

NiemanReports

April, 1957

Are Newspapers Losing The Competition For Talent?

Norval Neil Luxon

Unsolicited Visit to China

William Worthly

Do We Know How to Cover China?

Harold R. Isaacs

Censorship in Cuba

Marvin Alisky

The Newspaper Job

John B. Oakes

Trial By Newspaper

Joseph M. Harvey

The Women's Magazines

Roland E. Wolseley

Press Neglect of the Humanities

Howard Mumford Jones

Science and Censorship, Gerard Piel — *The Lesson of Advertising*, Gerald W. Johnson
— *The Power of the Supreme Court*, Anthony Lewis — *Why I Took the First Amendment*,
William A. Price — *Canada in Washington*, R. A. Farquharson — *Reviews* — *Letters on*
the Foreign Correspondent — *Nieman Notes*

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, Norwalk, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, The Hague, Netherlands; Melvin S. Wax, Chicago; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 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. XI; NO. 2

APRIL, 1957

The Newspaper Job

By John B. Oakes

I certainly hope that a certain number of you men before me want to take up newspaper work as your life interest. If you are serious about it, you have to be prepared for tough work, low pay, a lot of frustration, and a lot of fun. It's a profession as exacting in its own peculiar way as teaching or law. It demands much from its practitioners but offers much in return—at least in psychic income. And if you are serious about it, you have an advantage that my contemporaries did not have. They had to fight and sweat for jobs; you have them offered to you more or less on a silver platter. No, not jobs with big metropolitan newspapers with enormous circulation and large staffs; but jobs, plenty of them, on small and medium-sized journals throughout the country, particularly in the West. And that's the kind of place to start anyway—on a newspaper that can offer a variety of experience in everything from sermons to fires. Believe me, if you are interested in newspaper work as a career—and I hope you are—that's the way to start and the jobs are there.

You may have seen some recently-published figures regarding the mortality of journalism school graduates. I'm not talking about their health, but about the low proportion of them that enter the profession of journalism. Every school in the country has more job opportunities than it can fill. One reason for this state of affairs is that so many of the qualified newspapermen are not going into newspaper work at all, but into such better paid (and in some ways safer though infinitely less interesting) kinds of work as

John Oakes of the editorial board of the *New York Times* started his newspaper days on the *Princetonian*. This is from his talk to the annual *Princetonian* dinner January 12.

public relations, advertising, and house organs of large industrial corporations. Naturally, the newspapers themselves are partly to blame for this shortage—average starting pay for qualified college graduates in newspapers is somewhat less than in other professions—but I must add that, even relatively, working conditions and salary are infinitely superior today to those of twenty years ago. But you don't go into it for salary; you go into it because you want to become a first-hand observer of the exciting, fast-moving, complicated, dangerous world in which we live.

I don't mean to leave the impression, by the way, that journalism degrees are essential nowadays for entry into newspaper work. Far from it, though the old prejudice against journalism graduates—a prejudice so strong that some managing editors only a few years ago wouldn't have dreamed of hiring one—has just about disappeared along with the oldtimers who nurtured it. Newspapermen today are educated, and they have to be; and therefore I'd say that the prime requisite for professional journalism, in addition to an inquiring mind and integrity of purpose, is a first-class general education, with graduate work thrown in if possible.

You see, the stuff that newspapers deal with today is complex. It reflects the varied facets and many levels of our heterogeneous society. The well-equipped newspaperman ought to be a sociologist, an economist, a historian, a political scientist, a psychologist, a constitutional lawyer; and it is becoming increasingly important for him to know something about the natural sciences as well. To be sure, this is an age of specialization; but if you are going to try to interpret that age to the general public—and that is the function of newspapers and newspapermen—you have to be almost universal in your interests and broad in your horizons. What newspapers, and for that matter, the rest of the world, need most are educated men; and by educated, I mean men who have some comprehension of our civilization as a whole, its origins, its traditions, its culture, its aspirations. In short, the newspaperman of today has to be equipped to handle the big and tough problems, and handle them intelligently and responsibly.

So does his newspaper. The first and prime requisite of that newspaper is a sense of responsibility. You know, the First Amendment is not a one-way street. It wasn't adopted in the early days of this republic merely to give newspaper publishers a favored position. The philosophical basis for the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of the press is, as I see it, a guarantee to the public of its right to know what is going on. Some of the founding fathers didn't see any point to the amendment at all. Alexander Hamilton, that brilliant patriot the 200th anniversary of whose birth was celebrated just this week, wrote this in *The Federalist*:

What signifies a declaration, that "the liberty of the

(Continued to page ten)

Are Newspapers Losing the Competition for Talent?

A Journalism Dean Thinks They Are

By Norval Neil Luxon

Newspapers are facing tough competition in today's market for the college graduate.

Let me cite some facts.

Recent surveys by two professional schools of journalism—the University of Minnesota and the University of North Carolina—show that only three out of five of their male graduates of the past five years have gone to work for newspapers or press associations. The remaining 40 per cent graduated from my school of North Carolina have gone into graduate schools, advertising jobs, public relations, sales, and trade journalism.

The competition from other media—radio and television stations, industrial journalism, employee magazines, the editing of corporation reports and house organs, advertising agencies, department stores, and companies which handle their own advertising—is such that we have a hard time convincing our journalism students that they should go to newspaper jobs.

And should we?

Let me cite cases of two Carolina graduates:

Last June Champion Paper had a series of interviews with one of our seniors—a hard worker, a good, but not outstanding student academically. He was considered—and was in competition until the final decision was made between him and one other applicant—for a job editing a company magazine at a starting salary of \$6,000 with an early increase to \$7,500.

Fortunately, in my opinion, he did not get the job. Today he is working on a North Carolina newspaper.

Schools of journalism have a responsibility, not only to newspapers but also to their graduates. We are eager to supply the demand that newspapers make upon us for our graduates, but—and this is my second example—in all honesty and decency, I might add, how can I, as dean and adviser to a student—a veteran with a wife and child—advise him to take a newspaper job at \$54 a week when he is offered \$94 a week, plus many fringe benefits, by General Electric with an attractive schedule of substantial salary increases?

Why shouldn't newspapers approach the problem of hiring new personnel and keeping them after they are hired as intelligently as do accounting firms, advertising

agencies, department stores, manufacturers, and soup and soap companies, all of which have teams of trained personnel-seekers traveling from campus to campus from October through May?

Why shouldn't more newspapers determine upon a personnel policy and establish personnel programs. A start is being made by a few. But more attention must be paid by newspapers to attracting and retaining promising young university graduates unless they are to be satisfied, as I know they will not, with the rejects and the leftovers.

One thing I hope newspapermen will do. That is to cease and desist from the popular and widespread practice of cynical comment and discouraging advice to young people who ask about newspaper work as a career.

I have yet to hear a physician or surgeon, an attorney, or a minister discuss his chosen profession in derogatory terms.

To put it in the language of the street, I think it is about time that newspapermen stop "bad-mouthing" their own business.

What can newspapers do to keep the staff member on the job, once they have selected him with care?

First of all an adequate starting salary scale must be set up. I am not going to specify an exact starting salary because it won't apply to all sections of the country and cities of all sizes.

But it is clear that comparatively newspaper starting salaries are in a definitely disadvantageous position.

Compare for a moment the \$215 to \$475 monthly range—the average was \$336 last June and undoubtedly will be at least \$350 in June 1957—that corporations pay university graduates to start—with the \$149 to \$340 range and the \$247 average of 134 American Newspaper Guild contracts for starting salaries.

The newspaper average is \$89 a month below that of the corporations and more than \$100 below next June's probable average.

Why are starting salaries on newspapers in such an unfortunate position today?

I don't know. Let me cite what has happened comparatively in the past 30 to 35 years.

In June 1923, I went to work on the Columbus *Citizen* at \$35 a week. My journalism classmates that year took jobs paying from \$25 to \$35. Engineering graduates went to Westinghouse at \$90 a month in a training program that

Norval Neil Luxon is dean of the University of North Carolina School of Journalism. This is from a talk to the North Carolina A.P. Managing Editors Conference last November.

ran 18 months or longer. Accounting and business graduates thought \$125 to \$135 a good starting salary.

In other words, the journalism graduates of the twenties fared as well as most and better than many as far as starting salary was concerned.

Now, let's look at 1956. The 154 graduates of the University of North Carolina who got jobs through the Placement Service had monthly starting salaries averaging \$339.91 to be exact.

Of our journalism graduates, including two Phi Beta Kappas, one got \$75, and one \$70, and most of the others started at \$65. A number of newspapers offered \$50 and \$55—slightly below the median and average of the 134 Guild contracts cited earlier. I personally know of no student who went to work for less than \$60. Thus, the entire range of the journalism graduates in 1956 at North Carolina was from \$260 to \$325 a month, well below the average of the 154 jobs taken in accounting, advertising, banking and finance, retailing, sales, and transportation by their classmates.

Recently I told the South Carolina A. P. managing editors that for the Carolinas I do not think \$75 a week is out of line from the viewpoint of either the graduate or the newspaper. Remember, these graduates have spent four years on a university campus—two in a professional school preparing for a specific career. I think a lesser salary may be paid to the graduate who has had no journalism instruction, although I'd waive the differential in case of a Phi Beta Kappa, no matter what his major may have been. I think also that there should be at least a \$10—and preferably a \$15 weekly differential—in the case of students who have earned a master's degree. They constitute a selected group with training on a higher level.

In addition, the beginner—whatever his starting salary—should be informed when interviewed or hired of the increases which he may expect if he performs satisfactorily.

Some type of formal or informal in-service training program for beginning personnel should be installed.

With leading corporations operating training programs for university graduates, newspapers should give serious consideration to the establishment of well-planned, adequately-supervised in-service programs.

In my opinion, the opportunity to advance and to perform duties for which he is best qualified and in which he is most interested is even more important than is the starting salary to the new staff member. The training program should, if intelligently conceived and conducted, uncover the particular bent or talents of each neophyte.

The study of personnel turnover on small dailies in Texas, published in the Spring 1955 issue of the *Journalism Quarterly*, underscores the problem of holding staff men.

One thing that staff members appreciate and which costs little is recognition. This recognition may be only a personal word of commendation or a brief note of congratulation on the bulletin board. Bonuses for unusual enterprise are good-will builders. A number of newspapers are matching any state, regional, or national money prizes won by staff members.

Most newspapermen, I believe, tend to gravitate to newspapers whose news and editorial policies they are in sympathy with or respect. Most of the journalism graduates I have known in the past 35 years take pride in the newspaper on which they work. This sense of loyalty to the paper is a factor of which I am sure managing editors are aware and accept as one of the finer aspects of the newspaper profession.

We on the university campuses are trying to send newspapers intelligent, well-educated young men and women, well-grounded in the humanities and the social sciences, well-trained in the basic techniques of journalism and imbued with a willing and enthusiastic spirit for newspaper work.

The editors who hire and use our products can, I think, get more of our best students, many of whom they have been losing to competing media and to industry, if they adopt the suggestions I have made here.

Unsanctioned Visit

Bill Worthy Reports on China

On Christmas Day, William Worthy landed at Peking to spend his Christmas holidays in China. He had been invited and hoped that as the first American correspondent to China since 1949 he might get some scoops. A delegation met the plane. But they came to greet another passenger, the mayor of Bombay. "Name please" was Worthy's greeting, by an Intourist agent. None of the numerous requests he listed with the Swarthmore graduate at the Government Information Department was granted, except a cut-and-dried interview with Chou-En-lai and another with a brainwashed American prisoner. But he had a month in China to form impressions. On his return to Harvard for the second semester, to resume his Nieman Fellowship, he was asked to make many talks. This is from one of them.

Worthy is a correspondent of the Afro-American. For them he went to the Bandung Conference, spent five months in Moscow, toured Africa last summer and followed many other foreign assignments. He was one of

many American correspondents invited to China. The others did not go, after the State Department refused permission. Two correspondents of Look Magazine in Moscow went at the same time as Worthy, but separately. Neither they nor he knew of the other's plans. Worthy had served CBS at times, and broadcast for them from China. The State Department threatened penalties to the three correspondents. Protests against the ban on correspondents in China have been lodged by American publishers, and editors, broadcasters and leading publications. After two months of this, Secretary Dulles said the State Department had decided against penalizing the three correspondents. He said he and the President had considered the question of securing news for the American public from China but had found no practicable way to answer it at present. Worthy had waived all claim to protection under his passport and took no American money into China. His passport expired March 4. He has applied for its renewal.

By William Worthy

Before trying to give my general impressions of China, I want to present as much factual material as possible, with comment, and to let my impressions, some of which are contradictory, emerge in that way.

First, let me cite five comments by five different persons which will give you something of my own frame of reference.

The first comment was made about three years ago, down South, by a repatriated American prisoner-of-war who had lived in close contact with the so-called Chinese "volunteers" in a prison camp in North Korea. He remarked to me that "if you've talked to one Chinese, you've talked to them all." What this POW meant was that you get the same line again and again, no matter how many Chinese you have the opportunity to meet. I found that to be true during my 41 days in China.

The second comment was by a Western diplomat in Peking who has traveled considerably around China during the past several years. He told me of how few chances he and other foreigners stationed in China have to meet ordinary non-official men and women. Even when you speak the language, he said, it's like swimming in a river and remaining dry.

The third comment was by another repatriated American prisoner-of-war whose home is in Kentucky. After reviewing for several hours all of the mental and physical tortures

he had seen the Chinese practice in the camps he summed everything up by saying: "Those people are awful." After my interview with Lutheran missionary Paul Mackensen in the Shanghai Jail on January 16—a man who has been completely brainwashed—I had to agree that the Chinese Government officials who direct what Robert Lifton calls these "assaults on identity and self" are truly awful.

The fourth comment was by a Western correspondent in Peking who observed to me one day that a revolution could break out in any one of the provinces of China, and the handful of Westerners in Peking, Shanghai and other big cities would not necessarily learn a thing about it.

The fifth and final quotation comes from an Indian diplomat in China. He summed up the pervasiveness of the communist system by noting that nothing that happens inside China can be separated from the official ideology. Having been in the Soviet Union I would only add that this is even more true there than in a country that has been communist for only eight years.

Having a particular interest in educational and intellectual affairs in China, and in the life of students, I visited People's University on the outskirts of Peking, Tsing Hua University in Peking—the "M.I.T. of China," as one professor described it—, and Shanghai Conservatory of Music.

At People's University my main purpose was to inter-

view former corporal William Charles White, one of the three Negro American soldiers who remained in China after the Korean truce. I'll run through some of the information I gained from him. Most if not all of it is, I believe, accurate. The students work hard and they have fewer distractions than we here at Harvard, for example, have. I was told that the government, which urgently needs well-trained university graduates in just about every field, prefers to have its schools and universities far enough out of metropolitan centers to discourage the diversions of city girls and city entertainments. I interviewed White just five days after reaching China, and I wasn't at that time fully aware of international transportation difficulties. It was a Saturday evening that I saw him, and I made the mistake of not arranging in advance for a car to pick me up and take me the eight or nine miles back to Peking. When I was ready to leave it took White over two hours to get me a car. Apparently everywhere in China taxis are almost non-existent. It was too late to get an Intourist car. We phoned the Foreign Office Press Department and they had nothing available. Finally, for a fairly steep price I got a ride in one of the three or four cars reserved for faculty use. Needless to say, students don't own cars. Even if they could afford one it would be contrary to government policy of having a one-track scholastic purpose during one's years in school.

Another sidelight on student life: both Arthur Koestler and George Orwell have noted in their writings that every dictatorship seems to feel called upon to regulate and spy upon the people's sex life. Under the Communists, China has become a puritanical country, and the Chinese equivalents of Harvard's parietal rules are very strict. Last week another of the American prisoners-of-war who stayed in China after Korea came home. His name is Samuel Hawkins, and I talked with him several times in Peking. While he was at WuHan University he had trouble and claimed that he was expelled because he didn't conform to the ban on having girls in his room.

The most specific information that I was able to get at any institution of higher learning came from Dr. S. B. Tung, professor of electrical engineering at Tsing Hua University in Peking. Until 1955 he was teaching at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute after having graduated from the University of Illinois. Then at the age of 35 he decided to return to the motherland. The four-year course that he knew in the States is a five-year course at Tsing Hua and other Chinese technical schools. In China students must spend an overall total of 28 weeks in industry on three separate occasions before graduating. Dr. Tung finds Chinese students more conscientious than the average American student. This, he remarked, makes his teaching more difficult. They receive American technical journals. The courses are in Chinese. Some of the equip-

ment in his department of electrical engineering is Chinese-made; some comes from Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, with a lesser amount from Russia. He added that they hope before long to get American equipment also.

At Tsing Hua there are 8600 students, with an expected enrollment next fall of 10,000. The teaching staff totals 1100, of which 110 are professors. Most of the professors have studied in the States. Three of them are women. There are departments of electrical engineering, radio engineering, civil engineering, water conservation, architecture, power generating and mechanics. A couple of comparative statistics will give you an idea of the vast expansion of educational opportunities under the Communists—one of the keys to whatever popular support they enjoy among youth. Five years ago the student body was only around 2000. In the fall, as I said, it will number 10,000.

I dropped in on a morning lecture in political science to about 300 students. Almost uniformly the men had the standard blue and black cotton-padded jackets and trousers. Many of the girls wore the same. But there was an occasional girl in brown or maroon or printed blouse. Some of the girls wear braids. Some of the fellows keep their caps on; others don't.

The instructor was a slender man of about 35. He was not an impressive person, but he made up for it in intensity. I'm told that many like him have just emerged recently from their own indoctrination courses, and that there's practically an assembly-line production of lecturers on political topics. Over the blackboard was a loudspeaker connected with the director's office, where announcements for the entire student body are made. I didn't learn whether or not the director can in turn tune in on what the instructor and students are saying in the lecture hall. That, incidentally, is one of the devices which are becoming standard equipment in modern American schools. We tend to look upon such gadgets as mere gadgets, but they have a totalitarian potential.

This political science course meets once or twice a week, for 90-minute lectures. Here is a running translation by my Intourist interpreter of what the instructor was saying:

Our newspapers are different from Western papers. We don't publish so many social activities. We are trying to let everyone know the importance of socialism. Students must heighten their political consciousness. And then he went into a discourse on the true meaning of democracy:

In the West people may enjoy democracy but that kind of democracy is different from the kind here. People in the West view democracy in an abstract light. It is so-called unrestricted democracy. In essence it is capitalist and bourgeois. Some people here have been look-

ing forward to democracy with no bounds or limits. Such an idea would sabotage and decrease production. It would be of no help to the workers themselves. The government pays attention to rectifying such ideas in the minds of those people.

I also visited the Institute of National Minorities where the government is training cadres composed of the various minorities to go back into their home areas and serve as administrators, teachers, propagandists and Party members. Under the Kuomintang there was considerable racial and cultural discrimination against these minorities, but this regime is determined to have a unified country and is bending over backwards to placate any potentially disgruntled elements. I was told that in places where there is a shortage of classroom space, children of Army personnel and children of minority groups get preferential treatment.

In 1954 and 1955, for about 14 months, there was an extravaganza campaign against a Chinese intellectual named Hu Feng. He was charged with counter-revolutionary sins and was target No. 1 for the controlled press during that prolonged period. The man disappeared, and no one knows what has happened to him, but Westerners in Peking say that the press never cited one scrap of evidence against him. It is generally believed that the crime of Hu Feng, rather than being guilty of any specific act against the regime, was simply that he had become too free a thinker, and the Party decided that an example had to be made of him. The campaign resembled the worst precedents ever set in Russia during Stalin's last years. One Britisher in China said that the Hu Feng campaign was the last outburst of real madness in China, and that in a speech about a year ago at a special conference of intellectuals Chou En-lai came close to promising that there would be no more of that ferocious nonsense.

It was explained to me that any remorse on the part of the government was strictly on practical grounds. All the intellectuals had been scared stiff, and no one was doing any work for fear of getting into ideological trouble. No nation committed to industrializing itself rapidly can afford to frighten and alienate its brainpower. During 1954 and 1955 there was even an attempt to import from Moscow the insane doctrine of Lysenko that acquired characteristics can be inherited. Those who believe in Mendel were labeled anti-Marxist.

In the latter part of 1956, after the Hu Feng campaign had been buried, a Chinese paper or magazine reported on something which it labeled as bad as that had happened during the Hu Feng campaign. At some laboratory there had been an experiment in crossing plants or transmitting acquired characteristics. The results of the experiment turned out to be so different from what they should have been if Lysenko had been right. So the seeds were just uprooted. Now the Chinese publicly ridicule such excesses, and the

official slogan today is: "Let flowers of many kinds blossom, let diverse schools of thought contend." No longer must Chinese researchers wait to see what the Russians have to say before announcing their own findings.

I do not mean, however, to give the impression that academic freedom in China has followed this all-out effort of less than two years ago to scare intellectuals into political submission. I personally don't believe that a totalitarian regime can afford to permit complete academic and intellectual freedom, despite the counter-pressure of encouraging scientific and technological development. That, I feel, is one of the contradictions of a dictatorship that cannot be resolved.

I am often asked how much freedom to criticize exists in China for intellectuals and non-intellectuals. The simplest answer is that there is considerable latitude so long as you do not question the premises of the Communist system. I put the question to a Westerner in Peking who reads Chinese and follows the press very closely. He told me that the press carries quite a bit of criticism of management, bureaucracy, technical matters and challenges by individuals to the wage scales assigned to them. But the point is not to cross the razor's edge between permitted criticism and heresy. If your footwork is not fancy enough and you write a letter to the editor, you're likely to be visited by a security policeman, in which case you'd better confess quickly and say that your wages really should be downgraded even further than they already were. But if your complaint is acceptable, a reporter from the *People's Daily* in Peking may come down to your place of work, get the whole story and then print a blast against the management or the government agency concerned.

The prison interviews granted to Stevens, Harrington and me served at least one purpose: we established that besides Rev. Mackensen and Father Fulgence Gross at least five of the other Americans are behind the bars of the Shanghai Jail. Until then, for over a year, even the British Embassy, which looks after American interests in China, could only guess at the men's whereabouts.

Elsewhere in China I came across a Chinese churchman who, presumably through the grapevine that functions in all dictatorships, was up-to-date and, I later found, accurately informed about one of the jailed missionaries whom he formerly knew. Difficult as it would be, I have no doubt that if a corps of competent and not easily discouraged American correspondents were to be stationed in China they would be able to track down bits and pieces of the long and involved stories of these unfortunate political hostages. Because of our policy, or perhaps the bureaucratic instinct of classifying nearly all of the material on the prisoners, and also because of our generally strident tone toward everything on the Chinese mainland, much of the world is predisposed to believe, and in fact believes, that

Washington has all along made far too much of an issue of the prisoners. It was in China and not in the United States that I learned the devastating fact that of the 30 or 40 Chinese prisoners in American jails, whom the Peking government is going through the motions of championing, every last one is in on a murder or narcotic charge. No government is eager to repatriate murderers and dope peddlers. But until the facts are presented to the world, and preferably with a Peking dateline, the Chinese sitting at the Geneva bargaining table with American Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson can conceal their real demands under the camouflage of demanding a humanitarian exchange of prisoners.

The journalistic pursuit of the handful of spot news stories with a specifically American angle would of course justify a heavy budgetary layout by the main news agencies after the hiatus of eight years. But apart from such the question often asked me is how much news could be gathered by permanent U. S. correspondents in China. Most news, as of now, would have to be feature and background material. Much of it would be speculative and based on the "feel" of things which, in the present total absence of any Chinese censorship, could readily be communicated. During my six-week stay hardly a day passed without some little story or insight or inkling of a story coming my way. Hurrying one Sunday morning to tape-record a church service, my interpreter and I listened to five or ten minutes of song and prayer before an usher informed us that we had stumbled into the wrong building. This was a decrepit Salvation Army structure with just a handful of worshippers rather than the well-attended carefully maintained church around the corner to which visitors are steered. From a girl on the staff of a foreign embassy I learned that her tailor and others in the trade who have been nationalized in the last year have lost all initiative and pride of workmanship and now turn out poorly made garments after exasperating delays.

Inside the Shanghai Drug Store I could not help but notice the continuous crowds around the counter which features the birth-control literature and unblushingly sells to men and women the unpackaged, unwrapped contraceptive devices. The literature was also for sale, but the display copies were chained to the counter in the way of our post office pens.

Across the street from the drug store at Wing On Department Store I sensed the undiminished admiration for American products when I was shown consumer goods, from "Singers" to "Florsheims" to "Parker 51s," which retain their private capitalistic names although manufactured now in state-owned factories of the People's Republic of China. The reappearance of beggars during my brief stay

appeared to indicate a dwindling fear of the police and of the Draconian laws against the tin cup. More importantly, it fitted in with the recent atmosphere of relaxation and of real though unavowed liberalization.

As part of the job of assessing the future development of a country largely shielded from any outsider's microscope such footnote items are zealously collected by governments enjoying diplomatic relations with China. The same is true of the American Embassy in Moscow. Choose any morning, afternoon or evening, and in the streets of Peking or Shanghai you will find personnel of the larger embassies strolling along gathering the minutiae of daily life. A visiting correspondent under the whip-lash of a limited visa has no choice but to soak in and later try to check a mass of second-hand reports during interviews and dinner parties at the various embassies. A permanent correspondent could do his own strolling and follow leads that come his way from diplomats and others. Needless to add, any reporter in China who planned to rely on leaks of secret information would be singularly unproductive of copy. Either by learning from the Russians or by devising their own security techniques the Chinese have their country now so rigged that only authorized news gets out. The one difference from the Soviet Union—a difference which makes life in Peking less morbid than in Moscow—is that the Chinese, in their greater wisdom and sophistication, have a less comprehensive and more rational definition of state secrets.

Neither for the permanent American correspondents of the years to come nor for future transients with one-month visas is there any guarantee that the liberty to film and tape-record will remain as broad as it was for us three. Communist rules change without notice. But the regime shows no fear of documentary reporting, and, to pick an example, I strongly suspect that a "See It Now" television camera crew would not only be admitted to China but would also be given remarkably gracious cooperation. Judging from the hundreds of irrepressible children who always came running from nowhere at the sight of my simple 16 millimeter camera the biggest practical problem for a large crew with extensive equipment might be the traffic problem, which usually upsets the police. Bureaucratic headaches would likely be administrative and not political. On the relatively few occasions when, in frustration at delays and obstacles, I wanted to wring the nearest neck, I managed to perceive that I was operating in a country completely severed since 1949 from high-powered, deadline-conscious Americans and that in some cases I was dealing with inexperienced clerks and administrators who only yesterday were struggling not with competition-harried reporters but with their own individual illiteracy.

Covering Red China

Not Only May We, But Can We?

By Harold R. Isaacs

The struggle to win freedom of movement for reporters from the Communists is an old story. But the fight to win it from the United States Government is a new story and a humiliating one for all of us. Let us assume, however, that the argument between the press and Mr. John Foster Dulles over sending reporters to China will be won by the press. Mr. Dulles has already done his best to assure that the victory, when it comes, will seem more like a triumph for the Chinese Communists than for the principle of a free and untrammelled press. But we are getting used to surviving Mr. Dulles; battered and bleeding and with the mocking laughter of Communists and "neutralists" ringing in their ears, American reporters will before too long re-enter China to face the job of reporting the affairs of that country for the American public. The real question editors ought to be free to be worrying about now is: how is that job going to be done?

It is easy at this moment to fall into the temptation of seeing the mere presence of American reporters on the scene in China as a kind of fetishistic guarantee that adequate information will be forthcoming. Let us not be tempted. We had American reporters on the scene in China for years, for decades, a young army of them by the climactic years of 1948-1949. Yet it is doubtful whether anyone is going to claim seriously that as a result we had any kind of a well-informed public, or that the basis had been laid by day-to-day journalism for a reasonably clear public awareness of the facts of life in China, or any effective preparation—even among serious news readers—for what ultimately came to pass there.

There are many reasons for this failure and they cannot all be assigned to the press. The few prophets there were on this subject were prophets without honor in this country. Perhaps the best of insights, journalistic or otherwise, could only in that time have passed from view, like arrows in the air. But the truth is that in general American press coverage out of China in years gone by was peculiarly barren. It would not only be undesirable, it would be absolutely impossible now to re-establish those old patterns of coverage.

In the days before the Japanese war, the correspondent in China was as a rule comfortably situated either in Shang-

hai or in Peking. Customarily he did not move far from his comforts. He rarely spoke any but a few phrases of Chinese. He could usually even deal with merchants, servants, taxi drivers, and ricksha coolies in pidgin-English, a primitive patois with rather limited possibilities of serious discourse. He depended upon a select circle of authoritative informants in the embassies and perhaps in the Chinese foreign office. If he was unusually interested or enterprising, he may have had informants or contacts among various Chinese political factions. These would all normally be English-speaking. In the unlikely and troublesome event of having to communicate with someone in Chinese, there was always an interpreter available, either at the place or in one's own entourage.

Some correspondents and almost all agency bureaus employed their own men, who were usually resourceful jacks-of-all-trades whose main job was to cull the press or bring in the news from along the many twisted Chinese grapevines. This individual enjoyed certain financial and social prestige through working for the foreigner in this capacity and he might occasionally be loyal and devoted to his work or his particular employer. But this was not too difficult, for no heavy claims were made upon him.

By these means, aside from features and oddities, very little firsthand news of China beyond the treaty ports and Peking ever moved along the channels that reached American newspaper readers. It is interesting to note, too, that most of the correspondents who worked for American papers in China in the easier-going years before 1937 are now forgotten. There were of course honorable exceptions, men who worked hard at their trade, who became seriously interested in Chinese affairs, but it is still not easy to attach any of the names we remember to any body of written work about China distinguished either by its impact at the time it was written or its wisdom after the event. In their week-to-week output even some of the most conscientious correspondents for the major papers did little better than the agency men (who were strictly forbidden to think about what they wrote.)

Reporters returning to China now or in the near future will do so in quite different conditions. In the first place we are now, at last, seriously interested in China, its politics, its industry, its agriculture. We are also interested as we never were before, in the Chinese people, how they feel about things, how they are reacting to their government, how they are faring, how they see the changes in their lives, in the cities and in the country. We have a

An old China hand himself, and veteran correspondent, **Harold Isaacs** now teaches at the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

right to rue the belatedness of this interest—an intelligent American concern for the state of being of the Chinese peasant a generation or so ago could have changed a lot of history. At any rate, we do have this concern now, and we want to know a great deal more than the Communist regime in China is likely to want us to know.

Instead of the penetrable disorder of the past, we now confront an efficient totalitarian regime which wields full control over all news, all news sources and, no doubt, even over the private speech of private persons. We have the whole Russian experience of past years as a model of what to expect, except that nothing in the Russian experience is likely to prepare us for the charm and skill with which the Chinese will seek to lead us where they want us to go. It will certainly be impossible for the correspondent in China to have an interpreter on whom he can rely. On short journeys there is no doubt that sharp-eyed and sophisticated correspondents will be able, even in these heavily-controlled conditions, to learn useful facts and gain useful impressions despite all the barriers. But the correspondent stationed in China to do a regular job in the future will have to be able to have some reasonable command of Chinese to carry out any but the most routine press association functions. In the old days any Chinese who knew any English at all was anxious to display it; today even Chinese who know English refuse to speak it, and fewer and fewer know it. A knowledge of Chinese—never regarded as essential by newsmen in the old days—will be absolutely essential for any correspondent who wants to do a serious job in China from now on.

And a serious job will be the only one worth doing. The day is gone forever when the foreign correspondent in China was primarily a spectator of quaint doings. The politics, economics, and the state of mind of the people of China have become, a bit tardily, matters of vital concern for the American public and it will become the job of the press to meet its new needs.

This is probably asking a great deal. The press is only one channel, and by no means the most effective one, for the communication of information, ideas, attitudes. The missionaries and Pearl Buck scratched more American minds with more marks about China than all the newspaper dispatches ever sent from there all put together. Even if it could be established that these sources served us any better, they will not be available. There will be no returning for the missionaries and there is no way of summoning up a creative writer. The press is what we have and the press is what we are going to have to depend upon. Its problems are going to be so great and the need to solve them so serious, that it is staggering to have to expend energy first of all on recapturing from our government the right for people who want to ask questions and report the answers to go anywhere they like.

The Newspaper Job

(Continued from page two)

press shall be inviolably preserved?" What is the liberty of the press? Who can give it definition which would not leave the utmost latitude for evasion? I hold it to be impracticable; and from this I infer that its security, whatever fine declaration may be inserted in any constitution respecting it, must altogether depend on public opinion and on the general spirit of the people and of the government.

While I am mighty glad for the safety and security of our democratic liberties that the First Amendment was imbedded in the Constitution, Hamilton had a point here when he noted that "the general spirit of the people and the government" is what really counts in the last analysis. We have all gone through a period in our very recent history when that "general spirit" was sorely tried, so far as our democratic liberties were concerned, and when even the Constitution had to absorb some pretty rough shocks. But the Constitution survived.

What I am trying to say in regard to the freedom of the press is that it involves a reciprocal obligation: an obligation on the part of government and the public and also an obligation on the part of newspapers and newspapermen. The guarantee alone is not enough; a free press is meaningless if the press is venal or corrupt, which our American press with rare exceptions is most certainly not. But a free press is also endangered if it becomes fat and lazy, and disregards its duty to keep the people informed—or at least to offer the people the opportunity to keep themselves informed. And on this point, especially in this era of "fat-dripping prosperity"—in Sandburg's wonderful phrase—I am afraid that a larger segment of the American press than I care to admit does not fully meet the real test. Don't misunderstand me. I sincerely believe the American press is the best in the world. My criticism is that it still isn't nearly good enough, and I hope that many of you will come into this profession of ours and help make it better.

But if newspapers have an obligation under the First Amendment, the Government certainly does too. That is why some of us are so deeply disturbed by the present attempt of our own Government to use the newsgathering faculty of American newspapers as an instrument of diplomatic policy. I am referring of course to the prohibition against American newspapermen visiting China, which seems to me to be a genuine threat to the freedom of the press just because it is a direct interference with the people's right to know. And so is the growing aura of Governmental secrecy surrounding official proceedings in Washington. This is a new and increasing menace to freedom of the press, but not only freedom of the press: freedom of the people of the United States, you and me, to know what's going on as free citizens of a free democracy.

Press Neglect of the Humanities

By Howard Mumford Jones

The article on technical writing by Harold K. Mintz in the January number of *Nieman Reports* awakens my enthusiasm, creates one minor dissent, and leads me to this plea to the newspaper world for extending the implications of some of the things he says. The point on which I disagree is Mr. Mintz's discussion of the vocabulary of the technical writer. He perpetuates the fallacy that it is "better to use two-syllable words (Anglo-Saxon preferred) than five-syllable words, plain words than technical ones, concrete words than abstract ones." The passage contains 23 words, three of which are used more than once, so that he employs only 16 words (I count his hyphenated words separately). Of these 16 words the ones that give meaning to the passage are, with one exception, from classical roots—"syllable," "preferred," "technical," "concrete," "abstract." (The exception is "Anglo-Saxon," which in this form is probably from late Latin.) I doubt that even the 45 per cent of the enlisted personnel not high school graduates, for whom Mr. Mintz pleads, will have any difficulty in understanding his passage. Some Anglo-Saxon words are more than two syllables, and some Latin words are one-syllable words—for example, "use" in the above quotation. What Mr. Mintz really says is that you should avoid jargon and write as simply and accurately as your material will permit.

Everyone must applaud the principle, and Mr. Mintz's six paragraphs of direction—outline, brevity, vocabulary, definition, drama, experience—are sound injunctions. And though Mr. Mintz does not confine himself to science reporting, I think the principles he sets forth are those which have made science reporting some of the best work of our time, just as they have made the expository prose of the *Scientific American* the admirable thing it is.

But if I may confine myself to the newspaper for the rest of my remarks, why does Mr. Mintz by implication limit himself as he does? The Society of Technical Writers defines its field as securing, organizing, and presenting scientific or engineering information. Other interests and other fields are woefully mishandled or ignored by American newspapers, though they are fields of like importance and complexity. The difficulty is that the city desk recognizes that science reporting is "hard" and wants a competent person to cover it, but that the city desk does not understand that the social sciences and the humanities are equally complex and important and ought to have equally competent reporting.

Howard Mumford Jones is professor of English at Harvard University, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, author and editor of many books, and provocative critic.

One exception develops in the social sciences, of course: somebody skilled in business (and sometimes political) news may be assigned to cover a national meeting of, say, the American Economic Association. But anybody who has casually followed the average covering of other social science gatherings—sociologists, social psychologists, anthropologists—soon learns not to count on any expert understanding by the newspaper comparable to the expertise of science reporting. I do not mean that science news never goes wrong; I do mean that social science news goes wrong more often than not. It goes wrong for ascertainable reasons. One is that the city desk does not understand that the analysis of society is quite as technical a job as the analysis of the atom. He therefore sends any handy reporter to cover the meeting. A second reason is the incorrigible belief that the only way to write a story about such a meeting is find (or invent) a human interest angle. Why a human interest angle should be demanded in the case of social science and not in the case of science is a question nobody asks.

But the greatest failure in technical writing is the handling of scholarly news. The very phrase sets up a resistance block in the mind of the city editor. Scholarship is not news. Obsessed by the assumption that a gathering of philosophers or linguists or historians is by definition a gathering of dreamy and impractical minds dwelling upon remote and unlikely problems, he either ignores the meeting or sends somebody to work up a human interest story.

I know whereof I speak. We have four leading research councils in this country—central high-command bodies over the armies that push forward on the frontiers of knowledge. These are the National Research Council (science), the American Council on Education, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies, with which I have something to do. This last is principally, though not wholly, concerned with humanistic scholarship.

In 1956 the ACLS held its annual meeting in Washington. Press releases were carefully prepared, and enthusiastically ignored. Invitations were sent to staff members of the local papers, some of whom came. The results were painful. Two reporters turned themselves into funny men, and pretended they couldn't understand any of the language used by the scholars. (I doubt they would have felt it appropriate to be equally funny about a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the words of which are commonly far more unintelligible.) A third account asserted that the ACLS is composed of "humanitarian" societies, including Phi Beta Kappa!

The substitution of "humanitarian" for "humanistic" is an obvious function of ignorance, but so is the inclusion of Phi Beta Kappa. The reporter understood that a Phi Beta Kappa key is a reward of outstanding achievement as a scholar; therefore Phi Beta Kappa must be a member of an organization of scholars. Not only did he not trouble himself to check his facts, but neither did the city editor. The confusion of "scholarly" in the sense of dutifully getting your lessons and "scholarly" in the sense of research activity concerned with human culture is as elementary as the confusion between "physic" meaning a laxative and "physics" meaning a science. What would never be permitted in science reporting on a great newspaper got by in the case of the humanities.

How was it possible for the newspapers in the nation's capital to mishandle news in this elementary fashion? The subject of the ACLS meeting was of primary importance. We live under an eighteenth-century constitution. Our legal system was shaped by eighteenth-century minds. Our notions of voting, of representative government, of the privileges and duties of citizenship were begun by the founding fathers of 1776 and 1789. Our standards of music descend from the eighteenth century. So, until recently, did our standards of art. So do our assumptions about individualism. And the common denominator that ties all these elements together is the eighteenth-century assumption that the mind of man is governed by reason.

This assumption is challenged in our time. In the age of Freud rationality is less powerful than it was in the age of Locke. Contemporary composers complain that the public is so obsessed with "classical" music that they cannot get a hearing, whereas the contemporary public complains that modern art has abandoned eighteenth-century standards. The individual voter in a population approaching 170 millions cannot possibly think about himself as did the individual voter in a population of three or four millions. Our constitutional system, though the words of the document have not altered, is radically different from what it was in the days of Thomas Jefferson. We are trying to run a twentieth-century nation by nineteenth-century methods under an eighteenth-century constitution. Shall we succeed? No more important question confronts the American people. This was the issue to which the annual meeting of the ACLS addressed itself, and both the issue and its importance were made clear in press releases before the meeting took place. The meeting was either ignored, ridiculed, or misunderstood, largely because the city desk, apprehensive about science, is not in the least concerned about scholarship.

As I write, the 1957 meeting of the ACLS is yet to be held. It will concern another crucial issue: why do we misunderstand the Asiatics? Why do they misunderstand us? This is a problem of philosophy, of law, of economics, and

will be discussed by men quite as expert in their fields of knowledge as any nuclear physicist, but I am willing to bet that the meeting will be as mishandled by the press in New York in 1957 as the meeting in Washington was mishandled in 1956. I hope I am wrong.

Much scholarship in the social sciences and the humanities is trivial, many scholars are dull fellows, much that goes on at their professional meetings is of little importance. Much scientific research is trivial, many scientists are dull fellows, much that goes on at scientific meetings is of little importance. Yet the newspapers assume that it is important to make the public understand what science is all about—hence Mr. Mintz's excellent article. Why is it not equally important to secure equally expert coverage in the social sciences and the humanities?

The issue is a grave and public issue. We are engaged in the greatest ideational warfare of modern history. The conflict is one for the minds and hearts and emotions of men and nations. It cannot be won by airplanes and bombs. Victory will go to the side that secures the more abundant life for the peoples who accept its premises. A more abundant life does not spring automatically from science and invention, for these get nowhere until the social sciences take over and show how the results of science and invention can be in widest commonalty spread. The inability of Congress to understand that votes for armaments are insufficient unless you also have a continuing policy in social thought and social action is a mark of the importance of the issue.

But a good life is not merely a problem of food, clothing, and shelter. Men want intangible goods like love and faith, they want the satisfaction of art and of personal fulfillment, they want peace, they want a sense of the continuity of human life. This is the field of the humanities, and it is the function of humanistic scholarship to preserve, study, and enlarge the area of the great, lasting intangibles of civilization—something that, to the shame of American journalism, is better understood from the *Jerusalem Post* to the *Manchester Guardian* than it is by the average city editor in this country.

Scholarship in the humanities and in the social sciences is quite as technical as is science. Mr. Mintz's article emphasizes the needs of informed writing about science and engineering. What we need is to insist that scholarship in the social sciences and the humanities is equally mature and technical, that newspaper coverage has the same responsibility towards it that it has accepted in the field of science, and that it is equally important to make the American public understand the work of the research man in these areas. I think the covering of scholarly activity is the greatest failure of responsible journalism in the United States, but I suggest it is not an irretrievable failure.

Canada in Washington

A Canadian Editor Views the News from Inside His Embassy

By R. A. Farquharson

Even with its sealed despatches and coded telegrams there are many things about an Embassy that resemble a newspaper. But there is this fundamental difference: while you are battling to get more readers, we do our best to see that as few people as possible read our hottest stories.

The foreign service of Canada is really a highly trained reporting service and often officers turn out more copy than the average newspaper reporter. Sometimes it is copy produced under the pressure of time and if one of our reporters makes a mistake he cannot complain about people who say they were misquoted.

Think of the Ambassador as a Bureau Chief, the East Block as the newspaper office, the different divisions as deskmen and Mr. Pearson as the editor-in-chief who long ago found out what some editors have never learned, that it pays to travel. The East Block is connected by wires with bureaus in the chief capitals of the world and supplements the wires with Queen's couriers who carry what is called the diplomatic bag, which I have never seen strapped to a wrist because no wrist is large enough. The bag that goes up and down four days a week from Washington to Ottawa may include twelve or more sealed sacks of mail and when the courier gets into his locked compartment for his solitary journey there is no room to spare.

The hot copy from our bureau goes by wire to Ottawa and so that we will be informed about what is happening Ottawa sends us telegrams received from other Canadian Posts. For instance, when the Suez crisis broke so suddenly our wire traffic doubled and our communications people worked around the clock.

You try to keep your news from the opposition. So do we. But we go to more elaborate precautions. Our copy is graded. If it is unclassified it is not coded. If it is confidential, secret or top secret it is fed through coding machines installed in secret rooms in all the larger bureaus. In the small bureaus it is still coded and uncoded by book. You can see how much pressure developed when Cairo and Tel Aviv and Beirut were in the centre of the news, sending and receiving the hottest type of material, and doing all the coding in the pre-machine way.

To rush copy Canadian Press uses speed classifications like flash, bulletin and 95. We do the same thing only we use different terms, like "Most Immediate," "Immediate" and

Mr. Farquharson was managing editor of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* and then editor of *Saturday Night*, before he was appointed the chief press officer of the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

"Important." And when any telegram marked in the first two categories arrives, no matter what hour of the night, the operator calls the duty officer. And as a telephone is regarded as a security risk the duty officer has to go to the Embassy to see what it is all about. Sometimes a guessing game a little like the old 20 questions solves the mystery without breaking security and saves a trip.

There are reference numbers on every telegram and each paragraph is numbered so if you have to telephone Ottawa about something really secret the instructions are to send a wire that you will be talking about subject X-324. With the copy in front of both men it is reasonably easy to carry on an intelligent conversation without once mentioning the subject. Paragraph numbers can be a real help.

I got my first experience with despatches and telegrams at NATO and I was pleased when I came to Washington to find really good reporting in the Canadian service. By desk standards the leads are weak and the story is never in the first paragraph. But crowding everything in the lead has been known to distort a story. Foreign service officers are not trying to sell papers. They are simply striving to give as clear a picture of the facts as they can.

Sometimes our despatches are well ahead of the public news and I find it still a hardship to keep a really good story under my hat. Sometimes they are parallel with the news services. Sometimes they follow the news service and only confirm a newspaper story. Once in a while a telegram points out a number of mistakes made in a news story on which a good deal of profound editorial comment has been based. As I do none of this reporting myself I can say that I am proud of the way my departmental colleagues keep Ottawa abreast of what is happening. I have been told by friends in a number of different Embassies that no foreign service is better than Canada's.

We have a great advantage in being a bilingual country. Up to the present our colleagues from Quebec have largely carried the bilingual load but the younger men coming in from English-speaking Canada are more and more fluent in both languages. I am sure that the time will come when it will just be taken for granted that a candidate for the department will read, write and converse with ease in either language. Arnold Heeney, our Ambassador in Washington, sets the example for the post by his fluency in French as well as in English. There is one thing about the foreign service—there is no English or French hyphen when Canadians are abroad.

Before I leave the subject of my diplomatic colleagues—I think of myself as a newspaperman and have never filled in my occupation as “diplomat” on a landing form—let me take a crack at the corny habit of some news writers referring to the “striped pants set.” In more than two years I have not seen a single pair of striped pants in the Embassy at Washington. In Toronto I have worn striped pants at newspaper weddings. I never had occasion to rent them in either Paris or Washington. Had I been working in London it would have been different, for the striped pants and the short black jacket is the uniform there of the city, more than the uniform of the diplomatic corps.

Newspapers should go modern and not cling to the clichés of the past. Embassies are busy offices and the local coloring of extra-territoriality and diplomatic immunities and the other jargon from remote centuries is still only true in the sense that in this disturbed world it is dangerous to take away what in some countries is a necessary protection.

I am tired of cracks that with a diplomatic license plate on my car I can park in front of any fire hydrant. When I get a ticket for illegal parking I pay it, which is something I seldom did when I was on a newspaper. Every Canadian in Washington goes on the assumption that diplomatic immunity does not fit in to modern traffic regulations, and pays up. It cost my young assistant \$15 one day when he parked in front of the Embassy, worked through lunch hour and forgot to move his car before the deadline descended at 4:30 p.m.

Because our Embassy chancery is a six-story house built by a very rich woman, there are some luxurious offices. The Ambassador sits amid the splendor of richly carved paneling in what was formerly the dining room. I have a large and pleasant office, with a fireplace, on the ground floor. It is never cold enough to use the fireplace and I would willingly give up the apparent luxury for the efficiency of modern office planning. I would give a good deal for the type of telephone setup I had in my newspaper days but governments do not have the money to spend that private enterprise, I think rightly, spends.

We are constantly being asked to entertain at the Chancery groups of wives whose husbands are attending international conventions. The Information Division explains that this is a business office and we cannot show groups around but that we would be happy to welcome them in the library and show some Canadian films.

On a recent occasion when there were a dozen Canadians in a group of 60 women, a Canadian from Toronto came into my office as they were leaving and said that she was mortified at the cold reception Canada had provided. The same group had been at an eastern Embassy the day before and had been served refreshments. I assured her again that this was a business office, that we could not tour 60 women

through the Ambassador's office while he was at work, and that we had no kitchen. I did not tell her that if we had served refreshments it would have come out of my pocket or the Ambassador's pocket. Some of the other Embassies are not nearly as busy and set an example which I see no reason for following.

In information work you have to decide on what is important because you cannot cover the whole front. In many ways we are only doing a token job but I would sooner select what I thought was important to do than try to get a large enough staff to do everything.

We are among the smaller information setups in the United States. I would appreciate a larger staff but to create a huge public relations operation like a private corporation would, I feel, be a great mistake. We should not spoonfeed organizations which can acquire information from commercial channels. I still believe that the purchased story is appreciated more than anything the Canadian Government can provide for nothing.

We concentrate on newspapers and individuals who have shown an interest in Canada. We, of course, have mailing lists but these are ticked individually for every mailing and as far as possible the service is personalized. I remember too well the countries that used to send me so much material that I stopped opening the envelopes.

We are careful about sending information to Senators and Congressmen. Every time a man on the Hill telephones or writes or shows interest in Canada we try to keep anything in his particular line going to him. Recently we have had a number of senatorial inquiries for copies of the Gordon report. Senator Neuberger phones quite often with questions, and I can assure you that the Senators I have got to know do their home work. We try at all times to remember that we are in the business of providing facts, not propaganda. Anything in the public domain we produce on request, whether or not it is favorable.

News coverage of Canada continues to be disappointing. In specialized fields it is improving, particularly on the financial side. The old quote that “where your treasure is there will your heart be also” is, of course, the reason that several American papers daily carry Canadian stock quotations. Every year more writers are doing Canadian features and magazines are showing an increasing interest. But as far as the day to day general news is concerned I doubt if there will be much improvement until there is a fundamental change in the methods of the American news services.

It is a great tribute to the Canadian Press that AP depends upon it to cover Canada and depends on no other national news service in the world. In every other country AP has its own reporters, its own filing editors. But this means that stories written for Canadian consumption reach New York

without being edited for American readers who so often have not the faintest idea what Canadian political terms mean. I mention only AP because every check I have made shows the AP carrying more Canadian news than rival services.

There is so much interest in Canada I am sure there would be a great improvement in the amount of news printed if somewhere along the way it acquired an American accent. True AP did experiment with staff men in Ottawa without too much success. There is, however, a great deal more interest in the U.S. about Canada now than there was then. We are playing an entirely different role in world affairs.

Let's look at the other side. How good is Canadian reporting of the American scene? My answer right off the bat is that it is not good enough.

After reading the night file from the *New York Times*, the AP, UP and other services for a good many years, I thought I understood American politics. I am only beginning to realize how little I know yet. I was a managing editor of two papers for more than 12 years and never set foot in Washington. In the last two years I doubt whether more than six Canadian editors have visited Washington. One editor of an editorial page came for a week and saw many people. That was the longest visit. Another editor flew to a White House correspondents' dinner and flew right back. Another was my house guest overnight. Only twice in two years has a Canadian editor who directed news or wrote opinion asked to see the Ambassador.

I would have gone to Washington with alacrity if it had been suggested that I go. I had the strange feeling that I

had to stay and run the shop. I did not realize then that I could do a much better job in directing news play and assigning my own reporters if I had background knowledge. Washington is certainly the external capital it is most necessary for Canadian editors to understand.

The Washington corps of Canadian correspondents work hard, but every single one of the eight is working alone and four, in addition to the single Canadian Press correspondent, are serving more than one paper.

In addition to the Washington corps the United States is covered by reporters on fleeting assignments from home base. The sudden rise of the UN in news importance, will, I devoutly hope, lead to a group of Canadians being stationed there. A reporter sent down in the middle of a hot situation can only write an intelligent story if he is assisted by other reporters or if his own Canadian delegation has time enough to fill him in on what is going on in a forum which is so different from anything he has experienced in Ottawa.

Outside of Washington and New York reporting of the United States to Canada is entirely in the hands of American news services, with some assistance from British and French services. I think it is fair to make the same criticism of American reporting to Canada that I made of Canadian reporting to the U.S. It is in the wrong national accent.

There isn't the slightest doubt in my mind that Canada is going to be playing an increasingly important part in world affairs. I am looking forward hopefully to the day when the Canadian newspapers will consider the world their beat and not rely so completely on other national agencies, which naturally think of their own country rather than Canada.

Travel Grants for Regional Editors

First Report on a Project of Southern Niemans

With the first six months of its organization and work completed, the Southern Association of Nieman Fellows Inc., feels it is established on a sound corporate and business-like basis and that results already are measurable from its projects.

The executive committee would like to thank the Fund for the Republic for making the general project possible. We believe the value to the South as a region and the nation as a whole is high.

In our view the quality of applicants has been uniformly high and the projects worthy. Grantees were selected on the basis of applications and personal interviews and the projects approved all fitted into the purpose of SANF and the fundamental objectives of the Fund as well.

The geographic spread of approved applications and of candidates pending approval has been as good as we had

hoped. We sought principally to select the best qualified people applying regardless of their location or size of newspaper. So far grants for newspaper people from Georgia, Florida, Alabama, South Carolina, Kentucky and Virginia have been committed or already used and active applications are before the selection group from Tennessee, Louisiana and Arkansas. We feel this is excellent, especially since the Fellows' program has been known to newspapermen only about five months.

Furthermore, grantees reflect a wide range of responsibility on their individual papers. So far grants have been awarded three editors, two executive editors, an assistant editor, a Sunday magazine editor, an assistant woman's editor and a business editor.

Application openings were announced through trade media, wire services and also by means of a mailing

piece sent to the top news executives on all daily papers in the Southern states.

Through Dec. 31, 1956, 30 applications had been received and reviewed and nine grants approved and applicants informed. Only two grantees began their travels in 1956. Consequently the attached financial statement reflects only their expenses and organizational and judging expenses.

Already completed:

Louis Harris, executive editor of the Augusta, Ga., *Herald-Chronicle*. Harris traveled to Japan, spent seven weeks there, investigated various matters concerning the textile industry, information on exports to and imports from the United States, matters affecting competition between Japan and US textile industries, comparative working conditions, political freedoms, organizational freedoms of Japanese vis-a-vis American textile workers. Harris' report will be disseminated for general publication by February 1, with over 200 daily papers in all Southern states being offered the series of articles and mats of pictures free in a personal letter, and announcement of the availability of same disseminated through trade media and wire services.

Tom Abernethy, editor of the Talledega, Ala., *Daily Home*, visited England for six weeks, studying freedom of the press, particularly the availability of information in the local community and from local government to the non-metropolitan press of England. He also investigated such matters as training of journalists in England, limitations on court coverage, etc. Abernethy's reports are interesting and enlightening.

Other grants approved, travel to begin after January 1, 1957:

James Glendinen, assistant editor, Tampa, Fla., *Morning Tribune*, for travel in Franco Spain, studying civil liberties of the Spanish people after 20 years of Franco dictatorship. Glendinen plans to leave about May 1, 1957.

Don Cummins, business editor, The Birmingham, Ala., *Post-Herald*, to make a general economic study of Western Europe, its market and its relation to the American position in the world economy, a study of working conditions of the average European worker, his standard of living, recreational opportunities and family life, and the freedom of the European worker in relation to government control. He will leave about April 1, 1957.

Miriam Gann Hill, assistant woman's editor, the Birmingham, Ala., *News*, to travel to Japan to study the status of Japanese women in the home, in business, in industry, government and politics, and to determine what part these women play in the struggle between the forces of Communism and the free world. Mrs. Hill plans to leave in April, 1957.

Joseph Lambright, editor, the Savannah, Ga., *Morning*

News, to travel to Brazil and study that country's development, its complete integration of many races, its limited press freedoms, and struggles toward modern development. He left in March, 1957.

Joseph Landau, Sunday magazine editor, the Louisville, Ky., *Courier-Journal*, to study Western Germany. His double-barrelled program would include a close look at Germany's approach to its relationship with both the United States and the Soviet Union, and the relationship between the individual German and his government, his feelings about whether or not he believes that he can control it, and his views as to party affiliations. Landau left in March 1957.

Barton Norris, Jr., executive editor of the Roanoke, Va., Times World Corporation, to visit France, England and North Africa, studying British and French attitudes toward the proper role of American foreign policy, in the particular framework of the Middle Eastern situation, the future of NATO, Cyprus and the French-North African tensions. Mr. Morris will leave in April, 1957.

Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston, S. C., *News* and *Courier*, to study the effect of the continuing presence of large numbers of American troops in England, Germany and Spain . . . these three representing an ally, a former enemy and a neutral country where bases are established. He intends to investigate the economic impact of these troops on the countries, the manners, behavior and adjustment abilities of Americans in relation to the host countries, and the civil liberties of these troops as subject to the laws of the countries where they are stationed, as well as the civil rights of the nationals of those countries in relationship to US service men. He left in February, 1957.

Experience is beginning to provide a guide in travel costs. Grants will average between \$2,000 and \$3,000, with an exceptional trip to such a distant point as India or the Southeast Pacific perhaps a little more. At any rate, it appears the full annual grant will provide, as expected, some 12 to 15 grants. So far \$30,000 of the \$60,000 has been received by SANF.

The executive committee, after first experience with administration of the project and with its earliest results, feels without question that the Southern travel grants program should be continued for a second year after July 1, 1957 and perhaps made a continuing project after that year.

Respectfully submitted

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF NIEMAN FELLOWS, Inc.

Executive Committee

Robert W. Brown, President

E. L. Holland, Jr., Vice-president

Sylvan Meyer, Secretary

Cuban Press: Censorship Replaces Bribery

By Marvin Alisky

The Batista regime of Cuba during January and February switched from the big carrot to the big stick, from widespread bribery to overt censorship of the press.

Until late in 1956, newsmen in recent years were often bribed by whatever agency of government their regular news beat covered. (See "Havana Havoc" in *Nieman Reports*, April 1956.)

Then, late in October, the Inter-American Press Association met in Havana. When the I.A.P.A. had met in 1955 at New Orleans, Cuba was one of the *latino* republics with a clean bill of health, free from press censorship in the watchful eyes of the association's Freedom of the Press Committee. The 1956 report also gave Cuba the same good standing.

Anti-government forces, intent on ousting General Fulgencio Batista from the presidency of the republic, decided that the I.A.P.A. meeting in Havana was opportune. During periods of surface tranquility, the old system of bribes from governmental officials might bring favorable comment from a majority of the press. But in times of violence, reasoned the rebels rallying around Fidel Castro, Batista would be forced to use overt censorship.

In peaceful times, many Cuban reporters occasionally take a handout both journalistically and financially. The reporter pockets the bribe, then writes about the governmental unit in question favorably.

Seasoned Cuban observers, such as Robert M. Hallett, Latin American correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*, point out that not all Cuban newsmen used to accept bribes. Some Cubans wrote what they saw. Others took money from the Batista opposition. But the anti-administration forces had less money, were able to ply a smaller number of reporters with bribes.

When Batista came to power in 1952, the newspaper *La Calle* closed down. Its publisher, Luis Orlando, opposed the new president bitterly. In April 1955, when *La Calle* resumed publication, the government charged that Orlando had gotten money from ex-President Prio to reopen.

Two months later, the paper was again closed, as the government heaped legal action on its publisher. Today those complicated law suits are still "pending."

Convinced that the I.A.P.A. meeting would insure attention from foreign newsmen from all over the Western

Hemisphere, rebels struck late in October 1956, trying to force the president's hand.

Colonel Antonio Blanco Rico, head of the Cuban military intelligence, was assassinated on October 28. From the shadows, gunmen fired into his group as the colonel and his friends were leaving the Montmartre nightclub.

Aldo Baroni of the Mexico City daily *Excelsior* witnessed the shooting and quickly circulated the news among both the general public and the I.A.P.A. membership.

The next day, October 29, General Rafael Salas, chief of the National Police, was killed as he led an assault on the Embassy of Haiti. The general broke the traditional rule of asylum by entering a foreign embassy to capture nine Cubans who had been given sanctuary. The Cubans were killed on the spot. The general lingered, then died on October 31.

The rebels expected censorship, full martial law. But they were surprised. No such measures came. The government waited and watched. While the I.A.P.A. met, Batista did not declare a state of siege, the *latino* decree that suspends all constitutional guarantees in time of grave emergency.

Some I.A.P.A. delegates commended the president for his control. And the full membership went on to elect as president of the Inter-American Press Association for the ensuing year a Cuban, Guillermo Martinez Marquez, publisher of the Havana daily *El Pais*.

However, the New York *Times* did feel called upon to assert editorially that the uproar had emphasized that beneath the "surface calm of Cuban life, there is a ferment of violence."

The next move came in the easternmost part of the island. Fidel Castro led his rebels into the city of Santiago to raid police barracks and communications centers. That was on November 30.

In the next month and a half, fighting broke out in eastern Cuba about twice a week. Finally, on January 15, President Batista decided to wait no longer. He proclaimed a state of siege, and imposed press censorship.

The censorship was tentatively scheduled to end March 2; on February 26, the United Press reported that censorship had formally been proclaimed ended by the government. But the trouble appears far from over. Veteran Cuban observer Herbert L. Matthews of the New York *Times* reports the forces of Castro more determined than ever to fight on.

Veteran Latin American observer Harry B. Murkland got reports in February that the rebels had killed 200 soldiers since November 30, and that 200 other soldiers had been

Marvin Alisky is assistant professor of journalism and television at Indiana University. He has made close studies of journalism in several Latin American countries and has reported his observations before in *Nieman Reports*.

arrested for refusing to fight the rebels (*Newsweek*, February 18, 1957).

Through the curtain of censorship, other reports told of guerrilla warfare in the forests of Sierra Maestra. If the fighting continued, the censorship would be extended past its originally promised termination date.

Cuban papers were not the only publications censored. The January issue of the *Miami Herald* of Florida was sent to authorities directly from the airport. Censors clipped out an article expressing views of a former Cuban president, now exiled in Florida. Then the amputated papers were allowed to be put on sale on Havana newsstands. It was the first time in seventeen years that Cuban censorship had

been applied to foreign daily newspapers.

Nor were newspapers and magazines of Cuba the only native media in trouble. The Inter-American Association of Broadcasters, through its headquarters in Chile, on February 8 requested President Batista to lift censorship from the newscasts of Cuba "on behalf of the 5,000 free radio and television stations in the Americas."

On January 23 and 24, United Press reported on the possibility that Communist agents are trying to keep the trouble stirred up. Whatever the various factors involved, the anti-Batista forces are far from eliminated. If they quiet down for the time being, the bribery system may replace the censorship of the press. But be it the carrot or the stick, the Cuban press has its problems.

Trial By Newspaper

By Joseph M. Harvey

"Trial By Newspaper" is a best-selling slogan today, high on the hit parade of counsel for defendants whose deeds or misdeeds have been chronicled in the press.

Like so many slogans or sayings, a few colorful and oftentimes biased words are used to express an idea briefly. But as with so many slogans and sayings, the few words say too much.

"Trial By Newspaper" has an ominous, threatening, villainous sound. It conjures up fears of tyranny, of danger to home and mother and our Founding Fathers, of an assault on Old Glory and the Bill of Rights, and all those other clichés so dear to the tongues of Fourth of July orators.

But when you draw back a bit, take a good look, turn on the lights and consider this Ogre, it shapes up as no bigger or more formidable than any other problem facing us in this fast-moving, complex whirl that is our world today.

In fact, it is not even a new problem. English barristers were bellowing about the problem a century ago. You might even say the invention of the printing press started the whole thing.

Melting this mountain down to mole-hill size, one major issue remains.

Do news stories about murders and robberies, graft and swindles and all the other classifications in the catalogue of crime prevent a defendant getting a fair trial?

Do these accounts in the press prevent an accused getting the "speedy and public trial . . . by an impartial jury"

This is from a talk to the Boston Bar Association, January 30. **Joseph M. Harvey** is a reporter on the *Boston Globe* and also a member of the bar.

which the Constitution guarantees to him? (U. S. Constitution, Article VI)

No one will for a moment deny that the alleged acts of murderers and robbers, the purported misfeasances and malfeasances of officials and the charges against grafters and corrupters fill up news columns well in advance of the day when the judge dons his robe and the jury files in to hear the evidence.

Do jurors remember what was printed? Have they formed opinions? Lawyers have a maxim that: "What goes in de bene, stays in the head." But how many of you here today can remember the headline in this morning's newspaper? In last night's paper? In yesterday's paper?

As a practical matter, what is a modern day trial court to do? Jurors cannot be isolated. News travels fast and completely—especially in these days when men cross the country in three hours and go around the world in 48.

In such a fast moving world, it is essential to the liberty of free people that they know what is going on around them.

That is the other part of the problem—the other side of the coin of trial by jury.

Here we have two major freedoms of our American way of life meeting and colliding head-on.

An accused has a right to a fair trial by an impartial jury, and the people have a right to be informed by a free press.

Which one—if either—should give way?

Everyone in this room today knows—perhaps out of his own experience—that there have been abuses of the jury system. These abuses are old and of long standing.

Governor John Winthrop in 1644 complained of juries both in England and in the new Massachusetts Bay

Province that gave arbitrary damages. (Winthrop: *Arbitrary Government Defined*, Harvard Classics, Volume 43, Page 57)

In 1877, the *Law Times* in England described as "one of the great scandals of our legal administration" the "perversity or blunders of juries." The *Law Times* cited Vice Chancellor Malins' prediction that the jury system "will cease to exist in 20 years."

Said the *Law Times* then of the jury system, "The system is certainly falling into disrepute." (64 *Law Times* 93)

In our own days, judges of some of our highest courts have questioned whether the jury system works true justice. Perhaps now is the time for a new look, a new analysis of the use of juries. Perhaps it is the jury system and not the press that should give way in this problem.

It might be that in this modern day, the rights of accused would be better protected by making it possible for all those who feel they have been prejudiced by publicity to have the case heard by a judge without a jury.

Of course judges, like jurymen, read newspapers. But judges, by their training and experience, should be better qualified to receive and weigh evidence apart from any private opinions they might have.

As long as there are newspapers, the problem of publicity in advance of trial will always remain.

Now, of course, just as there are abuses in the jury system, so are there some abuses in the press, in the newspapers.

I recall an occasion when I was in Germany during World War II as a correspondent for the Army's newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt came to Frankfurt on the Main to give a press conference on the subject of fraternization of American soldiers with German girls. She was against it.

She declared to the assembled press then that: "True love is the only basis of a happy marriage."

A reporter for the Chicago *Tribune*—a newspaper that was a bitter foe of all the Roosevelt family—wired back his story on Mrs. Roosevelt's remarks.

He began his story thus: "True love is the only basis of a happy marriage, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, mother of four happily divorced children, said here today."

The reporter told us later he got a bonus for a well-written story.

So, of course, there are abuses—or perhaps just differences of opinion. But as James Madison pointed out in his arguments to the Constitutional Convention concerning the First Amendment: "Some degree of abuse is inseparable from the proper use of everything, and in no instance is this more true than in that of the press."

But, Madison added, in telling the convention of provisions in state constitutions concerning freedom of the

press, "It has accordingly been decided by the practice of the states, that it is better to leave a few of its noxious branches to their luxuriant growth, than, by pruning them away to injure the vigor of those yielding the proper fruits."

Madison continued: "And can the wisdom of this policy be doubted by any who reflect that to the press alone, checquered as it is by abuses, the world is indebted for all the triumphs which have been gained by reason and humanity over error and oppression." (Madison: *Report On the Virginia Resolutions*, Madison's Works, Volume 4, Page 544)

Madison's views on freedom of the press were quoted at length by the United States Supreme Court in a majority opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in the case of *Near v. Minnesota*, decided in 1931. (282 U.S. 697)

In that case, the editor of a so-called "scandal sheet" was enjoined from publishing his paper under a state statute that declared such papers to be a nuisance. The Supreme Court struck down the statute.

The press, the court said in that case, is immune from prior restraints and censorship. The importance of this immunity had not lessened over the years, the court said.

The court added: "Meanwhile, the administration of government has become more complex, the opportunities for malfeasance and corruption have multiplied, crime has grown to most serious proportions, and the danger of its protection by unfaithful officials and of the impairment of the fundamental security of life and property by criminal alliances and official neglect, emphasizes the primary need of a vigilant and courageous press, especially in great cities."

Those words were spoken a quarter of a century ago—before the days of Murder, Incorporated; before the days of the Brinks gang; before the days of bandits invading private homes, and before the days of so many of our present day crimes of major magnitude.

About 100 years before the *Near* case, there was a trial in our own Supreme Judicial Court of Theodore Lyman, one-time Mayor of Boston, on criminal libel on complaint of Daniel Webster. Lyman was charged with libeling Webster in a newspaper editorial.

Chief Justice Isaac Parker delivered a famous charge to the jury in that case. He told the jury that the press "is the chief engine to create and sustain civil, political and religious liberty."

The Chief Justice declared: "It is the sustaining, vital principle of freedom—it proclaims the vices and abuses of government—the rights of the citizen—the merits and demerits of rulers—and these are its proper and legitimate offices.

"He who would restrain it in the exercise of those functions commits treason against the fundamental principles of civil liberty." ("Report of A Trial," by John A. Whitman, 1828)

How is the press going to determine the merits and demerits of officials in a criminal investigation if newsmen cannot probe into what police and prosecutor are doing?

How are the people going to know whether there is or may be a criminal alliance between criminals and law enforcement officials if the press does not report the investigation in full?

Certainly, some of what is printed may hurt someone at a future trial. But where is the greatest hurt? Who is going to say where the line should be drawn? The parties? The lawyers? The courts?

The United States Supreme Court in the case of *Pennekamp v. Florida* (328 U.S. 331) decided in 1946, considered the problems raised by newspaper comment made both before and after judicial proceedings.

Comment before trial, of course, may not be as free as comment made after a trial, the court conceded.

But, the court added, "In the borderline instances where it is difficult to say upon which side the alleged offense falls, we think the specific freedom of public comment should weigh heavily against a possible tendency to influence pending cases."

Where pre-trial publicity has created a "clear and present danger" to the fair and orderly administration of justice, courts have undisputed power to act of their own motion, as well as on appeal, to protect the rights of an accused.

As in the case of *Delaney v. United States* (199 F2d 107) decided in 1952, the United States Court of Appeals in the opinion by Chief Judge Magruder granted a new trial because news accounts in advance of trial were found to be prejudicial.

Judge Magruder said in that opinion that, "How best to protect accused persons from the prejudicial effect of newspaper publicity has been a matter of immense concern."

But, he added, the American view is that "this modern phenomenon of trial by newspaper is protected to a considerable degree by the constitutional right of freedom of the press."

Said Judge Magruder: "The courts, then, are limited to doing what they can to insulate jurors from the prejudicial effect of such publicity as by cautionary instructions, or by granting continuances, or in some cases granting a change of venue."

Therein seems to be the wisest course.

Continuances, cautionary instructions, a change of venue, or even a new trial—although all of them are accompanied by some difficulties—would seem to protect the rights of an accused from prejudicial publicity without venturing further along the dangerous path of censoring the press.

Censure and censorship are not far apart. A frightened press is not a free press.

The Lesson of Advertising

By Gerald W. Johnson

The most significant development of recent years in the newspaper press is the trend toward monopoly which, as far as local communities are concerned, is now 81 per cent complete. That is to say, of all American cities and towns now served by daily journalism, not one in five has a competing newspaper.

A trend so strong was never created by the human will. No organizing genius has ever been great enough to bring it about. What did it was the tremendous and still increasing expense of newspaper production which is paid, for the most part, out of the business income of the community. There is a limit on what any city can pay for news and only the very largest can afford to support more than one newspaper. The business is a natural monopoly as certainly as the waterworks, the telephone company and the urban transit system, and nothing can be done to reverse the process.

There is no need to stress the dangers of monopoly. They are known to you all. But it is worth while to note in news coverage the press monopoly does not exist. It has stiff competition from radio and television, competition that cannot be eliminated by gaining control of the local broadcasting stations, because too many outside stations can be picked up by local sets.

The monopoly is in the field of opinion rather than in that of news, and here the competition of radio and television is not and never will be effective because broadcasting necessarily comes under political control, and political control by its very nature is fatal to the free expression of opposing opinion. The fact that the number of channels is limited makes it necessary to impose some central control to avoid chaos. We have delegated that control to the Federal Communications Commission and in writing the law great ingenuity was exercised to remove the FCC from political control. To date it seems to me that it has worked pretty well; the FCC has not been perniciously political. But it will be. Never doubt that for a moment. Give it a few more years and it will be as definitely an instrument of politics as the Republican and Democratic National Committee are today. It simply isn't in nature to keep a political body from being political, any more than a court order changing MacGregor's name to Perkins thereafter keeps him from being a Scotchman.

So in the matter of presenting opinion, that is, interpretation of and comment on the news, the monopoly of the newspaper press is effective, and that is the menace that the institution offers to American liberty. The menace is reinforced, strange to say, by the honesty of some publishers. The more determined a publisher is that his news-

paper shall present nothing but sound doctrine, the more certain he is to present unsound doctrine. No one doctrine is completely sound. No one creed holds all truth. Only in the free play of all ideas do we have a fair chance of finding the best, and only the newspaper that faithfully reports all shades of opinion is reasonably sure to be offering its readers the truth.

Referring to monopoly as "the" menace may evoke criticism from those who see threats on many sides—from sensationalism, from commercialism, from venality, from poltroonery, and so on. But all these are admitted faults of the press that nobody defends; any damage resulting from them the offending newspaper brought upon itself as certainly as a man suffering from delirium tremens brought it on himself. Monopoly, on the contrary, is a threat inherent in the situation; it is nobody's fault and, as far as I can see, it cannot be removed.

But while the steady progress of monopoly seems to me inevitable, all its attendant evils are not inevitable.

The Democrats of late have been doing a great deal of squalling about the "one-party press" and with some justification from the party standpoint. But as yet ours is a one-party press only to a very limited extent. If the time ever comes when we shall have a genuine one-party press in this country you can say good-bye to the United States as we have known it; for the suppression of all ideas except official ideas will mean the suppression of liberty and the rise of Hitlerism under some native name.

It seems to me that the American press has a wide-open door behind it through which it can escape from the worst effects of monopoly. That door is nothing more mysterious than a study of the real nature and effects of its own advertising columns. Coming from me, an admission that anything is to be gained from serious study of advertising means something, for I have spent my life working in the editorial end of journalism, and you know what the editorial end usually thinks of the advertising end.

Nevertheless, I do not share the sorrow of those sociologists who are constantly lamenting the debauchery of the American mind bemused, benumbed and betrayed by constant exposure to the open and aboveboard propaganda in advertising. A great deal of it is lying and exceedingly clever lying at that. It has to be clever, for there are laws against the coarser grades. Of the three ordinary kinds, the government flatly forbids lies and damned lies, and looks with a fishy eye on statistics, so the really good copy-writer soars into higher levels of mendacity, making his appeal to subtle psychological weaknesses.

But never mind that. Look instead at the visible, tangible results, namely the goods on the shelves of American retail stores. There is little doubt that their general level of excellence is the highest in the world. So are the prices,

but so is the income of the purchaser. Put it this way: compare an American who makes a fair living but is not rich, with his opposite number anywhere else. I submit that what the wife of an American automobile mechanic, for instance, takes home in her shopping bag after a visit to the supermarket is, on the whole, better than what the wife of an automobile mechanic takes home in any other country. Perhaps the superiority of one soap over another is a figment of the copy-writer's imagination; but travelers agree that *any* American soap is distinctly better than any soap offered elsewhere at an equivalent price.

Yet the learned doctors are offended because, they say, Americans are told more lies about the virtues of competing brands of soap than any other people are told. It may be so, but that is the view of the learned, and the fact remains that the soap is good, which is what impresses me, and impresses the great mass of Americans. In other words, the egghead sees the lies, but the squarehead sees the soap, and whereas one laments the other is content.

One very eminent egghead understood this principle. In the days when our troubles with our southern neighbors were one of our chief worries, Woodrow Wilson said that he got at the truth about Mexico by "balancing lies." I am sure that the American consumer gets at the truth about economic goods through a similar procedure. The lies told about one soap are balanced by counter-lies told about another; and so with cigarettes, automobiles, washing-machines and all the other gadgetry magnificently touted in the advertising columns. The upshot is to make the American consumer not the worst swindled but the most discriminating purchaser in the world. Swindled he is, without doubt; but the process is that of making him desire things he does not need, not that of making him buy shoddy goods.

Yet it is precisely in the field of advertising that all ideas are given completely free play. Far from looking at novelty with suspicion, advertising regards it as the pearl beyond price and the man who can think ahead of the crowd, instead of being burned at the stake, is given a private office with a carpet by Bigelow on the floor.

James Madison believed that this principle applies to political ideas as aptly as it does to the economic market. Read essay Number Ten in *The Federalist*. Justice Holmes believed it. Read his famous dissent in the Abrams case. Thomas Jefferson believed it. Read his First Inaugural. All the great champions of freedom of the mind, from John Milton to Adlai Stevenson, have believed it.

The promise in our present situation, the bow in the cloud, so to speak, is that the wisest men among American newspaper publishers also believe it, and that the majority of all publishers may come to believe it as firmly as J. S. Mill and Lord Acton did. Just as out of the fury of con-

tending vendors' claims we have emerged with the best market in the world, so out of the fury of contending thinkers' claims we may reasonably hope to emerge with a larger share of truth than we could obtain by any other method.

The opinion that we loathe and believe fraught with death, said Holmes, we should be careful not to suppress unless it defeats the immediate and pressing necessities of the law.

The American press has unmatched facilities for collecting and presenting everything that men all over the

world are not only doing, but thinking and saying. If it will use those facilities to the limit, the menace of monopoly will have its fangs extracted and the promise will be magnificently fulfilled. For even in some idea that we loathe and believe fraught with death, and certainly in some other idea, we shall discover the hitherto unknown truth, and the truth shall make us free.

This is from the William Maxwell Memorial Lecture, given by **Gerald Johnson** at the third Press Institute at Ohio State University School of Journalism, Feb. 27.

Obituaries

Zechariah Chafee

From news broadcast Feb. 8, by Louis M. Lyons on WGBH-TV and FM.

Prof. Zechariah Chafee died this morning [Feb. 8] at Phillips House of a heart attack that sent him to the hospital last Saturday. He was 71.

He was one of the great spirits of this community for 40 years and had been a force for freedom of the mind in America all his life.

The vitality of his mind and the high drama of his presence are well known to the viewers of this station.

Only a week ago last night he gave the final television lecture in his pioneer series in the television chair which Harvard created for him last year. "The Constitution and Human Rights" was the series. It was the essence of his lifetime thought and teaching, on the basic fabric of our liberties.

I saw him the next day and he was gay with release over the finishing of that last big job. He called me over to his parked car to tell me of the next meeting of a club we belonged to, in which he was always the leading spirit. "I'll see you there," I said. "No, you won't," he chuckled. "We're going to Europe." But next day he was stricken with a coronary.

It had hit him before, more mildly. Indeed he had a heart attack the day before his last lecture. The station was preparing to deal with a gap in their program when they were informed that Professor Chafee would be there as scheduled.

And so he kept his last engagement and finished his work. Our television audience saw him in his last performance.

It was an experience to remember. For there was a ring to his words when he talked of the freedoms men have won and how they have won them.

He leaves us a legacy of ringing words in a shelf of great books. And they are all about freedom—all the general books he wrote. *Freedom of Speech* was one of his first. Later *Freedom of Speech and Press*; *Fundamental Human*

Rights; *The Blessing of Liberty*—his last book, which we discussed with him last season on this station. And *Government and Mass Communications*, which was a part of his contribution to the Commission on Freedom of the Press. He was vice chairman under Robert Hutchins and devoted much of his energy to this for three years, to 1947. *The Inquiring Mind* was one of his early books, 1928, and it describes him.

He served the United Nations on a commission on freedom of information in 1947 and 1948, and then was a United Nations delegate to Geneva in 1948, a colleague of his friend Erwin Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*.

Zechariah is an old-fashioned name. His friends called him Zach. He came of an old Rhode Island family which was mixed up with other leading families of Rhode Island and it had a Quaker vein in it.

He went to Brown, class of 1907, then he worked in business three years before entering Harvard Law School, class of 1913. Then he practiced law three years before returning to the Law School to teach in 1916.

This sandwiching of practical work and academic life characterized his busy life. In 1931 he was consultant to the National Commission on Law Enforcement and did a report on lawlessness in law enforcement.

As a young law professor he broke a lance for the rights of the individual against lawless law enforcement that was to threaten his career. He was one of twelve lawyers and teachers who publicly protested the Palmer red raids that rounded up and deported aliens accused of communism in 1920.

This inflamed the 200 per cent Americans among Harvard alumni who demanded he be fired. President Lowell defended him. The Harvard Corporation investigated the case and exonerated Professor Chafee from the allegations of radicalism. A long generation later, the Harvard Cor-

poration was to turn to him to prepare a brief on its position in defense of academic freedom.

In the hysteria of the inflamed days of 1920 the Brookline Public Library banned his book on *Freedom of Speech*. Judge George W. Anderson of the Federal Court in Boston wrote a scathing denunciation of the library trustees, in words that have high color today:

"The real issue," said the judge, "is whether these trustees are censors . . . are excluding this book because it is obscene or indecent or mere trash, or because they do not agree with some of its contents."

That sounded like Chafee himself.

His distinction in law led to his appointment as a University Professor in 1950, one of the most distinguished appointments Harvard makes. In this very special chair he was free to do what he liked. He developed a course for the undergraduates at Harvard College on "Fundamental Human Rights." Out of that course came his book *How Human Rights Got Into the Constitution*, and that was the basis of the television course he just completed.

These sixteen lectures he did on Channel 2 are to be distributed nationally to educational television stations.

In 1912 he married Bess Frank Searle, who survives him. They had two sons, one deceased, and two daughters, now married.

His technical fields of law were equity and commercial law. He taught them 41 years at Harvard.

In teaching, or writing, or lecturing, or in his social life, he was a rare spirit. He enlivened his lectures with his vitality and flavored them with humor. You could hear his high-pitched laugh through the corridors of Langdell Hall. He had vast learning. He loved a good joke, and it could be all the better for being on himself. He was full of good talk and full of gaiety in his daily relations. But few men had so much capacity for indignation at injustice or for such scathing contempt of demagoguery and falsity. His pen was trenchant when dealing with the overriding of individual rights. The books and pamphlets and articles he wrote in defense of freedom make a very barricade of our liberty.

Obituaries

Ralph Barton Perry

From news broadcast by Louis M. Lyons on WGBH-TV and F.M., Jan. 22.

Ralph Barton Perry died in his sleep this morning. He was eighty. Illness had confined him the past two years.

He studied and taught and wrote philosophy at Harvard College for a full fifty years. For another ten, as Emeritus, he continued his philosophizing about American life and the values life is lived by.

Professor Perry, through the first half of this century and something over, was a vital part of Harvard and of American thought.

As a young scholar he was chairman of a department that included James, Royce, and Santayana. In later life his colleagues were Alfred North Whitehead and Ernest Hocking.

Professor Perry was born in Poultney, Vermont in 1876, son of a teacher. He went to Princeton and then for graduate study under William James at Harvard, starting in 1896. For two or three years he taught at Williams and Smith College. But from 1902, he was a part of Harvard until he became emeritus in 1946.

"A part of Harvard" is an understatement. He was part of the main spring that made Harvard tick. He was one of the syndics of the Harvard Press. He devoted himself to the board of the Alumni Bulletin. He was an enthusiastic supporter of Harvard athletics. For years his seat at football games was next to ours. One rainy Saturday we'd given up the game. But it cleared after noon and we called Mr. Perry, then past seventy-five. "Oh, he's gone already," was the answer.

When the younger faculty were restless over the uncertainties of the Harvard appointive system twenty years ago, Professor Perry was one of a famous Committee of Eight, all senior professors, asked to look into it. Out of their work came the present system of faculty appointments.

When William Allen White launched his Committee to Aid the Allies in World War II, Professor Perry organized a parallel committee at Harvard and directed its work. For five years of his war-time leadership, it was the most dynamic activity of the Harvard faculty. For another five year it was an informing channel of faculty discussion of public issues.

All his life he wrote, on philosophy and about public issues. Little books on the war, such as *Our Side is Right*, *On All Fronts*; and great tomes like *Realms of Value* which he completed in 1954, his last work and the end of his life of the mind; a work of a decade and the synthesis of a lifetime.

His book on *The Thought and Character of William James* was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for biography in 1935.

Just to glance down the titles of his books through forty years is the quickest way to add up the scope of his activity: *The Approach to Philosophy*; *The Moral Economy*; *Present Philosophical Tendencies*; *The New Realism*; *The Plattsburg Movement*; *The Free Man and the Soldier* (he was a major in the first World War); *The Present Con-*

flict of Ideals; editor of *William James' Collected Essays*; *Philosophy of The Recent Past*; *General Theory of Value*; *A Defense of Philosophy*; *The Thought and Character of William James* (that was the Pulitzer Prize winner, 1935); *The Meaning of the Humanities*; *Shall not Perish From the Earth* (this is the second World War); *On All Fronts*; *Our Side Is Right*; *Plea for an Age Movement*; *Puritanism and Democracy* (that is one of his big ones); *Hope for Immortality*; *One World in the Making* (this was Wendell Willkie's *One World*); *Characteristically American*; *The Citizen Decides* (only five years ago); *Realms of Value* (in 1954, based on his Gifford lectures at Glasgow in 1946).

But this is just a paper record. The force and vitality of the man was in his presence, in his teaching, in his talk. He loved good talk and he wanted to talk about everything, to be informed about everything, to have a part in everything.

He was a little wispy figure who could never have weighed 120 pounds soaking wet. But he had large features in a strong face with big expressive brown eyes, and the strength of his personality was felt wherever he was. Even in his eighth decade he was ever the life of the party whether in fun or in penetrating discussion—and his talk always ranged over both and kept them well mixed.

When he was young his associates were the great minds of the earlier day. When he was old his friends were young and they seldom thought of him as old. His thinking was always up to date. He always had another book in mind before he finished the last, and he had one outlined, planned and much discussed when he was overtaken by his final illness. Even that did not keep him from writing letters to the newspapers on current events.

Mr. Perry's was the kind of personal force that makes a faculty great and makes a community alive.

Few of the activities I have known at Harvard in the last nineteen years did not owe something to his interest. Indeed he was on the committee whose work and agitation led finally to this station. He took so active and creative an interest in these news broadcasts in their earlier years that he was almost a collaborator.

I brought with me tonight a little book done when he seventy-three, titled: *Characteristically American*. The jacket describes it: "A distinguished philosopher asks what

it means to be an American—in thought and deed and feeling. He searches out the essence of the American mind and the American character, and points the way to a wise and serene synthesis of seemingly conflicting values. A book that will bring peace to the mature mind."

It is full of pithy and pungent comment on the characteristics of Americans.

But I have time for only a paragraph and it better be the last one, where he sums up. Here it is, R.B.P. speaking: "Since the faith which is here presented is also my own faith, I may be permitted in conclusion to drop into the first personal pronoun, and to say what remains to be said, without argument. The fundamental principles of Americanism seem to me quite simple and trite—individual responsibility, cooperation, intelligence, love, kindness, generosity, sympathy, and the Golden Rule: individual responsibility, that is, dedication of the will to the good as one sees it, and the acceptance of the burden of service; cooperation, that is, working with others for an end which is greater than any one because it embraces all; intelligence, that is, using one's brains to guide one's hands and one's words; love, that is, caring for others; kindness, that is, manifesting love to others; generosity, that is, giving to others without thought of oneself; sympathy, that is, interchanging feelings with others; the Golden Rule, that is, reckoning each individual in his own terms as having claims similar to one's own.

"The principles are simple and trite. But their application is difficult and always new, incapable of perfect achievement, and inducing humility in any one who holds the principles high and measures himself by them. And their application is complicated and tortuous, requiring all the faculties, arts, and technologies at human command. This is what I think to be most profoundly American and most profoundly human—the striving and the contriving, with the hope that one may gain something in the right direction, and with the assurance that if one fails it will not be by default but because of the greatness of the cause."

This was 1949. In the years that followed his optimism was hard pressed as these principles were trampled in demagogic destructiveness. But he kept his flag high for freedom of the mind and entered the fray with a vigor that made him a shining mark.

A philosopher with a philosophy worth fighting for.

"In Contempt of Congress."

Why I Took The First Amendment

By William A. Price

Back in November, 1955, there was a knock on the door of my Manhattan apartment that served to place my whole life in focus. Outside was a young man who handed me a subpoena which "commended me to appear as a witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee headed by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi. The Eastland committee had embarked on its investigation of the New York press.

Immediately I was confronted with the need to clarify in my own mind two questions:

1. Would my rights as a citizen be violated if, as was to be expected, the Senate committee compelled me to answer questions regarding my political and personal beliefs and associations?

2. What responsibilities did I have—if any—as a newspaperman, considering the Constitutional prohibition in the First Amendment against Congressional abridgement of a free press?

Fifteen months later I am preparing to stand trial in the Federal District Court of Washington, D. C., on the charge of contempt of Congress as a consequence of my decisions on these two questions.

In answering these questions for myself I drew on my own observations and experiences of the current American scene and the role that some Congressional investigating bodies had played, consulted with lawyers and, for perspective, dug back into some of the great writers in history who had discussed the nature of liberty. In the end I was compelled by my own conscience to refuse to answer questions put by the committee when they concerned my political or personal beliefs and associations. I did so on the basis of the guarantees written into the First Amendment for the protection of the right of citizens to speak, assemble, petition the government, publish and worship and the even more important implied right of the body politic to hear and to read.

I "took the First Amendment" and did so as much by the injunction of a seventeenth century poet, a nineteenth century political economist and a twentieth century educator as for any other reason. I came to rely heavily on John Milton's "Areopagitica—A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing," John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty" and the testimony of Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, former president of Amherst College before the Senate committee on Constitutional liberties in November, 1955. I wished, in retrospect, that such writings as these had been required reading in the first course in journalism I ever took.

Milton writes: "And though all the windes of doctrin

were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licencing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falshood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the wars, in a free and open encounter. . . . give her but room, and do not bind her when she sleeps . . ."

Mill adds: "When there are persons to be found, who form an exception to the apparent unanimity of the world on any subject, even if the world is in the right, it is always probable that disentsients have something worth hearing to say for themselves, and that truth would lose something by their silence."

And Meiklejohn: "When a question of policy is 'before the house,' free men choose to meet it, not with their eyes shut, but with their eyes open. To be afraid of any idea is to be unfit for self government. Any such suppression of ideas about the common good, the First Amendment condemns with its absolute disapproval."

Familiar sentiments, perhaps, and heady stuff. How do they apply to the fact that I refused to tell the Eastland committee whether I was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party? I had volunteered the statement that I had never been a Communist to my own managing editor and to the Newspaper Guild bodies considering arbitration of my subsequent discharge and had agreed to repeat such a statement under oath in any pending arbitration proceedings. Why not answer to the committee?

The reason for refusing to answer can be summed up in one word—compulsion. To invoke John Stuart Mill again, he offers a caution to Milton's sentiments above, "It is a piece of idle sentimentality that truth, merely as truth, has any inherent power denied to error, of prevailing against the dungeon and the stake." And Meiklejohn: "The question, 'Are you a Republican?' or 'Are you a Communist?' when accompanied by the threat of harmful or degrading consequences if an answer is refused or if an answer is this rather than that is an intolerable invasion of the 'reserved powers' of the people."

In my own terms I had seen the uses to which this question had been put. If one conceded the propriety of this question, then the next question was proper too—do you belong to such and such an organization or hold a particular view which might be parallel to a position held by the Communist Party. Such a concession in the first instance leads to "guilt by parallelism" which knows no end except capitulation and final impotence.

I had once participated in a modest effort in my own

home town in New Jersey to end discrimination practiced against Negro doctors in the local hospitals. I and others found that although our ends were conceded as worthy, the resistance centered on diverting the effort by describing the methods involved as somehow "alien to the community" even though those of us participating were, although generally younger than those who resisted the change, long time residents of the community. This was ten years ago.

As of 1957, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is openly and ridiculously characterized as "Communist dominated" by some who would destroy it. It is the same diversionary device, but the difference in language (considering all that the new label conjures up) and the openness of the characterization is a measure of the ground that has been lost on the altar of concession. Likewise, it is not just a coincidence that Eastland, the segregationist, is also Eastland, the latter-day McCarthy. I saw the fight for many democratic objectives thus diverted. If one even had "doubts" as to the divine origin of the McCarthy writ, the only alternatives were to continue to fight and thereby be also labelled or to become immobile. As the months went on, many good people dropped out of organizational life—the circle narrowed and the groundwork for mass conformity was laid.

But this process had a special impact on me personally. I found that in testing the infallibility of the cliché (Mill says: "All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility.") I had to dig deep into reality for answers. The very process of questioning is an enriching one because when one answer is found, other questions arise and the chain leads to inquiry into many fields not originally pertinent to the first questions. So my life became enriched by an expanding interest into many new fields. This enrichment I prize highly and what one prizes highly he does not quickly relinquish.

I should say also that I felt this habit of questioning—even if I felt it led to certain political answers for me—did not affect either my objectivity or my competence as a newspaperman. It did, in fact, I'm sure, increase my capacity to function as a newsman because above all it made me curious. Certainly in my twelve year employment by the paper which discharged me within two hours of my appearance before the Eastland committee, professional competence or objectivity was never at issue.

I once heard a newspaperman described as the man who "asked the important questions." There is no greater compliment than this that can be paid a newspaperman.

These considerations seemed to answer for me the first of the questions posed here at the beginning. To answer for my political beliefs, etc., under compulsion, was to concede precious ground.

What responsibility did I have, if any, as a newspaper-

man? What responsibility did I feel any newspaperman must assume when he is compelled to testify as to his associations and beliefs in a Congressional hearing obviously devoted to investigating newspapers?

This was a more difficult question for me to answer because it was obvious that my own publisher did not think "freedom of the press" was an issue relevant to the Eastland hearings. Neither did a number of other papers although an apparent majority of those who editorialized on the subject did see a threat.

I think this question depends upon whether a member of the "working press" feels that he, an individual, has a responsibility to the public interest. I would surmise that most newspapermen feel such a responsibility.

But what is the nature of this public interest? At the risk of overworking my favorite sources, let me go back to them momentarily. All three make the same point.

Milton's pamphlet quoted here is a treatise against the licensing of books which he describes as designed "to bring a famine upon our minds again, when we shall know nothing but what is measur'd to us by the bushel." Mill also puts the matter in terms of the effects which silencing one man's opinion may have on society when he accepts a definition of his own times as "destitute of faith, but terrified at scepticism" and says, "The greatest harm done is to those who are not heretics, and whose whole mental development is cramped, and their reason cowed, by the fear of heresy." And Meiklejohn: "Just so far as, at any point, the citizens who are to decide issues are denied acquaintance with information or opinion or doubt or disbelief or criticism which is relevant to those issues, just so far the result must be ill-considered, ill-balanced planning for the general good. It is that mutilation of the thinking process of the community against which the First Amendment is directed."

So we get around, eventually, to a right which is broader than freedom of the press which, in its narrow interpretation, means only the right to publish—we get around to the concept of the people's right to be informed, to know, to have access to facts and to hear opinions no matter how controversial these opinions may be. This is the ultimate public interest that a newspaperman must consider because he first of all has a responsibility to such an interest, and secondly, he cannot function fully as a newspaperman unless he can function freely. He is, in a sense, dependent for his survival as a newspaperman on conditions which he must help create, or at least protect. A free climate of opinion is, in a sense, therefore, as much a "working condition" that he must insist upon as are good wages, minimum hours and all the specifics which he may demand be written into a Newspaper Guild contract.

The belief that a member of the "working press" has such a responsibility which may transcend the abrogation of the same on the part of a publisher is also expressed by Walter

Lippmann. He has written (*New York Herald Tribune*, Jan. 10, 1956) as follows:

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 an agency of Congress" should not be questioned. I submit that it must be questioned.

The crucial question posed by the Eastland committee is whether Congress has the power to censor the individual employees of a newspaper, by its power to investigate. This is a tremendous instrument, combining the power to make laws, to enforce those laws, to judge and punish men under those laws.

This tremendous instrument can be, notoriously as it has been, used to harass, to intimidate, to punish and destroy. . . . Congressional censorship of the employment of newspapermen would, if 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 privilege 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 of oppose the setting up of a precedent that can lead to the gravest abuse.

Perhaps most of this discussion has been subjective and/or abstract. There are legal reasons for the invocation of the First Amendment under such circumstances which stem from the language of the First Amendment itself:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Congress is thereby prohibited from legislating in the fields of these vital rights and the courts have held that where it is prohibited from legislating, it is prohibited from investigating. So the purpose served by the Eastland hearings becomes clear because it is isolated from legitimate legislative function and stands separate as a device "to harass, to intimidate, to punish and destroy," as Lippmann put it. When this device is directed against newspapermen during an investigation into the press, the committee's offense is double. There is, of course, no clear ruling on this by the Supreme Court and this is why my case will be so put as to test this principle.

Citation for contempt of Congress is not the only punishment exacted by the committee however. I, for instance, was a Navy pilot during the war and continued flying as a private pilot afterwards. No flight I ever made comes near to matching the committee's wild flights of fantasy when they attempted to play cloak and dagger. The open hearings in January of last year were preceded by closed hearings and during these hearings I was asked if I had ever flown an airplane for the Communist International, had I ever been a Communist courier, and a string of similar questions. I was appalled at such questions and denied them right down the line, even asking the committee to help me frame an answer that would for once and all dispose of any flamboyant insinuations—which were unsupported, by the way, by the testimony of any other witness, any affidavit, or even any charge. One would think that out of decency, if for no other reason, this should suffice, but it didn't.

The same questions, or ones closely similar were asked in the open hearings in what could have only been a deliberate attempt to leave me with a dead albatross hung around my neck. Here again I flatly denied the insinuations, still unsupported by any testimony or documentation, but as newspapermen well know, even when the innuendo is denied, the question lingers on. Such is the wrath of Senator Eastland.

I am not the only recipient of this wrath. There are three *New York Times* employees who also have been indicted as the result of resisting the committee's questions during the same hearings, one of them has already been tried and sentenced to six months in jail and a fine. There are at least eight newspapermen of long tenure and experience who have lost their jobs as a result of the hearings.

P.S. My biographical data can be summed up as follows:

I was first employed by the *New York Daily News* in June, 1940 as a copy boy. My first newspaper job was with a small weekly, the Springfield (N. J.) *Sun* for six months previous to going to the *Daily News*. I left the *News* in the fall of 1941 on a leave of absence for military duty after enlisting in the Navy. I served in the Navy as an aviator until late in 1945 and attained the rank of Lieutenant (Senior Grade)—spent two years of the war in the Aleutians and the Central Pacific. At the end of my terminal leave I returned to the *Daily News*, became the pilot of their photographic airplane for six months (1946) and then became a reporter. As a reporter I covered most of the beats there were, police, general assignment, worked on the *News* straw poll, and for about three years covered the United Nations, then at Lake Success.

I appeared before the Eastland committee in Washington on Jan. 5, 1956. (Closed sessions of the committee were held in New York before this and I appeared in these on Dec. 7, 1955.) I have since been cited for contempt on nine counts and indicted on eight counts and will go on trial in Washington March 11. I was discharged from the *News* by telegram the same day that I testified in Washington.

I was raised in Montclair, New Jersey, and am 41 years of age.

Science, Censorship And The Public Interest

By Gerard Piel

Scientific writing and technical writing have now been given formal status as professions by the organization of their respective national associations. They have different and complementary roles. The scientific writer, according to his incorporation papers, is concerned with the external communications of science; that is: communications between science and the public-at-large. The technical writer, in turn, is concerned with internal communications, with the preparation of the reports between and among scientists, engineers and technicians.

Let us look first at the problems of technical writing. Now what sort of problems could they be? One would think that in the internal communications of science we had a situation that is ideal for bell-like clarity of transmission and reception. The report, the paper or the manual is addressed to a small audience. The members of this audience may be presumed knowledgeable. They have reason to be interested and they are compelled to understand. Even so, these sessions will be devoted to the art and craft of writing as a means of mediating technical communication. The professional writer is now accepted by the scientist and engineer as a fullfledged partner and collaborator in the preparation of papers and reports. The King's English, as expounded by the brothers Fowler, is gaining ever wider recognition as the medium, *par excellence*, through which most of the problems of technical communication can be solved.

Such concern with the technique of communication in this ideal situation suggests the frailty of human communication under any circumstances. It gives us also an impressive measure of the importance of communication in the process of research. It is not too much to say, in fact, that without communication there can be no research. In an exact sense, the situation is analogous to Bishop Berkeley's point about "the tree in the quad"—it doesn't exist if there is no one there to see it. So, new research simply has no existence until it is communicated from one scientist to another. The fact is that there is no "fact" in science that is final or significant in itself. Work has meaning only as it is connected to the general fund of knowledge and to the extent that it is established as a base for further increase of knowledge. It gets so connected and established only by communication. No discovery is ever the work of one

man or group of men, working in isolation from the concerns of the community of science as a whole. On the contrary, most discoveries are made simultaneously by two or more independent workers or groups of workers.

This consideration of the importance of communication in research underlines the highly practical significance of freedom in the communications of science.

The last two decades of war and cold war have seen an appalling expansion of secrecy in the operations of our Federal Government. Public officials have set up or fallen into practices that are foreign and repugnant to our system of government. Censorship has pressed most heavily upon science. It does not only obscure large areas of applied science. The technological revolution in warfare is pushing the frontiers of knowledge; as a result, much work in basic science is classified as "top secret," "secret" and "confidential." And because people, as well as documents, are classified, censorship reaches far outside the government payroll to embroil a frightening percentage of our scientific establishment in the security system.

All of this has been said before, and it has been the subject for eloquent protest and indignation at every recent convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. But there was no systematic inquiry into the spread of censorship until a year ago when the so-called Moss Committee of the House of Representatives undertook its investigation of government information policies. This committee—a sub-committee of the House Committee on Government Operations, headed by Representative John E. Moss of California—has given us a model demonstration of the exercise of the congressional investigative power. Its quiet and thorough work deserves much better coverage by the press, especially by the press of science. Testimony before this committee has developed for the first time the magnitude of the problem of censorship.

Witnesses have agreed that censorship since the outbreak of World War II has locked up something like 100,000 file drawers full of classified documents in the city of Washington and at U.S. military and governmental installations throughout the world. The Army estimates that it alone has 2,000,000 classified documents in its files. Such an accumulation of secret material must be deeply disturbing to anyone who prizes the institutions of our democracy. It is a measure of the degree to which we have permitted anxiety about national security to compromise our traditions and our principles of government. As one eloquent scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, has said it, "Our own political life is predicated upon openness. We do not believe any group of men

Gerard Piel is publisher of *Scientific American*. This is from a talk to the Conference on Scientific Editorial Problems of the American Association for the Advancement of Science last December 26.

adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it, that the only way to detect it is to be free to inquire. We know that the wages of secrecy is corruption. We know that in secrecy error undetected will flourish and subvert."

One report of the Moss Committee reminds us that nowhere in our Constitution or in our statutes is the Executive Department authorized to declare things secret. The government information statute is one of the earliest on our books. It set up rules and regulations for the disclosure of information by public officials and makes no provision anywhere in its language for secrecy. Yet it is this very statute which is now invoked in presidential orders establishing censorship and secrecy. Now, of course, there is need for secrecy in the operation of government. But censorship has flourished in recent years throughout the Executive Department without supervision or review by the legislature or by courts. Perhaps this is because the original statute, making no provision for censorship, made no provision for its review. The Moss Committee is the first agency to undertake such an investigation.

The secret documents that cram the files in Washington relate, of course, to all kinds of concerns of government, to intelligence reports, to forgotten purchase orders, as well as to current scientific research. Some of these documents probably should not be declassified for a generation; it might be wise, for example, to reserve certain intelligence reports for inspection by future historians.

Some documents, however, should never have been classified, especially in realms of fundamental science, and ought to be immediately declassified. But it is clear from the testimony before the Moss Committee that most of these documents will never be declassified. The sheer magnitude of the task and the scarcity of qualified personnel, they say, will make it impossible, no matter how well-intentioned and determined we would like to be. The best the Army hopes to do is declassify about 10 per cent of the documents in its custody, a maximum of about a quarter of a million. Declassification at this rate could not even keep up with the current rate of classification. All of the testimony points to the conclusion that we must seek prevention rather than cure. The most that can be hoped is that some brake on the rubber stamp will slow down the accumulation of secret papers.

This is especially important for science, because research tends to stay classified once the rubber stamp has made its mark. Most strictly military censorship has its own built-in, automatic declassification. The order of battle cannot be kept secret for long because military plans are self-disclosing as they are put into operation against the enemy. Similarly,

the data surrounding the development of a new weapon are disclosed to larger and larger numbers of people as the weapon progresses from the laboratory and the factory to the field. But there is no such automatic process for research. Work in science will stay locked up unless pressure is brought to bear upon the military to declassify it.

Many fields of science, according to testimony before the Moss Committee, are now compromised by the taint of secrecy. Professor Philip M. Morse of M.I.T. told a wry story in this connection. He published what he thought was a novel and significant contribution to queueing, or waiting line, theory. This is a branch of mathematics that has many uses in a world where increasing numbers of people are standing in line; it can help to schedule the landing of airplanes at crowded airports or to decide how many cash registers to install at a supermarket. When his paper was published, Morse found himself subjected to catcalls from certain colleagues who had been associated in a secret, wartime project with Bernard O. Koopman, now at Columbia. Koopman, they said, had done the work long ago. Morse had never heard about it because he had not been involved in that particular project and Koopman's work was still classified. When Morse sought to get the work declassified, he was told that, while Koopman's paper was itself concerned with a no longer classified project, it incorporated reference to work by a man named Clark that was still classified. The reason Clark's paper must remain classified, the censors explained, is that nobody has been able to identify this man Clark or to find his paper. Under the circumstances, Professor Morse has taken the only sensible action: he has yielded that salient in the territory of queueing theory to the censors.

We have always opposed the tendency in our Executive Department to make government a private affair. We know from experience how secrecy can shelter corruption and incompetence and promote incest and sterility in the making of policy. Now we have a new reason for opposing secrecy in the operation of government: it obstructs the progress of science.

Secrecy has injured science in another aspect. It has added a smell of the sinister to the climate of sensation which has surrounded the popular discovery of science as the source of new technology for war and peace. Consider, as a recent instance, the statement by a Federal Judge that "the younger generation of pure scientists" are suspect of treasonable politics. But we cannot blame the censor exclusively for the poisoning of the public relations of science. The sensations have been expanded and inflated by the publicists of science, even by the well-intentioned, to the point where many of our fellow citizens have science firmly identified in their minds as an accessory activity of the weaponeering, home appliance and pharmaceutical industries.

Our second concern is scientific writing, addressed to the public outside of science. This function of journalism has assumed an obvious new importance in our life. The theoretically informed citizenry of our democracy must be especially informed today about the work of science if it is to make wise judgments in public affairs. But sound public information about science is also integral to the life of science itself, for this is an era in which science must turn to the public for its support.

Science writing has shown great improvement in matter and form in this country in recent years. Most scientists will agree that it is distinguished by greater accuracy and by less flagrant affronts to good taste. As a result, they have accepted the notion of collaboration with science writers, just as they have accepted the notion of collaboration with technical writers. But we have far to go. The principal appeal in the popularization of science is still the one-note siren song of utility. Science, in the public mind, is a means to ends—to all kinds of exciting and useful ends, to be sure: to the space ships that are being delivered this year by our automobile factories, to cancer cures, to bigger bombers and faster jets. As such, science is worthy of public support, the citizen says, providing it comes through with more of the same. There is peril for science, however, in reliance upon this distorted view. The same citizen is showing signs of ennui and anxiety at the prospect of further miracles.

There are other deficiencies. The current vintage of science writing shows a tendency to evade the difficulties of exposition; knotty topics are suspended instead in a solution of rich and beautiful prose. In the newer media of communication, which have more recently discovered that science is a matter of large public interest, the popularization of science is confounded by the rituals of mass entertainment. One standard routine dramatizes science through the biography of a hero scientist: at the denouement, he is discovered in a lonely laboratory crying "Eureka" at a murky test tube held up to a bare light bulb. Another treatment invites the audience to identify itself with a hopelessly fatuous master of ceremonies who plays straight man for kindly, condescending Dr. Science.

All of this, we are told, is what the public wants. But even if it could be shown that the public had a taste for such dubious entertainment (the Hooper ratings are against it) it would still be hard to see how it promotes the popularization of science. The suspicion grows that the mass communication image of science reflects not the public taste but merely lack of ardor on the part of these popularizers.

But publishers and producers are learning that the half-life of bunkum in America is growing short. It is increasingly dangerous to underestimate the intelligence of the American public. Recently there have been notable additions to the casualty list of the American press. And stars are burning out faster these days.

Unhappily, it is an equally good rule for the science writer not to underestimate the ignorance of his public. This applies not only to the public-at-large; it holds equally well in addressing the otherwise educated members of our society. The ignorant include most of the spokesmen and articulators of the public consciousness: our scholars, artists, writers, lawyers, legislators, and our administrators and executives in business and government.

It is this ignorance that underlies the divergence in the academies of America between the scientific and the humanities faculties. This is an old story, of course, dating back to the mid-19th century. It arose from the need to specialize which has sharpened with the increasing complexity of civilization. But the gulf has widened and deepened in recent years. Ignorance of science is advertised today as the warrant of the self-styled humanist. The argument goes this way: "The aim of education is a decent, moral world made up of decent moral people. Science must therefore be secondary, because science cannot help anyone to be a decent, moral person. Science is vacant where value is concerned. The humanities provide the value."

The humanities, by this line of argument, are staked out as the territory of the anti-rationalists. "Reason," they say, "must ever be the slave of passion." Science can show us how to achieve our ends. But for motivation and purpose we must seek guidance elsewhere, in tradition or faith, in the sensibilities, emotions and yearnings that well up in the human spirit, beyond the understanding and control of reason.

To argue thus is to ignore how much of the outlook of all men in our time is conditioned by science. In politics, the choice of the aims of national policy is profoundly conditioned by what we know from human biology and from cultural and physical anthropology about mankind, its history and its place in nature.

Such are the concerns that inspire the scientist in his work. They are not different from those that move the painter or the composer, the historian or the poet. Utility alone could never have sufficed to bring science to its present wealth of understanding. The motives could never have been less than those that all men share and which inspire the best achievements of men in other fields of intellectual endeavor.

This is the aspect of science most neglected by science writing. It is, I submit, the facet that is most susceptible to popular appreciation and comprehension. The preoccupation with information should give way to popularization of the objectives, the method and spirit of science. If the public is to support the advance of science for motives other than utility, then people must be able to share not only the useful, but the illuminating and the beautiful that come out of the work of science.

Women's Magazines -- Dope or Dynamite?

By Roland E. Wolseley

One of the stories my father used to enjoy telling us when I was a boy was about a bridegroom who discovered on his wedding night that his bride wasn't everything she seemed to be. First he saw that she had a set of false teeth. Next he learned that she wore a wig. And finally he found out that she had a wooden leg.

We can hardly imagine a bridegroom being fooled that way today. Surely he would know all these facts long before he had his fifth date with the girl.

But there are some secrets even the sophisticated, modern young man does not know about his bride. For, under the firm guidance of certain magazines for women, the bride of today is not everything she is thought to be by her loving bridegroom. From girlhood on she is under a constant campaign to alter herself. This began when she started to read a girl's magazine, continued into young womanhood, when she read one of the several periodicals aimed at her, on into the days of the engagement, when she read one for brides, to the first days of married life, when she bought a magazine at the supermarket and also perused a more matronly woman's publication to which she had been given a subscription as a wedding gift.

Through the advertising, and the special departments of these and kindred magazines for women, modern females are urged to change the natural color of their lips, hair, nails (both finger and toe), and skin. They are urged to alter their general shape as well. While no modern bridegroom today finds himself unexpectedly married to a one-eyed, one-legged, and toothless woman, he often does find that her face has been hiding under layers of powder and cream, that her eye-lashes will come off at her will, that her lips are really more blue or brown than red, that her apparently clear vision is clear only because there are invisible eye-glasses being used, and that there really are some sags and bags where only the svelte figure appears because of girdles and carefully engineered brassieres.

And, as the years go by, he will see his wife, under the stimulus of these magazines, acquire a whole dressing table full of creams and sprays and pastes and powders and perfumes and other liquids—all costly, of course—and all designed to preserve either what she honestly once was but is no longer, or create, as does a sculptor or a painter, a portrait of what she would like to look like.

Roland Wolseley is director of Syracuse University's School of Journalism. This article was written before the *Woman's Home Companion* ended its 83-year run, but its demise has not changed the picture he draws.

He sees her weigh herself thrice daily, eat only certain foods, ply herself with a small drugstore supply of pills and capsules and other pellets, starve herself at times, crowd her feet into shoes a size or two too narrow or an inch too high at the heel. He watches her endanger her health, for beauty's sake, by not wearing enough heavy clothing in wet or wintry weather because proper clothing would not be dainty or would make her look too old. He finds his wife worrying more over whether her seams are straight than over the fact that there are new wars abreeding. Whether her hat is of the right pillbox style appears to concern her more than the relative merits of political party platforms. Consequently, she votes for the presidential or senatorial candidate who has the more stylish wife—or just any at all.

And all this he can lay to certain women's magazines. They have received help in recent years from radio and television and for a longer time from newspapers, movies, and billboards. But the magazines, with their color printing and their devilishly direct aim at women readers, are the prime factor. And what is more, the editors usually are proud of it. Otis L. Wiese, editor and publisher of *McCall's* has said in an article entitled "My Pitch is Women," that women get "continuing support for going through life the way they do" by reading women's magazines.

This accusation that women have been taught falseness is only one of many criticisms of these publications. Before we look at them and also at the other side of the story, we might try for a little perspective on the periodicals themselves.

The women's magazines of the United States divide into a half-dozen groups. Not all are answerable to the same complaints or to be credited with the same virtues, but most of them are. Numbering about 75, and almost all monthlies, they are subscribed for or bought off newsstands by roughly 32,000,000 persons a month; most of these purchasers are girls or women. It is an accepted practice to multiply the circulations of consumer magazines like these by five, since others than the buyer read them. (Think of the reading given them in the beauty parlors.) Thus in one month these periodicals have a readership almost equal to the population of the country, or about 160,000,000. Obviously there is considerable duplication, since the number of females of all ages in the United States is around 82,000,000.

Just which magazines are signified? First are the big five: *Ladies' Home Journal*, *McCall's*, *Woman's Home*

Companion, *Good Housekeeping*, and *Household*, in order of circulation size. All are more than 50 years old. *McCall's*, the oldest, is 86 and the *Companion* (as it prefers to be called) is 83. So their influence has been exerted for some time. Together they had, in 1955, a paid circulation of 19,423,000 every month. Today it is more rather than less than that, since circulations are going up.

In case this figure means nothing, let me point out that the combined circulation of five leading magazines of ideas (*Harper's*, the *Atlantic*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Reporter*, and the *Nation*) is not much over three-fourths of a million. So it is about twenty million for the women's magazines and three-fourths of a million, or less than one-twentieth, for the idea magazines.

The second, known as the supermarket group, is a relatively new one. In it are *Family Circle*, the largest; *Woman's Day*, and *Everywoman's*. Their combined circulation is more than 9,000,000, or 45,000,000 readers. Again there must be considerable duplication with the service books, as the *Good Housekeeping* type is called in the business, but just how much is not on record, if known.

The fashion magazines are: *Mademoiselle*, *Vogue*, *Harper's Bazaar*, *Fashion and Travel*, and *Fashion*. These have comparatively small circulations, not much over 1,000,000 combined. Several are old; *Bazaar* was founded in 1867 and *Vogue* in 1892. They do not reach the masses of American women directly but they do influence them decidedly through retailers of clothing and other commodities for women.

After them come *Seventeen*, for teen-age girls, with about 1,000,000, and the three books for brides, *Brides*, *Modern Brides*, and *Bride and Home*. All but *Seventeen* are quarterlies and add only another 300,000 circulation. In this group also are the two rivals, *Glamour* and *Charm*, aimed at employed young women with something like 600,000 each. This group totals about two and a half million.

Then we have a host of periodicals known as the romance, fan, and confession books. About ten million subscribe or buy from the stands and thus support nearly 40 different publications. Finally there are the small circulation serious or technical magazines for women in business, in various phases of educational work, and in clubs and sororities. These run into several dozens and add another million. Of these six groups, the ones I am dealing with are the first five.

These magazines all are aimed at women. I am not concerned with all the magazines that women read, only with those intended especially for them. Fortunately many women do read the magazines of ideas, the technical journals, the scholarly periodicals, and the magazines of public affairs.

Whatever we may think of the weakness of the women's

magazines they are leagues ahead of the literature for ladies available a century ago. You have only to do a little reading in the hearts and flowers, sentimental slush that appeared in *Graham's*, *Sartain's*, or *Peterson's* of the nineteenth century to realize how far the magazines for women have progressed. Here, from the serialized novel called *Gillian*, by one Mrs. Ann S. Stephens, which ran in *Peterson's* in 1859, is a typical passage:

There the young girl lay, with her head uplifted by the pillows of the couch, her hands softly folded over her heart, and her lips parted as sweet, unuttered words died away upon them in smiles.

You could have counted the beatings of her heart through the muslin folds of her dress; the rise and fall of the white hands clasped over it, and crushing out perfume from the spray of moss rose-buds which trembled to each thrill of happiness that stirred her bosom.

Then she turned her head upon the pillow, giving both glowing cheeks to the air. She gathered the roses from her bosom and pressed them to her lips with both hands, murmuring softly, as the water drops fell, "He loves me! He loves me!"

It was not until Sarah J. Hale became editor of *Godey's Lady's Book* in 1837 that there was an attempt, in a popular magazine for women, to treat readers as intelligent thinking beings, and even she was slow to come to the point. Not before 1890, when Edward Bok became editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, did a mass circulation magazine for women tackle the job of encouraging women to crusade for a better society, to be genuinely discontented with conditions as they were. Bok campaigned for more simply constructed houses so as to cut down the housekeeper's work. He asked for cleaner communities, he objected to disfiguring billboards, he refused patent medicine advertising, and he was a strong fighter against adulterated foods and helped put the Pure Foods and Drugs Act on the books.

From the early 1900's the magazines we are considering improved technically to the point where each issue was a magnificent example of the printing art. But except in his own magazine and a few much smaller ones, the Bok influence subsided until after World War II. Until then the magazines were dominated by advice on fashions, health, cooking, and housekeeping. Fiction still was saccharine in them all, including Bok's. Even as late as 1946 Elizabeth Bancroft Schlesinger was complaining, through the *New Republic*, about the women's magazines published during 1944 and 1945 because they were almost all ignoring woman's responsibilities as a citizen. She found that they barely mentioned such important public issues as racial discrimination, the black market, the meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Yalta, and various other post-war economic and social problems and trends.

As the United States has crept out of its world isolation some of these periodicals have gone along and have broadened their own horizons considerably. But there still are numerous fundamental weaknesses.

The most often heard complaint is that these magazines have developed a cult of the beautiful. They encourage fanaticism about being stylish and pretty to look at.

Related to this is their regimentation of women. Because these magazines, especially those that deal heavily with fashion information, work hand-in-hand with clothing manufacturers and retailers, assisting them to merchandise their wares, women have become sheeplike in their following of fashions.

As a man who sees many young women every day, I am appalled at how much alike they look. If it's the vogue to wear Bermuda shorts, hundreds of co-eds obey, although they may be knock-kneed, bow-legged, or ludicrously fat or skinny. If the fashion this year, according to *Seventeen* or *Mademoiselle*, is to wear cardigan sweater sets, cardigans are stuffed into the luggage before college opens in the fall.

During the first week of a university semester you can look over a class of co-eds and barely tell one from the other except for the fact that the clothes are of varying colors, or, most likely, of different shades of the same color, with names like cigar brown. As any women's club or church women's society lecturer can affirm, uniformity is the creed among the matrons as well. Young or old, women in America have more or less the same hairdoes, the same style of clothing, the same poses. The modern co-ed is trying always to look like the girl in the advertisement.

The magazines also stimulate in women a constant craving for objects and services that they may or may not need. Sometimes they are necessary and desirable. But some of these objects drive whole families into debt by saddling the budget with innumerable machines, bought on the installment plan.

In doing all this they at the same time develop a dislike in women for homemaking or at least housekeeping. There is a constant attempt, made through the reading matter as well as the advertising, to paint work at home as distasteful, dirty, and dull (paradoxically this is not the theme of the do-it-yourself clan). In issue after issue women are urged to escape housework whenever possible. During Save a Wife Week late in 1956 the Paper Plate Association urged husbands to celebrate the week by getting a quantity of disposable plates "and doing away with dishpan hands." Or, as another advertisement put it, "make a new way of life for your wife." The tone is: Get out of the kitchen. Drop that mop forever. Move your vacuum cleaner on air. No more turning the switch to defrost. Have more time for this or that. Reduce cooking time to a matter of dropping food into boiling water or leaving it in the oven for a few minutes. Destroy the art of creative cooking. A reader

wrote to the *Ladies' Home Journal* recently: "If I could change the world I would like . . . no frozen biscuits—it's no fun any more to learn to cook."

The magazines contradict themselves in this and must confuse the woman reader. Although urging women to get the housekeeping and cooking done pronto, these same magazines contain elaborate, time-consuming recipes. Ann Griffith pointed out in the *American Mercury* several years ago that the recipes should be called constructions.

"Salads," she wrote, "require not only a great deal of preparation time but also a working knowledge of geometry. The ingredients are not mixed comfortably . . . but ranged stiffly around a platter, a pattern of cubes, strips, rectangles, circles, and triangles."

Miss Griffith recounted the reading time of the menu-article, the time used in making out a shopping list, the time checking on which staples the cook has about the house, and other time used in following the recipe. I tested this with a random selection from a current issue of a large magazine for women.

The recipe came from one of the magazines that says regularly that simplicity is a feature of all good housekeeping. We get here an idea of the snappy, easy job of putting a salad together. This concoction is called "Mandarin Chicken Salad." It is merely the salad, remember. Still to be prepared are all the other courses. All the little woman has to get into one spot is some chicken, onion, salt, lemon juice, celery, grapes, mayonnaise, mandarin orange segments or tangerine sections, almonds, lettuce, and olives. And of course all the usual bowls and tools.

Assembling these ingredients is a job in itself; one does not find tangerines at any store and mandarin oranges rarely are available at all except in cans, and not all supermarkets carry the tinned variety. The almonds must be "toasted and slivered," the olives pitted and ripe, the grapes seedless. The chicken preparations are formidable: it must be cooked and then cut up. The onion needs to be minced. These eleven different ingredients must be measured in quantities ranging from two to three cups to the various sizes of teaspoons and tablespoons.

Then comes the job of combining portions of this, chilling it for "several hours," then doing a tossing job with the remaining components, then lining the salad bowl with lettuce leaves, arranging the various mixtures in proper levels, and decorating them.

If there is one constant cry against these magazines from their critics it is that they print too much false, insincere, stereotype fiction. The heroes of stories are described by the authors and portrayed by the artists engaged to produce the illustrations usually as fashion-plate Americans, almost always politically conservative. The heroines are raving beauties who apparently use all the deodorants and other prepara-

tions advertised in the adjoining columns. If not beauty queens they almost always are paragons of some sort. For instance, not long ago in *Family Circle* the heroine was described as "slim, blonde, and more-than-attractive . . ." During the same month *McCall's* carried a short story whose hero was described thus: "He was tall, handsome, and broad-shouldered." And of course the heroine had "large, expressive eyes which were expressing just one thing as she looked at him—admiration."

Cute writing is not restricted to the fiction. A columnist in *Family Circle* quoted a woman as saying:

"I work day in and day out, but I never seem to get ahead of the mess."

"What mess?" asks the columnist.

"Why, just look at my kitchen," says the first woman.

"... I don't see a mess," says the author. "I see a lovely lived-in look."

Or this from *McCall's*:

"Our October cover girl is . . . wearing a selene befeater-type hat in Monaco blue faced in pink." With the aid of my dictionary I found that Selene (capital S) was the name for the goddess of the moon. So I put on my Olympus moth-eaten-type hat in Luxembourg grey faced with dirty hometown grey and stopped reading.

But as with all matters, there is another side of the story. So far we have been examining the dope in these women's magazines. But there also is dynamite.

They publish quantities of thoughtful, serious literary work, possibly about all the middle class American woman traffic will bear right now. The leader in this respect has been *Mademoiselle*, which with several other periodicals has printed some of the best work of the past, such as that of Stendhal, and some of the best of the present, like the poetry of Dylan Thomas. Few outstanding American writers of this century have not, at some time, appeared in these magazines. To a lesser extent this is true of European writers also. It is common today to see the new books by Ernest Hemingway, Rebecca West, Pearl Buck, John Hersey, and other leading writers of fiction appear first in the women's magazines.

Non-fiction, even more than fiction, has reached a high point of quantity and commensurate quality. Not at all untypical was the article on Artur Schnabel that appeared in a recent *Vogue*; neither was the one on the Scarlatts printed not long back in *Woman's Day*.

One can find some excellent analyses of the dance and of other of the arts in these magazines; our leading critics are welcome in them. Also, articles of considerable social

significance are appearing. They deal with genuinely vital subjects: juvenile delinquency, censorship of reading matter, segregation of the races, the crises in education, religious intolerances, civil liberties, and the like. Often these are socially more liberal than articles on similar subjects when handled by certain of the magazines for the general public, such as *The Reader's Digest* or the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Women readers are almost being given correspondence courses in facts about government and politics, economics, and sociology through these magazines. The periodicals are discharging an adult function. In some instances parts of them amount to being handsomely illustrated textbooks.

These publications are to some extent responsible for the greater interest in international government and cooperation which women today hold as they never had held it before on a mass basis.

What, then, can we conclude about the magazines for women? Are they dope or dynamite? They are both at one time, some more of one than of the other. There still is more dope than dynamite in them, but that we must say while realizing that years ago there was no dynamite at all in them. We are progressing.

Magazines for women should not, of course, be all toward pushing women to civic action. Nor on the other hand, should they be all dope, only quieting medicine that tells us that all's right with the world, just to forget our troubles, that some one, somehow, will solve them magically for us.

The formula should be some parts dynamic material and some parts honestly helpful, commonsensical, snob-free content. Such a formula would not permit the printing, as now, of as many different reducing diets as there are magazines, ignoring the fact that some women have no sense and will to try and drug or diet without consulting a doctor first.

What these magazines will contain depends largely upon the women who read them. For, in our economic order, mass magazines of this sort must mainly give women what they want, so as to keep them as subscribers and newsstand purchasers and in turn sell them as potential customers to the advertisers. Thus, by women's choices of them, their support of them, they can show which they want. I should not want to think that most American women really want some of the ingredients they get from their magazines. I believe they want to make more use of their heads than the editors think they do. Women must do more to show editors that they are concerned for what is inside their heads and not so much worried about what their heads look like.

The New Soviet Posture

By E. L. Holland, Jr.

KHRUSHCHEV AND STALIN'S GHOST, by Bertram D. Wolfe. Praeger. 317 pp., \$3.95.

Bertram Wolfe calls the Khrushchev speech at the now historically significant Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party in 1956, "perhaps the most important document ever to have come from the Communist movement." It is essential, he writes in this wholly penetrating study, to go over it with a fine tooth comb for here is much light on Communist thinking and maneuverability.

This famous speech is, of course, that which set the Western world to pondering with a great intensity, for it was a weapon as Khrushchev sought to cut down the image of Stalin, the cult of the individual, which that dictator himself had created with both words and guns. Mr. Wolfe speculates as to the reasons why this device had to be used; many of the possible answers to the question have already been set forth by others—the one most impressive to me still being that it was essential for the new leadership to do whatever was necessary to divorce itself from complicity in the earlier diabolical schemes. It follows that this kind of thing would fool no one in a free land, but in Russia the populace and party moguls at all levels are manifestly quite accustomed to the fantastic game of make believe which is the total history of Russia since 1917.

Interestingly, Mr. Wolfe opens up with a discussion of the strange circumstances surrounding Stalin's death. After noting the possible murder speculation, he concludes that he himself now thinks Stalin died of natural causes. But, he writes, one reason for the downgrading of Stalin could be that there were rumors Khrushchev and Co. had killed him. This, then, was "explanation why" for any so thinking.

The first "novelty" of the Twentieth Congress was a reiteration of the line that war is not inevitable. Mr. Wolfe accurately notes that Stalin himself used this line at times—that it is simply peace zig to war zag. And when analyzing the "peaceful coexistence" emphasis, Mr.

Wolfe, it seems to me, very sharply defines the question:

"If you will yield to us without resistance, we will not use force. If you resist, we will use force. But yield you must. So it is up to you to decide whether there is to be a rape, or a peaceful voluntary yielding."

This it seems to me probably pretty well defines the importance of the Khrushchev speech and position. True, it has significance because it seemed to be reversing

Russia's most manifest characteristic, praise and idolatry of Stalin. But as Mr. Wolfe makes clear, that may mean much, or on Soviet leaders' calculated whim—if there is such a thing—it may mean little.

It is an accurate definition to use in measuring what has happened in Poland and Hungary. Hungary would not yield, therefore force in the Stalinist manner. Poland would yield, if granted a little, and there the new approach was used, and it was voluntary surrender, at a relatively small price for the Russians.

Blood on the Desert Sands

By Manzur Siddiqui

HERITAGE OF THE DESERT, by Harry B. Ellis. Ronald Press. 311 pp., \$5.00.

An exposition of the life of the Arabs and their homes in Saudi Arabia and other Middle Eastern countries, this book gives a detailed account of the Arabian domestic, social, economic, and political life.

The author had an opportunity of living and working as a correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor* in the Middle East for three years. He posted himself with the full facts of his "beat" before sitting down to write the book. He keeps the tradition of objective reporting by giving true pictures of situations, relating facts, providing background, and leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions.

Opening the book with the description of a heavily veiled Arab woman traveling in a cart, the author provides a good introduction to Arabian life, more elaborately described in the main body of his book.

Hurriedly passing through the history of Arab society from the advent of Islam, the author brings the reader to the fall of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War I, where the burden of the book concerns itself.

The chapter on the "Mandates and Their Heritage" provides a useful background for understanding the present shape of the Middle Eastern countries.

The part played by the American University of Beirut and other Western educational and social institutions in bringing

about the awakening of the Arabs is very elaborately covered in the book.

The author has spelled out the family feuds and their complexities between the rulers of the Middle Eastern countries that keep them at loggerheads even in matters of common pursuits. The example of the occupation of thrones of Iraq and Jordan by the descendants of the late King Husain of Hajaz, who was driven away from his kingdom by King Saud, father of the present ruler of Saudi Arabia, gives a convincing picture of a long-term enmity, extending to the present, between Saudi Arabia on the one hand and the Hashemite Kingdoms of Iraq and Jordan on the other.

The Baghdad Pact and its consequent effects of creating two definite groups in the Middle East and the Muslim countries of Iran and Pakistan of pro-West tendencies on one hand and an opposing group on the other, is discussed at length.

The value of the oil-rich tracks and their discoveries are detailed in the book. The story of the wealth thus brought about in Saudi Arabia and other Middle Eastern countries makes informative reading.

The book gives a picture of the rise, fall and decline of the kingdomship and the upcoming of the present ruling class in Egypt. It provides a good background to a student of pre-nationalization of the Suez Canal in the Middle East in general, Egypt in particular.

—From *The Asian Student*, Feb. 26.

Dwellings for Drones

By Fred Pillsbury

THE CRACK IN THE PICTURE WINDOW, by John Keats. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. 194 pp., \$3.00.

The publication in 1950 of David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* triggered off a chain reaction of popular sociology which, seven years later, shows no signs of abatement. In recent months we have had William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man*, and Russell Lynes' *A Surfeit of Honey*, and now a third, *The Crack in the Picture Window*, by John Keats, (formerly of the Washington *Daily News*), has been published by Houghton Mifflin.

Mr. Keats' book is a 196-page blast at development life in America—the people who have built the developments, the people who live in them, “the little box on the cold concrete slab” itself, and the financial arrangements the development dwellers, the builders and the banks have involved themselves in.

The subject is certainly worth a blast. In every metropolitan area of America the bulldozer is at work churning farmland into flat, treeless, ranch-house-regimented developments. Whereas a house used to be an original thing built with loving craftsmanship (or at least that is what we like to think), today the houses most Americans live in are turned out like automobiles, and all too many are as badly designed and as over-priced.

Mr. Keats has built his argument around a cast of fictional characters, or I should say caricatures, who include John and Mary Drone, the Amiables, the Fecunds, the Faints, the Voters, the Spleens. These people live lives of quiet victimization at the hands of contractors, sharpie lawyers and sloppy government. The Drones and their friends get cheated every way they turn. Every day in every way they go deeper and deeper into debt. The author, I suppose, has some sympathy for these people, otherwise he would not have bothered writing about them, but he has made them so hopelessly naive and devoid of charm that I, at least, felt something akin to satisfaction at each new misfortune they encountered.

The Crack in the Picture Window is

not fiction. The Drones and their friends are merely illustrations which alternate with the author's factual reporting. But it might have been a more effective book had it been fiction. It could have been funnier—and sadder—if John and Mary Drone had been believable story people facing believable story situations. It could have been a “Mr. Blandings Builds His Dream House” on a lower income scale—and somebody still could steal the idea.

As it is the book is not terribly strong. Mr. Keats' main thesis is that “housing developments are a disruptive influence in our national life (and) pose many clear and present dangers to us all.” I think this is an exaggeration. Not all housing developments are abominations. I am not as sure as the author of “the housing development's destruction of individuality.” Perhaps if there had been more individuality among the Americans who have wound up in our great pea-in-a-giant-pod developments, we would have better developments. Which came first, the development chicken or the conformist egg? I'm for the egg.

Mr. Keats' solution to the development dilemma is Planning and Control. He favors, for example, a “regional master zoning plan” for metropolitan areas—but without even dipping into the political problems of putting such plans through. We can, he suggests, “ban monotonous development by prohibiting builders from slapping up look-alike boxes; by requiring each house to be substantially different from its neighbor.” To me this is a rather frightening proposal which could quite possibly make developments worse than they are. Bad as much development architecture may be, government—local, state or national—could make it worse.

The author believes that “construction firms could properly be brought within the jurisdiction of a public utilities commission and be assigned a certain percentage of profit on their capital investments, just as are gas, electric power and transportation systems,” and here, I think, he has a nice idea—if only because it must be giving developers from coast to coast the heebie-jeebies.

I would like to think that zoning, planning and other forms of government regulation could be cure-alls for the suburban slums we are saddling ourselves with, and of course they can make the patient feel and look a little better. However, the real fault lies with the Drones and their friends, and how much can you protect them from themselves without aggravating the situation? Regulation, after all, is only as good as the regulators, and the Drones must choose the regulators from the ranks of the Drones.

The Crack in the Picture Window is a sprightly book, at times quite funny. I differ with it, but I am glad I read it.

Tom Sancton's Novel

COUNT ROLLER SKATES, by Thomas Sancton. Doubleday. 383 pp., \$3.95.

Handicapped by the lack of a fiction editor, this pedestrian journal has had no review of a successful first novel by Tom Sancton, star reporter on the New Orleans *Item*, and a Nieman Fellow of 1942. His editor, George Chaplin ('41) reports that the book sales had passed 15,000 in early February and sends the following brief review from the Jan.-Feb. issue of Books on Trial, an eight times a year publication of Thomas More Assn., Chicago:

... This book is not easily forgotten, not easily judged. It is written with masterful skill and mature polish. There are no flaws, either of execution or taste, which one is predisposed to forgive in a first novel. Sancton, a journalist of long standing, knows his native New Orleans and re-creates that lost time when the century turned; that interlude before 1914.

He knows his caricature too: the mismatched visionary Count with his mystic beliefs in roller-skating as a panacea for the world's problems; the bewildered Hilda; the pathetic nymphomaniac stunt diver, Hester Mallory, and a melange of minor characters evoked with sureness and clarity.

Mr. Sancton has written a provocative book in the tradition of Wolfe, Melville and Twain. Robust, vital, poignant, with a profound feeling for an almost mythical American past, *Count Roller Skates* shows promise as an unusual first novel which presages more to come.

Big Think About Business

By Harold Liston

THE ORGANIZATION MAN. By William H. Whyte, Jr. Simon and Schuster, New York. 429 pp., \$5.00.

THE AMERICAN BUSINESS CREED. By Francis X. Sutton, Seymour Harris, Carl Kaysen, James Tobin. Harvard University Press. Cambridge. 414 pp., \$6.75.

To venture to wrap up both these important books in a single review may seem too large an order. But it may be convenient for the reader. For *Organization Man* as Whyte pictures him may have been conditioned by the ideology of the business creed which Professors Sutton, Harris, Kaysen and Tobin describe.

Writing an original appraisal of Whyte's provocative work is just about out of the question now. It has sold too well. One can't shake off the impressions of earlier critiques and rather widespread vocal interpretations. But just a glance in the direction in which Whyte throws a worried look can set the stage.

Primarily, Whyte is concerned about (1) the decline of the "Protestant ethic" in favor of the "social ethic;" (2) the horrors of "scientism, belongingness and togetherness;" (3) the subjugation of the individual to the group via love of the new Great White Father, the huge corporation; and (4) the debasement of genius, be it scientific or philosophic.

Whyte, assistant managing editor of *Fortune* magazine, blazes no new trail in his concern about white collar collectivism and the "lonely crowd." He owes a debt to David Riesman, among others, by joining in an apparent nostalgia for the simple days when a Carnegie or a Vanderbilt was unafraid of making a decision, good or bad. At the very least, if not pleading for a return of the uninhibited robber baron, Whyte feels something vital and important, the real starch, is slowly being washed out of the fabric of American business life.

As an example, he chooses the liturgy of a Monsanto Chemical Corp. film, used to attract bright young men to its laboratories: "No geniuses here; just a bunch of average Americans working together."

Entrapment of the individual in the "organization" is not translated by Whyte

into an evil inherent in the operation of the large corporation. He makes it a phenomenon more fearsome than that. Almost a new breed of "Big Brother." We are being smothered by kindness, "understanding" executives, managerial diffusion, guarantees not only of our daily bread, but 96-score butter as well.

And it's not simple non-conformity Whyte wants, it's a good old fighting spirit. He wants men to fight the corporation, cut off its friendly tentacles when they begin to smother individual thought in "group decisions."

He gives the back of his hand to the school of sociology which holds that science is the key to the understanding of human activity. His humor, sly and wry, is at its best when dealing with the personality tests, so much a tool of the modern major-generals of personnel.

Much of Whyte's *Organization Man*, as he spilled out into the suburbs in search of a problem-free bed, turned up earlier in his *Fortune* series on Park Forest, Illinois. He leans heavily on that research in this book. In *The Organization Man*, too, he develops the theme he first introduced in his *Is Anybody Listening?*

Sociologist Sutton and economists Harris, Kaysen and Tobin have cut themselves quite a different suit of clothes from the business pattern.

They have kneaded, beaten, chopped and chewed random and particular utterances of the business community to define a business ideology which arises, they suggest, from the psychological strain of the roles the businessman must play.

From a newsman's point of view, they've done an admirable job of recording what businessmen say they believe and of placing the statements in the proper context of business activity and operation.

Institutional advertising is the principal source for the creed—the kind that is bannered by lines such as "We Can't Legislate Happiness," "Why You Cannot Get Ahead as Your Father Did," "Progress is Our Most Important Product," "Service is our Merchandise"—the last from a maker of gears and ball bearings.

The authors also cite extensively NAM publications, speeches of businessmen, trade journals and editorial stands of business magazines.

The authors reject the notion that the American business creed is merely the reflection of economic self-interest, narrowly conceived. The creed, as an ideology, goes beyond the premise that economic self-interest is the sole motivation of men in their economic behavior. Sutton and his associates seem to find in the business creed much that is aimed at self-justification—symbols to guide the businessman through a morass of decisional and social conflicts that otherwise might send him to the booby-hatch or off the roof of the Irving Trust Company.

It is by eschewing economic motivation as the only basis of the business creed that the book seems to set the stage for the emergence of a business ideology in which the "Organization Man" can thrive.

What are some of the key points of the business creed?

1. Free enterprise is the keystone, if not the entire foundation, of the democratic structure of the United States.

2. This country is a land of "small" businessmen; business ownership is dispersed and the owner is the "lady next door;" business enterprise is a family or team; business enterprise sells "service," not Mason jars, and business is responsible not alone to owners, but to consumers, employees and the general public. (This latter point, diffuse responsibility of business, is found in the present managerial version of the business creed to a greater extent than in the "classic" creed.)

3. Profits are merely a system of accountability of management, and large profits only signal the need for expansion of the profitable enterprise.

Those will do.

While the authors find little in the business creed that is admirable in itself, the book is not designed as an attack on the business creed. It's not unfair to point out, however, that the tone of the writers occasionally slips into less than complete detachment. When the slips do occur, the attitude borders on the petulant.

In describing the "tone" of the business creed, Sutton and his associates write:

The creed prefers common sense to

abstract argument, "shirtsleeve economics" to academic theories, the ordinary meaning of words to professional niceties of definition, the testimony of purchasing agents about prices to the analyses of economists, and the sales experience of a Paul Hoffman to years of governmental service or university study. The long theoretical tradition in support of the business position, from which the classical creed draws much of its argument, is paid little explicit honor in the ideology. Adam Smith is not revered, even though the coincidence that 1776 is the publication date of *The Wealth of Nations* would enhance his usefulness as an ideological symbol.

Even economists are not beyond needing, albeit of a gentle variety.

In one sense, Whyte's *The Organization Man* is a slightly below-the-surface appraisal of what has become a business-engendered social phenomenon. *The American Business Creed*, by going a good deal deeper, seems to illuminate, using the scientism that Whyte deplores, the arena in which the Organization Man is spawned. (Whyte, too, might regard the other book, the work of four authors, as an example of the group science he abhors.)

A key to the beneficence of the organization as Whyte sees it may be found in a "Business Creed" phrase: "A principal reason for the emergence of the managerial strand of business ideology is precisely the discrepancy between the classical model of small and weak business proprietorship and the real world of great corporate enterprises."

The authors insist that the "economic determinism" so strong in the classical business creed is "not available" to the managerial creed and . . . there have been "isolated efforts to replace it with a sociological determinism, according to which the corporation executive is powerless, not so much because of economic factors, as because of organizational and social pressures."

It's a good deal easier to do justice to Whyte's book in a review after one careful reading than it is to *The American Business Creed*. Whyte's attitude seems easier to produce in essence. Sutton and his associates bear careful study. They have a lot

to say and their positions are carefully buttressed by solid example as well as by abstract economic and sociological reasoning.

The newsman, if he absorbs these two books, may want to regain some equilibrium. Try Von Mises *The Anti-Capitalistic Mentality* as a dessert course. The little volume presents a colorful defense of the system which gave rise to *The American Business Creed* and *The Organization Man*.

Impulse to Secrecy

By Robert F. Campbell

FREEDOM OR SECRECY, by James Russell Wiggins. New York: Oxford University Press. 242 pp., \$4.00.

Anyone who has illusions about current threats to freedom of information—and wants to keep them—should stay away from this book.

For Mr. Wiggins catalogs in logical sequence what he calls the "impulse to secrecy," an impulse that "will alter and curb our governmental institutions if it is not itself altered and curbed."

Russell Wiggins is a front-line soldier in the fight for the people's right to know. As chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association and more recently as chairman of the comparable committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he has been an articulate defender of that right for many years. Mr. Wiggins has seen at first hand the developing threat to the free flow of information in Washington, where he is executive editor of the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*.

But he knows that the federal government is not the only agency that has made it more difficult for the people to learn how their business is conducted. His survey shows that "legislative, executive and judicial establishments of local, state and federal governments challenge the right of citizens to scrutinize their transactions." If the present trend continues, he warns, "we shall one day reach a place where we have made the choice between freedom and secrecy. We shall pass a point beyond which we cannot go without abandoning free institutions and accepting secret institutions."

While Mr. Wiggins is disturbed about the increasing tendency of legislative committees, city councils, executive agencies of government and the courts to shut out the public, he finds a few bright spots in the picture.

One of these is the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946, by which Congress required executive agencies to give notice and hold hearings before taking certain actions. (But even here the agencies still find it possible to impose penalties in a secret, unjudicial manner.)

Another is the activity of a special House Subcommittee on Government Information headed by Representative Moss of California. This committee has made the initial report on a series of hearings covering restrictions placed on release of information by executive departments. Mr. Wiggins calls the creation of this subcommittee a tardy beginning toward placing a statutory foundation under the right to know about the executive departments of their government.

And in the area of private business, he finds a trend toward, and not away from, release of information to the public. This has come about because business executives have learned that in the long run the price of secrecy is too high to make it a practical policy.

Mr. Wiggins realistically avoids the claim that a free flow of all news to the public would necessarily follow removal of all governmental restrictions on information or publication. Weaknesses in the press itself sometimes lead to suppression, distortion or omission of legitimate news. But do these weaknesses excuse governmental secrecy? Mr. Wiggins thinks not.

Russell Wiggins makes a persuasive argument for a conscious choice in favor of freedom rather than secrecy. The book will be especially interesting to newsmen who share his concern over developments of the past 15 years. But more than that, it deserves the thoughtful consideration of men and women in all walks of life who may not have been aware of the gradual encroachments on their freedom. For until citizens generally become aroused, there is little hope for re-opening the gates that are closing against the free flow of information.

What Caused Racial Revolution?

By Julius Duseha

RACE AND NATIONALITY IN AMERICAN LIFE, by Oscar Handlin. Atlantic-Little, Brown. Boston. 277 pp., \$4.00.

In just 20 years a racial and religious revolution has exploded across America, shattering prejudices, jarring attitudes, exposing doctrines of race superiority as utter foolishness. The changes have come so fast that few historians have had a chance to determine their causes. In a new book Prof. Oscar Handlin of Harvard lists reasons for the revolution. Some are as surprising as the swiftness of the changes themselves.

In his book, *Race and Nationality in American Life*, Prof. Handlin notes that as different leaders and movements as Adolf Hitler and Nazism and Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal were largely responsible for America's changing attitude towards race and religion.

"The example of the degradation of Germany, and the mounting revulsion in response to it, steadily turned Americans against the practices, the movements, and the ideas associated with Fascism," Mr. Handlin writes.

The premise that one group of people, in this case Jews, was inherently inferior to another, whom Hitler called the Aryan race, was basic to the Nazi ideology.

"A revived consciousness of the importance of the ideals of equality and liberty also contributed to the change in attitudes," Mr. Handlin goes on to point out, adding:

"In the 1930's the reaction of the New Deal to the depression crisis strengthened the humanitarian ideals. Franklin Roosevelt and his most influential admirers were not, at the start, very greatly concerned with the problems of the minorities . . . But, whether it willed it or not, the New Deal created an ideology . . . Identifying the Jeffersonian elements in the American tradition with humanitarianism, the New Deal called attention to the values of equality of opportunity and increasingly focused attention upon the problems of the minorities."

Internal and External Trends

While Hitler's Nazism and Roosevelt's New Deal did so much to destroy Amer-

ica's racism and hate movements, these were not the only reasons for the revolution. "A variety of internal and external trends converged in the middle of the decade of the 1930's to produce a far-reaching revolution in the practice, the politics and the theory of group life in America," Mr. Handlin concludes.

Minority groups began to realize that they as well as those who would keep them in inferior positions could use political power to realize their goals. The general prosperity which spread throughout the United States during World War II "eased the immediate strains of competition for places," in Mr. Handlin's words, and broke down many of the economic barriers erected to restrict minorities to undesirable work.

The supposedly scientific studies which fortified racial and religious prejudice were so widely disproved that, says Mr. Handlin, "by 1940 it was difficult to find a serious, reputable exponent of the racist views once so widely held."

Mr. Handlin notes the role of the U. S. Supreme Court, especially its decisions of 1954 and 1955 ordering the desegregation of public schools. However, he seems to underestimate the court's contribution to the racial revolution, and it has been substantial.

Nor does he explore the effects of the World War II draft, which threw together Americans of all races and religions. Other observers have credited this dislocation with having a great effect on the changing U. S. attitude toward minorities. Perhaps Prof. Handlin does not think so.

His book is not limited to a discussion of the reasons for the racial and religious revolution, although that section is most timely with desegregation—in schools, in parks, on buses—making so much news. The first chapter, "The Origins of Negro Slavery," is an excellent essay surveying the evolution of slavery in colonial America. Equally good are his chapters on the growth of theories of race superiority in the 19th century, the anxieties of the Victorian years, and the work of the commission whose findings led to the restrictive American immigration legislation of

the 20th century, embodied today in the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952.

Still Too Much Prejudice

Mr. Handlin is an expert in the history of immigration, a subject clouded with racism and prejudice. His book, *The Up-rooted*, a study of the experiences of immigrants to the United States, was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in history for 1952.

Prof. Handlin recognizes that there is still too much racial and religious prejudice in the United States. He cites such incidents as the riots in Cicero, the disturbances at Cairo, the Emmet Till case. Now he might add the bombings in Montgomery, Ala.

"But," writes Mr. Handlin, "the backward look is encouraging. In the past 20 years, our society has experienced a veritable revolution, scarcely noticed by those who participated in it. The experience of Europe, the actual diversity of our people, and the strength of our free institutions provided the instruments for destroying the inequalities of practice and theory that made minorities of some of us."

—From the Decatur (Ill.) *Herald* and *Review*.

Mark Howe's Holmes

A son of an outstanding biographer of Oliver Wendell Holmes the elder, has followed his father's example by performing a similar service for his son, Oliver Wendell Holmes, the younger.

Harvard Law School Professor Mark DeWolfe Howe published March 8 his *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Shaping Years, 1841-1870*. His father, Mark A. DeWolfe Howe, is the author of a standard biography of the elder Oliver Wendell Holmes, U. S. man of letters.

Professor Howe was secretary to Justice Holmes from 1933 until 1934, a few months before the Justice's death in 1935. The book is published by the Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press.

The book deals with the youth of the younger Holmes, through Harvard College, the Civil War, Harvard Law School and a tour of Europe—formative experiences which greatly influenced the adult Holmes. Professor Howe reveals that while the son liked his father and admired the qualities in the parent which made him

The Backwash of Westward Settlement

By Robert B. Frazier

and his writings so popular, he was, in fact, deeply disappointed in his parent. After praising his father's penetrating mind, the son told a friend in a letter that "if he had had the patience to concentrate all his energy on a single subject, he might have produced a great work."

The father's *Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* appeared in 1858. Its picture of dining room conversation suggests the quality of talk in the Holmes household. The brilliance of the conversation was due not only to the father, but also to the son, whose reputation as a conversationalist persisted throughout his life. Professor Howe comments: "To say that Holmes and his father knew intellectual companionship is not to say that the justice thought either that his father's versatile capacities matched his reputation or that he made the most of the abilities with which he was endowed."

The *Autocrat* appeared a year after the son entered Harvard College. As an undergraduate Holmes attracted the attention of the college authorities more by his misbehavior than his scholastic attainments, Professor Howe reports. In his Freshman year he was fined one dollar for writing on the posts in a tutor's room. Shortly before he was due to be graduated he "incurred a censure for being engaged in breaking the windows of a member of the Freshman Class." The Harvard President also complained that the younger Holmes had been guilty of "repeated and gross indecorum in the recitation room of Professor Bowen."

Holmes went directly from Harvard to the Civil War. He was wounded twice, and his diary and his letters home contain a graphic picture of that conflict as seen by an individual army officer.

Returning from the war, he entered Harvard Law School. After completing his studies, he went to Europe for a summer's stay. He came back to Boston to serve as an apprentice with a Boston law firm. The volume closes shortly after Holmes' admission to the Massachusetts Bar.



THESE THOUSAND HILLS, A. B. Guthrie. Houghton Mifflin Co., 346 pp., \$3.95.

The westward sweep of empire, from the Kentucky frontier of the 1820s to the Pacific frontier of the 1850s has never been pictured better in fiction than it was half a dozen years ago in two novels by A. B. Guthrie. *The Big Sky* was the story of the mountain man, the tough, uncouth savage who bested the Indians at their own game and who saw in the new West only profit and challenge. The mountain man's story was followed by *The Way West*, the story of the pioneer who crossed in '45 in a wagon train and who came looking not for quick money but for opportunity for himself and his family—the family the mountain man never had. Now Mr. Guthrie, a Montanan with Kentucky and Harvard trimmings, gives us the third of what can be a trilogy of novels on opening the west.

In *These Thousand Hills*, Bud Guthrie tells the story of the backwash of settlement. After the pioneers of *The Way West* came to Oregon many of them, itchy of foot, found the country getting too civilized. They turned eastward again and settled the inter-mountain region—Montana, Wyoming, the Dakotas and Oklahoma, states newer in settlement than are the states along the ocean.

Like the two previous books in the trilogy, this novel is complete in itself. But, as in the other two, there is a transition character. This lends credence to our belief that the author is setting out, piece by piece, to do a giant "work" on the West. The transition character here is Lat Evans, the third son of Brownie Evans who was a teen-age bridegroom when the pioneers of *The Way West* arrived in Oregon. Lat goes to Montana where, between 1880 and 1887, he is converted from an itinerant cow-hand to a substantial citizen. His credit is good. He's on the school board which didn't exist in 1880, he's active in the Methodist Church and is being considered for the Senate, just as soon as statehood is achieved. Also he married the wrong girl, loses the loyalty of his best friend, and

seems headed for certain success and frustration as the book ends.

This is not so good a book as the previous two. It lacks the feeling of vastness that characterized *The Big Sky*. And one misses the sweep of movement and migration that came so clearly from *The Way West*. But it does have plot, real plot, a complication and a resolution of sorts. Plot, as such, was not needed in the first two books.

Maybe this novel impressed us less because it, and the people in it, belong more to the traditional sort of "western" story. The cowboy, the bronc, the marauding wolf, the rustler, the other stock characters of dinner-hour teevee programs have all come into their own by the time Lat Evans goes to Montana. Also we read of barbed wire, a bank, a school, a lawyer, and other refinements that were unknown when Lat's grandfather moved his family across the plains and the mountains to Oregon.

It is not without its memorable characters. We have Tom Ping, good, lonely and loyal and destined to be a failure. And Callie, who made a house her home and who was denied the love she craved. Above all, of course, there is Lat himself, victim of a confused moral standard that will make him miserable the rest of his life.

One wonders now if Bud Guthrie is through. Will there be another volume devoted perhaps to the town dweller who took over where the cattleman left off?

Maybe this is the last one. Maybe, when Lat returns, somewhat ashamed of himself, to the wife he can't love, Mr. Guthrie figures the West is settled, and that "order" and "decency" have settled down on the land the mountain men were despoiling only half a century earlier. In either case the series of novels present a splendid picture of that half century between savagery and civilization.

This was originally an editorial in the Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*, Jan. 9. Robert Frazier, associate editor of that paper, was a Nieman Fellow in 1952-53.

The Power of the Supreme Court

By Anthony Lewis

GOVERNMENT UNDER LAW: Record of the John Marshall Bicentennial Conference at Harvard Law School, September, 1955. Edited by Arthur E. Sutherland. Harvard University Press. 587 pp., \$7.50.

For a decade and more after the court crisis of the mid-Thirties the role of the Federal judiciary was almost a forgotten issue in American politics. The doctrine of self-restraint, newly preached and practiced by the judges, made the day seem distant indeed when government policy to deal with the country's worst depression waited upon the word of nine men. Then came the war, and after it new emphasis on foreign policy—areas beyond judicial power.

But now, again, the courts are at issue. From new sources come charges of usurpation. A Southern legislature finds it politically desirable to move the impeachment of six Supreme Court Justices. A Senate committee chairman, Eastland, sees "one pro-Communist decision after another" in the Court. A House committee chairman, Walter, speaks of assumptions of power by "A.D.A. judges."

At the same time there are counterpressures, from the "liberal" side, to have the courts do more. These critics deplore the failure of the judiciary to stand up to the legislature and executive and protect Government employees from the excesses of the loyalty and security programs. They would have the courts assert new powers in the areas of passports, immigration, the right to employment. Many feel the legislature has been allowed too much freedom in restricting the First Amendment rights of Communists.

What, then, should be the role of the judiciary in American Government? When should nine appointed Justices assert their views against those of the people's elected representatives, or in the absence of legislation? How can the courts justify the use of their extraordinary power to invalidate legislation—virtually unique among governments—and delimit that power so as to avoid the judicial tyranny of the past? These were the questions that, for one reader, pro-

vided the theme of this conference on Government Under Law, for all the variety of its speakers and subjects.

The book comprises major papers and shorter comments by more than thirty persons, among them Chief Justices of the United States, England, Canada, Australia, and South Africa; other judges, leading members of the bar, and academics. Topics range from Chief Justice Marshall himself to constitutionalism in other countries.

The transcript of such a conference cannot be of uniform interest or excellence, and this book certainly has its lesser moments. No one reader is likely to find all the subjects appealing, nor could such a collection be expected to provide the depth of analysis attainable when a single problem is attacked intensely. But there are riches to be found, and notably so in efforts of the distinguished speakers to find a philosophical justification for judicial review.

Professor Paul Freund of the Law School puts the case wittily for the negative (not expressing, it should be made clear, his own conclusion):

"Almost every justice of the Supreme Court, over the generations, has had occasion to lament the fact that so grave and delicate a responsibility was intrusted to so incompetent a group as his colleagues. This unanimity of judgment is, I submit, the most impressive argument against the practice of judicial review in due process cases. And if the judges made a botch of things in the Twenties when they were censors on the right, how can we expect them to do any better as censors on the left? For if, as Holmes said, the Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics, it should be equally true that it does not enact Mr. Justice So-and-so's Social Ecstasies."

Aside from the question of the judges' competence, there is the familiar charge that Americans' preoccupation with the *constitutionality* of measures sometimes obscures the matter of their *wisdom*. Mr. Justice Frankfurter notes resignedly in his paper here: "No matter how often the

[Supreme] Court insists that it is not passing on policy when determining constitutionality, the emphasis on constitutionality and its fascination for the American public seriously confound problems of constitutionality with the merits of a policy." Dean McGeorge Bundy of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences may be correct when he suggests, in his paper, that concentration on the "legality" of our internal security measures in recent years may have inhibited searching inquiry as to whether their "fundamental premises . . . may be deeply wrong."

Finally, on the negative side, there is a democrat's doubt about leaving the most basic questions in our society to the judges.

"One sometimes envies," Justice Frankfurter says, "the certitude of outsiders regarding the compulsions to be drawn from vague and admonitory constitutional provisions . . . Like all legal provisions without a fixed technical meaning, they are ambulant, adaptable to the changes of time. That is their strength; that also makes dubious their appropriateness for judicial enforcement. Dubious because their vagueness readily lends itself to make of the Court a third chamber with drastic veto power. This danger has been pointed out by our greatest judges too often to be dismissed as a bogey. Holding democracy in judicial tutelage is not the most promising way to foster disciplined responsibility in a people."

History gives no clear answer. The Jeffersonians, whose attacks on John Marshall were as violent as anything heard from the South today, nevertheless wanted the Supreme Court to strike down the laws to which they were opposed—the Alien and Sedition Acts, the charter of the Bank of the United States. Charles Warren, the Supreme Court historian, concluded that opposition to the Court, in its early days at least, "was directed not so much at the *possession* of the power of the Court to pass on the validity of Acts of Congress, as at the *effect* of its exercise in supporting or invalidating some particular measure in which the particular political party was interested." There, as Justice Frankfurter says, lies the problem. Can some consistent theory of judicial review be advanced that will make it more

than the answer to a particular interest's prayer at a particular moment?

Most of the men represented in this volume are skeptics on the subject of judicial review. Professor Herbert Wechsler of the Columbia law faculty says, for example, that it is "true, and becomes truer as the passing years reduce the clarity of relevancy of the original meaning of important constitutional provisions, that this function presents to courts what are essentially political problems." And Associate Professor Robert G. McCloskey, of the Harvard government department, asks: "What reason is there to believe . . . that courts are better equipped than legislatures to determine when a statute has unduly cribbed and confined the human personality? What reason is there to think that courts are better able than legislatures to balance the value of federalism against such values as the right of fair trial or of economic liberty?"

Yet each of the speakers seems to end by proclaiming himself, as does Professor Wechsler explicitly, "a supporter of judicial review—against even the judicious doubts of its august judicial critics."

One answer commonly given, here as elsewhere, is that the courts serve a useful function, and one not inconsistent with democracy, if they merely prevent hasty action by the legislature—force "a sober second thought by the political branches," as Mr. Wechsler puts it. If they follow this approach, the courts will not absolutely prohibit legislative action in a given area—as, for example, the Supreme Court in its *laissez-faire* heyday did as to minimum wages. They will instead, as Professor Freund suggests, say in effect to Congress: "You can't do it this way, you have to do it in some less drastic way."

It is this approach which is the key, so hard for some doctrinaire observers to grasp, to Justice Frankfurter's judicial record. The Justice is willing to strike down state action as impinging upon interstate commerce because Congress can easily pass a law to change such a decision if it does not approve. He will flag down the federal executive for going beyond the intent of Congress in restricting civil liberty, because Congress again can easily restate its intent if it wishes. He will monitor the procedures used by

Government, because other, less harmful procedures are usually available to reach a desired end. But he is plainly uneasy about invalidating a Congressional act in terms that make the difficult process of constitutional amendment the only possible political correction for the Court's decision. And his doubts have for some years been those of the Court majority.

A second answer, not conflicting, is given by Judges Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., of the United States District Court for Massachusetts, and William H. Hastie, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. They argue that courts at their best throw light on issues that remain unexplored in legislatures. They do this by exploring intensely the narrow facts of the particular case. "Is it not true," Judge Wyzanski asks, "that in courts, at least at present, when as Professor Freund told us we are no longer taking an absolute view of constitutional questions, every consideration is debated and brought forward with greater skill, with more attention to detail, with wider intellectual resources, than is common in the legislature? Is it not true that the legislators and the people at large have had their whole horizon expanded by the work of the courts?"

So long as the courts refrain from imposing an absolute judicial veto, then, they can help create the conditions for more intelligent public and legislative consideration of a problem the next time it is at issue. They become, Judge Wyzanski says, "teachers to the citizenry."

Both these views seem to be implicit in a spirited defense of the courts by Professor Henry M. Hart Jr. of the Law School. His concern is broader than judicial review; it is with the influence of law generally on society. Professor Hart is critical especially of a skeptical sentence of Judge Learned Hand's, quoted by other speakers at the conference: "A society so riven that the spirit of moderation is gone, no court *can* save; . . . a society where that spirit flourishes no court *need* save."

"What the sentence assumes," Professor Hart says, "is that there are two kinds of societies—one kind, over here, in which the spirit of moderation flourishes, and another kind, over here, which is riven

by dissension. Neither kind, Judge Hand says, can be helped very much by the courts. But of course that isn't what society is like. A society is something in process—in process of becoming. It has always within it, as ours does, seeds of dissension. And it has also within it forces making for moderation and mutual accommodation.

"The question—the relevant question—is whether the courts have a significant contribution to make in pushing American society in the direction of moderation—not by themselves; of course they can't save us by themselves; but in combination with other institutions. Once the question is put that way, the answer, it seems to me, has to be yes."

Law in this broader sense is the concern of Justice Frankfurter when he concludes:

"In what I have been saying you have no doubt heard undertones of a judge's perplexities—particularly of a judge who has to construe, as it is called, vague and admonitory constitutional provisions. But I am very far from meaning to imply a shriveled conception of government under law. Quite the contrary . . . My concern is an affirmation—my plea is for the pervasiveness throughout the whole range of government of the spirit of law, at least in the sense of excluding arbitrary official action. But however limited the area of adjudication may be, the standards of what is fair and just set by courts in controversies appropriate for their adjudication are perhaps the single most powerful influence in promoting the spirit of law throughout government. These standards also help shape the dominant civic habits and attitudes which ultimately determine the ethos of a society."

Another view of the courts is that they can serve a kind of representational function in a democratic society. There may be interests so scattered or vague or politically disarmed that the legislature tends to disregard them, but the courts should offer them protection within the careful confines of individual cases.

Something like these values seem to be in the mind of Professor McCloskey when, for all his doubts, he suggests that the courts take a critical view of employment restrictions such as occupational licensing and union membership barriers.

For in these areas the special, private interest in favor of restriction may be able to focus its political pressure as the broader public interest cannot.

"The right to pursue the calling of one's choice," Professor McCloskey says, "is surely as important to some people as free speech is to professors. Mark Twain, with his dreams, would have felt that his personality was vitally inhibited if he had been prevented by a legalized system of nepotism from becoming a river boat pilot on the Mississippi."

Again, judicial review may be justified as a device to prevent the transitory political majority from permanently disabling the minority. It is the courts' responsibility, as Professor Freund phrases it, "to help maintain the constitutional order." It is from this responsibility that the courts derive their power to curb laws abridging the freedoms of speech, press or assembly. The same responsibility might in the writer's opinion, justify more affirmative action by the courts against the efforts of this country's passing rural majorities to entrench themselves by malapportionment and the gerrymander.

A useful conception is that of the "inner check." If the political forces are working freely, if the minority is not being excluded from the legislative process or being inhibited in its right to persuade others, then the Court should stay its hand. But if there is a fundamental flaw in the political process, or a threat to it, the Court can act.

For example, when a single state's legislature passes a tax or a highway regulation which interferes with interstate commerce, only that state's interests were likely to have been represented in the legislature. The needs of other states in a national market—in short, the national interest—were not a part of the decision-making process. There was no inner political check. On the other hand, continuing with the same example, Congress—representing all the nation—should be perfectly free to regulate or restrict interstate commerce as it wishes.

The Court need make no apology here to any abstract idea of democracy. If it acts to ensure the inner political check, it is certainly not playing a role inconsistent with democratic government. In this sense the Court can justify not only

its power over state laws—clearly essential in a Federal system—but its unique power over the national legislature and executive.

Corollary to this view of the courts' function is the understanding that they can be effective only as their decisions find acceptance by the public. If, as Judge Hand says, the spirit of liberty is once gone from a people, the courts cannot bring it back. But Professor Hart is surely correct in suggesting that the courts can reach down to deep-rooted instincts of liberty and justice, nourish them in the public and help supply leadership in the right direction.

Within the fairly narrow limits set by their own humility, then, the courts have a twofold obligation in using the power of judicial review: to find consistent standards for their own judgments on the basic constitutional issues, and to express both their standards and their reasons for acting with a logic and articulation so compelling as to ensure public acceptance. Judge Hastie uses a simple example, presenting fewer problems than judgments on legislation: "A case arises in which police officers seizing a suspect observe that he swallows something, which is believed to be a narcotic. They wish to recover that. They give him an emetic and he regurgitates. Now, how do we reach the conclusion that this method of getting evidence is intolerable in our society? What are the criteria that go into our value judgment? Is it that we have had some very terrible recent experience with governments whose officers do not respect the integrity of the human personality? Is it something that has been instilled in us through humanistic thinking? . . . If we judges would get clear in our minds what makes us reach such a conclusion, and then articulate it in our opinions, it would help."

It is the view of some friendly critics in the North that the Supreme Court has not yet provided an adequate rationale for its most controversial recent decisions, those wiping out state-imposed racial segregation in schools, parks, transportation. Why is the Court justified in updating its doctrine when Congress, for its special reasons, has not moved? What are the compelling reasons of Twentieth Century

democratic society? In Chief Justice Warren's opinion in the school cases an effort at articulation was made. But there have been no further efforts—the subsequent segregation cases have been decided by memorandum orders without opinions.

No one can fairly argue that wiser words from the Court would have prevented the present outbreak of irrationality in the South. Men who would make membership in the N.A.A.C.P. a crime or impeach a Justice because he was honored by a labor union are not likely to be persuaded by wisdom. But the responsibility is on the Court in any case, and in the long run its fulfillment will make a difference to the country and especially to the place of the Court itself.

For one source of the courts' sovereignty is, at last, their evocation of the people's deeply held moral convictions. Some such basis, reaching past the politicians to the unexpressed sense of justice of Southerners as well as Northerners, is the hope for the eventual success of the Segregation Cases.

The theme of morality is sounded by many in this volume, but most effectively by John Lord O'Brian, the eminent Washington attorney whose most recent great work has been criticism of loyalty-security procedures. Mr. O'Brian describes himself, with humor and perhaps nostalgia, as a Nineteenth Century liberal.

"I was brought up in an atmosphere pervaded by Victorian concepts of law," he says. "In carrying out those concepts many think that the Victorians failed pretty miserably; but they did have the idea that standards of justice were to be measured by the needs of the individual—not of the state . . .

"In approaching the Constitution, what I'm really saying is that no canon of interpretation in this day can omit the element of moral conviction. And I might quote somebody who said it more wisely, in saying that 'there can be no health in a democracy where there is no acceptance of the supremacy of law, where the law is not interpreted in terms of the highest moral insights regarding man's nature.'"

The editor notes that Mr. O'Brian "spoke without oratorical display, but his quiet words had an obvious and profound effect on the audience."

Jaundiced Eye

To the Editor:

Frank Kelly's stirring defense of the Fund for the Republic against a "slanted" press in the January *Nieman Reports* is a striking document. In pleading for public understanding of the foundation and its work he makes a strong case against certain newspapers and magazines for leaping to adverse conclusions when not fully possessed of the facts.

Yet, this defense is to me a glaring example of the type of fuzzy thinking that seems so often to infect many of our "liberals."

What, for example, is Robert Hutchins' idea of a Communist?

Kelly gives us these Hutchins quotes: "I wouldn't hesitate to hire a Communist, if he were qualified for his job, and I were in a position to see that he did it."

". . . I am against Communism. I am for justice, even justice for Communists. . ."

"If I had any evidence that a man was a conspirator against our government, I certainly would not hire him."

Is not a Communist one who subscribes to the principles, aims, philosophy and objectives of international atheistic Communism? Does he not believe that an ultimate victory for Communism, worldwide in scope, will follow the revolutionary overthrow of competing systems?

Mr. Hutchins says he would not hesitate to hire a "Communist." Yet, if he had "evidence" a man was a conspirator against our government, he would not hire him.

Presumably, Mr. Hutchins makes a distinction between conspiratorial Communists and just plain Communists—and so long as he continues to do this, press and public alike will regard him (and the Fund) with a jaundiced eye.

Says Mr. Hutchins: ". . . the practice of judging people in terms of labels rather than in terms of themselves is contrary to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights."

But the practice of coddling Communists, in whatever form, also is contrary to the principles of our Constitution, which provides in Article III, Section 3,

that: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. . ."

Can one be a Communist without adhering to our enemy and without believing in, or advocating overthrow of republican government? Most Americans, I

think, would answer with a resounding "No!" They regard a Communist as a per se conspirator against our government, our religion, and our way of life—certainly not a person to be "hired" for a job, sensitive or otherwise.

HUGH MORRIS '51

Louisville *Courier-Journal*

Home Office Covers the World

From John Cowles to Prof. Kruglak

I just recently read your extremely interesting article entitled "The Foreign Correspondents" in the January issue of *Nieman Reports*.

Although the Minneapolis *Star* and *Tribune* did not have a full-time foreign correspondent abroad at the time you wrote your article, last year we employed Robert Hewett, at that time bureau chief for the Associated Press in the Middle East, who has had extensive foreign service for the Associated Press in many parts of the world. Since early last fall, Hewett and his wife, Mary Morgan Hewett, who is a photographer, have been in the Near East and North African areas for us.

Although your article was concerned only with full-time foreign correspondents, I think you might well have made reference to the fact that some American papers like the Minneapolis *Star* and *Tribune* have home office staff men travel extensively.

You might be interested to know that last year, for example, the following were some of our home office staff men who were abroad getting a first-hand look at the international situation:

William P. Steven, executive editor; Wilbur Elston, editor of the editorial pages; and Daryle Feldmeir, managing editor of the *Tribune* each went around the world, as did I. Each spent some time in the Middle East, in South Asia, and in Southeast Asia, as well as in Europe.

Three of our home office staff men went to Russia on separate trips—George Peterson, an associate editor of the editorial pages; George Grim; and Cedric Adams. Peterson also spent some time in Scandinavia.

Robert W. Smith, one of our associate editorial page editors, spent two months in North Africa and the Middle East.

Bradley Morison, also an associate editorial page editor, went to Germany.

Victor Cohn, our science reporter, covered the atomic energy meeting in Switzerland.

Graham Hovey, an editorial page writer, went to Japan and Thailand.

Scott Long, *Tribune* cartoonist, who also writes for our editorial page, and Carl Rowan each spent a month or two traveling through Africa. Other staff men went to Europe and Latin America.

Although our staff foreign travel last year was greater than in previous years, it was simply an intensification of a policy that we have long followed. For example, we sent Carl Rowan to cover the Bandung Conference in Indonesia, and the year before that Rowan had traveled extensively for us in South Asia.

We receive not only the Associated Press, the United Press, the International News Service, but also the New York *Times* and the Chicago *Daily News* foreign services. Consequently, we have relatively little need for routine sport news foreign coverage from our own men.

In a situation like ours, I believe we can select, edit, and comment on the news much more intelligently by following our practice of having home office staff men make foreign trips than by spending the same amount of money in having two or three additional full-time foreign correspondents stationed abroad.

Don't you think our point of view has some validity?

JOHN COWLES

Foreign Correspondents

From Clifton Daniel

To the Editor:

I agree with Theodore E. Kruglak (*Nieman Reports*, January, 1957) that American news agencies, newspapers and radio and TV stations have too few correspondents in Western Europe.

I must say, however, that some of the statistics Mr. Kruglak gives to support his contention are very misleading.

For instance, Mr. Kruglak leaves the reader with the impression that the New York *Times* has only ten correspondents in Western Europe. He mentions correspondents in England, France, Italy, Germany, Belgrade, Vienna, Stockholm, Geneva, The Hague and Madrid.

In fact—depending on where you draw the line between East and West, the New York *Times* has about sixteen or seventeen full-time staff correspondents in Western Europe and twenty-one or twenty-two in Europe as a whole.

The present line-up is as follows: London, four; Paris, four; Germany, three; Rome, two (including one highly qualified Austrian citizen); Moscow, two (one there and one awaiting a visa); Vienna, two (one currently in Budapest); and one each in the following cities: The Hague, Madrid, Warsaw, Belgrade, Ankara and Athens.

In addition, the *Times* employs a very large number of full-time local workers, some of whom have editorial functions and often write for the paper. The paper has a long list of stringers as well.

Most of the staff correspondents travel frequently and cover more than one country.

Referring to the high turnover among correspondents in Europe, Mr. Kruglak cites me as a "prize exhibit." He says that when he interviewed me in Germany I was "fresh from London and unfamiliar with the German language." Since 1952, Mr. Kruglak says, I "have made the rounds to Moscow, then to the *Times* foreign desk and Margaret."

Mr. Kruglak chose his "prize exhibit" badly. For ten of my fifteen years abroad I was in London. That is not a very rapid turnover.

I went to Germany with the intention of staying three or four years. I left only because I was needed elsewhere—i.e., in Moscow. My departure occasioned no drastic "turnover" as I was succeeded there by M. S. Handler, who had already spent several years in the country.

I was in Moscow only thirteen months, but I did not leave for any policy reason. I was called home on account of ill health. The man who succeeded me, William J. Jorden, prepared for a long assignment by spending a year studying Soviet affairs and the Russian language.

In talking about turnover, Mr. Kruglak ignores the fact that the *Times'* chief correspondent in London has lived there off and on since 1938, that the chief correspondent in Paris has been there since 1944, that the bureau chief in Rome has lived in Italy practically all his life, and that the *Times* has not changed its Vienna correspondent for twelve years.

Mr. Kruglak also seems to imply in his comments about me that a correspondent should not work in a country if he is "unfamiliar" with the language. How does he propose that correspondents should broaden their experience and learn new languages? When he saw me in Germany, I had already been studying the language for several months, and I was having a lesson every day. In addition, I had the services of five bilingual assistants.

Finally, the fact that I have married since I returned to the United States has absolutely nothing to do with the turnover of correspondents in Europe.

CLIFTON DANIEL

From Prof. Kruglak

To the Editor:

First, a personal apology to Mr. and Mrs. Daniel. What seemed a mild academic jest on a hot August afternoon in Evanston now appears in cold print on a blustery January morning as a comment bordering on bad taste. For this I am truly sorry.

But I stand by my factual comments. Mr. Daniel must have skipped my opening paragraph entirely. I based my conclusions on research in Western Europe and said so—any conclusions referred to this area and this area only. Nor did I

imply that the New York *Times* had only ten correspondents in Western Europe. Certainly my reference to its London bureau manpower would give the reader an entirely different impression than the one Mr. Daniel received. I was referring to the number of newspaper bureaus in Western Europe. There has been no change in the *Times* situation with the exception of The Hague, where a part-time correspondent has been replaced by a staff man. At the time of writing, there appeared to be no Geneva replacement for Mike Hoffman.

I cited Mr. Daniel's experience deliberately to point up the seeming waste of experienced manpower. The fact that the New York *Times*, which has the largest overseas staff, the best foreign editor, and greatest strength in depth, used a man (experienced as he was in London) who was still learning the language to fill a hole in Germany struck me as symptomatic of a basic weakness which exists to a degree among all media. When you consider that Mr. Daniel's predecessor in Germany had the same problem, it seemed to me a dramatic method of pointing up the situation.

I never implied that all correspondents are neophytes. There are enough reporters of the stature of William Stoneman of the Chicago *Daily News*, Hank Wales of the Chicago *Daily Tribune*, or Volney Hurd of the *Christian Science Monitor*—to name a few—to indicate that we do have career correspondents. But the thin grey line is thin indeed. Could Mr. Daniel name three London bureau chiefs on the job today who were there when he started in this area? I can think of only one.

Mr. Daniel also wants to know how I propose that correspondents should broaden their experience and learn new languages. I think he has pretty well answered that question for me in two of his comments. I should think that one way would be to follow William Jorden's example by studying the affairs and language of the country before going there. Mr. Daniel also cited the four-man bureaus in Paris and elsewhere. Presumably the number 4 man in the bureau is learning the language while being the low man on the totem pole. Another source might very well be the American free lance

writers in these countries a la the New York *Post's* recent move.

The fact that the New York *Times* correspondents in some countries cited by Mr. Daniel have been there for many years reflects credit upon the *Times*, but it does not alter my basic premise—that there is high turn-over of correspondents in the American media of information in Western Europe. And there just aren't enough correspondents in the business today.

I doubt that Mr. Daniel would seriously dispute this.

From Clifton Daniel

Reply to Prof. Kruglak:

It was not my intention in writing to the *Nieman Reports* to launch a controversy with you. I agreed, as I said, with your general conclusion. I felt it necessary, however, to correct some implications that seemed to me to be ill-founded.

I am grateful for the copy of your reply, and I have a couple of comments to make on it:

You seem to equate knowledge of the language of a country with competence as a reporter.

The best answer I can give to that is the following: I won an Overseas Press Club award for my work in Moscow, although I went there with only a beginner's knowledge of Russian. (Incidentally, I spent a summer session at Columbia learning Russian, and after seven weeks I could read, write and speak it haltingly.) I was also nominated for a Pulitzer Prize. I did not win it, but the men who did—the three members of the Hearst team—do not speak a word of Russian.

I did not go to Germany to "fill a hole." I went there as a foreign correspondent with twenty years of experience, ten years of it abroad. I would not consider myself a "neophyte." As for Stoneman, Wales and Hurd, I have personal knowledge of the work of only one of them (Bill Stoneman), but I am sure they have frequently worked in countries where they did not speak the language, and have done it very well. The best foreign correspondent I know, Homer

Bigart, does not speak a word of foreign language. He has won two Pulitzer Prizes.

None of this is to say that knowledge of a foreign language is not useful (I have studied three), but it is not the only criterion.

As for the London bureaus, I cannot name three men who were in London when I was there, but I can tell you that Drew Middleton of the New York *Times* has lived in London off and on since 1938, Don Cooke of the *Herald Tribune* first went to London in 1944 or 1945 and knows the city well, and John Lloyd of the AP has been there at least ten years. I don't know any other bureau chiefs there.

Those are my comments. I hope you will find them useful. They are not offered in a spirit of controversy.

From Prof. Kruglak

On Television Correspondents

To the Editor:

Before Nieman Fellow John Day gets his protest into the mails, may I hasten to explain some of my remarks (*The Foreign Correspondents—Nieman Reports* January, 1957) concerning the television correspondents. It is true that there has been little change in the number of such correspondents between 1953 and 1956 but in fairness to the medium I must point out that there has been a change in complexion. I refer to the point that in my study back in 1953 I did not include newspaper or magazine photographers as correspondents nor did I include the few television cameramen working for the networks. As a matter of fact the trend at that time was for the TV people to go in for exchange deals with European newsreel or television news groups. I recall an incident in Rome at that time in which the NBC bureau head proudly displayed the Italian exchange schedules as evidence of NBC's enterprise.

All this seems to have changed. CBS news director Day and NBC's Sharkey assure me that they are emphasizing their

own camera work, and that TV photographers are considered foreign correspondents. The accomplishments of these men in the Hungarian revolution lead me to believe that I did them an injustice in discounting their importance in the field of foreign correspondence.

While I am making a clean breast of things, I should add that I did not anticipate the Hungarian or Suez situations when I prepared my notes last Spring. In one respect my remarks were completely at variance with the facts of life as displayed in Hungary. I expressed my doubts that non-American correspondents for the wire services would report hard news in satellite countries knowing that their lives were forfeit if they strayed from the party line. Any one who has been reading Endre Marton (AP) or Ilona Nyilas (UP) knows that this husband and wife team are not allowing any thoughts about returning to jail to influence their dispatches.

The Fall developments also produced a resurgence of war correspondents, a facet I am now trying to explore under the general heading of "the logistics of foreign coverage." It is quite a jigsaw puzzle and I am still trying to fit the pieces.

TED KRUGLAK

P. S. I hope you'll get after John Day to do a piece on the changing role of the TV cameraman. It would be a valuable contribution to the literature of news coverage.

Reviews—

BOOK REVIEWS in this issue are by Julius Duschka of the editorial page of the Decatur (Ill.) *Herald and Review*; Robert B. Frazier, associate editor of the Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*; E. L. Holland, Jr., Birmingham *News*; and the following Nieman Fellows: Harold Liston, Bloomington (Ill.) *Pantagraph*; Robert F. Campbell, Winston-Salem *Journal*; Anthony Lewis, New York *Times*; Fred Pillsbury, Boston *Herald*; Manzur Siddiqui, *Daily Dawn*, Karachi, Pakistan.

Nieman Notes

1939

Edwin A. Lahey, chief Washington correspondent of the Knight papers, was the guest speaker at a Nieman dinner February 27. This was a notable occasion. An old hand at these affairs says it was the best talk since Lahey was last in Cambridge. It served also to renew the Lahey legend at Harvard. In the first group of Nieman Fellows, Lahey made an indelible impression on the university with his pungent vocabulary, his practical wisdom and forthright personality. He more than anyone else stamped a character and planted a tradition for the Nieman Fellowships.

Irving Dilliard, editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, gave the William Allen White Memorial address in February at the University of Kansas.

Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., reports that he has won his long and strenuous campaign to secure a television channel to add to his Radio Station, WKYB in Paducah, Kentucky.

John Clark's widow, Rhoda Clark, was one of the first members of the New England Newspaper Editors Association. Attending its second annual conference in Boston, Mrs. Clark reports the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle*, which she has published since John's death, continues in thriving condition.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, served on the selection committee that awarded the first grants of the Fund for Adult Education for people in the media of communications. Three of the 20 grants for a year of study went to newspapermen, three to magazine writers, nine to broadcasters, three to film people, two to teachers of journalism.

1940

Hodding Carter gave the Eric W. Allen Memorial Fund lecture at the Oregon Press Conference at Eugene on February 15 and 16.

1941

Lowell Limpus of the New York *Daily News* gave the second lecture in the Medill Patterson Lecture Series at Fordham University, March 21. His subject:

"The Role of the Newspaper in Meeting the Social Responsibilities of Modern Communications Media."

1942

Professor Kenneth Stewart of the University of Michigan looks forward to becoming a grandfather this summer. He is chairman of the resolutions committee of the Association for Education in Journalism, which meets in Boston in August. Evelyn is writing for the Detroit *Free Press*.

1943

John Day, news director of CBS and Christopher Rand (1949) of the *New Yorker* magazine, spoke as members of a panel on journalism to a Harvard Career Conference in Cambridge, February 20.

Bob Elliott and Vera are spending most of their time in Honolulu with Henry J. Kaiser, Bob's boss.

Frank K. Kelly has a new book, *Reporters Around The World*, a juvenile published by Little, Brown & Company. He is vice-president of The Fund for the Republic.

1944

Charles S. Jennings reports that he has been "on the news desk at *U.S. News & World Report* long enough now to have my name on the masthead. Before last July, my experience in the magazine field was virtually nil but there is a very friendly and cooperative gang at *USN&WR* and they all have helped make my initiation a pleasant one."

Fred W. Maguire directed the Third Press Institute at Ohio State University School of Journalism, where he is a professor. Gerald W. Johnson gave The William Maxwell Memorial Lecture.

1946

Ben Yablonky, professor of journalism at New York University, was one of two journalism professors to win awards in the first group of grants by the Fund for Adult Education to people in the communications media. He plans to study television operation so as to add courses in television to NYU's journalism offerings.

Arthur Hepner reports the birth of Thomas Stephen Hepner on February 21. "He's a little on the small side—3 lbs. 10

oz.—but, says the fatuous father, just delightful. And says the doctor, thank heavens, a solid, lively little guy who will be fine after an extra stay in the premature nursery. We'll have him home by about April 1. His mother, of course, is fine."

Richard E. Stockwell's book, *Soviet Air Power*, was the winner of the \$250 second prize in the 1956 Best Book Contest of the Pageant Press, Inc., which published it.

1951

Malcolm C. Bauer, associate editor of the Portland *Oregonian*, has been appointed to the Board of Trustees of Reed College for a six-year term.

Simeon Booker, chief of the Washington bureau of the magazines *Jet* and *Ebony* is president of the Capital Press Club.

Sylvan Meyer has recently been elected president of the Southern Association of Nieman Fellows. Hugh Morris is vice-president, and Red Holland (1949) is secretary-treasurer. Both are on the selection committee, along with George Chaplin (1941) and Paul Evans (1947).

Dwight Sargent passed through Honolulu on his way around the world. He'll spend a few days in Rangoon.

1952

On March 22, Robert W. Brown and his wife left Washington for New Delhi where Brown is to be information officer for ICA (Point Four) in India, assigned by the U. S. Information Agency. Brown left the editorship of the *Columbus*, (Ga.) *Ledger* for this foreign service.

Pepper Martin, Far East correspondent of *U. S. News and World Report*, has been all over the Orient. He writes:

Life isn't quite as hectic as it was during the days of war and continual crisis out here, but there's enough to keep one busy. I got to Melbourne for the Olympics and of course had many long sessions with the Bill Tippings (1952). Then back through Southeast Asia and 10 days with Keyes Beech (1953) on Okinawa investigating the fabulous new Communist mayor of Naha. I'm leaving next month for the Philippines, Hongkong and Formosa, and later in the year back into Southeast Asia. That is unless Dulles reverses his stand on China. It seems

awfully silly to be sitting on the sidelines with a visa and still unable to go in. Nothing that Dulles or anyone else has said convinces me that it is either right or politic to bar correspondents from China.

Lee has also had her share of travels. She was the only correspondent to go with the Air Force when it ferried the Indonesian toops to the Middle East for the UNEF. It was her first trip to Djakarta, India, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon, and she thoroughly enjoyed it.

1953

Commander **Beverly L. Britton** reports that he is working on plans for coverage of the International Naval Review to be held in Hampton Roads, June 12. Twenty-seven nations will be represented and 50 or more U. S. warships.

John H. Flower has been transferred to London as London Editor of his paper, the *Sydney Morning Herald*.

Harry Schmeck left the Rochester *Times-Union*, January 14, to join the New York *Times* where he continues as a science reporter. He had a byline story on p. 1 in the *Times* his second day there—on the Columbia report about the unconservation of parity.

Calvin Mayne won the \$500 second prize in the National Association of Home

Builders "community facilities" series contest.

1954

In January **Henry Trewhitt** moved from the Chattanooga *Times* to the Baltimore *Sun* as a staff reporter. New address: 1407 Saunders Way, Glen Burnie, Md.

1955

Guy Munger has joined the staff of the Honolulu *Star-Bulletin*, moving from the Greensboro (N.C.) *Daily News*.

The New York *Herald Tribune* syndicated a series on the Mid-East by **Henry Tanner** of the Washington Bureau of the *Houston Post*.

Alicia Patterson, editor and publisher of *Newsday*, has announced the appointment of **William J. Woestendiek** as editorial page editor, a newly created post. He had been editor of *Newsday's* Weekly Review.

Robert H. Hansen, back on the job at the Denver *Post* after his illness, is on editorials, following particularly the progress of underground water legislation, prompted by a piece he did last fall. He has been working on a series on the development of oil from shale, touched off by the Middle East oil crisis.

1956

John L. Dougherty was appointed city

editor of the Rochester *Times-Union* in January, moving up from the telegraph desk.

Richard E. Mooney has moved from the Washington bureau of the United Press to the New York *Times* on the economics beat. One of his first *Times* stories penetrated the cloudiness of the emergency oil setup, following the blocking of the Suez Canal. This anticipated the Senate oil hearings which confirmed his report.

Ed Seney bought himself a weekly newspaper in February, the South Miami *Town and Country Reporter*. He and his wife had just started a monthly magazine, the *Miamian*, the first of the year.

Ed Hale has been covering the New York legislature this session for the Buffalo *Evening News*.

Ronald Plater, back on the cable desk of the Brisbane *Courier-Mail*, Australia, reports he is now making practical use of his Harvard studies in a weekly column on foreign affairs for the *Sunday Mail*.

Hisashi Maeda of *Asahi Shimbun* reports that **Dwight Sargent**, 1951, editor of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald*, reached Tokyo, March 1. Maeda invited him to a "sukiyaki party." Maeda has a book on *Atomic Energy and World Politics* expected out in the Fall—a by-product of his Nieman studies.

NIEMAN REUNION

JUNE 18 - 19 - 20

Hastings Hall
Cambridge