes were being dispatched to Europe by the Air Force to pick up three junketing Senators at a cost of \$20,000. Once the news was out, the planes were cancelled. But the Republican bosses at the Pentagon have not to this day revealed which if any of the Senators (all Democrats, by the way) ordered the planes. And the Senators aren't telling either. The taxpayer was barely saved a severe skinning.

A Senator was recently reported to have taken a large party of eight to a dozen relatives, friends and aides on a grand "inspection" tour of Europe. The trip lasted almost seven weeks. But getting the details out of the Pentagon or from the Senate Committee which authorized the trip would be harder than getting the trigger mechanism for the H-bomb.

Does a member of Congress really need his wife and children along to help him in his inspection trips? (One even took his mother-in-law along this year.) The law allows use of government transportation for dependents if "accompanied" by a member of Congress on a trip authorized by a Committee. There's a mild "and approved by the Secretary of Defense" added at the end of the section but this unhappy fellow has never been known to say no. Why not repeal this law?

Junketing isn't confined to trips across the waters. Members of Congress make fairly liberal use of Air Force planes

getting back and forth to their home states. Some of these trips could hardly be classed as "business."

There is one slight glimmer of hope. Representative Omar Burleson (D., Texas), chairman of the House Administration Committee, is reported eager to make junketing expenses of House members public. But there's little sympathy for the move on the Senate side.

I'd like to say that I'm heartily in favor of these trips by Congressmen. If anything, I think members travel too little.

In closing I'd like to discuss the case of former Rep. Douglas Stringfellow (R., Utah). Just before the 1954 election he was found to have given a false version of his war record. Instead of having been badly wounded in an enemy engagement in World War II, he was instead badly wounded on a routine patrol. His disablement certainly deserved the sympathies of all. But few could condone the fact that Mr. Stringfellow used a false account of his war record to be elected to Congress. Or that he then proceeded to lecture in all parts of the U. S. for hundreds of dollars an evening, vividly recounting his tortures in German prisons, when he'd never been in one.

Stringfellow's undoing was an appearance on a television show when a former buddy recognized him and reported him as not being a war hero but just another wounded soldier. The Congressman then withdrew from his race for reelection.

Getting final proof of Stringfellow's true service history from both the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency was one of the toughest news assignments I've ever had. Yet a highly-placed official at CIA later told me cynically, "Sure, we knew all along Stringfellow was not telling the truth. But he also was a member of Congress and we weren't going to squeal on him."

In brief, I feel that Congress itself is missing a great chance to set an excellent example for governmental officials. If Congress corrects its own failings—enters a public confession of *mea culpa*—in this field of news, then it will be in a position to criticize the bureaucrats who may want to cover up. The peals from the ringing of such a bell on Capitol Hill would be heard in even the remotest police courts of this land.

A National Newspaper In Japan

By Hisashi Maeda

"How big is your newspaper?" Almost every newspaperman has been asked this question by strangers. The question has been asked of me many times since I came to the United States last September.

"Well, four million five hundred thousand or more—though I haven't exact data—," I answer. "What! Four million five hundred thousand?" everyone says. And after the figure is confirmed the questioner usually says, "Then, your paper would be the biggest daily in the world." I reply, "No, it isn't. I believe the *Daily Mirror* of London is the biggest and ours is the second or third largest." And I do not forget to add, "But, ours is not a sensational paper, it is a quality paper."

National newspapers having large circulations are characteristic of the Japanese Press. The circulation of the so-called Big Three, or national newspapers accounts for more than one-third of the total circulation of all 176 dailies in Japan. The Big Three are *Asahi Shimbun*, for which I work, *Mainichi Shimbun* and *Yomiuri Shimbun* (*Shimbun* is Japanese for "newspaper.") National newspapers are circulated in all parts of Japan. In America the *New York Times* is one of the national newspapers, but most of its circulation is concentrated in New York City and its vicinities and very little of it goes to other parts of the United States. On the contrary, the circulation of Japanese national newspapers is fairly well distributed throughout all parts of the country.

Other newspapers in Japan can be classified into two groups, so-called block newspapers and local newspapers. Block newspapers are circulated in several prefectures. (There are forty-six prefectures in all Japan. A prefecture is similar to a state.) Each major region has usually one strong block paper. Local or city papers are circulated primarily in one prefecture or town. The *Chubu Nippon Shimbun*, one of the block newspapers, has a circulation of nearly 970,000, and *Tokushima Shimbun*, one of the local newspapers, publishes approximately 120,000 copies. The total newspaper circulation in Japan is 34,200,000 and Japan's population is about 89,280,000. Therefore the ratio of the circulation to the population is 1:2.6.

Hisashi Maeda is on the staff of *Asahi Shimbun*. He is now at Harvard as an associate Nieman Fellow, one of the first two such newspaper fellowships, sponsored by the Asia Foundation. This paper was his contribution to the weekly discussions of the Nieman Fellows of their own newspapers.

The Japanese national newspaper is a large enterprise. For example, when the *Asahi Shimbun* was founded in 1879 it published only vernacular dailies, but now it publishes, besides Japanese dailies, *Asahi Evening News* (an English daily), *Shukan Asahi* (similar to *Time* or *Newsweek*), *Asahi Graph* (similar to *Life* or *Look*), *Asahi Sports* (sports news-weekly), *Shogakusei Asahi Shimbun* (a weekly for school children), *Nogyo Asahi* (agricultural monthly), *Kagaku Asahi* (scientific monthly), *Fujin Asahi* (women's interest monthly), *Asahi Camera* (photo art monthly), *Asahi Nenkan* (yearbook), *Shonen Asahi Nenkan* (yearbook for children), *Japan Quarterly* (in English), *This is Japan* (in English—annual), and many books.

Besides such publications the national newspapers handle cultural undertakings. They have public service departments. The departments were originally established to engage in publicity work aimed at getting more subscribers. However, today, their activities include general cultural and social undertakings, such as annual scientific and educational grants, awards for cultural achievements, occasional musical concerts, lectures, exhibitions, sports meets, dispatching of mobile medical teams, and collecting of contributions for disaster-stricken areas. The *Asahi Shimbun* is sponsoring the Japanese Expedition which will go to the Antarctic next year. Some of its own airplanes are now being readied for the expedition in Hokkaido, northernmost island of Japan. The larger Japanese newspapers have fleets of planes for speedy news coverage. One of the factors which have made the newspapers attach importance to such undertakings as these is the fierce competition for circulation.

This might give you the impression that the economic position of Japanese newspapers is fairly good. But it is not.

One of the Japanese newspaper industry's weaknesses lies in its huge debts, usually more than its own capital. Another is the decreasing margin of profit, resulting from the fact that the subscription remained at a relatively low level until September 1954, despite the rising cost of newsprint, because of the intense competition.

Despite their unfavorable financial conditions, Japanese newspaper companies have continued a bitter circulation war, giving away premiums and free sample copies. Declining advertising revenue resulting from deflation dealt a hard blow to the newspaper industry and, as a result, newspapers raised subscription rates in September 1954 in the face of criticism from readers. Prices and subscription rates vary somewhat according to the number of pages per copy and the localities where the newspapers are published. However,

at present newspapers are generally sold at the following rates:

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------|
| Monthly subscription | |
| Morning and evening combined . . . | 330 yen |
| Morning or evening only | 200 yen |
| Single copy price | |
| Four or six pages | 5 yen |
| Eight pages or more | 7 yen |
| (360 yen equals \$1.00) | |

In Japan more income of the newspapers is derived from circulation than from advertising. As of the early part of 1954, the revenue of major national papers is divided as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Subscriptions | 57-60% |
| Advertising | 32-40% |
| Other publications, etc. | 3-10% |

During the early part of 1954, expenditures of leading national newspapers were as follows:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Personnel | 18-23% |
| Newsprint | 40-45% |
| Other materials | 2-3% |
| News-gathering and other editorial expenses | 9-12% |
| Miscellaneous expenses | 20-40% |

The profit rate of newspapers as a percentage of their capital was 5.3% in the first half of 1954, while profit rates of other industries such as the cement, paper pulp and electric appliance industries were between 13.36 and 19.4 per cent.

Approximately 95 percent of the total circulation of Japanese dailies is home-delivered. The remaining 5 percent is sold at newsstands or delivered by mail. In Watertown, Mass., where I am living this year I see newspaper boys hurl their papers at the doors as they ride along on their bicycles. And so in stormy days the papers get awfully wet. In Japan boys are kinder. They put your papers inside your door or in the mailboxes. Larger Japanese newspaper companies employ distribution agencies, and the work of newspaper boys sometimes affects circulation. One agency distributes only one national newspaper.

The *Asahi Shimbun* publishes dailies not only in Tokyo, but also in Osaka, Kokura and Nagoya. The newspapers are circulated in all parts of Japan. Besides maintaining offices in the four cities where it publishes, the *Asahi* has more than 300 branch offices throughout Japan. This news network is larger than that of *Kyodo News Service*, Japan's largest news agency, with which the Big Three newspapers are not affiliated. The *Asahi* subscribes to the Associated Press, Reuters, Agence France Presse, *New York Times*, *The Times* (London), North American Newspaper Alliance, Pan-Asian Newspaper Alliance, *China News*, Press Trust of India, Korean Press, Soviet News, Radiopress and

some others. We have staff correspondents in New York, Washington, San Francisco, Honolulu, London, Paris, Bonn, Istanbul, New Delhi, Singapore, Hongkong, Taipei and Seoul.

Each of the national newspapers employs about 6,700 workers, of whom around 25 per cent are in the editorial offices. Many foreign newspapermen visiting Japan have been surprised at the number of workers and have suggested that we should reduce the number of employees. However, the trade union is continually complaining that employees have too much to do. The management is trying to cut staff by not replacing men who die or retire. It is also moving employees from the less busy positions to more important and busier ones.

In the editorial department of the Tokyo main office of the *Asahi*, under the managing editor and the assistant managing editor, are the following sections: editing (copy desk); political; economic; social (human interest and police news); foreign news; local news; sports; communications (domestic telegraph news); photography; proof-reading; reference (morgue); arts and sciences; article examination; survey of public opinion; radio and television news; general affairs; and two others.

Each of these sections has usually one editor, three to six assistant editors, and fifteen to eighty staff members. There are nearly thirty editorial writers, more than half of whom work in the Tokyo main office. They are not under the managing editor, but under the chief editorial writer, who is a director of the company.

Reporters of more than ten years' experience are considered full-fledged journeymen. For example, in the foreign news section of the *Asahi* the average experience is fifteen years, and the youngest member has been on the job for five years. Assistant editors (assistant chiefs of the sections) have generally about twenty years' experience.

In Japan young people who want to be newspaper reporters usually have to take entrance examinations given by the newspapers. Professors of journalism in Japanese universities feel that the way to improve the newspaper is to employ young men who have had superior professional training. However, the newspaper management considers the best classroom for newspaper reporters is the editorial room. Arguments about the entrance examinations continue, between the professors, who insist on the importance of professional education, and the newspaper managements, which contend that a general education is sufficient for a person to become a reporter. Neither side has come up with a formula that is entirely satisfactory.

Of the students who were to graduate from colleges in the spring of 1955, approximately 1,800 took the entrance exami-

nations of the *Mainichi Shimbun*, but only ten were accepted. This shows the difficulty in finding employment in Japan and why most of the college graduates rush to get jobs in the offices of the central government, big companies, banks and other large organizations.

Applicants for newspaper jobs have to pass a written examination which includes writing a digest of a complicated speech, composition of a theme, translation from foreign languages to Japanese and a news quiz. Those who got good grades on the written examination take an oral examination, and then a rigid physical examination. Only those who passed those three examinations are accepted—on trial. Most of the cubs are assigned to branch offices after about six months' training in one of the main offices. Lucky young reporters come back to the main office after several years' training in the branches.

Some people, however, enter newspaper work as a result of personal relations without taking regular entrance examinations. Others move onto a national newspaper from a local newspaper. It is interesting to note that such people occasionally are more successful than those who passed the rigid regular examinations.

Notwithstanding the fact that it is very hard to become a newspaperman in Japan, newspapermen are not well paid. The starting monthly salaries for college graduates are around 11,500 yen (nearly \$32), which is, however, a little more than the starting salaries of civil servants.

What is a newspaper worker's family budget like? Here is a sample case of a 32-year-old employee of a Tokyo newspaper (according to *The Japanese Press* 1955):

He has two dependents and draws a monthly salary amounting to 25,000 yen (nearly \$70). His household budget, estimated on the basis of a family budget survey conducted by the Statistical Bureau of the Prime Minister's Office in 1954, is as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|
| Total Monthly Income | 25,000 yen | |
| Deductions: | | |
| Taxes | 2,018 yen | |
| Social Security | 1,250 yen | 3,268 yen |
| Balance (take-home pay) | | 21,732 yen |
| Expenditures: | | |
| Food | 9,830 yen | (45.2%) |
| Housing | 1,700 yen | (7.8%) |
| Light and fuel | 980 yen | (4.5%) |
| Clothing | 2,300 yen | (10.6%) |
| Miscellaneous | 6,922 yen | (31.9%) |
| | 21,732 yen | |

It is probably surprising to Americans that 45 per cent of the income is spent on food. The budget shows that he spends 2,300 yen for clothing, but you must remember that he needs about 20,000 yen to buy a new suit, which

Americans can get for \$50. You can easily understand how hard it is for Japanese newspapermen to live.

In addition to the regular monthly salary, Japanese newspaper workers are generally paid two bonuses a year, each amounting to about one month's income. About 70 per cent of the bonus is used for clothing, housing, light and fuel expenses. Some people pay their debts with the bonuses.

Newspaper workers are unionized on a company-by-company basis. Therefore, the company-wide union comprises various types of workers—editorial staff, members of the business department, printers and others. There is no country-wide craft union such as a national typesetters' union or phototype workers' union.

About forty of the seventy-nine newspaper workers' unions, including a fairly large number of influential ones, are organized into the Congress of Newspaper Workers' Unions. Being only a federation of unions, however, it does not try to conclude a labor contract with any employer organization.

The Congress joined the General Council of Japanese Trade Unions, a 3,000,000-member national labor organization, in June, 1954. The largest labor group in Japan, the General Council of Japanese Trade Unions supports the Socialist Party, which is the second biggest political party in Japan.

Union-employer bargainings mostly center around pay increases. With the newspaper management in financial difficulties, wage increase negotiations are often deadlocked, but very few strikes take place. Both the management and the union usually work out a compromise at the last moment.

Foreign newspapermen visiting Japan invariably express surprise at the sight of typesetters picking up individual types one by one from among the thousands stacked on shelves. The reaction is quite natural, for typesetting has been the least advanced phase of the Japanese newspaper industry. The process of setting type by hand is inefficient and requires a tremendous amount of labor. A skilled worker can pick up thirty pieces of type a minute.

Impressed by the efficient operation of linotypes in foreign newspaper plants, Japanese publishers have long hoped to have similar machines set up in their composing rooms.

The Japanese language calls for more than 10,000 kanji (Chinese ideographs). Moreover, we use two other kinds of characters, katakana (the square form of syllabary) and hiragana (the cursive syllabary), each of which has forty-eight letters. This complexity of the language has

been the major factor which has retarded the mechanization of the typesetting process in Japan until recently.

Shortly after the end of the Second World War, however, the Japanese government took the bold step of cutting down the number of Chinese ideographs for common daily use to about 2,300.

This action made it possible for Japanese newspapers to undertake mechanization of the typesetting process. Mass production of practical monotype machines was started in 1951. The trend is toward mechanized typesetting not only for newspapers but for all other types of publications.

At one of the national newspaper offices in Tokyo, thirty-four monotype machine were in operation as of July, 1954, and these machines were turning out, on the average, 70 per cent of the paper's type setting. But at the same time more than 100 workers were still picking up type by hand at the above plant. However, publishers say that the time is not too far away when all typesetting for Japanese newspapers is done by monotype.

Let me say something about how we edit newspapers in Japan. National newspapers publish both morning and evening editions. The two editions are considered to be parts of one copy. In areas where evening papers can't be distributed on the day they are published, newspapers in which news of morning and evening editions is combined are distributed. National newspapers are distributed in two to four main offices, but all the foreign news and much of the domestic news originate in Tokyo offices. Foreign news is of course translated in the Tokyo main office. However, the managing editors in the offices are given a free hand to edit as they wish.

We publish about ten editions of our morning newspaper. The first edition goes to the areas furthest from the publishing office, and the tenth edition is the so-called city edition. There are four editions of evening papers. Nearly forty people are working on the copy desk. Besides them more than twenty employees are editing local sections (usually for each prefecture) of the morning papers. The first edition of evening papers is published around noon and the late city edition of morning papers around 3 a.m. That is to say, one edition comes out almost every hour. This is quite a job, but such methods continue because of the severe competition.

Let us look at the city editions of *Asahi Shimbun*, Tokyo, for a day in February, 1956, as samples.

Morning paper:

Page 1—National news, mostly political. Top of page 1 is for the top news of the day, since the deadline of the last evening paper. So it varies

as domestic politics, economic, international, accidents or sports. But cases in which the news of murders and accidents occupy the top are far fewer in Japanese newspapers than in American papers. Sports news comes to the top only for such important sports news as the Olympics. We do not jump stories in Japan. There are usually several pictures on every page.

Page 2—Editorial (one or two), international news and comment, news of human interest from abroad. Usually the news of international politics occupies the top of this page.

Page 3—Features, profile of a person in the news, essays by outside writers or readers, novel (one novel usually continues for several months or more), comments by columnists, letters from readers, answers furnished by the Information Bureau to the readers' questions. The features background big news stories.

Page 4—Economic news, domestic and overseas, and economic comment.

Page 5—Book review, comments on movies, plays and fine arts, radio and TV programs, college news, Go-Play (a Japanese game).

Page 6—Sports news, domestic and foreign, and sports comment.

Page 7—Police news, news of human interest, cartoons, obituaries of nationally prominent people.

Page 8—Local section: local news, weather forecast, notes of meetings, obituaries of locally prominent people, meetings, complaints or thanks from readers for public service facilities.

The editions which are distributed in each prefecture have one or several different local sections. These sections were established in order to compete with local newspapers.

Evening paper:

Page 1—International news, domestic political news, feature stories, essay written by an editorial writer, editorial paragraphs, and weather forecast.

Most of the overseas news usually comes in after the deadline of morning papers; so evening papers usually carry much important news from abroad, which often is the top news.

Page 2—Home section: novel for children, cooking, dressing, nursing, letters from women readers and Shogi (a kind of chess).

In recent years many women have been writing to newspapers, and this section provides a forum for them.

Page 3—Police news, news of human interest, cartoons and sports.

Page 4—Economic news, including transactions of stock markets, novel, radio and TV programs.

I hope the above gives you a rough idea of how we edit a newspaper. But you may ask how we would handle such an affair as Princess Margaret's romance. Well, we aren't dry and cold like the *Times* of London. We report what's going on. But the news isn't treated in a sensational way.

Japanese law prohibits the holding of stock in newspaper companies by persons not directly affiliated with newspaper work, in order to prevent newspapers from being influenced by special interests. On some newspapers even office-boys hold some stock: But of course most of the stock is held by the publishers and directors of the company.

Most of the newspapers declare that they are politically independent. However, there are differences of opinion among newspapers, even among national newspapers. Some are somewhat conservative and others are somewhat progressive. One of the interesting things is that some newspapermen from so-called progressive papers have become leaders of the conservative party in the past.

The Japanese press had long years of control, enforced by the Japanese government during the war and by the Allied Occupation after the war. Since April, 1952, however, when the Peace Treaty went into effect and Japan formally regained sovereignty, there has been no control of the editorial phase of the newspaper business.

But there seems to be some tendency on the part of the government to revive press control. A storm of protest was aroused from the press in March, 1954, when it was learned that the government was planning to enforce an anti-espionage law, ostensibly for the purpose of implementing a provision in the U.S.-Japan Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement, stipulating that Japan shall take steps for the preservation of secrets to be agreed upon by the two countries. On March 23, 1954, the government submitted an anti-espionage bill to the Diet. The Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association submitted to the Diet and the government a demand for revision of the bill. One of the reasons the press protested is that the phraseology of the bill tended to be ambiguous in many points and was liable to be abused by law-enforcement agencies to the detriment of the freedom of the press. However, the bill was enacted with minor revisions despite the strong public opinion against it. Fortunately, not a single case has arisen so far in which punishment has been imposed under this law.

The Care and Feeding of the Telegraph Editor

By John Dougherty

You're the editor of a daily newspaper in a medium-sized American city.

You're convinced the newspaper must do a better job of presenting the news of state, nation and world if your paper is to survive, to keep its READERS as well as its circulation.

That point has been made so well and so often that it bears repeating only as it introduces your problem:

Just whom do you get to do this better job of editing?

Where is this unheralded genius who will insure that your newspaper reports, interprets, and illustrates the news in a way that will catch the reader's swift-roving eye?

The chances are that the Answer to your problem was born about the time the problem was—three or four decades ago, when America awoke to its world power position, when the world began to shrink to its present size, that of the smallest Atom.

Mr. Answer has been in the newspaper business as reporter, copy reader, or whatever from three to twenty years. He may be working in your editorial department now. Probably he's already your telegraph editor.

Then when do you start getting a better product?

The time, sir, is up to you.

* * *

The Telegraph Editor is made, not born.

Nobody ever walked into your office fresh out of college and said he wanted to learn to be telegraph editor. Like everybody else (including you), the telegraph editor started out to be a Great Reporter. Perhaps he learned that the mastery of the techniques of his craft was good job insurance. Perhaps he filled in on the copy desk during somebody's vacation, and stayed because the slotman liked his work. Perhaps he's still a reporter.

Size up his qualities. Is he interested in reading anything in your paper that he didn't write himself? Does he ever read a book? Does he devour the New York *Times*' Review of the Week? There are a dozen other signs of the kind of intellect you want. If he's not a copy editor you'll have to train him as a copy reader first, of course, and maybe you'll make a half-dozen tries before you get the right man.

Now you have a man—either the capable, news-wise editor you had all the time, or a new one you've brought along yourself.

Now, give him his head.

John Dougherty is Telegraph Editor of the Rochester *Times-Union*. He is now on a Nieman Fellowship.

A Spot for the Individual

By Ed Hale

Don't freeze him into a deadly routine, a stereotyped formula of news display. This is the great danger. The wires clatter frantically 24 hours a day, and most of the copy has to go on the spike. If the Telegraph Editor becomes an automaton, only stirred to action when a dictator falls or a bomb goes off, he's not doing the job you need.

Don't let him become an i-dotter or a t-crosser.

Encourage him to ask "Why?" Let him pester the wire service for more of what he thinks you need.

Don't fret if he puts his feet up and reads a good out-of-town paper once in a while.

Urge him to use the tried and tested techniques—the locator map, the dramatic illustration, the indented type, the "selling" headline. Don't complain if he tries a new technique and it isn't letter perfect at first.

Let him think of the morrow—what well-displayed, worthwhile telegraph story does he have ready to put in if the day's wire report is dull?

Let him think of the moment, too. The morning headlines scream that Turkish rioters kill Greeks in return for an insult. Outside of your small proportion of Greek readers, who cares in the afternoon? Your Telegraph Editor doesn't have to be a well-informed diplomatic source to know that the Turks and the Greeks are Uncle Sam's Allies in the Near East. Your Telegraph Editor will re-do the wire dispatch to get into the first paragraph the fact that two United States Allies are involved in this affair. (If he did, he'd be 12 hours ahead of the wire services, who began writing their leads about the effect on the alliance for the next morning's papers.)

Allow the young man to be wrong now and again. If he lives in fear that he won't get every important story on Page 1 at the earliest possible hour, he'll so diffuse his efforts that your newspaper will never get out of its rut.

Urge him to use the resources of the city staff. Eliminate any artificial bar between telegraph and city desks. If your Telegraph Editor knows there's a Salk vaccine reporter or an amateur astronomer on the city staff, or a guy who's been to Burma, be sure he uses them.

Send the Telegraph Editor out some afternoon to interview the visiting diplomat. Maybe you'll be surprised at the result.

Send him on one of those trips to a Texas air base or a South American capital or the United Nations. The fresh air will help, and ideas breed well in fresh air.

Most of all, let him be Telegraph Editor and just that. Don't expect him to give your readers all they need to know about world affairs in between the times he's editing copy himself and writing headlines.

The ways in which the story of the news can best be told haven't all been tried. Perhaps your Telegraph Editor will come up with an answer. Good luck!

As the population booms, as the gross national product bounds through the billions and as the cult of the guided missile vies with that of the brickbat, the newspaper stands out—unique. While the production line turns out ciphers, the newsroom still is the place where the work of the individual gets the headlines.

The variety of the provincial press puts a premium on the guy with his own way of going. Because the U.S. has no national press or single newspaper that is read by everyone everywhere, there's plenty of room for differences on the provincial press. That's the press with overlapping interests and interconnected wire services. You know it.

From Bangor to San Diego. From Newark to San Francisco, Miami to Seattle. And all the points in between—Abilene, Oak Ridge, Lead, Shamokin and Punxsutawney. In skyscraper lobbies, in crossroad stores and on the nation's doorsteps, you find a newspaper—a newspaper that covers a region and is read by hometowners.

Reporters, editors, circulation men, the advertising staff, the printers, the stereotypers, the pressmen, the mailers, copy boys, executives, truck drivers, Frank in the back shop and Mary on the switchboard. They're the lazy, the bright, the stupid, the eager and the talented. They're the men and women of the provincial press.

More than 1700 newspapers, bought daily by more than 56,000,000 readers: The Hour, The Day, The Breeze. The Chronicle, The News, The Times and The Tribune. The Echo, The Beacon and The Blade. The Pantagraph and The Nonpareil. The World, The Globe, The Star and The Sun. The Union and The Capital. The Sentinel, The Vindicator, The Advocate, The Pioneer, The Citizen, The Reporter, The Statesman, The American, The Patriot. The Democrat, The Republican, the Freeman. The Rocket and The Headlight. The Repository and The Mercury. The Banner and The Item. The Mirror, The Reflector, The Quill and The Camera. The Call and The Clarion.

That's the provincial press with mastheads of tradition, hope and hyphens flying. As wide and as broad as America, the press probes the vitals blaring and hinting with bias and objectivity, with fact and fancy, with guts and hypocrisy. The greatest press the world has ever known, it's hated and loved and not feared much anymore. There's a fair shake for some and a bum deal for others. Called its own worst enemy and the champion of the people, a market-place and an ivory tower. The provincial press is a contradiction that eats its own words. It's a \$100-a-week job and a sacred trust.

But most of all, the provincial press is the province of

the individual. It's where the lone reporter can stand out. It's where the big job needs to be done by little guys who know they'll never become a James Reston.

These are the ordinary newsmen who put their heads on the chopping block every time an edition rolls. The best refuse to compromise to keep the ax from falling. They write the story as they see it, not as they think the boss, the literary critic or the public want him to write. The best newsman writes for no one but himself.

The reporter, however, has to accept the past—the framework, the disciplines and the rules of the business. Rules don't bother the best poets in their craft; they take the age-old style book, poke around a bit and come up with something that has never been phrased so precisely. The newsman can do the same thing with his headlines, deadlines and stereotypes—if he cares enough. If he cares enough to avoid the Christmas handout, lethargy (his own and his paper's), and the cynicism of the crowd who only work for the paycheck. The reporter will remain his own man if he keeps his threshold of indignation low and doesn't grow a turtle's shell as the years pass. And the best men usually care enough to stay out of the side pocket of the local pool. There's a long list, but each reporter and editor has to find his own code. No one else's will do.

In provincial newspapers, there are a lot of restrictions and some compromises. That I'm sure about. I'm sure everybody else is, too, since it's a major topic of conversation. But I'm also sure about another point that receives little notice. The provincial press is a fine place for a free mind. A lot of drudgery gets in the way. You may work 90 per cent of the time on the routine until you come to the 10 per cent that makes the job worthwhile. But even full time, it's a search for truth and accuracy. That, it seems to me, is no mean way to spend your time.

The provincial press is the place for workers who like a good fight now and then. Whether it's with the boss over a story that should be written or with someone trying to hide facts, the chance comes often to strike a blow for what counts in life.

These rather random thoughts are probably obvious. But at Harvard I've met some talented young men who believe the newspaper field is limited. No room for a good fighter. Many want the law school or the business school. They painfully explain that newspapering sounds like good fun, but they want the good fight.

Maybe so. But I can't think of a better place to wage a battle for what's good in life than on a newspaper. I doubt if the businessman with his production line or the lawyer in probate court gets more satisfaction than the general assignment reporter. On the other hand, if it's money these young men are after, I wish they'd say so. Actually, though, a newspaperman's pay isn't too bad these days.

Then, too, there's the wire-service man in the line bureau and the bright young man on the *Buffalo News* writing obits, waiting for his chance. And there are all the newsmen trying to pay off a \$10,000 mortgage, loving their jobs and seeing a future that's not too bright.

They should remember, now and then, that they are in the front lines of American life. They're on their own in a lone sort of job. They don't fit a wrench to a bolt, but they do work where the tradition of the individual counts high. In fact, newspapering is the province of the individual.

The spot where **Mr. Hale's** individualism flourishes is the *Buffalo Evening News*. He's stoking up for the job now on a Nieman Fellowship.

Havana Havoc: Too Many Dailies

Subsidies Corrupt Crowded Cuban Journalism

By Marvin Alisky

In the United States in recent years, observers of newspaperdom have moaned: "Too few dailies." In the Republic of Cuba, the cry has been the opposite: "Too many dailies."

Whereas a decrease in the number of dailies has maintained fiscal health—and hence reportorial health—among the surviving papers in the U.S., an increase in the number of dailies has denied the same benefits to the numerous competitors in Cuba.

Havana could support five dailies decently, yet is saddled with more than a dozen others (excluding the need for at least one Chinese-language and one English-language daily). The Latin American tradition of pamphleteering is responsible.

Havana has a population of one million, and twenty-one daily newspapers. New York, with more than nine times as many inhabitants as Havana, cannot support anywhere near that number of dailies. London has twenty-three daily and Sunday newspapers, but London has more than nine times the population of Havana; metropolitan London has twelve times the population. Furthermore, a majority of London's papers are national in circulation, whereas only a few of Havana's are.

Moreover, London's newspapers do not have the broadcasting competitors that Havana's do. The British seeker of broadcasts has but three choices on his radio dial (the three BBC services) and but two on his video dial (BBC-TV and the new Independent TV Authority channel). Of the five networks, only the ITA competes with British newspapers for advertising accounts, though all five services offer news in their bid for circulation.

By contrast, Havana has the most competitive broadcasting market of any city in the world: thirty-two standard or AM (550 to 1600 kilocycles) radio stations, five television stations. In the world-wide realm of radio, only Mexico City—with twenty-nine standard stations plus shortwave and FM outlets—comes close to duplicating Havana's competitive market. In the realm of television, of all the cities in the world,

only New York and Los Angeles—with seven TV stations each—have more competing channels than Havana has.

The island of Cuba runs 800 miles in length, only twenty-five to 135 miles in width. The republic's population totals six million. Five-sixths of these reside away from the national capital and no other Cuban city is one-fourth as large as Havana.

A few of the leading radio stations—such as CMQ and *Radio Progreso*—maintain networks of local affiliates covering the entire republic. The two most powerful Cuban transmitters among AM stations, *Radio Progreso* with 50,000 watts and CMQ with 25,000 watts, can reach most of the island's communities even without hooking up their provincial affiliates. But most radio stations of the capital must rely on a Havana primary audience. The eighty-five non-Havana radio stations serving the provinces attest to that fact. A few Havana stations utilize shortwave duplicators to capture a national audience, but the scarcity of Cuban shortwave receivers in homes limits the effectiveness of that effort.

The solutions open to so many radio competitors for the advertising dollar and the Havana audience are principally two: (1) low advertising rates, and (2) specialized programming. The latter trend has resulted in one Havana station airing nothing but news headlines, weather reports, and the correct time. Another station schedules mostly programs dealing with sports. Only the handful of leading stations indulge in a wide variety of programs within their own schedules.

One of the five Havana television stations, CMQ-TV, has satellite transmitters in four provincial cities: Matanzas, Santa Clara, Camagüey, and Santiago. A competitor, *Televisión Nacional*, has one satellite in Santa Clara, making the total number of Cuban TV stations ten, though five of the transmitters merely repeat Havana programs via microwave and film.

Actually, Havana may not be able to support more than three television competitors. One of the stations, CMBF-TV, is owned by the company which owns CMQ-TV. The CMQ organization utilizes the second channel as an outlet for feature-length motion pictures. CMQ-TV itself is too crowded with a variety of offerings, including news, to squeeze many movie-theater films into its scarce open-time segments.

Marvin Alisky is assistant professor of journalism at Indiana University. He has had personal experience besides professional studies of Cuban journalism. Readers may recall his earlier contributions, "TV News Format," July, 1951, and "Mexico's National Hour on Radio," October, 1953.

The fifth and newest television station, Channel Ten, will try to succeed where Channel Eleven, CMTV, failed. The former "fifth" station went on the air in November 1953, and by August 1954 CMTV had gone bankrupt and was off the air. Neither the available advertising nor audience could be stretched enough to support the original fifth TV station.

Even ignoring the magazines and weekly newspapers published in Havana, as well as the radio-television competitors for advertising and circulation, the twenty-one daily newspapers of the Cuban capital constitute a highly competitive market among themselves.

Two of the Havana dailies are Chinese-language evening newspapers, removed from the competition for Spanish-language readers but not from the competition for advertisers. Havana's Chinese colony represents an attractive market to various advertisers.

Two of the Havana dailies are English-language newspapers, though one, the *Havana Post*, goes beyond its resident-American readership to encroach a little upon the generalized circulation as well as the specialized.

Of the remaining seventeen Havana dailies, the "big three" are *Diario de la Marina*, *El Mundo*, and *Información*. These three lead in circulation, number of pages per edition, number of column inches of advertising, size of physical plant, and number of employees. The remaining fourteen Havana dailies are relatively small in each of these aspects, compared with the three leaders.

With a bulk of the available advertising revenue captured by the big three and four runners-up, the remaining papers survive on subsidies or perish. The total number of Havana dailies in recent years has remained about twenty, but the names of the papers trailing in circulation change periodically.

The smallest Havana dailies are sheets which appear for a few months or a year or two, then disappear, having drained off a few readers and advertisers who could better have supported the more substantial newspapers struggling against the ever-tempting governmental subsidy.

The larger publishers have told me they frankly hope for the removal of the circulation trailers so that the circulation leaders can be free from subsidy offers.

The *latino* pamphleteer launches a newspaper to serve a cause, usually one political party or point of view. Once the cause or the money behind it wanes, the newspaper stops publishing.

Cuban political minorities insure the continuation of the smaller Havana dailies. The government of President Batista also offers subsidies to any newspaper which will accept it. And since the government subsidies usually are larger than the political-minority outsiders' offers, pro-

Batista journalists can be found even among the circulation leaders.

When visiting Americans discover there is no official press censorship in Cuba and thereafter assume the existence of a vigorously independent press, they are mistaken. The Batista regime, like the administration before it for several years, relies not on the big stick but the big carrot, not the jailing of editors but the outright bribing of them. The system is called *botella* (bottle) handouts, though such subsidies are in money and not liquor.

Diario de la Marina, founded in 1832, the oldest daily in Latin America in continuous publication, prides itself on its topflight reporting and makeup. Its competitors charge that *Marina's* inclusion of a rotogravure section daily hints at subsidy, considering Havana advertising rates. The same charge is leveled at *Información*, which also has a rotogravure section every day. With less dignity, a shorter history, and fewer pages of encyclopedic coverage, *Información* sounds less convincing than does *Marina* when both answer their competitors' charges. With the exception of *El Mundo*, most of the competitors are hardly on solid ground themselves, proverbially being far blacker pots than the leading kettles they attack when approaching U. S. international advertisers.

Even if governmental subsidies reach only those newspapers trailing the circulation leaders, individual reporters from all papers may well be tempted. The number of newspapers and broadcasting stations which make up the Havana media spectrum simply keep individual newsmen's salaries low.

That a professional journalist may be bought is more tragic in Cuba than in many other Latin American republics without Havana's professional-level of journalism. Cuban newsmen have a closed shop. The only way to receive working papers as a journalist is to graduate from the Marquez Sterling School of Journalism, a dependency of the national Ministry of Education. Created by presidential decree in 1942, the school's instruction in journalistic technique maintains professional standards advocated by U.S. schools of journalism. The only other centers of journalism-technique instruction of similar standards in all of Latin America can be found in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela. (Mexico's national university awarded its first journalism degree in January 1956, though previously trade-school level journalism instruction has been available in Mexico.) In a few other Latin American centers journalism instruction can be found, such as in Guatemala, Ecuador and Colombia, but the emphasis is upon social sciences rather than U.S.-style editing and reporting techniques. Thus Cuba is one of the seven republics, out of twenty Latin American nations, which provide extensive

training in what Americans consider professional journalistic writing.

Not that the Havana training is limited to techniques. Ethical principles are preached by the sincere faculty, even though they are fighting a losing battle at least in regard to those graduates who begin work for the smaller Havana dailies. Or for those who begin work on a provincial paper, governmental bribes are easily available. In addition to the twenty-one Havana dailies, provincial Cuba has thirty-four daily newspapers.

If reform of Cuban journalism is to take place, Cuba must support fewer than fifty-five dailies, Havana fewer than twenty-one. The nucleus for a truly admirable press exists: the school of journalism and the law requiring each new journalist to be trained in the techniques of his medium. Will journalistic reform usher in political reform or must the former result from the latter?

People Do Read About Science

By Harold A. Klein

A pilot study of the public interest in science news was carried out by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan among 200 people of varying backgrounds. It was sponsored by the National Association of Science Writers and New York University, with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. More than half of the interviews were taken in metropolitan Chicago and the rest in two rural counties in upstate New York—Onondaga and Cortland.

"A survey of 200 people does not, of course, provide conclusive evidence, but it is extensive enough to be interesting," said Hillier Kriehbaum, associate professor of journalism at NYU and chairman of the NASW surveys committee. "These 200 people did not represent the nation at large. But their answers are valuable as indications of the replies that might be expected in a national survey of how people feel about science, scientists, and science news. Encouraged by the results of the pilot study, the NASW now will seek funds to finance such future research."

In the survey of 200 individuals, about three-fourths said they read science news and about one-fourth said they read all the science news printed by their local newspapers.

The question was asked, "Would you be interested in having more science news and information presented in your local paper, or do you think there is enough now?" Almost half of the 200 wanted more such coverage. Many suggested that other types of news, including sports and society items, be curtailed to make room for wider science coverage.

One-third of those questioned had attended college. The

better educated are more likely to read science news and prefer more extensive coverage. Those who have had courses in some field of science while in high school or college are especially avid science readers. Farm dwellers among the 200 are less interested than city dwellers, but differences in age and income seem to have no relation to a desire for science news.

The researchers found that the avid reader with intellectual preferences is the person most likely to want more science in his paper, but there were not many people of this type in the group of 200. Most of the people interviewed are occasional or indifferent readers, but even these expressed some interest in more news in science. It seems likely, the researchers concluded, that there is a potential for growth of the science audience at many levels of readership. The size of this potential and its focus of interest could not be determined on the limited basis of the pilot study.

More than half of those interviewed said they are satisfied with the current presentation of science news. Those who are not satisfied had these suggestions: make the language and explanation simpler, try for greater accuracy, avoid sensationalism, give more details, use visual aids, and write more follow-up stories.

Almost all of the 200—all but three—had read about the Salk vaccine for polio. The most common subject of non-medical science reading, the survey showed, is the atomic bomb. The most widely read items of psychological news concern mental health.

The avid reader of newspapers or magazines was found to be also a heavy science reader, but this possible relationship between sheer quantity of "news intake" and science reading does not seem to hold for radio and television. Those who listen frequently to radio apparently do not read science more or less than others. On the other hand, TV fans seem to read less science news than others.

The researchers conclude that perhaps members of the avid TV audience are not the kind of people who would read a lot even if there were no competing medium. But, they add, it may also be—as other studies have shown—that television is seen chiefly as entertainment and not as a news source.

Those who depend most on magazines and television are more satisfied than others with the science news they get, the survey showed. And science readership is greater the more the reader depends on magazines as his major source of science news.

According to the survey, television does not yet appear to play a large role in transmitting science news to the major portion of any level of science readers. But the pilot study suggests, the researchers say, that TV is a potentially important means of communicating science information.

Prospectus for an Editorial Page

By Julius Duscha

Editorial pages are better than they used to be, but they are still not good enough. Experts in typography have streamlined the pages. Horizontal make-up has replaced vertical. There is more white space. There are more cartoons, more maps, more pictures. The pages no longer look exactly the same day after day after day. The editorials are set in larger type. Editorial writers have met Rudolph Flesch, the man who has tried to reduce readability to a science. But underneath the new wrappings are the same old shallow editorials and syndicated columnists. At best, the editorials are uninspired; at worst, juvenile. Most editorials are still as badly written as most sports columns. On many papers the syndicated columnists still get printed as automatically as the weather ear. On many papers only a linotype operator and the proof room read the columnists before they are published; the editor of the page is too busy, or too lazy, to read let alone edit them.

A book and a speech have prompted these observations. The book is a revised edition of *Editor and Editorial Writer* by A. Gayle Waldrop, director of the College of Journalism at the University of Colorado (Rinehart & Co. Inc., New York). The speech was made by Max Freedman, Washington correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian*, to the 1955 meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers and printed in the January, 1956, issue of *Nieman Reports*. Both Professor Waldrop and Mr. Freedman examine critically the editorial pages of American newspapers.

A newspaperman, and an editorial writer in particular, will find much inspiration in *Editor and Editorial Writer*, a textbook for journalism school classes in editorial writing. There are excellent chapters on the purpose of an editorial page. There are glimpses into some of the offices which produce the great editorial pages. There are discussions of columnists, cartoons, letters to the editor and public opinion polls.

But anyone who has read a cross-section of American editorial pages, not just the handful of great ones, wonders whether Professor Waldrop has been looking at the same editorial pages that the vast majority of newspaper subscribers read, or, rather, skip over. In the 498 pages of the book Professor Waldrop mentions the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* 98 times, or on one of every five pages. The Washington *Post* is referred to 56 times; the New York *Times* 53 times; the Milwaukee *Journal*, 39; the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, 38; the Des Moines *Register & Tribune*,

34. Professor Waldrop turns again and again to the handful of great editorial pages for examples of good editorials because, one imagines—no, one knows—it is such a difficult, indeed, almost hopeless, task to find good editorials in the rest of the newspapers. This is a tribute to the great editorial pages, but, whether intentional or not, it is also a devastating comment on the majority of American editorial pages.

Mr. Freedman found, after examining fifty American editorial pages, that "nearly all papers fulfill the role of local leadership with high distinction." But he also found "intellectual impoverishment" when editorial writers tried to discuss such issues as the Dixon-Yates contract, desegregation, negotiations with Russia and Communist China, East-West trade and the United Nations.

Professor Waldrop's book is pleasant reading. He knows what makes a good editorial page; he knows good writing, and writes well himself. But, unfortunately, Professor Waldrop's book leaves the reader with the impression that American editorial pages are pretty good. Perhaps they are, but they are not good enough. Mr. Freedman's criticism was helpful as far as it went.

All right, so editorials are badly written, unconvincing, uninteresting. So all too many newspapers still use five to six columns of their editorial pages as a dumping ground for syndicated columnists and features ranging from Washington commentators and popular psychologists to poor verse and tired jokes. Examples? Turn to the editorial page of the newspaper published in your own city. If you are fortunate enough to live in one of the few cities which has one of the great editorial pages, you can find at your out-of-town news stand the typical editorial pages that are under discussion here.

But enough of this destructive criticism. This is beginning to sound like an editorial. What should a good editorial page be?

The editorial page to be outlined here could be put out by one full-time editorial writer, with assistance from the paper's copy desk and help from other staff members who are particularly qualified to write occasional editorials. Two full-time editorial writers would of course be better.

On this editorial page the first three columns would be reserved for editorials, the other five for whatever material the editor thought would best background and interpret the news. Both the editorials and the backgrounding and interpreting would be heavy on local, state and regional news, but not to the exclusion of national and international news.

There would be no "must" features on this page. Each

Julius Duscha writes editorials for the Lindsay-Schaub papers in Illinois. He is now on a Nieman Fellowship.

day the editor would start out with a clear page. He would not simply fill in the few blank spaces left after the Washington columnists, the psychologist, the poems and the other standard features that have made editorial pages so dreary were placed in their accustomed positions.

There would be from one to six editorials on the page each day. A single editorial would be used only on those days when the newspaper was setting forth its opinions on an extremely complicated, and important, subject. Some days there might be six short editorials. Again, that would depend on the way the news was running. Usually there would be three or four editorials. One of them would be about a problem in the city where the newspaper is published. Another would deal with state and regional matters. The rest would be about national and international news. At least a couple of times a week there would be a "vest-pocket" essay, good-humored comment on customs and mores. The editorials would not exclude matters in such fields as science, literature, sociology, psychology and amusements as proper subjects for comment.

Most important of all, the editorials would express a point of view. The other five columns of the page would be available for backgrounding and interpreting the news. If an editorial fails to express a viewpoint, it has not fulfilled its purpose.

The editorials would of course have to be well-written, interesting. No matter how attractive an editorial page looks, it will not be read unless it is well-written.

Illustrations would not be barred from the editorial columns, as they still are on most papers. Pictures, cartoons, maps, drawings would be used with the editorials whenever possible.

The straight backgrounding and interpreting that would be banned from the editorial space would be the principal content of five columns of the page.

Syndicated columnists would not be barred from these five columns, but they would not be assured of a nesting place where they could lay their eggs and squawk day in and day out. If a columnist were good, if his column helped illuminate some aspect of the news, he would be used. If it was one of his bad days, if his column was the same old cacophony of words signifying nothing but his prejudices, the column would not be used. The columnists would be fighting for position on the editorial page along with everything else on the editor's desk each day.

In addition to the columnists which the newspaper buys the editor of the editorial page would find on his desk every day all the background material which has been received from the wire services and the other news and feature agencies to which the newspaper subscribes. There is little space for such background or interpretive pieces on the news pages of most newspapers today. There is hardly

enough room for the hard news of the day. But on the editorial page there would be five columns every day crying out for stories illuminating the news.

Also on the editor's desk would be occasional interpretive stories written by members of the news staff of the paper. These would be about local, state and regional matters. There also should be interpretive pieces written by the editor of the editorial page.

Then of course there would be the morning mail—letters to the editor, the handouts, the reprints from the magazines and from other newspapers, the Congressional Record.

From his pockets the editor would pull clippings and notes from last night's reading. Perhaps he was reading a new book that helps to make the news more understandable and which can be reviewed for the page, or from which excerpts can be printed. In his top left-hand drawer would be other reading he has liked.

From all this material the editor would be able to fashion five columns of interpretive matter far more interesting than the fare of columnists that is now offered on most editorial pages. Some days there would be only one or two interpretive articles on the page, but more often there would be three or four, illustrated with pictures, maps and cartoons.

But would not all this be an impossible task for an editor? Challenging, yes, but not impossible. The selection of articles for the five columns of interpretation should not take more than an hour at the beginning of the editor's day. The copy-reading, headline-writing and make-up for these five columns would be done, not by the editorial writer, but by the newspaper's experts in those fields, the copy readers. The editor of the editorial page would only have to give the copy editor a general idea of how the page should look. The newspaper's library staff would seek out the needed illustrations for the editorial page. The editor of the page would have the rest of his day for reading, research and writing.

There is no magic formula here. The one indispensable prerequisite is a publisher determined to make the best possible use of the eight columns of expensive newsprint which he sets aside each day for an editorial page. A good editorial writer may come a little higher than a winded, foot-sore reporter pensioned off to an editorial-writing desk. But a good editorial page editor is the difference between an editorial page that is read, and has influence, and a page that is skipped over in the reader's quest for the sports pages and the comics.

This, then, is a plea for a well-written and well-edited as well as an interesting looking editorial page. This means editorials which express a point of view and editorial pages which background and interpret the news, which serve as something more than a roost for columnists.

Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire

By Lawrence G. Weiss

This is an abbreviation of a much longer article in the Colorado Quarterly February, 1956

During his first week as publisher of the *Denver Post* in February, 1946, Palmer Hoyt walked over to one of his editors and asked abruptly, "Which Denver radio station calls itself 'The Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire?'"

"None," said the editor. "I've never heard it before."

"Then put it on the front page," Hoyt ordered. "Put it on the nameplate on the front page of the *Denver Post* tomorrow."

In February of this year, the *Post* will have completed ten years as "The Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire" and the handiwork of a publisher who wants it to be great. It is time to take stock of its success and failure, to see how far it has come and how far it still has to go. It is time to ask what kind of voice the Rocky Mountain Empire has and what that voice is saying to the *Post's* readers.

A ten-year balance sheet of good and bad at the *Post* must be strongly weighted in Hoyt's favor. When he took over, the *Post* was underequipped, understaffed, out-of-date, and undistinguished in news coverage, makeup, typography, and fairness. Despite a few brilliant staff members, it was a thoroughly undistinguished newspaper. Today it is one of the nation's better afternoon dailies, one that no city need be ashamed of. It has not attained the stature of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* or the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, but it can stand up well in most other competition. It is far more responsible, reliable and public-spirited than any of the afternoon newspapers of New York City.

Before Hoyt made it the voice of an empire, the *Post* had played a number of equally pretentious roles against the backdrop of a tawdry and tempestuous West. During four decades under Harry H. Tamm and Frederick G. Bonfils, it had been "Your Big Brother," "The Paper with a Heart and Soul," and "The Best Newspaper in the U. S. A." For a long time it was known in Denver as "The Bucket of Blood on Champa Street."

The historian, Frank L. Mott, has called the old *Post* "the yellowest of the yellow journals." Its huge red headlines trumpeted the sensationalism of the day, crusaded for worthy and unworthy causes, maligned public officials, preachers and businessmen who refused to advertise. Its publishers were shot at, accused of blackmail, and hauled into court on libel charges. One of them was condemned by the Committee on Ethics of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Prof. Weiss teaches journalism at the University of Colorado. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1948-49.

The *Post* dropped pennies into the street and sounded off on sirens to draw attention to itself. It sponsored circuses, train rides, and beauty contests. In its news columns, it solved crimes, tried suspects, found men innocent or guilty without bothering to wait for the police and the jury. Color was the dominant motif. "We're yellow," Tamm said, "but we're read, and we're true blue."

A kind of twilight lassitude had settled over the newspaper by the time Hoyt came to Denver in 1946. After the deaths of Tamm (1924) and Bonfils (1933), the *Post* had lost much of its exuberance and daring. The headlines still blared and the circus makeup on page one still looked like a purposeless patchwork. But the tone was more subdued, the spirit was tamer, the enterprise was missing. Like the West itself, the *Post* was settling down and losing its frontier vigor.

The paper's mediocrity helped to accentuate Hoyt's achievements. Within a year, there was word of a sweeping change, a "Hoyt revolution."

Among countless major and minor fruits of the Hoyt revolution at the *Post*, three appeared to be the most lasting and important.

A fair and vigorous editorial page, one of the *Post's* strongest assets, was founded by Hoyt in 1946. In the beginning under Fred Colvig and during the last three years under Robert Lucas, the editorials have been strong, clear, and pointed. They meet issues head on. They take unequivocal stands. They reason rather than rant. They say plainly what the *Post* thinks about the affairs of Denver and the Rocky Mountain Empire, the affairs of Washington and the world.

Hoyt interferes very little with the *Post's* editorial policy, although presumably he would if it departed too far from its liberal Republican line. He can count on Lucas to support internationalism, free trade, and a policy of strength towards the Russians; to fight McCarthyism and defend civil liberties; to urge federal aid for Western development; to oppose demagoguery in both parties and to end up backing the Eisenhower administration on a majority of issues.

Although the *Post* has been a spirited supporter of Eisenhower from the beginning, it is occasionally unwilling to follow the Eisenhower party line. This has led to some estrangement between Hoyt and his old golfing and fishing friend, Dwight Eisenhower; but Hoyt is determined to stick to his guns. When the *Post* thinks the President is wrong, the *Post* is going to say so. It has said so on offshore oil, on the Eisenhower loyalty program, on Dixon-Yates

and, most of all, on the Administration's power and reclamation policies. In its clash with the Administration on power and reclamation, the *Post* has called for the dismissal of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. Hoyt knows the *Post's* criticism has angered the White House palace guards and all but shut him off from the President's counsel, but it's a price he's prepared to pay for his newspaper's editorial integrity.

A good separation of news and opinion is another Hoyt achievement at the *Post*. When the newspaper moved into a new \$6,000,000 plant in 1951, Hoyt took the occasion to re-emphasize the basic tenet of his journalistic credo:

"It is the belief of the *Denver Post* that slanted journalism, the practice of mixing news and editorial opinions, is dishonest and should be relegated to the dead past.

"We wish to say again that you will find our news in the news columns, our editorials in our editorial columns. And it is our pledge that we will never attempt by emphasis, omission or commission to mislead the public because of an editorial policy."

A strong capacity to resist pressure is the third major attribute Hoyt has given the *Post*. The one sure way to get Hoyt's dander up is to try to pressure him to change or omit a news story or an editorial policy. As some men collect hunting trophies, Hoyt collects lists of advertisers and pressure groups he has told to "go to Hell" when they tried to tamper with his newspaper. Both at the *Portland Oregonian* and at the *Post*, Hoyt built a reputation as a man who won't be pushed around. A businessman who threatens to remove his advertising unless Hoyt keeps out a news story is likely to find the story on page one.

There have been other fruits of the Hoyt revolution at the *Post*, but the three discussed above have been the most important in lifting the *Post* out of the large class of run-of-the-mill papers in the nation. A critic of Hoyt in Denver makes light of these accomplishments of the *Post's* publisher, arguing that Hoyt ought not to be given medals for doing what every publisher ought to do anyway. Hoyt has no afternoon competition, the critic says, and that makes it a lot easier to be strong and independent. The fact is, however, that although every publisher ought to behave as Hoyt does in these three respects, many publishers don't. And even in monopoly towns, few have had the courage to defy advertisers as Hoyt has. Even fewer have had the principle to defy their friends.

Apart from the three major accomplishments, Hoyt's other advances—in typography, in makeup, in news coverage—have made the *Post* immeasurably better than it was, but not perceptibly better than most afternoon dailies. It is in these latter fields, particularly in the field of news coverage, that the Hoyt revolution has yet to be fulfilled.

The greatest failure of the *Denver Post* is in the area of news coverage, news editing, and news display. Here the *Post* measures up to the standards of most other papers, but it falls short of the greatness Hoyt is striving for. The *Post* is average, where it ought to be superb. The news department turns out an interesting and readable newspaper, but it fails in its high obligation to keep the Rocky Mountain Empire adequately informed. The voice of the Empire is not telling the people of the Empire what they need to know. A good deal of what it is telling them is trivial and unimportant.

All too frequently, Hoyt's *Denver Post* is found in the company of papers that put sensationalism above substance. While its man Eisenhower was pressing the Russians for agreement to avert atomic annihilation, the *Post* lead headlines were "CAB DRIVER ADMITS MURDER" on July 19, "STATE TRAFFIC KILLS FOUR" on July 20. On those days, wittingly or unwittingly, the *Post* was directing readers in the Rocky Mountain Empire to the murder confession and the accidents first. It was saying on those days: This is what the *Post* thinks is most important. (Besides that, it was ignoring, as it often does, the distinction between "CAB DRIVER ADMITS MURDER" and "POLICE SAY CAB DRIVER ADMITS MURDER," a distinction that should be as important in journalism as it is in law.)

If the *Post* too often offers the Empire crime and sensationalism in place of solid news, it does not do so consistently. Its emphasis shifts from day to day. Hoyt argues that the choice of lead stories is meant to tell the reader not only what the *Post* thinks is important, but also what the *Post* thinks is interesting. He says his editors are constantly balancing interest against importance, "but the front page has got to be interesting, if we're going to sell any newspapers."

The problem of balancing interest and importance lies at the heart of the *Post's* difficulty with the news. It has substantial bearing on each of the following items, which must be listed on the debit side in any fair balance sheet of the *Post's* performance.

National and international news is invariably subordinated to the news of Denver. And the effect is to encourage the Empire to be provincial rather than cosmopolitan.

In this connection, it is interesting to compare "The Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire" with the unofficial voice of the Mississippi Valley, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. In twenty-eight daily issues from September 16 to October 15, 1955, the *Post-Dispatch* included sixty-eight national and international stories among its seventy-eight top stories, that is, among the three stories that got the biggest play each day. In the same period, the *Denver Post* included only twenty-nine national and international stories among the

top seventy-eight. The figures, of course, don't prove in themselves that the *Post* was wrong and the *Post-Dispatch* was right. They do indicate, however, that the voice of the Mississippi Valley is emphasizing something quite different for the people of that region from "The Voice of the Rocky Mountain Empire." And the emphasis could spell the difference between an average newspaper and a great one.

During the same twenty-eight day period there were ninety national and international stories on the front page of the *Post-Dispatch* that couldn't be found in the Denver *Post* anywhere at all. The *Post's* front page had only forty-three national and international stories that couldn't be found anywhere in the *Post-Dispatch*.

The *Post* short-changes Empire readers by cutting important stories too short. It does this partly because its rising advertising lineage is reducing the amount of space available for news. It has to trim stories in order to fit them in at all. But the *Post* also trims many stories by choice. It believes that brevity makes for sharper writing, that length drives away readers, that shorter stories are more attractive. Much of its trimming it can justify on the grounds that it is merely "trimming away fat."

In the case of front page stories, however, the *Post* frequently finds it necessary to trim away substance as well. It has a no-jump policy, which means that every story that begins on page one must end on page one. It cannot be continued on another page. Since so much of page one is taken up with headlines and pictures, the space for the stories themselves is severely limited. As a result, major national and international stories usually run between 500 and 750 words, sometimes less than 500. Some stories can be told adequately in that amount of space; many cannot. Story after story that runs 1,500 to 2,000 words in the *Post-Dispatch* is covered in 700 in the *Post*. Sometimes the *Post* backs up its page-one story with a secondary story inside, but not often enough.

The *Post's* makeup allows room for too few stories on page one. That means the reader has to hunt carefully through the back pages to find news that should be called to his attention at once. On days when the *Post-Dispatch* runs fifteen front-page stories, the *Post* may have as few as five. And the *Post* has no news summary to alert readers to stories on inside pages. No reader can tell at a glance what the cream of the news is. He must thumb through each of the *Post's* fifty or sixty pages to find out. Many readers think it isn't worth the trouble.

The *Post* is skimpy and superficial in its coverage of regional news. It does an adequate job of covering the major spot news and some broad regional problems like the West's shortage of water. It ran a brilliant series last summer on uranium mining and investment in western Colorado and Utah. Usually, however, the regional coverage is

short on digging and interpretation. Too many regional issues are neglected or treated superficially. The *Post* rarely takes enough time to explain them.

The *Post* tried a series on Western communities last year, but the stories were shallow. They were full of booster material of the kind put out by chambers of commerce. They ignored real community problems.

In the thirteen-state Empire, the *Post* has only four full-time correspondents, and three of them are in Colorado. Neither they nor the scores of part-time stringers can do the kind of interpretive reporting the Empire needs.

The *Post's* Sunday edition fails to do the kind of summarizing and explaining readers need to keep up with and understand the news. The Sunday *Empire Magazine* is slick and attractive, but it's devoted to light feature material and pictures rather than serious news issues. The Roundup section makes some effort at interpretation, but it chases off in a different direction every week, with no clear idea where it is going. It includes no summary of the week's news. It goes to press early and ignores developments late in the week. No planning is evident in its choice of articles, and the subject matter is rarely related to current news. What the daily news columns have left unsaid or unclear, the Roundup makes little effort to catch up on. Most of the section is devoted to amusement and travel stories.

The staff at the *Post* knows that Hoyt wants "a great newspaper," but it has no clear idea, in the news area, of the precise ingredients in Hoyt's concept of greatness. This may be because Hoyt is not entirely clear and specific about the concept in his own mind. At any rate, he has not succeeded in transmitting to the *Post* staff a precise and consistent idea of the kind of newspaper he wants the *Post* to be. "We know we're the voice of the Empire," a *Post* reporter said not long ago, "but we don't know what kind of a voice. We change from one day to the next. Sometimes it seems that every one of our editors is working with a different kind of newspaper in mind."

When Hoyt came to Denver, he had neither the time nor the need to spell out his concept of a great newspaper in exhaustive detail. He had merely to point out a direction. The *Post* was inferior in many obvious ways, and the remedies were equally obvious. Hoyt set to work on the obvious changes at once. He lifted the *Post* from the class of mediocrity. He gave Denver an afternoon paper it could stop apologizing for. What he wanted was clear and simple, and he accomplished it with incredible speed.

But the way from here on will be far more difficult, not clear and simple at all. The shortcomings of the *Post* are no longer so obvious, and the remedies will be far more elusive than they ever were before. If the *Post* is to keep on improving, it is no longer enough for Hoyt to proclaim his devotion to the ideal of "a great newspaper." He has

to decide now precisely what he means. He has to make it clear to every man and woman on his staff what kind of newspaper he wants. He cannot hope to repeat the dramatic progress of his early years in Denver, but he can start the *Post* moving again. Most of all, he can weed out the chronic inconsistency which has led the *Post* to flounder in recent years without a fixed and rigid sense of direction.

Two propositions tend to emerge from a study of the West and its major newspaper. The first is that the Rocky Mountain Empire needs a voice. The second is that the man most capable of providing it is Palmer Hoyt.

The West is ready for a great newspaper. The Rocky Mountain Empire needs a voice to help its growing, to restrain its youthful excesses, to give it leadership and wise counsel, to keep it informed about its government. A shifting and unintegrated chronicle of news miscellany will not do the job, nor a seasoning of seriousness in a potpourri of sex, crime, and journalistic pabulum. The West needs a paper like the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* or the Louisville *Courier-Journal*—yet a paper peculiarly fashioned to its own character and needs.

The Denver *Post* can become that kind of newspaper and that kind of voice. Hoyt has taken it a long distance in the right direction. He has the capacity and the will to take it further. The time for the Hoyt revolution to move onward to the final stage has clearly arrived.

“Free Press” Issue At Chapel Hill

By Robert T. Pittman

The issue of an editor's right to speak his mind seldom goes before voters. Even when freedom of the press was established in the United States by the Constitution, the people had little voice in the decision. But exactly that issue was presented to the student body of the University of North Carolina in an election in February and the result quieted many voices accustomed to saying “the college kids are going to the dogs.”

Occasion for the vote was a recall election of students Louis Kraar and Ed Yoder, co-editors of the college newspaper, the *Daily Tar Heel*. With a number of “crusades,” the editors had earned a campus reputation of willingness

to criticize almost anything—including student government and college administration.

Some of their opinions were unpopular and when they described the appointment of a new football coach as the arrival of “a parasitic monster of open professionalism in our midst,” a strong protest movement developed. Soon over 700 students had signed a petition demanding recall of the elected editors.

The opposition candidate argued that since students paid a compulsory fee to support the paper, “every student enrolled in the university is a publisher of this newspaper and has rights as such. I dare say you will not find any commercial newspaper where the publishers will give complete control to the editors to take any stand they so desire.”

College-boy politics clouded the issues as the election neared. Student leaders who had been the subjects of critical editorials joined the ouster movement.

North Carolina daily newspapers defended the young editors. The *Raleigh News and Observer* commented:

“Maybe such an election will serve a good purpose. The issue in it, of course, will not be merely firing the editors, but whether or not Carolina is a college in which freedom of editorial opinion is tolerated.”

The *Raleigh Times* said that “in the recall election . . . editors Yoder and Kraar will not be on trial. The students at the University will be. We hope they acquit themselves.”

Dean Norval Neil Luxon, of the School of Journalism (which has no connection with the student newspaper), spoke up for the editors:

“It is an extremely dangerous and bad precedent that ten per cent of the student body can bring about an election to recall an editor of a student newspaper. . . . It is my hope and my belief that the Carolina student body will understand the issues involved well enough to vote against recall by an overwhelming majority.”

The corollary disputes of athletic professionalism and power politics muddled the water but as the students went to the polls, one issue overshadowed all others: the editors' right to publish their opinions in editorials no matter how unpopular those opinions might be.

When the ballots were counted, there were 1,777 votes to retain the editors and 932 to replace them. In a popular vote, freedom of the press won an easy victory. Strangely enough, it was the bobby-sox wearing co-eds who voted most solidly for free speech.

Robert T. Pittman is a graduate student in journalism at the University of North Carolina.

Colorado Opens Courts to Cameras

A journalistic milestone was the action of the Colorado Supreme Court in March to lift the absolute ban on cameras in the court room. The ruling leaves it to the discretion of the trial judge within his responsibility to conduct an orderly trial. This action came after the Court had been convinced by demonstration that photographing of court proceedings need not disturb the decorum of the court room.

The background of the demonstration that persuaded the Court is told in the two news stories that follow:

Rocky Mountain News, Jan. 31.

The Camera Comes to Court

By Robert Stapp

Newspaper photographers produced graphic evidence in the Colorado Supreme Court chambers Monday that they can take pictures unobtrusively.

In a hearing of nationwide import to the journalistic and legal professions, the National Press Photographers Assn. presented its plea for permission to take pictures in courtrooms.

Without disturbing Justice O. Otto Moore, who is presiding at the hearing, two members of the association snapped photographs at the 2-hour morning session, developed them during the noon recess and presented them in evidence in the afternoon.

Justice Moore looked at them impassively and admitted them as exhibits.

Pictures Taken

Arthur Witman of St. Louis, president of the NPPA, and Milton Freier of Washington, chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee, took nearly 50 pictures with miniature cameras concealed under their coats. Later, they demonstrated to the justice how they had done it.

Newspapers, radio and television newsmen are appealing from an American Bar Assn. canon of ethics forbidding the taking of photographs in courtrooms.

The canon has been adopted by the Colorado Supreme Court in its rules for judges of inferior courts. This is the first

time a court, on its own initiative, has conducted a full-scale hearing on the touchy subject.

The canon in question, No. 35, provides: "The taking of photographs in the courtroom during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting or television of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the dignity of the proceedings, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court and create misconceptions in the mind of the public and should not be permitted."

Ban Attacked

Thomas Edwards of Cleveland, general counsel for Scripps-Howard Newspapers, attacked the ban on the grounds that neither the "American Bar Assn. nor any other association" has a right to dictate the court's conduct of a trial.

"With new and modern methods," he said, "photographers are no different than any other reporters. It is up to the court itself to decide if a contemptuous action has occurred—not the bar association."

The basic rights of the press are set forth in the Constitution, he pointed out, and "if they are not interfering with the decorum of the court, no court or bar association can take those rights away from them."

David Rosner, representing the Colorado Bar Assn., read a statement from that group, neither approving nor opposing the taking of photographs in courtrooms.

Judge is Master

Justice Moore asked him for his personal views on the subject.

"Personally," Rosner said, "I have always thought that the judge should be master in his own court."

Justice Moore read into the record the

results of a poll he had conducted of Colorado's district judges. Of the 29 who responded, he said, 18 favored a change in Canon 35, and 11 approved it as it stands.

Dist. Judge James Noland of Durango read a prepared statement of his own views on the relationship of the press and the courts. He said picture-taking in courtrooms should be left to the discretion of the trial judge.

E. Ray Campbell, president of the Post Printing and Publishing Co., assailed the canon, not on the grounds that the press is entitled to admission but that "the public is entitled to know what goes on in open court."

Please Public

The absolute prohibition against picture taking is "harsh and unreasonable," he asserted. "Judges should regulate the taking of pictures in precisely the same manner as they regulate all other conduct in court."

Superior Court Judge Mitchel B. Johns declared, in a written statement, that "the touchstone of decorum is the ability of the judge to maintain it. . . . The courts exist for and are owned by the public and the public is entitled to be represented therein."

Fred Mazzula, counsel for the NPPA, read a brief summarizing the association's position.

He conceded that "cumbersome technical equipment" might interfere with the decorum of the court and asked, therefore, that the taking of newspaper photographs be divorced in the canon from broadcasting or televising court proceedings.

He argued that:

1. The reason for the restraint imposed upon the news photographer is no longer tenable.

2. The term "freedom of the press" is not limited to the printed word, but encompasses pictures.

3. Canon 35 is discriminatory and therefore "a denial of a constitutional right."

4. The ban on news photographers is no longer necessary.

He charged that some elements, unable to exclude the news reporter himself, "will attack him vicariously by banning the news photographer."

To emphasize the inconspicuousness of news photographers, artists from the *Rocky Mountain News* and the *Denver Post* attended the afternoon session and made free-hand sketches of the participants.

Artists Busy

Joseph Costa, chief photographer for King Features and the first president of

the NPPA, gave an exhaustive review of the association's 10-year fight to gain admittance to courtrooms.

He maintained that the public is as much entitled to "objective visual reporting as to subjective written reporting."

He submitted photographs from two murder trials, at one of which photographers were admitted and the other excluded. "The photographer has been the whipping boy for all the grievances that anybody has against newspapers generally," he declared.

During his presentation, he opened his coat, revealing a small camera, and took three pictures of Justice Moore, pointing out that the sound of the shutter was inaudible while he was talking.

The hearing probably will continue into next week.

Rocky Mountain News, Jan. 31.

Judge Would Admit Photography to Courtroom

By Dist. Judge James M. Noland

EDITOR'S NOTE: Justice O. Otto Moore of the Colorado Supreme Court is conducting a hearing this week on the high court's ban against picture taking in courtrooms in Colorado.

One of the chief witnesses Monday was District Judge James M. Noland of Durango.

The Supreme Court's ban on pictures stems from the American Bar Assn's. Canon 35 which holds that picture taking detracts from the dignity of the court and distracts witnesses. It prohibits judges from permitting the taking of pictures in the courtroom.

Judge Noland's testimony presents a clear picture of the issue.

I am of the opinion that one of the prime duties of the trial judge is to maintain dignity and decorum in his courtroom, and as stated in Rule 36 to so conduct proceedings as to reflect the importance and seriousness of the inquiry to ascertain the truth.

I am not in favor of bringing to our courtrooms, in the words of an Eastern court decision, "the distractions and dis-

turbances of the market place." That is a catchy and high-sounding phrase, but I don't adhere to the argument that we are limited to a choice of a closed courtroom or a market place fiasco. No judge worthy of his office is advocating market place conditions. There are, I think, sane solutions to this question.

The views which I express are all based on the premise that the photographic equipment to be used is of the unobtrusive, noiseless, non-flash type, that the operators of such equipment shall be limited in number and confined to designated places as are the newspapermen at the press tables. In short that there be absolutely no disturbance of proceedings.

It would be my present stand that live-broadcasting and live-television facilities are not yet adapted to courtroom orderliness and should not be permitted until more advances have been made, which will undoubtedly come to pass. It would also be my position that should any witness or juror be nervously or otherwise disturbed or distracted by photographic equipment of any kind, his or her wishes must be given priority.

Courts Are Public Forums

I have always had the conviction that since the passing of the Star Chamber era, our courts are public forums. With the possible exception of those trials involving testimony disruptive of the public morals, we universally recognize the right of citizens to occupy the limited seats in the spectator's end of the courtroom.

We permit the press—and rightfully so—to occupy the press table with their pads and moving pencils and to report to their reading public a full word picture of the proceedings. I see no difference between the right of the reporter to print his story on the front page and the right of the photographer to reproduce his pictures there or on the television screen.

My main concern over this question, however, arises from a matter which has not come in for much, if any, attention from either side of the controversy. We who are close to law administration know that we have the greatest, soundest, fairest judicial system yet devised by man.

From observations of mine over many years, I do not believe that the "man on the street" realizes this. To most people outside our legal ranks, the courtroom is a mysterious place where sits a black-robed austere judge, surrounded by attorneys talking in un-understandable lingo, the "slickest" of whom always wins the case.

It is strictly off-limits for the man who has no business there, and he doesn't want to have anything to do with the place. If you don't believe this, make your own survey. Talk to the clerk in the grocery store, the laborer over at the factory, the farmer.

System Needs Support

His ideas on courts have been gained mostly from paper-back books, sensationalized written versions of trials, the movies. I believe that a survey would show that the great majority of American people have never witnessed a trial, perhaps have never entered a courtroom.

My concern is the continuance and strengthening of this system of ours. That system exists only by authority and consent of the people. The courts don't belong to the judges and lawyers.

I want our citizens to know and realize what a truly sound system it is, and if

we can't bring these people to the courtroom, I would like to take the courtroom to them.

I note that the Committee of Civil Rights of the New York Bar Assn., in a report condemning televising and broadcasting of trials, said in part, "A trial is conducted solely to adjudicate a dispute between the litigants . . . It is not for education of the public."

Citizens Provide Means

I don't subscribe to that viewpoint. Certainly trials are primarily to adjudicate disputes, but it is the public themselves who provide the facilities for such trials, who make the laws governing our whole court system, and the public had better be educated and kept informed as to what is going on in those courtrooms if their faith and confidence in this system is to be maintained.

I would like to see this problem of preservation of decorum and dignity as it is related to courtroom photography left largely to the discretion of the trial judge.

How to Save Newsprint

The world-wide newsprint shortage appears to be approaching crisis proportions, to judge by the cries of alarm in the daily newspapers and the trade journals. Some of our most obese papers have even begun to wonder how they can reduce their bulk in order to conserve the precious stuff.

There is one obvious answer, however, that never seems to rate a mention in the suggested solutions. Strangely enough, it is one that was gingerly ventured just a few weeks ago by a Denver daily, the *Rocky Mountain News*.

The *News* went to something of an extreme one day when it appeared *sans* advertising. Though it apparently was just an experiment, or perhaps even a stunt, the effect was startling to say the least. The paper counted a slim 24 pages, whereas its normal size runs between 60 and over 100.

This should give some idea of the proportion of the American daily newspaper—and the supply of newsprint—that is consumed daily by advertising. It may be

hard for the layman to believe, but the normal, healthy daily newspaper or national "slick" magazine will average between 65 and 80 per cent advertising in every issue.

In one year, for example, the nation's dailies increased their advertising lineage over 10 per cent. In the first ten months of 1955 it hit a grand total of 2,332,337,180, compared to 2,113,219,888 in the same period in 1954.

Profits, of course, have burgeoned correspondingly. And at the rate both have been continuing to expand, not even the sky will be the limit.

We are not suggesting that newspapers and magazines throughout the country go to the extreme the *Rocky Mountain News* did—although divesting themselves of all advertising once in a blue moon might give them—and their readers—a refreshing new slant on things.

But a sincere effort to cut down on the huge volume of ads that choke their pages and blur the eyes of their readers would go a long way toward relieving the newsprint shortage.

Besides, though admittedly it might lighten the publishers' pocketbooks a little, think of the load it would lift from the backs and the arms of us poor breadwinners who must carry home one or more of these gossip encyclopedias every day, or the relief it would offer the weary newsboy who must deliver them to our doors every day plus Sunday.

—*Colorado Labor Advocate*, Jan. 13

Protest on Newsprint

As a member of the Denver Newspaper Pressmen's Union, I would like to protest against your editorial of Jan. 13, entitled "How to Save Newsprint."

You may not be aware of the fact, but the manning of the mechanical side of newspapers is largely determined by the number of pages per day. Any reduction in advertising lineage, as you carelessly suggest, would result in a reduction in the number of pages, and consequently layoff of good union men.

On the other hand any increase in lineage brings pressure by publishers on the newsprint manufacturer to increase production facilities resulting in increased employment for the paper makers craft.

In the future I would suggest that you check your facts with a responsible newspaper union official instead of merely quoting A.N.P.A. figures.

You may use this letter if you like, though from what I've seen of your paper you don't make a practice of printing critical letters.

ROBERT G. MCGHEE,
1348 Chester St., Aurora

—*Colorado Labor Advocate*, Jan. 20

Editor Max Awner of the *Colorado Labor Advocate* suggested "If you should reprint our newsprint editorial, you will probably want to carry also the protest letter in our next edition."

Political Notice

We have also been reminded (under bulky FREE mailing) that Oregon's three U. S. Senators—Wayne, Richard and Maurine—saved us from the raging floods (by notifying Red Cross, U. S. Army Engineers et als) to get out and save voters. We leave the hallelujas a fielder's choice.

Bill Tugman's *Port Umpqua Courier*,
January 19, 1956

Hodding Carter's Paper Our 14,000th Subscriber

(AN EDITORIAL)

When Frank Jennings of Leland became on Monday the 14,000th paid subscriber to the *Delta Democrat-Times*, he symbolized one of the most important milestones in the growth of this newspaper.

Eighteen years ago, in 1938, when the *Delta Democrat-Times* was formed from the merger of the old *Democrat-Times* and the *Delta Star*, the combined, unduplicated circulation of the two newspapers was less than 3,000. In 1940, it had grown only to 4,200 and in 1945 to 6,700.

But in the last ten years, Greenville, Washington County and the mid-Delta have prospered. Our 14,000 subscribers do not reflect an increase in the population as much as a higher level of income and literacy. We like to think also that the *Democrat-Times* itself is in part responsible, for we have consistently tried to improve the quality of this newspaper and to provide our readers with the fullest pos-

sible coverage of local, regional and national events.

That effort continues. We will shortly add to our United Press news service the full facilities of the Associated Press. Among Mississippi's 21 daily newspapers only two others—the Jackson *Daily News* and the Meridian *Star*—offer both of these major news services to their readers. Except for the Jackson newspapers, the *Democrat-Times* has the largest reporting staff in the state. In recent months we have increased the size of the newspaper by a column, added a Sunday magazine in color, as well as other features, and installed completely modern engraving and darkroom facilities.

In Greenville 71 carriers bring the *Democrat-Times* to more than 7,500 homes. Thirty-two other carriers deliver the *Democrat-Times* in eighteen other communities in Mississippi and Arkansas; and eight motor route operators see that subscribers get the *Democrat-Times* in

the adjacent rural areas. In the newspaper plant on Main Street more than 80 employees are engaged in publishing the daily and Sunday *Democrat-Times*.

We will not be satisfied with even 14,000 subscribers although that figure is greater than the combined circulation of the daily newspapers in Greenwood and Clarksdale plus the circulation of all the weeklies in Greenville's immediate trade territory. It is exceeded only by the Jackson newspapers, the Meridian *Star* and the Gulfport-Biloxi *Herald* which serves two cities whose combined population is twice that of Greenville. As Greenville grows so will the *Democrat-Times*.

Meanwhile, we thank our every subscriber for making possible the circulation figures which we so gladly announce this week.

—Delta *Democrat-Times*
Greenville, Mississippi
January 10, 1956

The First Radio Editorial

Hugh Terry of KLZ made history Friday night when he broadcast the first radio editorial ever to go on the airwaves in this region.

The courts have ruled that radio stations can broadcast editorials, and President Eisenhower has urged them to participate in the formation of public opinion.

In this complex society, we need all the conscientious comment on affairs that is obtainable.

The only risk involved is that some radio editorials may not be labeled editorials. Since the broadcasting companies permit their advertisers also to furnish the programs, it is hard to know what we are getting in our homes. Most citizens cannot distinguish between advertising and news, propaganda and entertainment, recorded music and a real orchestra, live television or film. The Federal Communications Commission requires an announcement in these matters, but the broadcasters are clever in slurring over the fact

that a program is recorded or on film. And we don't know of any safeguard to warn of propaganda.

No doubt Hugh Terry, in making his broadcasts, clearly announced that he was presenting an editorial. We wish we could say the same of the owner of KLZ, which is *Time*, Inc. For *Time* has been going along for a generation, calling itself a "newsmagazine" when in fact it contains just one hidden editorial after another.

Editorials from radio stations or television companies are welcome. The public interest will best be served if they are recognized as editorials and if the controlling stockholders of the broadcasting corporation are periodically announced. Newspapers must reveal their ownership on Oct. 1 of each year. So must magazines. Why not radio and TV?

Americans are entitled to know who is influencing them.

Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*
Dec. 16, 1955

With a Huff and a Puff The Tribune Goes To Moscow

The Chicago *Tribune* has assigned one of its veteran reporters, William Moore, to represent it in Russia. He and Mrs. Moore have received their Russian visas and started their trip to Moscow yesterday.

This is the first time this newspaper has had a permanent representative in Russia since the 1917 revolution. While that was going on Larry Rue, a veteran of our foreign staff, made a daring and unlicensed foray which produced some great stories. In recent months our Paris correspondent, Henry Wales, made a two week visit to the country, but was not permitted to extend his stay.

The three major American news services maintain bureaus in Moscow, and a number of newspapers, among them the New York *Times*, *Christian Science Monitor*, Baltimore *Sun*, and New York *Herald Tribune*, has assigned correspondents there at different times.

The *Tribune's* reason for not joining them has been simple. We did not think it worthwhile to subject one of our people to capricious despotism merely to make him a vehicle of Russian propaganda. Now the Russians say that they welcome correspondents and will not interfere with their filing of objective dispatches. We are willing to find out whether they mean it.

Mr. Moore has been a member of our staff for 19 years, first in Chicago and more recently as one of our Washington reporters. He is a careful, capable reporter, well qualified to contribute to the accurate, comprehensive news report that we try to give our readers.

If he is permitted to report honestly what he sees in Russia, he should make valuable contributions to our pages. If he finds that censorship or restrictions on his movements compel him to send doctored news or propaganda, he will come home.

Chicago *Tribune*
Feb. 10.

On Editorial Writing

By Walter Lippmann

No doubt because I started life in the newspaper business as an editorial writer, I always think of a columnist as primarily a writer of signed editorials. There are differences, of course. But even if the two jobs are not identical twins, they are certainly near cousins. This is my excuse for what I am going to say about the functions of the editorial page.

When I first went to work on a newspaper, which was after World War I, the generally accepted theory was that it was the duty of the news columns to report the "facts," uncolored by "opinion," and it was the privilege of the editorial page to express opinions about what was reported in the news columns. To this simple rule of the division of labor between reporters and editorial writers we all subscribed. I can remember when it was not quite good form on the old New York *World* for an editorial writer to interview politicians about whom he meant to write a piece. Interviewing was something that reporters did. Brooding on what the reporters reported was what the editorial writers did. The editorial writer was not supposed to

know more facts than had appeared in the news columns of his paper.

In practice we all, reporters and editorial writers, broke the rule and this led to many disputes, good-natured and some not so good-natured. The news columns would have opinions with which the editorial writers disagreed. The editorial pages would contain statements of fact that the news editor had not certified.

In the course of time most of us have come to see that the old distinction between fact and opinion does not fit the reality of things. This is in part because the "facts" have become enormously more complicated than they used to be when the Federal Government was so much smaller and when the United States was still an isolationist country. It is also because we have all become more sophisticated about what are facts and about what are opinions. We have been made to realize that there is often no such thing as reporting "all the facts," that what actually happens is that we report those facts which, in our opinion, are important.

These developments have made obso-

lete the old distinction between reporting and editorial writing. It can no longer be said of a sound and modern editorial page that its function is to take the facts as reported in the news columns and then to express an opinion, in the sense of striking an attitude for or against this or that. The editorial writer's first function is to interpret and to explain the news, and no clear line can be drawn as to where the work of the reporter and the correspondent ends and where the work of the editorial writer begins.

The modern world being so very complicated and so hard to understand, it has become necessary not only to report the news but to explain it and to interpret it. This service of elucidation has to be performed, and it is in the hope of obtaining this service that—so I venture to believe—readers for the most part turn to the editorial pages and to the columns. They may be willing to listen to what we propose and what we oppose. But what causes them to come back is not that we tell them our opinions but that we help them, now and then, to find a pattern of meaning in the confusion and complexity of events.

ASNE Bulletin,
January 1, 1956

New York Times, January 5, 1956

The Voice of a Free Press

In executive hearings held recently in this city, in public hearings held last summer in Washington, and now again in public hearings held in Washington, a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi has been looking for evidence of what it considers to be subversive infiltration of the press. A number of employees of this newspaper have been called to appear as witnesses before the subcommittee.

We do not question the right or the propriety of any investigation of the press by any agency of Congress. The press is not sacrosanct. It is as properly subject to Congressional inquiry as any other institution in American life. It is the inescapable responsibility of Congress, however, to make certain that any such inquiry be conducted in good faith and not motivated by ulterior purpose.

A few employees of this newspaper who have appeared before the Eastland subcommittee have pleaded the Fifth Amendment. A few others have testified to membership in the Communist party over periods terminating at various dates in the past. So far as we are aware, no present member of the Communist party has been found among the more than four thousand employees on our rolls.

The policy of this newspaper with regard to the employment of Communist party members has been stated many times, and may be stated here again. We would not knowingly employ a Communist party member in the news or editorial departments of this paper, because we would not trust his ability to report the news objectively or to comment on it honestly, and the discovery of present Communist party membership on the part of such an employee would lead to his immediate dismissal.

In the case of those employees who have

testified to some Communist association in the past, or who have pleaded the Fifth Amendment for reasons of their own, it will be our policy to judge each case on its own merits, in the light of each individual's responsibilities in our organization and of the degree to which his relations with this newspaper entitle him to possess our confidence.

We may say this, however. We do not believe in the doctrine of irredeemable sin. We think it possible to atone through good performance for past error, and we have tried to supply the security and the favorable working conditions which should exist in a democracy and which should encourage men who were once misled to reconsider and to reshape their political thinking.

We have judged these men, and we shall continue to judge them, by the quality of their work and by our confidence in their ability to perform that work satisfactorily. It is our own business to decide whom we shall employ and not employ. We do not

propose to hand over that function to the Eastland subcommittee.

* * *

Nor do we propose to permit the Eastland subcommittee, or any other agency outside this office, to determine in any way the policies of this newspaper. It seems to us quite obvious that the Eastland investigation has been aimed with particular emphasis at the *New York Times*. This is evident from several facts: from the heavy concentration of subpoenas served on employees of this newspaper, from the nature of the examination conducted at earlier hearings by the subcommittee's counsel, Mr. Sourwine, and from that counsel's effort, at those hearings, to demonstrate some connection between a witness' one-time association with the Communist party and the character of the news published in this paper.

It seems to us to be a further obvious conclusion that the *Times* has been singled out for this attack precisely because of the vigor of its opposition to many of the things for which Mr. Eastland, his colleague Mr. Jenner and the subcommittee's counsel stand—that is, because we have condemned segregation in the Southern schools; because we have challenged the high-handed and abusive methods employed by various Congressional committees; because we have denounced McCarthyism and all its works; because we have attacked the narrow and bigoted restrictions of the McCarran Immigration Act; because we have criticized a "security system" which conceals the ac-

cuser from his victim; because we have insisted that the true spirit of American democracy demands a scrupulous respect for the rights of even the lowliest individual and a high standard of fair play.

* * *

If this is the tactic of any member of the Eastland subcommittee, and if further evidence reveals that the real purpose of the present inquiry is to demonstrate that a free newspaper's policies can be swayed by Congressional pressure, then we say to Mr. Eastland and his counsel that they are wasting their time. This newspaper will continue to determine its own policies. It will continue to condemn discrimination, whether in the South or in the North. It will continue to defend civil liberties. It will continue to challenge the unbridled power of governmental authority. It will continue to enlist goodwill against prejudice and confidence against fear.

We cannot speak unequivocally for the long future. But we can have faith. And our faith is strong that long after Senator Eastland and his present subcommittee are forgotten, long after segregation has lost its final battle in the South, long after all that was known as McCarthyism is a dim, unwelcome memory, long after the last Congressional committee has learned that it cannot tamper successfully with a free press, the *New York Times* will still be speaking for the men who make it, and only for the men who make it, and speaking, without fear or favor, the truth as it sees it.

Congress and the Press

By Walter Lippmann

The Eastland subcommittee announced last week that "this phase of our hearing is closed for the present." This phase has had to do with Communist infiltration of the newspaper press, and the specific target has been the *New York Times*.

The Committee has shown that over a period of some twenty years there have been employed on the *Times* some thirty men who have at one time or another been Communists. Considering that there are now more than 4,000 employees, considering how many thousands more must have worked for the *Times* in the course of twenty years, the percentage of the infiltrators has been minute. More significantly,

almost all of them have had quite subordinate jobs, and none of them has had nearly enough editorial authority to exercise any discernible influence upon the news and opinions of the newspaper.

* * *

The objective test of whether there has in fact been infiltration is whether or not the pages of the *New York Times* show any evidence of the suppression or distortion of news by the members of the staff. If the paper had indeed been subverted, any competent investigator would have been able to point to the evidence that the Communist infiltrators had served their cause in the pages of the *New York*

Times. As the Eastland subcommittee has offered no such evidence, has not even hinted that it could offer such evidence, it is as certain as anything can be that there is no such evidence.

What the hearings have shown is that the paper has at one time or another employed a very small number of Communists, and that these Communists have not infiltrated, have not in any visible way subverted, what the paper has thought fit to print.

* * *

But while the investigation of the *New York Times* is a dud, the affair of this investigation has raised a hard question about the freedom of the press and about the rights and duties of newspapermen. Does Congress have the power to investigate the press, and if it has, what if any are the limits of that power? There is no clear and authoritative answer to the question for the very good reason that it is in American experience a radically new question. Not for many generations, if ever before in our history has any organ of government claimed the power to examine and to pass judgment upon who shall work on newspapers.

The law on the subject has not been tested and it is not clear. Judicial opinion ranges from that of Judge Prettyman's decision in the Barsky case, which is that Congress may investigate whatever it suspects is a public danger, to the opinion of Chief Justice Warren in *Quinn v. United States* that "the power to investigate, broad as it may be, is also subject to recognized limitations." It has never been determined what those limitations are.

The practical situation is that Congressional committees will tend to push the limits of their power as far as the newspapers and public opinion permit. The law on the subject is not set. It is now being made by what we all do and do not do.

The crucial question posed by the Eastland committee is whether Congress has the power to censor the individual employees of a newspaper. If a Congressional committee has that power in case of employees who are, have been, or are charged with being Communists, what is to stop future Congressional committees from censoring newspaper employment on other grounds? Let the political climate change,

what legal ground is Congress to be challenged if it chooses to investigate the influence on the press of corporate interests, if, for example, it demands a public accounting of the financial connections and interests of publishers, editors, and reporters?

* * *

Once it is the accepted principle that Congress has power to set up standards of newspaper employment, the inner spirit and the practical meaning of the First Amendment will be deeply impaired. Congress has, of course, no power to pass laws dealing with the standards of newspaper employment. Has it the right to do the same thing by the power to investigate? As exercised by latter-day Congressional committees, the power to investigate is a tremendous instrument, combining the power to make laws, to enforce those laws, to judge and to punish men under those laws. This tremendous instrument can be, notoriously it has been, used to harass, to intimidate, to punish, and to destroy. Were it to become the accepted practice that Congress may investigate the press, machinery would exist to nullify the First Amendment.

The question therefore is whether the newspaper profession shall assent to or shall oppose the claim that Congress has the power to investigate the editorial management of newspapers. The hiring or firing of employees is an essential and a central part of the editing of a newspaper. My own view is that no part of the editorial management should, that no part can under the First Amendment, be ceded legitimately to Congress. If we who are connected with newspapers acquiesce in the right to Congress to censor on any grounds whatever newspaper employment, we shall have opened the way to a grave invasion of the freedom of the press.

It has been said, among others by the *New York Times* itself, that the press is not sacrosanct and that the right of "any investigation of the press by any agency of Congress" should not be questioned. I submit that it must be questioned. Of course the newspapers are not sacrosanct. They are subject, like every individual and corporation, to all the laws of the land—to the tax laws, to the anti-trust laws, to the military laws, to the labor laws, to the building laws, and, if they have watchdogs, to the laws about rabies inocula-

tions. What is sacrosanct is that the freedom of the press shall not be abridged by Congress. Congressional censorship of the employment of newspapermen would, if it is assented to, and allowed to become the practice, threaten seriously to abridge the freedom of the press.

* * *

The sacrosanct principle of the First Amendment was not adopted in order to favor newspapermen and to make them privileged characters. It was adopted because a free society cannot exist without a free press. The First Amendment imposes many duties upon newspapermen who enjoy the privileges of this freedom. One of the prime duties of free journalists is that they should to the best of their abilities preserve intact for those who come after them the freedom which the First Amendment guarantees.

It is, therefore, our duty, as I see it, to refuse to assent to, and instead to oppose, the setting up of a precedent that can lead to the gravest abuse.

New York Herald Tribune
January 10, 1956

Letters

The Indian Press on the Bombay Riots

To the Editor:

How did the Indian Press handle the Bombay riots in January?

In his very readable report to the *New York Times*, Mr. Rosenthal had some remarks on the performance of the Indian Press.

He said the real death toll was four to five times larger than what Indian newspapers and the Government of Bombay made it out to be.

As a newsman of Bombay I know the tendency of people to exaggerate the extent of loss, in life and in material, during such clashes. Even 'eye witness' accounts can rarely be trusted. This feeling that the whole truth is not being told by the Government is mainly traceable to experience in the days the British ruled over us, and in part to the hold rumor has in a country where mass communication is still inadequate. Till about ten years ago official communiques always made the Gandhian

crowds diabolically violent and the police models of self-restraint.

This scepticism is a carry-over, even as the civil service and police have been carried over from the old order.

But Mr. Rosenthal observes that he had it directly from the police that between 250 and 400 people had died, but that the Government clung to the figure 76.

It may well be that the Bombay officials share the natural bias of constituted authority everywhere to maintain that the minimum of force had been used.

But no Government in India, at the Centre or in the States, can hide the death of 200 people and get away with it. Members of the State legislative assemblies and of the Central Parliament have every right to demand that facts be told. They have the right to weigh every statement and get at the truth. And our parties have guarded this right jealously by active exercise.

Mr. Rosenthal makes yet another remark. He asserts that many newspapers, even when convinced that more than 300 had been killed, published only the figure supplied by the Government.

That is a serious accusation. To suppress truth knowing it to be true is as reprehensible as to publish falsehood knowing it to be false. Some Indian newspapers, let me admit, take their cue from the Government, but the best of them, those with tradition to guard and people's trust to retain, have resolutely resisted pressure.

True, the Bombay riots were played down in the Indian Press; but their seriousness was not discounted or any smugness displayed. Nero's fire was still the Great Fire and not just an arson incident.

Reporting riots in India is an old business, unfortunately, and Indian newspapers know what they do. It is a matter of perspective, primarily. When there were clashes in Bombay in November, the *New York Herald Tribune* led with the story on two consecutive days, as though they

signaled a civil war in India. The *Tribune* treated the January riots much more soberly.

In reporting riots the Indian newspapers have to weigh between their utter freedom to print what they like and their responsibility to the people. In times when passions are roused the Press cannot forget its duty to act as a restraining influence. These clashes are not Individuals versus Authority, where civil rights are at stake; they are between people and people, religions and religions. Even a factual report, in such inflammable moments touches off reprisals unimaginably gory. That is why in the nightmarish days of Hindu-Muslim riots the Press observed the convention of not mentioning the religion of the killed people. Breach of this rule by fanatical

journals only proved the wisdom of the restraint of the larger. In the small town of Godhra in Bombay State four years ago a whole street was burnt down and many people butchered all because a rabid journal had incited the people. The Chief Minister of Bombay on that occasion claimed that he was placed in the uncomfortable position of having to protect the people from the Press.

This is not an apology, but an exposition of a dilemma which often faces us. We have to be aware of the cost in human life of even a factual, unadorned report.

H. Y. Sharada Prasad

Mr. Prasad is a news editor of the *Indian Express* (Bombay) now holding one of the associate Nieman Fellowships sponsored by the Asia Foundation.

Education in Journalism: Rebuttal

To the Editor:

Not for a minute would I expect Dan Warner of the University of Washington to agree with my ideas about education for journalists (October *Nieman Reports*).

Mr. Warner is an advertising man now teaching in the School of Communications and he, not surprisingly, objects to my parenthetical remark that if I were organizing a curriculum for journalists I would not require the students to take *separate* courses in such technical fields as advertising. (Although I did say I would include a course which would amount to a survey of the publishing business as a whole.)

In fact, I would not have replied to Mr. Warner's comments (January *Nieman Reports*) were it not for the fact he protested that what I had said gave him "the shakes."

This would seem to be a serious disability, even for an ex-advertising man, and I want now to reassure him that there is no need to be so unnerved.

The principal point of my talk—and an idea he may rest assured will never become popular—was simply this:

In my opinion it is not the duty of a university to fill an undergraduate's head with *all the details* of what is likely to be his and related professions before giving him his diploma. I'd rather see a potential journalist, after taking some minimum

basic requirement of courses (decided upon by wiser men than I), then be turned loose to follow his intellectual curiosity into whatever fields it took him, especially if it took him outside the journalism trade course area. It seems to me a university will have been supremely successful if it has in four years helped the would-be journalist to develop his facility for thinking, leaving him to learn some professional skills even when he gets on the job.

In the case at issue, for example, I don't think it would be too unfair a burden to place on future journalists to assume that they will learn quite a bit on the job about advertising (or even journalism), given maybe a nudge or two in college.

Now what about this question of semantics Mr. Warner raises? It is hard for me to understand how any reasonable person could have drawn from my remarks the inference that I believe journalism means solely "the reporting and editing functions of a metropolitan daily." Nevertheless, after drawing this baseless inference, he goes on:

"Whatever the original connotation of journalism might have been, to most laymen and apparently to many journalists today it means someone who writes editorial material for a newspaper. Radio is something else. Television is different. And advertising is a separate area. To me

it makes little difference whether these are or are not labeled journalism. . . Here at Washington we have already climbed through this semantic thicket. The school of journalism founded in 1907 by Merle Thorpe is now officially the School of Communications."

Well I am certainly not opposed to educating radio and television broadcasters or advertising people. Indeed, I can see the advantages. But I had limited myself to a discussion about educating journalists.

As to elevating this whole business to the plane of "communications," let Bernard DeVoto's remarks in his last Easy Chair be my reply:

"When the sociologists or the advertising set or the professors of education get a new stereotype it is only irritating. But irritation becomes public pain when all three of them fall in love with it, as all three and lots of other people besides have done with 'communications.' Mr. Spectorsky uses it to mean advertising, radio, and television primarily but deals in the movies and the stage too, and some sectors of publishing. Communications is even more than that sizable total, however, and don't challenge my grammar for I get it from learned periodicals. Communications includes social anthropology, a science which studies the peck-order of people who patronize supermarkets and explains that young couples have lots of children nowadays because husbands have found out how much fun changing diapers is. It includes 'speech,' a humble art once called elocution or oratory but now in the keeping of people who take movies of your vocal cords, and it shades into press agency, which is now the engineering of consent. At state universities the big new Communications Building houses the department of journalism too, and this may foreshadow the death of the American press."

I hope Mr. Warner can forgive me for my—how would he put it—"old fashioned" notions about journalists. Like him, and unlike a good many of my newspaper colleagues, I think journalism training in college can be of value to the young man going into the field. But I view such training as a mere supplement to and not a substitute for a college education.

MORT STERN
Denver Post

Reviews — Science Sampler

By Donald J. Sterling, Jr.
FIRST BOOK OF ANIMALS. By the Editors of *Scientific American*. Simon & Schuster, New York. 240 pp. \$1.

The editors of *Scientific American* magazine this winter began a new enterprise. They published, in paper-bound books, collections of recent articles in particular important fields of science which appeared first in the magazines.

The pieces are written by or about research scientists. Where needed, the *Scientific American* staff has worked them over until they are understandable not only by other scientists but by any layman willing to pay attention to what he is reading.

First Book of Animals includes twenty-four articles reporting some of the things science has found out recently about beasts as tiny as the ant and as large as the elephant. At first glance it might seem that most of these studies are interesting but somewhat quaint examples of ivory-tower research—of learning for learning's sake. After all, with the exception of his own species, man has the animal kingdom comparatively well under control these days. Measuring the heartbeat of the hummingbird doesn't seem to have the life-or-death urgency in 1956 that, for example, launching an earth satellite has.

But the writers manage to give man a little glimpse of himself even in such unlikely activities as the mating habits of the drab little ditch-dwelling stickleback fish. A few of the subjects are intensely practical, especially the sea lamprey's threat to wipe out the trout of the Great Lakes. And there is real inspiration in the story of Karl von Frisch's beautifully patient, ingenious study of the language of the bees.

The 1956 Nieman Fellows had *Scientific American's* publisher, Gerard Piel, as a dinner guest in January. Several leading Harvard scientists spent a good part of the evening praising his magazine as one of the best organs scientists in different fields have of communicating with each other, and as a model of excellent popular scientific reporting. The new series of reprints serves as a sampler of the work.

Other titles in the series so far are *The New Astronomy*, *The Physics and Chemistry of Life*, *Atomic Power* and *Automatic Control*. Each costs \$1.

A 1946 Nieman Fellow, Leon Svirsky, is managing editor of *Scientific American*.

High Stakes and Low

By Peggy Durdin

A FOREST OF TIGERS. By Robert Shaplen. 373 pp. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.95.

The scene of this literate, well-constructed novel is Saigon, foremost city of Vietnam. The action takes place during the decades following the Japanese war and depicts in vivid, human terms a period when the Vietnamese Communists—Viet-minh—were directing and controlling Vietnam's struggle for independence from France. It was a time when the French were doggedly trying to retain in Vietnam the essentials of colonial rule, and the United States was caught between its friendship for France and hatred for communism on the one hand and its traditional belief in a country's right to self-government on the other.

Although *A Forest of Tigers* is a political novel—in the tradition of Malraux' *Man of Fate*—it is nevertheless first-rate fiction. In the unravelings of a solidly built plot, Mr. Shaplen has caught the feel and spirit of a time of intrigues, hatreds, double-dealings and violence, and his story moves smoothly, rapidly and with mounting suspense.

In making comprehensible to the West the complexities of present-day Asian attitudes, the political novel can be more illuminating than any amount of news reports, official statements and scholarly tomes. It is books like *A Forest of Tigers* that make real to Occidentals the strength and the frequent irrationality of Asian nationalism, the appeal of communism in Asia, and the delicate and complicated relations of the West—and in particular of the United States—with Asian peoples.

As the wife of the *Times'* chief correspondent in Southeast Asia, Mrs. Durdin has lived in the Far East for many years.

From New York *Times* Book Review, Feb. 12.

Satellites History

By John Dougherty

THE BALKANS IN OUR TIME by Robert Lee Wolff. Harvard University Press (Cambridge). 618 pp. \$8.

Balkans? Who cares about the Balkans? Forget Sarajevo, if you will, and think back to 1945, as Prof. Wolff does in his first chapter. It was the Balkans that first showed how the Soviet Union would treat the Yalta Declaration. Later, the Truman Doctrine was designed to prevent the sad Balkan story from being repeated in neighboring countries. Earlier, it was over Balkan issues that the thieves fell out and that Germany invaded the Soviet. Those are just some of the reasons Wolff gives for studying the subject. His introduction is as readable as any we've seen in quite a while.

Two hundred pages later, Wolff reminds us of the central fact that the course of events in the Balkans is so often explained "in the decisions of the great powers . . . and in their relationships to each other."

So the writer, a Harvard history professor specializing in Eastern Europe, sets to the task of telling both Balkan and big-power stories. He comes out well. He writes briskly; his survey of the "dead empire" and the "national awakening" is the best reading. But the meat of the book is World War II and after—a grim, sordid story that puts yesterday's headlines in perspective. It judges our achievements and mistakes, spells out Soviet duplicity, and describes in unmistakable terms the USSR's method of dominating its satellites. Churchill gets some hard knocks for his "percentages" agreement with Stalin on wartime influence in the area.

Wolff concluded his work 18 months ago; an epilogue carries the unfinished story through the Khrushchev-Tito meeting of last summer.

The middlin'-muddlin' reader might wish the author had left out a few hundred unfamiliar names of cabinet ministers; trying to condense too much detail into limited space is the principal fault of the book. A bit more color and description of some of the leading characters would brighten the story. But this is history, not journalism.

Guideposts to Economics

By Ed Hale

AN INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMIC REASONING by Marshall A. Robinson, Herbert C. Morton and James D. Calderwood, The Brookings Institution, 335 pages. \$3.

With this volume on current economics, the Brookings Institution has tossed its dignified homburg into the ring of popular science publishing. And the book is evidence three good heads were at work under that hat.

I won't say I read the book sitting on the edge of my chair, but I would recommend it to any newsman desiring some guideposts toward understanding economics. The trio of authors apparently have no axes to grind. Value judgments are left entirely to the reader after a presentation of alternatives.

The rather tricky broad general problems are taken up, issue by issue, without any distracting maze of over-qualification. Each chapter is tied to the general flow of the book through a four-step analysis technique. First, problems are identified. Then, the objectives are outlined and requirements set forth. The last two steps are a weighing of the merits of various alternatives and a final appraisal. The general effect is a unifying one and tends to cut down on any tendency to make judgments.

The general scope is indicated by these chapter titles: Problems and Goals, The Economy and Its Income, Competition in Our Economy, Labor and Unions, Debts and Money, Prosperity and Depression, Controlling Business Fluctuations, Economic Growth, International Economic Policy, Government and the American Economy.

I particularly liked the discussions of competition, labor, debt and government. Any hard-pressed reporter would appreciate the capsules of background and history. For instance, here's one on anti-trust laws:

"By enacting the anti-trust laws (more accurately, the 'anti-monopoly' laws) and establishing the machinery to enforce them, Congress has worked toward some 'rules

of the games' designed to maintain an effective market system. These laws, primarily the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, do not catalogue all the things that business can and cannot do—that would be impossible. They cite some general practices that can lead to monopoly, and give the courts wide discretion in deciding what constitutes illegal 'restraint of trade' or what practices 'substantially lessen' competition.

"Over the years, the interpretation of these laws has changed as circumstances have changed. The enforcement agencies, the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, and the courts have changed their views a number of times about what business firms can and cannot do. The process of judicial review, whereby cases or rulings are decided in federal courts, has enabled the changing ideas of the members of the judiciary to play a crucial role in the changing interpretation of the laws.

"In general, the anti-trust laws do not punish the mere size of firms . . ."

That passage indicates the general style of the book and the authors' ability to bring history up to date.

Occasionally, the reader will be troubled by some inconsistencies. But usually they are in different chapters and used to make a point. It's a bit troubling, though, to find railroads cited in one chapter as an early "natural" monopoly resulting in the 1887 establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission; then, in another, you find railroads used to illustrate how government can aid development of industry. In the case of the railroads, it was through land grants. It would help to know when the railroads became troublesome monopolies. Certainly in their early days they competed with canal traffic. If not, why would the government aid monopolistic development?

I also missed a discussion of local and state taxes and the growing dilemma of cities feebly making do with the property and assorted sales taxes.

In the chapter on government and the economy, I would have appreciated some consideration of the economics of federalism. There is implicit material there, but it was not made explicit.

For instance, in pointing up a shift of government activities from the local to the

federal government, the authors say: "In 1954, for example, the federal government accounted for about two-thirds of the total outlay by governments, local governments spent about one-fifth, and state governments spent about one-eighth."

This statement seems a bit unfair to the states. The \$67.8 billion federal budget expenditures for 1954 show that all but \$9.7 billion were spent for items "resulting from past wars and defense." Since war and defense are a federal function, would it not be more accurate to deduct the defense items when evaluating the role of the states?

Any of my amateur gripes, however, should not detract from the value of this book. It's really fine. Incidentally, the book is an outgrowth of a series of ten pamphlets used in adult discussion groups conducted by the Fund for Adult Education.

A New Biography of Watterson

By Louis M. Lyons

HENRY WATTERSON: RECONSTRUCTED REBEL. By Joseph Frazier Wall. Oxford University Press. N. Y. 362 pp. \$6.

This is an absorbing biography of one of the dynamic personalities of our recent past. Henry Watterson was already a legendary figure of the last days of personal journalism. A skilled historian has now given perspective to the legend and added to the human dimensions of one of the most original forces on the public scene. Watterson's is a dramatic American story and Professor Wall has given it full scope. A biographer could not ask more lavish material. He explores sympathetically the rich qualities that gave Watterson his great journalistic range and those contradictions of character that put him often in perverse opposition to the very principles and leaders of his choice.

Watterson's span as an influential editor swept all the way from the Civil War through the first World War. He was always as much politician as editor, and a powerful orator—in all his roles a great showman who never lacked an impact on his times. He had the theatrical quality of Mark Twain, the ebullience of Theo-

dore Roosevelt, the vigorous independence of William Allen White and the florid eloquence of Alben Barkley, who pens an ecstatic preface to this book. If a reader could ask for more insight into the political struggles in which Watterson was ever embroiled—from Tilden to Wilson—the book itself gives the answer. Watterson's part was always so personal that the personality dominates the story. He lived lustily in the passing day and sufficient unto the day was the way he felt about it. His instinctive feeling was more adequate to the simpler world of his earlier period.

Success came early and his role naturally to Watterson. Son of a Kentucky congressman, he spent his childhood on the Washington scene in the rending issues that brought his youth to end in the Confederate Army. He threw himself then into the task of reconciliation. The drama and dedication he gave this issue, brought him quick national attention that his own pungent personality held for half a century.

By 28 he was already editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and soon made it one of the most important Democratic voices in the Nation. Yet he managed to quarrel with every great leader of his party—Cleveland, Bryan, Wilson—and the quarrels were nothing trivial. Twice they were factors in defeating the party and once nearly ruined and lost him his paper. Indeed anti-climax was almost the one consistency of Watterson's career. But the man was larger than his foibles. The character of the individual gave life to his page. He was always himself. In the drama of his temper and the tingle of his words, the reader never lost interest. Family tragedies brought crushing griefs, but his zest for life never let down. In none of his sons could he hope for a successor in the great paper he built. This led him to overstay his time. In his last days he was an anachronism, yet a symbol of the personal force that elsewhere had passed from editorial control. The business man was taking charge everywhere. But in the *Courier-Journal* the blunt pen of an independent editor had its unchecked say until the end. That was the undying glory of Henry Watterson that raises a timely standard again in a great story greatly told.

Herblock's Book

By Ed Seney

HERE AND NOW, by Herbert Block, "Herblock," Simon and Schuster. 280 pages, \$2.95.

Some day when historians sum up the days of trials and tribulations of the past ten years (and probably many more to come) they will include Herblock in their list of the period's most influential and effective critics.

In Washington, his daily political cartoons on the idiosyncrasies of Capitol politics have probably sparked the prestige of the Washington *Post* and *Times-Herald* more than any other single factor. In addition, the cartoons are syndicated in 150 other papers and are probably the most widely reprinted of any cartoonist today.

Block, in his new book, has captured the pulse of national politics for the last three years. What he hasn't shown in reprints of 250 of his cartoons, he has ably shown in the text of the book. The story is well written and strong enough in its content to brand it as a landmark in political analysis.

Block has been able to do in political cartooning what Al Capp has done in comic cartooning: point wryly at stupidity in American life and legislation. Sometimes it is subtle, sometimes pointed, but in each case it puts over the idea. It is not the penwork of Block's cartoons that hits you, it is the idea behind it. He could draw stick figures and it would not detract from the power of the message.

Block is aware that all is not black or white in either major party, and he deplores Eisenhower's assumption that it is. Ike also comes in for a bit of ribbing on his penchant for golf. One of the best cartoons is the one where little children are having an Easter egg hunt on the White House lawn and one of them finds several golf balls in the bushes.

But in his quips at Presidents, Block is more or less non-partisan. President Eisenhower is no more a target for his pen than Truman was, and no doubt if the Whigs or Federalists were revived they, too, would wince under his watchful eye. He has been able to find and define the inane antics in Congress as well as the Administration, whether Democratic or Republican.

The fumbles and foibles of the Administration and Congress are better described by Block as HPx2 (Hocus-Pocus times two) and the text of the book deals mainly with this facet of Washington politics.

McCarthyism, (a word he claims to have coined) is (or was) his favorite subject. He caricatured the five o'clock shadow and the spade nose of McCarthy so well in many of his cartoons he identified him only as the "Unidentified Character." There is no doubt that he is on McCarthy's lists, both of them (political and personal), as Block himself suspects. But as he points out, so is President Eisenhower.

Block's book is well worth the few hours it takes to read. And assuming that in a few years he'll have another one, I'll be waiting for it.

More Herblock

From the December 29th newscast, WGBH-TV and FM, by Louis M. Lyons.

This is a time for bragging about one's Christmas presents. I am happy with Herblock's new book—Herblock's *Here and Now*, published by Simon & Schuster at \$2.95. It has 250 cartoons and 30,000 words of text.

These statistics are significant. For, as his host of admiring readers discovered in the first Herblock book, he is as much an artist with words as with pictures.

So this is much more than another cartoon book. It is a very penetrating and witty commentary on our times, as noted on the national political scene in Washington. It should be no surprise, with so humorous a cartoonist, but it is an unfailing delight to find his humor as pungent in text as in his cartoons. It is easier to illustrate the genius of Herblock in his cartoons. There his expression is as various as the daily grist of the news.

He has his light, airy pictures; those that are rapier strokes to poke through sham; those that are devastating in their irony; those that are blockbusters against the enemies of decency and of human dignity. And he has his days when he drops altogether the jester's role and also the crusader's, to illuminate a great moment or an ideal.

The last picture in his book was on the day of the death of Einstein. It shows revolving spheres, and one that is meant

for earth has a simple label on it: "Albert Einstein Lived Here."

The next to last was on Eleanor Roosevelt's birthday. A mother is pointing out to her little boy the Statue of Liberty. But he anticipates her: "Of Course I Know—It's Mrs. Roosevelt."

An already famous cartoon is the one that caricatured Charles Wilson's remark about unemployment—that some workers were more like bird dogs and others kennel dogs.

Herblock shows two fat cats in their exclusive club. One asks the other: "What Was Wrong About Charlie's Remark About Dogs?"

He finds Mr. Wilson a fertile source for cartoons, but they are the ribbing kind, with a laugh, and no meanness. When Wilson issued an order restricting news at the Pentagon, the cartoon shows him instructing an aid: "I'll Do All The Foolish Talking Around Here."

Another cartoon against official secrecy has an official explaining to a reporter, "No News Is Good News."

Herblock is a master of the illustration of such homely aphorisms.

The crowded schoolhouse issue he presents as Alice in Wonderland in the familiar picture of her head, arms and legs sticking out of the tiny doll's house.

He lampoons the security issue with a picture of a worried official asking his wife, as they start on the list for Christmas cards: "Shouldn't We Clear This With The Department?"

On Stalin's death, Death stalks beside him, saying, "You Were Always A Great Friend of Mine, Joseph."

His polemical power is delivered with shattering force against McCarthy and all McCarthyisms. But it is a tickling or teasing caricature he uses on Eisenhower and Dulles. In one Mr. Dulles is streaking off on a foreign mission, laden with paraphernalia, but he has left his head behind. "A Fellow Can't Remember Everything," he says.

His little plays on words need no explanation. When the Reece Committee was seeking to undermine our great foundations, Herblock shows Reece digging away at the foundation of freedom of inquiry. The line under it: "That's The Trouble With This Country: Foundations."

He is a master of the single line to tell his story. "Fair Is Fair" he writes under a cartoon of a lion and a human victim in the arena. The lion is labelled "Investigation Committee" and the sign on the wall: Animals Will Kindly Follow Their Own Rules of Procedure.

When the American Legion attacked the Girl Scouts, Herblock shows a body of fat storm troopers ambushing a campfire, and the legend: "Stand Fast Men, They're Armed With Marshmallows."

He counters "egghead" with "yegghead." "The Yeggheads do not of course say they wish to attack education. They only investigate it and put on a little pressure here and there to see that the schools and colleges get the idea. . . . Colleges are very hotbeds of learning. These are the places where ideas are propagated. And by whom? Teachers. Professors. Intellectuals."

If cartooning is a fading art in America, it goes with the development of newspapers to be primarily merchandising media that must cover the whole market. It is bad business to step too sharply on very many toes. The cartoonist needs to be specific, to search out what needs to be lampooned. The newspaper that wants to avoid taking sides or offending anyone is not a hospitable medium for the art of the political cartoonist.

Herblock works for an independent paper. But they let him be independent too.

He says: "I think independence not only has to avoid a slavish effort to follow a political party line; it also has to avoid a slavish effort to stand in the middle or off to one side. It has to decide what it thinks is right in each case. In doing this it has to run the risk of being accused by partisans of partisanship."

The genius of Herblock would be rare in any art at any time. The cartoonist's art grows scarcer in American journalism. Fitzpatrick of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* and Herblock of the Washington *Post* and *Times-Herald* stand at a peak, without peers. Of the two, only Herblock's cartoons are syndicated; so his work is more familiar. For sheer power, Fitzpatrick is unmatched. But in the quality of his humor, Herblock is our most distinguished cartoonist.

Nieman Notes

1940

J. Edward Allen came home the first of the year after 15 years service in Geneva as chief of information service for the International Labor Organization. The first chore he undertook was to take charge of the Boston office of the Newspaper Guild during the leave of absence of its executive secretary. His home address: 168 Lazell Street, Hingham, Mass.

Hodding Carter, publisher of the *Delta Democrat-Times* of Greenville, Miss., reports that "for no good reason, I am going with four friends on a 42-foot schooner for Spain, leaving April 1, an appropriate date for departure. We expect the trip to take four weeks. I am not sure whether I will be able to make the return voyage, the long way round, or not."

"Current Harvard Books" lists one by Hodding: *Robert E. Lee and the Road of Honor*, a biography for children, ages 11-14, published by Random. \$1.50.

1941

John H. Crider joined the foreign service of INS the first of the year as diplomatic correspondent in London. Crider was formerly on the Washington staff of the New York *Times*, editor of the Boston *Herald*, and most recently in public relations with Earl Newson & Co., in New York.

Collier's announced the first of the year the appointment of Vance Johnson as general manager. Former Washington correspondent of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, he joined *Collier's* when Paul Smith became its president.

1942

Doubleday & Co. announced in January that they have signed a contract with Thomas Sancton of the New Orleans *Item* for a first novel, to be entitled *Count Rollerskates*. Its setting is New Orleans in the first part of this century. Doubleday expects to bring it out this fall.

1943

John F. Day, Jr., director of news for CBS, delivered the final lecture to the special course for television students at the University of Minnesota School of Journalism, Feb. 10.

Edward J. Donohoe, assistant managing editor of the *Scranton Times*, served as chairman of the judges for the 1955 annual Broun Memorial Award.

1944

For the second successive year, Frederick W. Maguire, associate professor of journalism at Ohio State University, conducted a Press Institute for Ohio editors. It ran five days, starting Feb. 13, and closed with an address by Herbert Brucker, editor of the *Hartford Courant*, who was appointed for the second William Maxwell Lecture at the Institute.

1946

Time, Inc. now lists Robert J. Manning as senior editor, in the select company of Thomas H. Griffith (1943).

A book, *Soviet Air Power*, by Richard E. Stockwell is being published in April. The product of several years work, he completed it during an enforced layoff, following a serious operation that led him to resign as editorial director of American Aviation Publications. He is now in General Electric Company's Aircraft Gas Turbine Division. He says, "My work is concerned with advanced propulsion systems and consists of putting the events of tomorrow into the language of today, so that a limited but high powered audience can understand them."

New York University's television program "University" presented two programs in February on American journalism, conducted by Ben Yablonky, associate professor of journalism at NYU.

1947

Ernest H. Linford, editor of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, and Mrs. Linford, announced the marriage of their daughter, Judith, to Charles T. Wood on Feb. 4.

1948

Charles W. Gilmore of the *Toledo Times* received the annual award of the Northwestern Ohio chapter of Sigma Delta Chi for a series of articles on the rights of individuals who run afoul of the law. His series was "So, You've Been Arrested." Seven thousand reprints have been distributed to requests for it.

Carl Larsen of the *Chicago Sun-Times* added to his notable collection of news-

paper awards in January when the State civil defense director presented him the Award of Merit for a series of articles last year on the problems of atomic radiation.

In February Alfred A. Knopf published a novel, *A Forest of Tigers*, by Robert M. Shaplen of *The New Yorker*. Its setting is Vietnam, which Shaplen knew as a Pacific correspondent in World War II, a background which he drew on earlier for his volume of short stories, *A Corner of the World*.

1949

David B. Dreiman is author of a new book by Harper's, *How to Get Better Schools: A Tested Program*. It carried a foreword by Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. It is the story of the work of that body for the schools and its results. Dreiman took a leave of absence from his position as education editor of *Life* for the studies covered by the book.

Bob Eddy of the *St. Paul Dispatch* left for England on a Reid Fellowship, Feb. 26, with his wife and four children for six months travel and study in Europe.

Christopher Rand, *The New Yorker's* roving correspondent in Asia, is reported to have another book on the ways, for launching sometime in 1956, about the Far East.

The winter issue of the *Colorado Quarterly* carried an article by Lawrence G. Weiss: "A Voice for the Empire," a review of Palmer Hoyt's ten-year management of the *Denver Post*. Weiss is professor of journalism at the University of Colorado.

1950

John L. Hulteng, associate professor of journalism at the University of Oregon, addressed the Oregon Publishers Association at a symposium on editorial pages in February. Until last fall, he was chief editorial writer on the *Providence Journal*. He did the article on editorial writing in the special *Nieman Reports* issue of April 1950, "Reading, Writing and Newspapers."

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the *Cowles papers*, received the Heywood Broun award for 1955. This was in recognition of his vigorous initiative in developing the facts in the Wolf Ladejinski case which resulted in correcting the

"security risk" charge and changing the security procedure of the Department of Agriculture.

1951

The *Chicago Sun-Times* house organ announces that Hoke Norris of its news staff has sold a novel to Simon & Schuster, which Hoke began working on when he was a Nieman Fellow. He was then on the *Winston-Salem Journal* and the book has a Southern background. If Simon & Schuster are as smart as their ads they will next take a look at some of Hoke's short stories.

1952

Robert S. Crandall was named an assistant news editor of the *New York Times* in January. Crandall began newspapering in 1934 as a copy boy on the *Buffalo Times*. He went to the *New York Herald Tribune* in 1937 and was Sunday news editor there when he moved over to the foreign desk of the *Times* in 1952.

A. G. (Pete) Ivey, director of the University of North Carolina news bureau, is doing a column for some of the North Carolina Sunday newspapers. Until last year he was editor of the *Shelby Star*, and earlier on the editorial page of the *Winston-Salem Journal* and *Sentinel*.

1953

Kenneth Wilson of the *San Francisco Chronicle* copy desk reports on a reunion of the West Coast members of the 1953 group of Nieman Fellows. Robert Frazier, associate editor of the *Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard*, and Mrs. Frazier, and Melvin Mencher, of the editorial page of the *Fresno Bee* joined the Wilsons in San Francisco.

1955

Selig Harrison resigned from the Associated Press to become associate editor of the *New Republic* as of Feb. 1. Harrison served the AP in India for three years to 1954 and was on the New York desk in 1955.

Arch Parsons started for the SEATO conference in Pakistan March 1. His *Herald Tribune* assignment is now the Middle East. His wife is joining him in April, to look for a place to live either in Cairo or Beirut.

The GIST Of A Story . . . In The JOLT Of A Phrase!

He can put you there with a phrase. Often, too, he'll get you there ahead of any other news source you can turn to. For, of all the great newspapermen reporting today, few are more frequently *first* with the news—or more fluently *entertaining* in exploding it with a *jolt*—than Edwin A. Lahey . . . inimitable reporter, and chief of the Washington bureau of the Chicago *Daily News*.

In labeling Lahey as "one of the top U.S. labor reporters," *Time Magazine* (Dec. 19, '55) said: "Some colleagues go even farther. New York *Times* man Meyer Berger, who is often called the best U.S. reporter, says: 'Ed Lahey is the best reporter in America.'"

On the "first" front alone, Lahey's world scoops or national beats have been piling up at the rate of at least one a year—an amazing average in these days of mass news coverage. Take examples:

Late in August of 1952—from the Quebec retreat of the brooding Bob Taft—Lahey opened an ominous exclusive with these words: "Gen. Eisenhower's chances of winning the support of Sen. Taft are about zero." Then he added: "There are conditions under which Taft could be induced to put himself and his numerous followers in the Republican party to the job of electing Eisenhower president."

And Lahey pinpointed Taft's 'terms.' Then, for incalculable historic impact, lis-

ten to this: In the book, *The Taft Story* by William S. White, *that single story by Lahey is credited with having brought Eisenhower and Taft together for their famous Morningside Heights reconciliation!*

Consistently, the record rolls. In 1953, Lahey's story on the departure of Durkin from the Eisenhower cabinet scooped the press associations and all the newspapers of the nation.

Consistency continues. On June 28, 1954, from Guatemala City—after accurately predicting the happening a month earlier—Lahey scored a scoop on the fall of the Red-tinged Arbenz government to Col. Carlos E. Diaz and the Guatemalan Army.

Then, on May 28, 1955, from Buenos Aires, the consistent Mr. Lahey cut to the core of the Argentine crisis: "The conflict between church and state is very real . . . Peron and his editorial eunuchs keep saying that this is a minor business caused by a few needle-nosed priests who are messing in politics . . . But . . . it becomes quite apparent that the present fight can end only with the Catholic church or Juan Domingo Peron going down for the full count . . . Who will win? The Catholic church has been in business for 2,000 years. Peron has had his operation going on for 8 or 10. On form . . . it would seem that Peron will be heading for the hills with a posse in hot pursuit."

The *gist* of a story . . . in the *jolt* of a phrase!

A native of Chicago, Ed Lahey has been called "the most authentic bit of living Chicagoana who ever taught the facts of life to Harvard." Ed did go to Harvard—on a Nieman Fellowship. There he made his presence felt so quickly that even a competing Chicago newspaper was moved to say: "We don't know whether Mr. Lahey will learn anything from a year at Harvard, but judging from his start, Harvard and Boston may learn considerable from Mr. Lahey."

In his 26 years with the *News*, Lahey's assignments have taken him all over the U.S.A. . . . and to Africa, South America, Europe, China, India, Burma—almost everywhere. Consistency is a blazing jewel in the Lahey reportorial record. His writing has helped to make the *Daily News* outstanding across the nation.

From a half-page advertisement in the Chicago *Daily News*, Jan. 26.

Our Reviewers

Donald J. Sterling, Jr., *Oregon Journal*; John Dougherty, *Rochester Times-Union*; Ed Hale, *Buffalo Evening News*; and Ed Seney, *Florida Keys Keynoter*, are Nieman Fellows this year; Louis M. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Crimes, Courts and Newspapers

By Arthur E. Sutherland

This memorandum was prepared by Professor Sutherland of the Harvard Law School to brief the Nieman Fellows for a seminar. For several years a committee of the Law School, headed by Professor

Sutherland, has organized a series of three or four seminars a year, in which half a dozen lawyers join a dozen newspapermen in discussions of legal issues, cases and decisions of especial interest to the press.

Administration of criminal law, like most other activities of government, involves an attempt to reconcile conflicting interests. The interest of people generally in having an orderly society and to that end in having criminals swiftly detected and punished, is to some extent opposed to, and perhaps irreconcilable with our traditional respect for the immunity of the individual from certain official oppressions. We consider a man innocent until the State proves him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; we purport to limit government to searches and seizures which are reasonable; we pay at least lip service to the principle that a man need not be a witness against himself but may put the government to its proof; in aid of all these things we are apt to talk in terms of every man having counsel available to him at all stages of the enforcement of criminal law so that the citizen may be advised of his rights and may have an effective opportunity to stand upon them.

The dilemma that faces society in the presence of crime, and at the same time in the presence of these traditional immunities was admirably set forth by Mr. Justice Jackson in an opinion applicable to three cases decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1949,—*Watts v. Indiana*, *Harris v. South Carolina*, and *Turner v. Pennsylvania*, all reported in 338 U.S., at pages 49, 68 and 62 respectively, with Jackson's separate opinion at page 57.

He wrote:

These three cases, from widely separated states, present essentially the same problem. Its recurrence suggests that it has roots in some condition fundamental and general to our criminal system.

In each case police were confronted with one or more brutal murders which the authorities were under the highest duty to solve. Each of these murders was unwitnessed, and the only positive knowledge on which a solution could be based was possessed by the killer. In each there was reasonable ground to *suspect* an individual but not enough legal evidence to *charge* him with guilt. In each the police attempted to meet the situation by taking the suspect into custody and interrogating him. This extended over varying periods. In each, confessions were made and received in evidence at the trial.

Checked with external evidence, they are inherently believable, and were not shaken as to truth by anything that occurred at the trial. Each confessor was convicted by a jury and state courts affirmed. This Court sets all three convictions aside.

The seriousness of the Court's judgment is that no one suggests that any course held promise of solution of these murders other than to take the suspect into custody for questioning. The alternative was to close the books on the crime and forget it, with the suspect at large. This is a grave choice for a society in which two-thirds of the murders already are closed out as insoluble.

A concurring opinion, however, goes to the very limit and seems to declare for outlawing any confession, however freely given, if obtained during a period of custody between arrest and arraignment—which, in practice, means all of them.

Others would strike down these confessions because of conditions which they say make them "involuntary." In this, on only a printed record, they pit their judgment against that of the trial judge and the jury. Both, with the great advantage of hearing and seeing the confessor and also the officers whose conduct and bearing toward him is in question, have found that the confessions were voluntary. In addition, the majority overrule in each case one or more state appellate courts, which have the same limited opportunity to know the truth that we do.

Amid much that is irrelevant or trivial one serious situation seems to me to stand out in these cases. The suspect neither had nor was advised of his right to get counsel. This presents a real dilemma in a free society. To subject one without counsel to questioning which may and is intended to convict him, is a real peril to individual freedom. To bring in a lawyer means a real peril to solution of the crime because, under our adversary system, he deems that his sole duty is to protect his client—guilty or innocent—and that in such a capacity he owes no duty whatever to help society solve its crime problem. Under this conception of criminal procedure, any lawyer worth his salt will tell the suspect in no uncertain terms to make no statement to police under any circumstances.

If the State may arrest on suspicion and interrogate without counsel, there is no denying the fact that it largely negates the benefits of the constitutional guaranty of the right to assistance of counsel. Any lawyer who has ever been called into a case after his client has "told all" and turned any evidence he has over to the government, knows how helpless he is to protect his client against the facts thus disclosed.

I suppose the view one takes will turn on what one thinks should be the right of an accused person against the State. Is it his right to have the judgment on the facts? Or is it his right to have judgment based on only such evidence as he cannot conceal from the authorities, who cannot compel him to testify in court and also cannot question him before? Our system comes close to the latter by any interpretation, for the defendant is shielded by such safeguards as no system of law except the Anglo-American concedes to him.

Of course, no confession that has been obtained by any form of physical violence to the person is reliable and hence no conviction should rest upon one obtained in that manner. Such treatment not only breaks the will to conceal or lie, but may even break the will to stand by the truth. Nor it is questioned that the same result can sometimes be achieved by threats, promises, or inducements, which torture the mind but put no scar on the body. If the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Watt's Case* were based solely on the State's admissions as to the treatment of Watts, I should not disagree. But if ultimate quest in a criminal trial is the truth and if the circumstances indicate no violence or threats of it, should society be deprived of the suspect's help in solving a crime merely because he was confined and questioned when uncounseled?

We must not overlook that in these, as in some previous cases, once a confession is obtained it supplies ways of verifying its trustworthiness. In these cases before us the verification is sufficient to leave me in no doubt that the admissions of guilt were genuine and truthful. Such corroboration consists in one case of finding a weapon where the accused has said he hid it, and in others that conditions which could only have been known to one who was implicated correspond with his story. It is possible, but it is rare, that confession, if repudiated on the trial, standing alone will convict unless there is external proof of its verity.

In all such cases, along with other conditions criticized, the continuity and duration of the questioning is invoked and it is called an "inquiry," "inquest," or "inquisition," depending mainly on the emotional state of the writer.

But as in some of the cases here, if interrogation is permissible at all, there are sound reasons for prolonging it—which the opinions here ignore. The suspect at first perhaps makes an effort to exculpate himself by alibis or other statements. These are verified, found false, and he is then confronted with his falsehood. Sometimes (though such cases do not reach us) verification proves them true or credible and the suspect is released. Sometimes, as here, more than one crime is involved. The duration of an interrogation may well depend on the temperament, shrewdness and cunning of the accused and the competence of the examiner. But assuming a right to examine at all, the right must include what is made reasonably necessary by the facts of the particular case.

If the right of interrogation be admitted, then it seems to me that we must leave it to trial judges and juries and state appellate courts to decide individual cases, unless they show some want of proper standards of decision. I find nothing to indicate that any of the courts below in these cases did not have a correct understanding of the Fourteenth Amendment, unless this Court thinks it means absolute prohibition of interrogation while in custody before arraignment.

I suppose no one would doubt that our Constitution and Bill of Rights, grounded in revolt against the arbitrary measures of George III and in the philosophy of the French Revolution, represent the maximum restrictions upon the power of organized society itself. They were so intended and should be so interpreted. It cannot be denied that, even if construed as these provisions traditionally have been, they contain an aggregate of restriction which seriously limit the power of society to solve such crimes as confront us in these cases. Those restrictions we should not for that reason cast aside, but that is good reason for indulging in no unnecessary expansion of them.

I doubt very much if they require us to hold that the State may not take into custody and question one suspected reasonably of an unwitnessed murder. If it does, the people of this country must discipline themselves to seeing their police stand by helplessly while those suspected of murder prowl about unmolested. Is it a necessary price to pay for the fairness which we know as "due process of law?" And if not a necessary one, should it be demanded by this Court? I do not know the ultimate answer to these questions; but, for the present, I should not increase the handicap on society.

Mr. Justice Jackson with characteristic clarity here pointed out one unavoidable choice between freedom and authority.

Another and somewhat similar clash of interests arises between the desire of the public for news of sensational events,—news which newspapermen understandably wish to furnish—and on the other hand the desirability from the point of view of orderly administration of justice, that official proceedings in criminal cases be carried on in an atmosphere of calm and dignified detachment.

Certain features of democratic government,—the law-making process and, all that goes with it, committee hearings, debates on the floor of legislative bodies, public statements by legislators and administrators seeking to guide legislation,—all these properly respond to expression from the public for whom laws are being made and are properly and desirably reported by press, radio and television so that the public may in turn put pressure on its governmental officials. Furthermore on the administrative process (except where the administrator is in effect engaged in adjudication) the light of publicity properly shines at all times. It is desirable that the public be informed about what the President is doing, what the Secretary of State is doing, what the Governor is doing, what the Mayor is doing, what the local Chief of Police is doing. But in the administration of justice we seek in many ways an opposite policy. Great pains are taken at every step of judicial proceedings to insulate court and jury from popular pressure. The judge, in some instances throughout his life, and in others at least for the term of his appointment, is free from the threat of popular reprisal. The jury is supposedly selected for detachment rather than for its preconceived opinions and policies. Rules of evidence are devised to limit the proceedings to those matters which are relevant. Obviously testimony of popular resentment against an accused, or popular feeling that he ought to be acquitted, is not only irrelevant in the courts but sound policy excludes it to avoid producing social evils.

These policies raise important questions concerning the conduct of newspapers and other media of publicity.

In the first place do the newspapers in general adequately report and adequately comment on the denial to prisoners of rights to which they are supposedly entitled? Or (and this is said in seriousness and not satirically) is it the general opinion of the American public, reflected in the newspapers, that the protections thrown around persons suspected of crime are actually unwholesome; hence should the newspapers frankly state this as commentary when the protections in question are slighted or denied?

In the second place, is the reporting of sensational crime, and of police investigations prior to trial generally conducted in the United States with appropriate self-restraint?

The *Boston Herald* for Friday, January 13, 1956, carried as a headline running entirely across the top of the page

the words "BRINK CASE SOLVED, O'KEEFE KEY F.B.I.: THIS IS HOW IT HAPPENED." Then came photographs of six men, with the names in conspicuous type under each, and under the photographs another headline running entirely across the page "SIX BANDITS PUT IN JAIL HERE."

Curiously, however, the righthand two columns carry the headline "Suffolk Jurors to Act Today," which, one supposes, indicates that there was something for the jurors to consider. On page 18 of the paper appears a statement that the six-year statute of limitations would not expire until Tuesday, four days after the article in question was published. The editorial for the day states "The announcement of the solution is a great relief for Boston."

The Brink case in which public interest in the Boston area was, and is, immense, naturally was given this conspicuous publicity. However a question immediately arises in the mind of a lawyer as to whether the Grand Jurors in this case were in position to give consideration to the evidence presented before them if they had previously read the conclusions of the Boston papers.

Another example of newspaper criminal reporting can be found in the *Herald* of November 6, 1954. (The *Herald* is selected here not because it is any different from most other newspapers in its criminal reporting but merely because the man who is preparing this discussion happens to subscribe to the *Herald*.) On that day a headline, more than an inch high, running all the way across the page, read—"10 Grilled in Norwood Slaying." On the front page was also a picture of the victim, taken before her death, clad in a bathing suit; of her mother, being comforted by a neighbor; and of two distraught girl friends. The story, dated at Norwood, Massachusetts, the preceding day, contained, among other things, these statements:

"Police questioned 10 men tonight in the hunt for the slayer of Geraldine Annese, fifteen-year-old South Norwood girl, whose murder in a garage brought to a head a wave of criminal attacks in the suburb.

"As the 10, seven teen-agers and three adults, were being fingerprinted and grilled, police disclosed that a note, written in ink, and a cigarette butt, had been found in the garage.

* * *

"District Attorney Myron Lane and state police detectives swiftly joined Norwood police, who have been keeping a series of thwarted attacks suppressed from the public over a period of two months. Lane declared he was optimistic that the killer would be found.

"Lane revealed, in a late afternoon press conference following a preliminary autopsy, that the girl suffered a massive brain hemorrhage, that she was strangled as

well, and that there was no doubt a sex attack had at least been attempted."

The Boston *Herald* for the next morning carried a headline running across the page:

"BOY HIDES MOTIVE IN SLAYING"

Beneath is a photograph of a boy, with a mark on his right cheek. Underneath this is printed:

"After-Thought?—Peter Makarewicz, Jr., 15-year-old confessed killer of Geraldine Annese, 15, as he stands near the murder scene in Norwood. The scratch on his right cheek testifies to struggle in the garage where Geraldine was slain."

The story on the front page tells the readers—

"Police Chief Mark Folan, in an exclusive interview with the *Herald* tonight, revealed that Makarewicz plotted the 15-year-old brunette's murder "within an hour before she died."

"He said that Peter, a tall, extremely self-possessed boy, bore up coolly throughout the night under the questioning of state detectives but early this morning broke dramatically.

"Sobs for Long Time

"It happened, Folan disclosed, after silver nitrate tests on his hands and clothing—and on Geraldine's clothing—showed traces of blood.

"Even that did not faze the boy but then police laid the dungarees, corduroy jacket and kerchief he had torn from her after throttling her fatally, on a desk in front of him.

"He broke down and cried—a long time," Folan said.

"He was hysterical. We let him cry. When he pulled himself together, he looked at us and said: 'Yes, I did it.'"

"Then the boy launched into a confession most of the details of which are being kept secret by Dist. Atty. Myron Lane, who with Folan headed the investigation.

* * *

"Why? Dist. Atty. Lane says 'We have evidence that he had reason, although he didn't say.'

"Chief Folan asked the same question, said: 'Just—something snapped.'

"He said Peter insists he 'doesn't know' why he sneaked out the back way shortly before 9:45, when he knew Geraldine would be hurrying home to beat a 10 p.m. curfew, and hid in the shadows of the garage.

"She came swinging down the street, humming a tune called 'Teach me Tonight.' As she came into the driveway, he beckoned from the shadows.

"Geraldine went to him without fear. He was, after all, the boy next door.

"He induced her to step into the garage.

"Inside, he flung her to the floor. Her head struck the

solidly-packed dirt surface, hard. She was momentarily stunned, and when she revived he was choking her. She struggled briefly.

"Just then the boy heard steps. It was Geraldine's mother, Mrs. Joseph Annese, coming home from the Dean street residence of a son, Peter De Rose.

"As Geraldine struggled, the boy stuffed her mouth and eyes with dirt. She breathed it in—and choked. She never made another sound.

"Blood on Trousers

"Then he went back home, silently across the darkened garden plot. There was some blood on his trousers, and he stuffed them into a dirty-clothes hamper.

"And with that, he went calmly to the TV set and resumed his baby sitting.

* * *

"Tonight Lane said that despite Peter's youth he can go to the electric chair if convicted of first degree murder without a jury recommendation for mercy.

"Although he could not recall any previous case in which a juvenile has been sentenced to death in this commonwealth, he said:

"'The fact that he's a minor makes no difference—when the crime is murder.'"

The Norwood case points up the fundamental problems of fair trial and free press. On the assumption, here purely for purposes of argument, that Peter Makarewicz's confession might have been obtained from him not by his consent but by overcoming his resistance,† would any jury drawn from the vicinity, whose members had read the newspaper accounts, be willing to return a verdict to that effect? If the jury is persuaded that the boy is guilty, and if the confession is verified by other evidence, should the voluntary or involuntary quality of the confession make any difference? Should these questions be determined by the general public, on information supplied by the police and the District Attorney to newspapers, or should they be determined by court procedures, on testimony controlled by rules of evidence? How much weight should be given to the desire of the reading public to see sensational news material?

When the validity of a confession is in question protection of the accused presents a complicated problem. The first stage in any criminal prosecution may be a hearing before a committing Magistrate. If the confession is then read and reporters are present, the entire matter is spread in the newspapers as a matter of course. A conspicuous ex-

† He was convicted of murder with a jury recommendation that the death sentence be not imposed. The judge imposed a sentence of life imprisonment. On February 15, 1956, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts affirmed the judgment.

ample, in a particularly shocking murder case, is described in the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Stroble v. California* 343 U.S. 181 (1952). The validity of the confession is thereafter probably taken for granted in the community generally.

In Scotland, information concerning proceedings previous to trial is unavailable to the press. An English commentator finds the public availability of testimony before a committing magistrate in England, which is accessible to newspaper reporters like that in America less favorable to the defendant than the situation in Scotland. See *Journal of the Society of Public Teachers of Law*, 1951, Volume 1, pages 462, 463. In Scotland, there is no hearing before a committing magistrate, or hear before a Coroner, both of which persist in England and in some places in the United States. The whole Scots procedure prior to trial is conducted by public officers acting in confidence. The accused is informed of the substance of the case against him by the presentation, which gives him, at least fifteen clear days before trial, a list of the witnesses and all other evidence which may be produced against him. The accused or his lawyer may take statements from prosecution witnesses and examine the other evidence, and the public authorities in grave cases are liberal with their permission to show counsel for the accused statements taken by the Crown. The net result of this system is that there is no publication of evidence before actual trial.

For description of this procedure, see 54 *Law Quarterly Review* 352 and 353* (1938). For a suggestion that England retain the preliminary hearing but conduct it in private, see a note "Pre-trial Publicity" by Professor Glanville Williams, 15 *Modern Law Review* 98 (1952).

By an amendment to the "Summary Jurisdiction Act" (Northern Ireland, 1953), publication of any opening statement by the prosecution in a criminal trial was forbidden, and magistrates were authorized to forbid the publication of any evidence on the objection of the accused if made in good faith; and to forbid it even without objection where the magistrate finds that the evidence would prejudice the trial of the accused. This statute represented a considerable withdrawal from the original proposal under which publication of preliminary proceedings was very limited. The original proposal was strongly opposed by the newspapers. See "Summary Jurisdiction Act (Northern Ireland) 1953"—"Pre-trial Publicity," 16 *Modern Law Review* 485 (1953).

Efforts to regulate newspaper and radio discussion of pending prosecutions have met with little success in the

United States. In 1939, the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City adopted its Rule 904, which read:

"In connection with any case which may be pending in the Criminal Court of Baltimore, or in connection with any person charged with crime and in the custody of the Police Department of Baltimore City, or other constituted authority, upon a charge of crime over which the Criminal Court of Baltimore has jurisdiction, whether before or after indictment, any of the following acts shall be subject to punishment as contempt:

- A. The making of photographs of the accused without his consent.
- B. The making of any photograph in violation of Rule 3 hereof.
- C. The issuance by the Police authorities, the State's Attorney, counsel for the defense, or any other person having official connections with the case, of any statement relative to the conduct of the accused, statements or admissions made by the accused, or other matter bearing upon the issues to be tried.
- D. The issuance of any statement or forecast as to the future course of action of either the prosecuting authorities or the defense relative to the conduct of the trial.
- E. The publication of any matter which may prevent a fair trial, improperly influence the court or the jury, or tend in any manner to interfere with the administration of justice.
- F. Publication of any matter obtained as a result of a violation of this Rule."

On July 6, 1948, an eleven-year-old girl was stabbed by an unidentified man in the northwest section of Baltimore. The crime was atrocious, and parents in the vicinity were greatly concerned about their children. Later that day Eugene H. James was arrested and held for investigation. While in the custody of the police he made a statement admitting his guilt. He was taken to the scene of the crime, he pointed out where he had buried the knife, and a few hours later signed a written confession. He was tried for murder without a jury, as his lawyer contended that radio accounts of the confession and the circumstances made it impossible to select a fair jury. James was convicted and sentenced to death.

The following account of the publicity in this case was taken from the report of a proceeding to hold Baltimore Radio Show, Inc., and other radio organizations guilty of contempt. See 193 MD 300, 308 and following (1949); 338 US 912 (cert. den. Jan. 9, 1950).

"Miss Taggart, the night editor of the United Press, called Hamilton R. Atkinson, Police Commissioner of Baltimore City, about 7 p.m. stating that she intended

* "The Public Prosecutor in Scotland," by W. G. Normand.

to write a story embodying the information which he would either give or verify for her. Commissioner Atkinson verified certain information already possessed by her, and gave her certain other information relative to the case. Later that evening, Commissioner Atkinson was interviewed by the Press outside his office at Police Headquarters, and in response to questions, gave further information, although he denies that he gave out a formal press release for publication.

"At about 9:45 p.m. Miss Taggart placed on the teletype, operated by United Press, a dispatch concerning the case. This dispatch was received by the three radio stations and broadcast at various times during the evening, in slightly different forms. The broadcasters were capable of being heard throughout the city and in many of the counties of the State, and were heard by a substantial but indeterminate number of listeners. Similar broadcasts were made by other radio stations located within and without the state, and similar news items were published in newspapers published in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia and New York, circulating in the state. The newspapers published in Baltimore City did not publish the items complained of.

"At 8:45 p.m. on July 8, 1948, the appellant Connolly broadcast over the facilities of the appellant WITH the following information:

'After three days of unrelenting hard work on the part of every man in the department, the Baltimore police have just broken the Brill murder case—broken it wide open. Police Commissioner Hamilton R. Atkinson announced only a few moments ago that a man has been arrested and formally charged with the crime—the brutal and apparently pointless stabbing of eleven-year-old Marsha Brill in the Pimlico neighborhood Tuesday afternoon. The funeral of the little murder victim was held today and hundreds of persons attended. The man now charged with the Brill girl's murder is Eugene James, a 31-year-old Negro and convicted former offender, whose home is at 3311 Payton Avenue, not far from the scene of the crime.

'The police said James not only admitted the Brill murder and another recent assault in the same area but that he went over the scene of the crime with them late this afternoon and showed them where the murder weapon was buried. It turned out to be an old kitchen carving knife. Immediately after the finding of the knife the prisoner was taken down-town to police headquarters for a formal statement. The story of how James came to be charged with the Brill murder is an account of police work at its best. James was taken into custody yesterday mainly because of his record. Police remembered that he

had been charged or suspected in past years with a series of assaults and that about ten years ago he was sentenced to the Maryland Penitentiary for an attack on a ten-year-child. The police took into account also the fact that James' home was close to the scene of the Brill crime.

'James was questioned, along with other suspects, but no information of much importance was obtained from him until today. The police did not use any force, of course, but questioned him persistently. Then, this morning, according to the officers, James admitted an attack on a white woman recently in the same woods near where the Brill girl was slain. In that case, too, James used a knife but only to threaten his victim into submission. She was not otherwise injured. With more information supplied by James, police recovered the woman's pocketbook, which had been taken from her. Police said James was familiar with every foot of the ground on which the offenses, the assault of the woman and the slaying of the girl, occurred. James is not an obvious mental case. Throughout all his questioning, said the police, he seemed, as they put it 'quite cute', in other words, wary. When James freely admitted the assault on the woman the police were encouraged and renewed their interrogation with renewed vigor. They felt that James had admitted the lesser assault only to throw the police off the main track, and the police felt they were close to a confession in the Brill case. They were in fact. 'A few hours later the prisoner broke again and this time it was the break that broke the Brill case. James admitted that crime also and consented to accompany the police to the scene. On the ground, said the police, he made a more detailed admission. Among those who accompanied him to the scene of the crime were the highest ranking officers of the department. They were led by Commissioner Atkinson. With him were Chief Inspector M. Joseph Wallace, Inspector Joseph Itzel, who had directed the examination of James and other suspects, and Capt. Oscar Lusby, the comparatively new commander of the Northern Police District.

'The appearance of the high ranking police officials with an obvious suspect on the scene of the crime soon drew hundreds of idle spectators and for that reason the police did not linger on the ground any longer than necessary. Instead they took James and the evidence they had accumulated downtown to Police headquarters for a formal statement. From headquarters the prisoner was taken to the Northern station. He probably will be arraigned in Northern police court tomorrow.

'The first hint that the police were close to an important break in the Brill case came with word from an officer

of rank at headquarters that, while no arrests had yet been made and no charges had been placed, the police felt they had a very good suspect. James was the suspect of course. At that time he had not confessed the Brill crime, although he had admitted the earlier offense against the woman in the same neighborhood. Since the break in the case came so late in the day, the police were at first inclined to postpone making the actual charge against James until tomorrow. In view of the intense interest in the case, however, and in view of the alarm and agitation among parents and children in the area in which the crime occurred, Commissioner Atkinson decided to make the charge and announcement immediately in order to relieve anxiety among the families in the Pimlico area.

'The Police are deserving of the utmost commendation for the comparatively quick break in the case, and the commendation is merited by every man who worked on the assignment, from the highest to the lowest in the department. From the first Commissioner Atkinson personally took charge of the investigation. The hunt for the slayer promised to be a long, hard routine search. The killer had escaped from the scene despite a wide dragnet thrown around it soon after the alarm. Usually when an arrest is not made on or near the scene such cases develop into long, exhausting investigations that end, usually, only when the police get some favorable break. In this case the officers made their own break by remembering James' record and taking him in hand promptly. Had the police not been so alert and so prompt James might have fled the city. With the prisoner in hand, all the rest was accomplished by patient and skilled interrogation. Dozens of suspects were examined and released until the police felt reasonably sure that the lone man remaining in custody was the one they wanted. 'The police are to be congratulated. And it is tragic that all the community can do otherwise is commiserate with the bereaved family. Fifteen hundred dollars in reward money has been offered for the arrest and conviction of the Brill slayer, and the distribution of that money

among these who have earned it remains to be decided. But, if I am not mistaken, the police do not consider themselves eligible for rewards.

'And now a brief pause. Here is our announcer, Gil Kriegel, again with a message from our sponsor. I'll be with you again in a moment with more news and comments.'"

The defendant radio stations were charged with violating the rules of court which the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City had laid down and were convicted; but on appeal the Maryland Court of Appeals (with one dissent) held that the rules were violative of the Fourteenth Amendment. 193 MD 300 (1948).

The state of Maryland sought review by certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States, which that Court denied, 338 US 919 (1950). Mr. Justice Frankfurter, however, handed down an opinion discussing the denial of certiorari. He pointed out that the denial carried no implication that either the prevailing opinion or the dissent in the Maryland Court of Appeals was correct, and added an Appendix describing a number of English cases in which newspapers were punished for publication of accounts of criminal proceedings which exceeded a fair report of what had taken place in open court.

The severity of the English judges in such cases would startle many American lawyers and newspapermen. In general one thinks of England as having a vigorous tradition of press freedom. But one wonders whether the reporting of criminal proceedings which have not yet been through the adjudicatory stage has anything to do with the freedom of the press according to its proper purpose. Shaping of public policy is not at all involved.

The questions which we would like to have the Nieman Fellows consider are whether there is any practical way in which this sort of crime reporting can be improved so as to eliminate what seems to be substantial evils; and whether the press is accomplishing all that it should in providing enlightened criticism of the administration of criminal justice.

Postscripts

(Nieman Notes Too Late to Classify)

1950

Clay Hall, 16 year old son of **Max Hall** of the State Department, was in the Kraft Television Theatre play, on Feb. 22. Clay is in school at St. Albans. His father, an old AP man in Washington, is working on the Organization for Trade Cooperation in the State Department.

1951

Simeon S. Booker, associate editor of *Jet*, has been made head of their new bureau in Washington. His address: 1728 S Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

1952

John L. Steele did a cover article for *Time* on Sherman Adams in January and visited in Cambridge on his way to Lincoln, N. H.

1953

Robert C. Miller (1948), Australian United Press correspondent, reports a pleasant dinner with **Jack Flower** and his wife and adds the news that Jack is now editor of the Sydney *Sun-Herald*. He was assistant chief of staff of the *Morning Herald* when he was an associate Nieman Fellow in 1953.

A letter from **William Gordon**, managing editor of the Atlanta *Daily World*, a Negro newspaper, writes: "There is another side to this drama in the South, the side which never makes the headlines. There is the side showing whites and Negroes, against adverse conditions, working to improve conditions and to comply with the United States Supreme Court's decision on public school integration. There are many outstanding examples to support the above.

"My work is presently taking me into many interesting situations all over the South. I hope, when time permits, to pull something together for the Nieman Reports. I have already done several mag-

azine articles, including one for *Look*, October 19th issue of 1955. The title, "What I Tell My Child About Color."

1954

Lionel Hudson, who has been in the Australian Associated Press office in New York since his Nieman year, is returning to Australia in April to develop a news program for the new Australian television system, to start this Fall.

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* assigned **Richard Dudman** of its Washington bureau to Israel, early in March. Dudman has been to Israel several years ago to cover the illegal immigration of Displaced Persons to Palestine.

Alvin Davis of the New York *Post* and his wife adopted a second French baby, Anita, in February.

The Knight papers have moved **Robert Hoyt** from the Akron *Beacon Journal* to their Washington Bureau where he joins **Ed Lahey** (1939), bureau chief, and **Pete Lisagor** (1949).

1955

Bill Woestendiek did a five part series on the segregation issue in *Newsday*, starting March 2. The series title: The Great American Dilemma.

The Providence *Journal* contingent of Nieman Fellows joined their editor, **Sevelon Brown III**, in presenting a program at a dinner of the Nieman Fellows, and a guest list of Harvard Overseers, March 12. **Barry Brown** described the editorial page and **Albert Kraus** the business news department. The New Hampshire primary kept **John Strohmeier** away.

Nieman Fellows who covered the Seato Conference: **Christopher Rand** for *The New Yorker*, **Keyes Beech** for the Chicago *Daily News*, **Arch Parsons** for the New York *Herald Tribune*, **Capt. Bill Lederer** for the Navy.

Nieman Reports

A Bargain at \$3 a Year

Nieman Reports is published at cost, without advertising. Our printing costs have been increased three times and our size has gone from 32 to 48 pages since we set a \$2 subscription. We have to go now to \$3 a year. We will still offer a \$1.50 rate to journalism school students. At \$3 a year, it is still a publishing bargain with more content than any other \$3 magazine.

Copy to
come

NIEMAN REPORTS

77 Dunster Street
44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Please renew my subscription to *Nieman Reports*, for which I enclose \$3.00 for one year; \$5.50 for 2 years; \$7.50 for 3 years.

.....

..... Street

City Zip Code
Postal Zone

..... State

Make check payable to Society of Nieman Fellows