

# NiemanReports

---

April, 1958

## The Little Rock Story

Harry S. Ashmore

Segregation and the Press

Robert F. Campbell

A Hard Look at Sports Pages

John Hulteng

Reporting on Radiation Fallout

Arthur J. Snider

The Plus and Minus of Newspapering

Robert M. Pockrass

U. S. Reviewed in Japan

Kazuo Kuroda

Why Proportional Representation Is Declining

Myron M. Johnson

---

*The Creative Process*, Gerard Piel — *Guthrie and the Missionary* — *Research in Russia*, Howard Simons — *Reviews* — *Letters* — *Nieman Notes* — *Scrapbook*

# NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; 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; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; 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.; 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. XII; NO. 2

APRIL, 1958

## The Newspaper Job

By Simmons Fentress

I think that any person who is considering a career in journalism—or any career for that matter—should first ask himself just what he is looking for in the world.

If his confidential answer is merely money—translated into a town house and a country club membership—then I think he had better forget about journalism and look to the medical or business schools.

I don't know of any fortunes, or even near-fortunes, that have been compiled by working newspapermen. I can name ten reporters or editors who are underpaid for every one I think is overpaid. Historically, I think newspapermen have occupied much the same poor role—where compensation is concerned—that teachers now fill.

It has been said, with too much truth, that newspapermen are the most overprivileged and underpaid group of people in the country. Too often, publishers have expected them to live upon romance and glamor that the business unquestionably has had. I don't believe that there has ever been a good newspaperman who didn't get a charge out of seeing his name in a byline. But it is an undisputed economic fact, as well as an old saying in the city rooms, that you can't cash a byline at an A & P store, and that bit of wisdom was born of some pretty sad experience.

But things are slowly looking up. I think that even newspaper publishers are coming to realize that you must pay

**Simmons Fentress**, editorial writer on the *Charlotte Observer*, is now on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard where he was asked to talk to a Careers Conference on Journalism. This is from his talk.

good salaries to get hold of good men. The American Newspaper Guild has had a good influence in this field, both where it is active and where it isn't.

True, too many good people continue to leave newspapers every year for what Henry Mencken once called "the suburbs of journalism"—public relations and advertising—and the thing that sends them there is almost always the matter of economics. The glamor and romance that once were supposed to be adequate substitutes for decent salaries have shifted their locale to a degree—first to radio and now to a much larger extent to television. Money has consequently become more important, and this fact is being increasingly recognized.

Incidentally, those of you whose main interest may lie in those related fields—advertising and public relations, radio and television—will find that experience in journalism is often the best avenue of entry into them.

As I have said, newspaper pay is slowly improving. The Guild salary minimums on Northern metropolitan papers are now over \$150 a week after six years of experience, and these are minimums. The average is higher. I know a reporter on one of the Washington papers who is earning \$155 a week after four years on its payroll. The *New York Times*, whose quality reflects its progressive attitude in this area, has a minimum salary of \$200 a week for the 26 correspondents in its Washington bureau.

It can truthfully be said that things are better than they have been, and that the next ten years should see considerably more improvement.

I suppose you think by this time that I am some sort of walking cash register. Perhaps I should explain that I have emphasized this matter of legal tender because I consider it to be the biggest drawback—indeed the only major drawback—to a career in journalism. Let me explain that I think it is more than a cliché to say that there are other things in this world besides money.

The newspaper business is an interesting—even an exciting—business. It is a rewarding business. Its area of interest is nothing less than the realm of human experience and—at least to me—the person who tires of journalism probably has tired of life and the race, himself included. Every time I talk to a bank vice-president, worrying about his debits and his trusts, or a department store executive mulling over lingerie sales, I know I made a very fortunate choice. I think the broker in facts and ideas has it all over the broker in stocks, whatever the relative commissions.

As an editorial writer, after ten years of reporting, my joys come from trying to show decent people that they have no place in a white citizens' council, in pointing out that the President's ten-day vacations seem to come every three weeks, in noting that a slum in the heart of Charlotte

(Continued on Page 27)

*Nieman Lecture*

# The Story Behind Little Rock

## Was Its Meaning Lost in Reporting Its Drama?

By Harry S. Ashmore

*(The first Nieman Lecture, to mark the 20th year of Nieman Fellowships, was delivered at Harvard, February 21, by Harry S. Ashmore, editor of the Arkansas Gazette. He discussed the performance of journalism on the Little Rock story. He felt its meaning was largely lost in reporting that limited itself to the surface facts. He saw Little Rock as an illustration of "journalism's unfulfilled responsibility to provide perspective and continuity—to add the why to the what.")*

THEY tell a story down my way—or used to—about a native son who, when he traveled in the great world, always replied to the inevitable query about where he came from by saying, "Arkansas—go ahead and laugh." That, however, was in a simpler time when the state was largely known to those who live in the great cities, and are the most provincial of Americans, as a name which alternated in bad jokes with Oshkosh and Brooklyn.

Since last September there has been nothing funny about Arkansas, or its capital, Little Rock. Outsize headlines have converted the name into a symbol which arouses strong emotions not only among Americans but among people everywhere. It has become a new battle cry for those on both sides of the great moral issue that has divided this nation through most of its history, and still divides it. "Remember Little Rock" proclaims the great seal that adorns propaganda-bearing envelopes going out from the headquarters of the Southern Citizens' Councils. The same words have been sounded by Negro hoodlums moving against whites with drawn knives in the slum streets of Northern cities.

For anyone who lives in Arkansas, and particularly for one who practices journalism there, Little Rock has become an inevitable topic of conversation wherever he may find himself. Here in this proud seat of Abolition it is, I know, inescapable. So I shall deal with the Little Rock story tonight—but not so much with the dark and tangled tale itself as with the singular and alarming fact that it is a story so many have heard and so few have understood.

To me, at least, this seems an appropriate place to discuss the matter—particularly since I am here to help celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Nieman Foundation, that remarkable non-academic appendage of the University

which once sustained me for part of a memorable year in Cambridge. Perhaps the only pretentious thing about the Foundation is its statement of purpose, as defined in the will of its founder, Agnes Wahl Nieman—"to elevate and promote the standards of American journalism." But I do recall that the little group of police reporters, political correspondents, sports writers, and the like with whom I shared Mrs. Nieman's bounty took the injunction seriously. When we were not sitting at the feet of Harvard's great men we were most often assembled in a saloon, or other place conducive to reflection, pondering the ways of our calling, trade, business or profession. (We never decided exactly what job description best fits journalism, but then better men have tried and failed, before and since.)

This was, as time is reckoned nowadays, a long time ago. The Foundation was still classified as an experiment; we were the third class of guinea pigs summoned from the city rooms of the nation to see if, through a process of exposure and osmosis, our breed was capable of absorbing a meaningful dose of higher learning. I am too obviously prejudiced a party to pass judgment on the result—but I can note that, without significant departure from its original practices, the experiment has become a permanent institution which commands the respect of the communications industry.

THE world, and journalism, have changed a good deal in these 17 years, and not necessarily for the better in either case. The mass media have expanded to include the formidable newcomer, television, and a new dimension has been added to the raw stuff of history. Newspapers, although financially weakened by the additional competition for attention and the advertising dollar, have improved their techniques; we get the news faster and dish it up in prettier packages. We are as free as we have ever been—which means that we are as free as our proprietors have the heart and the will to be.

Yet with all of this, we seem to be no nearer to a solution to the fundamental problem my generation of Nieman Fellows wrestled with in our after-hours seminars at the Stage Club—how to present the day's events in meaningful perspective. Indeed, in some important ways, we seem to be moving in the opposite direction. The concentration on technique can, and often has become a sort of refuge

from this more complex problem. One of the major wire services is still bemused by Dr. Rudolph Flesch's formula which seeks salvation through syntax, and holds that public understanding can be improved through shorter sentences and more frequent paragraphs. It seems to me it doesn't really matter what tools we use so long as we wake up each morning and discover a whole new world, and write about it as though nothing relevant had gone before.

**T**HE Little Rock story is a case in point. It was, by universal judgment, the second biggest news story of the year—topped only by Sputnik. It attracted a concentration of correspondents, photographers, and radio and television technicians comparable to that which assembles for a national political convention. The newspapers, wire services, and networks sent their best men, too—seasoned hands to handle the fast-breaking spot news and think-piece experts to back them up. For many days the story had top priority on every news desk in this country and abroad—which meant the men on the ground could count on whatever space or time it took to report their findings in full. It is fair to say that journalism's best effort went into the Little Rock story.

Yet Harold C. Fleming, the perceptive executive director of the Southern Regional Council, whose business it is to chart the shifting pattern of race relations in the South, has written of the result:

“. . . what do the millions of words and television images add up to? Have they given Americans—to say nothing of foreigners—a clearer understanding of the South's malaise? As a result of them, will the national shock be less or the insight greater if a similar eruption accompanies desegregation in Dallas or Charlottesville or Knoxville? We can hope so, but not with much optimism. Only a few major newspapers, like *The New York Times*, a few thoughtful television and radio commentators, and a few good magazines sought to give a meaningful perspective to their reports from Little Rock.

“Conspicuously lacking in most interpretations is any sense of continuity. The upheavals in Tuscaloosa, Clinton and Little Rock were not isolated events, but episodes in an unfolding drama of social change. . .”

So speaks Mr. Fleming, and I can file no dissent from his verdict. All the traditional shortcomings of journalism were on display there on my doorstep. The cowboy reporters rode in to the scent of blood. They did not have to seek for drama; it was thrust upon them, with a complete cast of heroes and villains, and these readily interchangeable, depending upon point of view. I do not charge that the press sensationalized the Little Rock story; the facts themselves were sensational enough to answer any circulation

manager's dream. Moreover, I believe that with only rare and negligible exceptions the men and women who wrote the Little Rock story were competent and conscientious. Similarly, I have no reason to believe that any but a tiny handful were bound by any home office policy considerations or blinded by their personal prejudices. They performed their traditional function, within the traditional limits. They braved the mob that formed for some days around the High School, they interviewed the principals on both sides and many of the minor characters, they sketched in personalities and filled in color, and some at least tried hard to define the feeling of the community. Over a period of weeks they did a reasonably accurate job of reporting what happened at Little Rock—but as Fleming said, they have failed to tell why it happened.

The reason, I think, is that to American journalism the Little Rock story had an arbitrary beginning and end. It began the day Governor Faubus surrounded Central High School with his state guard. It continued so long as there was a naked edge of violence. It ended when federal troops restored a surface order to the troubled city. It has had subsequent footnotes only when the edge of violence re-emerged in clashes between white and Negro children inside the school. It survives in the press today largely in the sort of occasional oblique reference that passes for the background of more immediate news.

**Y**ET it is quite obvious that the Little Rock story did not begin in September. It is equally obvious that it has not ended yet. For Little Rock was simply the temporary focus of a great, continuing, and unresolved American dilemma which touches upon fundamental concepts of morality, of social change, and of law. Journalism has concentrated on only the exposed portion of the iceberg; the great, submerged mass remains uncharted.

It was, admittedly, an extraordinary difficult story to handle. A journalist is trained to seek out spokesmen for both sides in any controversy. They were readily and anxiously available in Little Rock. The case for resistance to the Federal Court's integration order was made at length by Governor Faubus, and bolstered by the more flamboyant utterances of the unabashed racists in the Citizens' Councils. The case for compliance was made by the local school officials, the mayor of the city, and, belatedly, by the president of the United States, with somewhat more passionate arguments freely offered by spokesmen for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. But this was a controversy that had at least three sides. Caught between the committed and dedicated partisans was a substantial and silent mass of plain citizens—confused and deeply disturbed. They were people who deplored desegregation and also deplored violence. They felt, many of them, a deep compassion for the nine Negro



children exposed to the anger and contempt of a white mob. But they also felt that the Negro children should not be attending the white school in the first place. They had been, most of them, willing to undertake what they considered the unpleasant duty required by the courts. But then, at the last moment, their governor had stepped forward and proclaimed that what they had accepted as the law was without substance—and that their failure to resist desegregation amounted to treason to their own traditions and to their own people. It may be true that most of those who accepted this thesis—and the majority have done so to some degree—did so with conscious rationalization. But it is also true that when emotion triumphed over reason they did not actively join the crusade of the governor and the Citizens' Councils; rather they simply subsided into troubled silence and by so doing withdrew their support from those few who attempted to stand against the tide. And because they were silent their attitude went largely unreported; the press took due note of the fact that in fairly short order Governor Faubus was obviously in command of the field; but here again it did not explain why—which is the heart of the story.

I T can be argued that these matters are too subtle for the proper practice of journalism—that those who rode to Little Rock as though it were a four-alarm fire could not be expected to plumb the hidden attitudes of the populace, and indeed that the effort to do so would represent a dangerous departure from proper standards of objectivity. Perhaps so, but there were other aspects of the Little Rock story that were equally vital and by no means so elusive. There was, conspicuously, the failure of leadership in Washington which matched the default of Southern leadership and made the ultimate showdown between state and federal force inevitable.

Before pursuing this thesis I should, perhaps, note that I am, to borrow Sam Rayburn's description of himself, a Democrat without suffix, prefix or apology. It should be noted too that I spent ten months in the wilderness with Adlai Stevenson in 1956, when the Democratic candidate's cries on this subject, along with all others, went largely unheeded. But, making all due allowance for my prejudice, I submit that the record shows that from May, 1954, when the United States Supreme Court reversed the old Plessy doctrine, until September, 1957, when the chickens finally fluttered in to roost in Little Rock, the Eisenhower administration took no affirmative action to pave the way for the sweeping social change the Court required or to temper the inevitable dislocations it would occasion. Indeed, the incredible fact is that the administration without preliminary moved directly to the ultimate resort of armed force, and then was confounded by its own belated audacity.

It required no delicate thumbing of the public pulse to

chart the course of growing defiance in the South. It was evident in the violent utterances of some of the South's public men and in the silence of others. It was made a matter of record in the passage of a variety of restrictive laws in the Southern legislatures. A conspicuous public monument was erected in Washington when 100 Southern members of the Senate and House signed their breast-beating Manifesto in the spring of 1956. Yet Mr. Eisenhower's only reaction to all this was an occasional bemused press conference statement about the difficulties of changing the minds and hearts of men. His administration, it is true, made token efforts to pass stringent civil rights legislation—which only served to lacerate the Southerners in Congress and certainly had an adverse affect upon their minds and hearts. And, of course, Vice-President Nixon, in the days before he sheathed his hatchet, along with other administration spokesman, made the proper obeisance to their party's Abolitionist tradition when they were campaigning in those areas where the Negro vote is heavy. But at no time did Mr. Eisenhower attempt to use the great moral force of his office to persuade Southerners of the justice of the course the Supreme Court required of them, or his great personal prestige in the region to allay their fears that they were being forced into a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary course. Nor did he employ the vast political powers of his office to negotiate with the recalcitrant Southern political leaders from a position of strength.

I am not one who accepts without reservation the thesis that the Republican allegiance of most of the proprietors of the press has been translated into a conspiracy to wrap Mr. Eisenhower in bunting and protect him against criticism. I do not believe that this was a primary cause of the press' conspicuous failure to take due note of the troubles that were shaping up in the South, and of the administration's apparent unawareness. I suspect that it stems rather from the limiting journalistic axiom that what happens is news, and what doesn't isn't.

Thus the reporters rode into the region only when there was action—when a couple of red-necked hoodlums in back-woods Mississippi dropped Emmett Till into a river, or a mob ruled that Autherine Lucy couldn't attend the University of Alabama, or John Kasper incited the citizens of Clinton to wrath. In between, an occasional reporter, usually from one of the magazines, toured the region, but these too often caught only the sound and the fury on the surface. A notable example was the series in the *Saturday Evening Post* last summer called "Dixie Says Never." The author, John Bartlow Martin, is a competent and conscientious practitioner, but his pieces were largely distilled from the utterances of the extremists without any qualifying balance. The certainly unintentional result was to give national credence to the contention of the Council-

men that they spoke for the whole of the Southern people, and the Council leaders themselves regarded the *Post* series as invaluable propoganda in their campaign to enforce the doctrine of brute resistance upon the silent majority. But the other and equally essential part of the story—the drift in Washington—went largely unnoticed except by a few peripheral critics who address a limited audience.

**I**F the reporting of the prelude to Little Rock was conspicuously inadequate, it seems to me that the postlude provides an even more distressing example. The stirring martial events of September were, it is true, somewhat confusing—particularly when President Eisenhower and Gov. ernor Faubus held their historic peace confêrence at Newport and there remained some doubt as to who came out with whose sword. Out of the communiques issued by the White House on this occasion, however, and the later meeting with the intermediaries from the Southern Governors' Conference, there emerged an assumption that the executive department of the federal government was prepared to back to the utmost the orders of the federal judiciary. This notion was reinforced by the arrival of the 101st Airborne Infantry, and by the presence in Little Rock of so many FBI agents they created a problem of hotel accomodations. Indeed, there was public and official talk of a vast document compiled by the FBI, at the direction of the United States attorney general, presumably in preparation for court action against those who were clearly defying the injunctions of a federal judge. During those fall days the embattled Little Rock School Board, under fire from the state government for carrying out the judge's order and deserted by a city administration intimidated by a show of strength at the polls by a Citizens' Council slate of candidates, waited for the federals to ride to their aid. All they got, as it turned out, was a withdrawal of the regulars of the 101st and a perfunctory guard detail of federalized national guardsmen under orders to observe what went on in the school but not to arrest any malefactors within the school, who might come to their attention.

It soon became apparent that this was far from enough to preserve any semblance of order. The mob which once came close to forcing entry into the school did not re-form, it is true, but it didn't need to. A far safer course was to inspire a small group of whites against the isolated Negroes. And as it became apparent that Washington had done all it was going to do, the Citizens' Councils became bolder and bolder in their campaign of intimidation, coercion and boycott directed against any who dared dissent from the defiant course they had chartered. This week the campaign bore its first tangible fruit in the expulsion of one of the nine Negro children who had responded in kind to caluculated mistreatment—an event greeted by the ap-

pearance of cards on the lapels of the student activists bearing the cogent notice: "One down—eight to go."

**H**ERE again, in spasmodic, uncoordinated fashion the surface of these events has been recorded by the press. But the other and more significant portion of the story has attracted little attention. In Washington, the decision to leave to the Little Rock School Board the entire burden of carrying out the court order against imposible odds has never been officially announced, in these terms but has been clearly acknowledged by the Department of Justice. The new attorney general, Mr. Rogers, said that there were no present plans for further legal action in Little Rock. He further noted that the administration had no plans for pressing for additional civil rights legislation as this session of Congress—a matter of some moment since the Justice Department had previously used as an excuse for inaction at Little Rock the failure of Congress to enact the enforcement provisions in the last civil rights bill. These pronouncements were followed by one of the most remarkable scenes enacted on Capitol Hill since adoption of the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Rogers appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee to be interrogated as to his fitness as attorney general, received cordial greetings, and was recommended for confirmation without a single question being addressed to him regarding his past or future course in the Little Rock case—and this before a committee that counts among its members Senators Eastland of Mississippi and Johnston of South Carolina. This singular occurrence was accorded no more than passing mention in the press and no one of consequence speculated in print or on a television tube as to the dimensions of what must have been one of the most remarkable political deals in recent years.

Just as the Little Rock story did not begin in Little Rock, it will not end there—whatever the ultimate fate of the eight children still remaining in the beleaguered high school. These events have already had tragic consequences in Arkansas and the South; those who were disposed to support an orderly adjustment to the new public policy have been discredited and disarmed—not so much by the extremists who are now in control, as by a national administration which deserted them in the first collision between federal and state force and declared in effect that the rule of law propounded by its own courts is not enforceable. And so, by default, what started out as a local issue has been built into a national constitutional crisis.

And it is no less than that—perhaps the most critical the nation has faced since 1860. I do not suggest that civil war is imminent, because of course it isn't. I do say that the drift in Washington has gravely compounded the dislocations that were made inevitable by the historical developments that were affirmed by the Supreme Court in

1954, and has left the country sharply divided on a complex moral and social issue at a time when national unity could be the price of national survival.

**T**HERE are many who share the blame. There is reason to wonder if our system of education has served us adequately when in its ultimate flowering it has produced a generation, north and south, that appears not only unable to grasp the implications of the race problem but unwilling to face it squarely. I have said of the South that its besetting problem is not the accomodation of the rising aspirations of its Negro people, difficult as that may be, but its inability to reduce the issue to rational terms. In slightly different terms, the same thing is true of the non-South—called upon now to translate its pious principles into action and blinking painfully over the mote in its own eye.

But by concern here is with journalism. No one can say with certainty that the course of events in the South could have been altered had the president exercised firm leadership—or that Mr. Eisenhower would have been disposed to act even if those who are supposed to man the watchtowers of public affairs had sounded the alarm. And now, after the fact, this is perhaps not of consuming importance. But the watchtowers still remain largely silent, and I suggest that this is a matter of pressing concern. For it seems to me that the American people are still not aware of what Little Rock really demonstrated—that not only did the administration have no plan to meet the crisis when it came, but even now, with all the bitter lessons before it, still has chartered no effective course of action nor displayed any disposition to do so.

I am the first to argue that time is of the essence in any resolution of the problem. In so delicate an area of human relations progress must be evolutionary. Yet time is of value only if it is put to some practical use; perhaps the most cogent single question yet raised was that put by Francis Pickens Miller of Virginia to a group of Southerners who at a national conference were pleading for a breathing spell. What, he asked, did they propose to do with it? It is clear that the Southern leadership has no program and no policy except the negative one of delay at any price—and part of that price will be a steady deterioration of race

relations not only in the South but in the Nation at large. And the administration has offered nothing except the politician's usual device for postponing unpleasant decisions—the creation of a study commission, which, if it does not founder on its partisan division, at some distant date presumably will come up with the facts the press should have been setting forth all along.

**T**HESE then are some of the aspects of the Little Rock story which seem to me to be largely unrecognized or generally misunderstood despite the millions of words that have adorned the front pages and boomed out through the loudspeakers. I suppose that a patient man with endless time on his hands might have put together the lurid fragments that were hurled at him and divined their meaning—but readers and listeners are usually both impatient and busy. It remains, then, journalism's unfulfilled responsibility to somehow provide perspective and continuity—to add the why to the what.

How can it be done, in the face of the real and in many ways growing limitations of time and space that beset all of us who live by the clock? I will confess that I have no readier answers than I did in the days when we Nieman Fellows brooded over the matter in the Stag Club. But I do know the task is urgent and steadily becoming more so.

And I think perhaps it begins with recognition that this is so—and that, valid as they may be, the excuses we have made to ourselves in private, and the proud boasts of freedom and infallibility we commonly make in public, are no longer good enough. I think we have got to get over the notion that objectivity means giving a villain equal space with a saint—and above all of paying the greatest attention to those who shout the loudest. We've got to learn that a set of indisputable facts do not necessarily add up to truth. Perhaps what we need most of all is simply the courage of our own convictions—to recognize that news is not merely a record of ascertainable facts and attributable opinions, but a chronicle of the world we live in cast in terms of moral values. We will err, certainly, and we will be abused—but we will at least be in position in the watchtowers, trying to tell the story in all its dimensions.

# Desegregation and the Press

By Robert F. Campbell

It was the fall of 1957—and the doors of a number of schools previously reserved for white children had been opened to admit Negro students.

In Nashville, Tenn., an unusually persistent Northern reporter questioned a Negro boy who had entered such a school. When the reporter asked, "What would you like to do when you grow up?" the reply came promptly: "I'd like to punch you in the nose."

In Winston-Salem, N. C., the parents of a white high school student asked her how she liked the idea of having a Negro enrolled in the school. She answered: "I don't mind that at all, but I sure wish those photographers would quit stepping on my toes."

In Little Rock, Ark., after Negroes had been admitted to Central High School, the New York *Times* published this report: "An organized attempt by segregationists to stage a walkout in protest against the enrollment of nine Negro students was unsuccessful. Forty to sixty white students walked out. Most of them headed straight for television cameras, set up across Park Avenue opposite the main entrance. Egged on by one television crew, two youths stood in the center of the street and hooted derisively at white students who remained in classrooms, their heads visible through open windows."

As the great desegregation story unfolded, newspapers, radio and television stations became more than reporters and commentators on the events of the day. Many of their representatives turned into participants, some willingly and some through no intention of their own. As such, they had to share in the blame or credit for the way things turned out.

For instance, the superintendent of schools in Nashville blamed the Nashville *Banner* in part for the violence accompanying desegregation there. Said Superintendent William A. Bass: "The Nashville *Banner* ought to be ashamed. They aided and abetted in developing a spirit of rebellion."

The *Banner* denied the charge. Tom Flake, the paper's acting city editor, wrote in *Editor & Publisher* that "television and radio, with their massive equipment, added fuel to the agitators' fires. And correspondents out of New York and other Northern cities looked, talked and acted sufficiently non-Southern to stir resentment among the hate-stirred Kasperites."

In city after city, white students and bystanders noted

---

Robert F. Campbell writes editorials on the Winston-Salem papers. Former city editor in Ashville, N. C., he was a Nieman Fellow last year.

that still, motion picture and television cameras were aimed in their direction. Some of them responded with a characteristic display of exhibitionism.

A photograph made outside a newly desegregated school in Charlotte, N. C., showed a mob following 15-year-old Dorothy Counts, a Negro, down the street. For the camera's benefit, one tormenter held his fingers over her head like horns. The picture made the front pages of newspapers from coast to coast. A few days later Dorothy withdrew from the school.

Fortunately, this was not the pattern everywhere. In some cities (and in Charlotte's other schools) desegregation was accomplished more quietly. There was some evidence of a cause-and-effect relationship between news policies and editorial attitudes, on the one hand, and a community's willingness to accept desegregation, on the other. But complicating factors made it impossible to prove the existence of such a link in every city where schools were desegregated.

For instance, Governor Faubus upset carefully laid plans (which had newspaper support) for the desegregation of Little Rock schools. And in Nashville, hate-Monger John Kasper stirred the segregationist element to violent action.

Still, many newspapermen recognized that they owed it to their communities to strike some kind of balance between their two-fold obligations: (1) to report the news fully and (2) to avoid stimulating community passions and possible violence by what was published in the news and editorial columns.

In Winston-Salem, the opening day of school marked the end of weeks of planning by the *Journal and Sentinel* news staffs. During the summer, readers had been told of the City School Board's action in approving the applications of three Negro students out of six who applied for transfer to a white high school. They knew, too, that two of those whose applications were approved had withdrawn them, leaving only one Negro child to enter a school with white children. Editorially, the newspapers supported the School Board's decision.

Reporters and photographers had instructions to be on hand for the opening of high school but to remain as inconspicuous as possible. Photographers were told not display their cameras unless incidents occurred. Actually, the instructions to the photographers were changed in mid-morning. The editors agreed that so many press photographers were on the school grounds that the use of cameras by local newspaper photographers would make little difference. But posed pictures were avoided.



Registration of the Negro student took place without serious incident. At this writing the girl is still enrolled and attends classes along side the white students.

In Charlotte, the newspapers had to keep watch over the entry of four Negro students into four different white schools. The *Charlotte Observer* gave its reporters and photographers the near-impossible assignment of being where they could see and hear everything, but not where they could be noticed. When trouble did break out, some of the Charlotte reporters formed a kind of barrier to protect a Negro student from spitters and hecklers.

Reporters who witnessed the demonstration against Dorothy Counts' enrollment at Charlotte's Harding High School say the presence of newsmen made no apparent difference in the conduct of the crowd. Some of them said that full coverage of the incident deterred many of the troublemakers, especially the adults, and made the police more alert to the danger of violence.

Nowhere else in the South did reporters become participants in the desegregation to the same extent as some of the scores of newsmen who were on hand for the violence in Little Rock. There both Negro and white reporters were attacked by roughnecks who resented their presence in the vicinity of strife-torn Central High School. Governor Faubus warned the reporters that the National Guard would take action against any reporters inciting mob violence. He said: "We want you to get the story in its fullest details as it develops, but don't try to make news."

Apparently not all of the newsmen took Faubus' warning to heart. After order had been restored, five reporters—four Northerners and a Britisher—agreed in a panel discussion before the Overseas Press Club, New York, that the press broke journalistic rules and traditions in Little Rock. CBS Reporter Bob Allison said that both Negro and white newsmen violated the unwritten code which says reporters don't make news and don't get involved in a story they are covering.

But despite these alleged shortcomings, the nation got a vivid picture of what was happening in the Arkansas capital. "Experts missed not a single weeping woman or screaming fanatic," said the *Chattanooga Times*. "Therein lies the duty of journalists. These things should not be soft-pedaled. . . . They should be described in all their shocking details."

Nevertheless, some newspapermen were plainly dissatisfied with the way the school desegregation story had been covered in that eventful fall of 1957. One reporter

for a Northern metropolitan paper suggested that communications media should pool their coverage so that a minimum number of reporters and photographers would be present when Negroes entered a white school. By doing this, he said, they would reduce the danger that they would contribute to violence. If they do not voluntarily restrict their coverage, he warned, the public may demand some kind of limitation.

But, as another reporter pointed out, pools aren't likely to satisfy the out-of-town press which moves into a community to cover desegregation. "If they were willing to work through pools," he said, "they'd have stayed home and used AP."

One fact is clear: the nation's press is going to have to deal with the problem of covering desegregation in the South for a long time to come. Some day we may reach the point where it isn't news for a community to comply with the Supreme Court decision. But before that day arrives, many an angry mob will gather to taunt Negroes who have been admitted or who seek entrance to white schools. What the mob says and does will have to be reported.

But is it enough to report the excesses of the mob "in all their shocking details?"

It seems to me that last fall's experience tells us that newspapers and other communications media must do more than devise an efficient way to cover the news. In the tinder-dry atmosphere that pervades many a Southern town on desegregation day, the press has an obligation to see that its own actions do not kindle the flames of passion.

Regardless of how a newspaper stands on the issue of segregation vs. integration, it can counsel respect for the law. And it can insist that the law be enforced.

But the press should go beyond editorial exhortations. In covering the news, it should make sure that its representatives do not become participants in acts that promote racial conflict. It should report what the mob does without becoming a tool of the race-baiters of all ages who thrive on notoriety.

And most important of all, the press ought to strive in its own community—day in and day out—to build the kind of race relations that make a riot or a mass demonstration unthinkable.

At best, the task of adjusting to the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation in the schools and other public facilities will not be easy. If the press acts thoughtfully and intelligently, it will not make those adjustments more difficult to achieve.

# A Hard Look at Sports Writing

By John Hulteng

Sports pages, in common with some other areas of the daily newspaper, have found themselves serving a changing market in recent years.

Before the broadcast media entered the picture, the chief emphasis was on a detailed play-by-play report of the sports event from beginning to end. Only a relatively few readers had witnessed the event personally. The others needed a complete fill-in.

Today the picture is completely changed. Anyone who is interested enough to be considered a potential reader of the story is also likely to have attended, listened to or watched the event on television. Not all of them, to be sure. But a very high percentage will have. For them, the detailed play-by-play is not so vital.

A recent survey of New York sports writers and editors revealed a unanimous shift from straight sports reporting to an interpretive approach. One editor said his staffers don't just report the result—they're looking for the reason behind the result, the whys and hows and the interesting angles the spectator, the radio listener or the TV watcher could not get himself.

Another New York editor said that his sports page is now designed to represent the equivalent of "a living room discussion in print."

This is a common-sense attitude toward the role of the sports page today. If you can operate on the assumption that most of your readers already have a play-by-play awareness of the sports event being reported, you can also assume that they want background rather than spot news.

Your weather reporter doesn't give play-by-play in a weather story. He doesn't write his lead:

"Light rain began falling at 6:15 this morning. It continued, with occasional brief squalls, until shortly before 9. Then a rising west wind, accompanied by heavier rainfall, brought the first fringes of a storm into the Eugene area. The rain grew heavier, beginning at 9:15, and between that time and 10:12 a total of .7 inch of rain was recorded at the Mahlon Sweet airport. Sharp wind gusts then were felt during the next seven minutes. The rain began to lessen at 10:20, and by 15 minutes to 11 the skies were beginning to clear."

---

A former sports writer, as he says, **John Hulteng** is also former chief editorial writer for the *Providence Journal*, a Nieman Fellow in 1950, now a journalism professor at the University of Oregon. This was a talk to the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Assn., Feb. 14.

Instead, your weather reporter begins with things your reader doesn't know about the storm, things he hasn't been able to see for himself. He writes about the consequences, the damage caused; he gives the meteorologists' theories as to how the storm began, and records the weather man's excuses for failing to predict its arrival. In short, he answers the questions left in the mind of a reader who has experienced for himself the play-by-play sequence of the storm.

This is the sports reporter's job, too, for the most part. He still has occasion for play-by-play from time to time, for events not easily available to the public in his area. But the biggest need today is for background, interpretation—the whys and hows.

Stanley Walker, in his book *City Editor*, said that there were only two styles of sports writing, the Gee Whiz school, founded by Grantland Rice, and the Aw Nuts school, of which Westbrook Pegler was an early exponent, before he got around to using the same technique in another arena.

But I would suggest that there is another school—the How Did It Happen? school. And this is the one that best suits the needs of the sports page reader today.

But this need for interpretation in sports pages presents some special problems—or perhaps, it would be clearer to say, accentuates some problems that have existed all along.

This business of interpretation necessarily involves the writer more fully in his copy than does spot reporting. Telling how and why something happened requires the reporter to draw on his own reactions, his own opinions, even. The line between interpretation and editorializing is a thin and fuzzy one. It is very easy for the unskilled practitioner—or the unscrupulous one—to overstep that line.

And when this happens, serious damage may be done to teams, managers, sports enthusiasts and to the newspaper itself.

This problem, as I suggested a moment ago, has always existed to some degree in sports departments. It has been traditional for the sports writer and columnist to be granted a latitude not enjoyed by anyone else in the newspaper shop. The latitude easily fosters the development of a neo-Olympian complex on the part of the sports writer. He sometimes begins to confuse his press box seat with a perch on top of the mountain, from which he can deal out lofty judgment on players, coaches and fans, all of them thronging at his feet to hang on his brilliantly deathless words.

This is not academic speculation on my part. I can recall this feeling—and its consequences—out of my own experience as a sports writer. Once, for example, back before World War II, I covered Class D. baseball in the Northern League of the Middle West. I shared the press cage—that's what it was, literally, hung out over home plate and reached by a long, precarious catwalk—I shared this with the broadcaster for the local radio station. I was writing for the local daily, a monopoly paper in its area, and he was broadcasting for the principal local radio station. We sat side-by-side in the press box.

I was also official scorer for the league in this town, as was the custom, and called the shots on hits and errors in close plays on the diamond below. It happened that I was feuding with my press box mate at this time and to nettles him I developed a neat—and thoroughly irresponsible—technique.

Whenever there would be a close play down on the diamond, I would deliberately hold back for a moment—until the broadcaster had called it one way or the other over the air. Then, acting as official scorer, I would call it the other way, forcing him to reverse himself on the air. This made him look less than expert to his audience and gratified me no end. It also nearly drove the league managers wild, since the scoring was a good deal less than professional on this stop. But that didn't bother me. I was young. I had a daily by-line and the only sports page in the area. I was a big wheel; they could go jump in the lake.

I tell you this not with any sense of pride in it. It was, of course, thoroughly irresponsible. I tell you only to emphasize that I know whereof I speak in discussing the tendency in sports writers to develop an Olympian complex, a Jovian attitude toward the figures and events about which they are writing. It is one of the occupational hazards of the sports writer. And when a writer yields to this tendency, he is in trouble—and so is his paper.

And the temptations, opportunities and dangers of this yielding are greater than ever now that the emphasis is on interpretation rather than straight news reporting.

The most vivid recent instance of such yielding and its consequences is the case of the Los Angeles sports writers and the Pacific Coast Conference.

At least the outline of this case is pretty fresh in the minds of most of us here in the Pacific Northwest. Yet to see what was going on in clear detail, you really have to go through the columns of the principal Los Angeles sports writers, day after day over the year or two that the PCC crisis was building. I have made such a check through the clips. It is my opinion that the writing of the Los Angeles columnists through this period constituted one of the most irresponsible journalistic performances that I can recall since my own back in the Northern League days.

This is *my* interpretation of what the columnists did, to be

sure. You have every right to question the rightness of that interpretation. If you do, I urge you to check the clips for yourselves. They are available at the offices of the University of Oregon athletic department.

But, acknowledging that it is only my opinion, I would go on to say that the Los Angeles writers during this period were guilty of editorializing of the most blatant type. They were guilty of distortions of fact. They were guilty of misrepresentation. And they were guilty of using some of the most notorious devices of propaganda known to the experts in this field.

For example. Throughout the period when they were bent on destroying the Pacific Coast Conference, the Los Angeles writers made almost daily references to the Council of Presidents of the PCC and the Council of Faculty Representatives. These groups included Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, Dr. Wallace Sterling, president of Stanford, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon, and Dean Orlando Hollis of Oregon. These groups the Los Angeles writers described as "dudes, mooches, chowderheads, comedians, liars, daffodils, faculty featherweights, intellectual sleepwalkers, power-drunk tankers, and a clique of clucks who tossed their brains into a thimble."

I have no wish to debate whether PCC rules were too strict and needed adjustment. The sports columnists had a right to offer opinions about that. They had no right, however, to degenerate into name-calling of the worst gutter stripe.

And they didn't stop there. They took out their venom on the players, particularly on the players from the University of Oregon. Coach Casanova, a quiet and long-suffering man, finally struck back just a little in the locker room after the Rose Bowl game when he thanked the LA sports writers for their help, saying that no youngsters could be humiliated and scorned as were his boys without bounding back fighting mad.

But the scorn for their playing skill wasn't the worst that the LA sports men handed out to the youngsters from Oregon. Let me give you this instance:

Midway in December, the officials of the University of Southern California announced that they would allow the University of Oregon team to use the USC field for pre-Rose Bowl practice. Immediately one of the LA columnists rushed into print to charge that "somebody goofed" at USC when permission was granted to the hated Oregonians to use the field. He went on to print a thinly-veiled incitement to UCLA and USC students to gang up on the Oregonians as they went to and from the field.

He printed in his column a quote from some unnamed and probably apocryphal observer who was worried that "everything from rotten eggs and old tomatoes to heads of cabbage and week-old grapefruit would fly at those

Oregon people as they went from the dressing room to Bovard Field." And then, in case anyone had missed his point, he emphasized that if the USC students needed any help in thus barraging the Oregon players, "they can get it from across town, from the Westwood undergraduates (of UCLA)."

In my book, this was a contemptible performance.

It apparently was equally contemptible to some of the more rational sports editors in the areas near Los Angeles. Here's what one of them wrote at the time:

"I have never read a more distressing collection of trash than that provided by the LA sports press on the Coast Conference bobbery. There has been emotion stripped of any facts. The sports boys have flunked the basic requirements of cub reporting."

Now, gentlemen, let me pose this question: Where were the publishers when their sports editors were flunking the basic requirements of cub reporting? Where were the publishers when their sports editors were serving up emotion stripped of any facts? They had a responsibility to the reading public in this instance which they apparently utterly failed to fulfill.

Sports editors generally enjoy more freedom than do other departmental heads in the newspaper structure. And sometimes they abuse this situation to the hilt. They sometimes delight in sidestepping and scorning their publishers and the rules they try to enforce in the rest of the paper.

Stanley Woodward, long a sports editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, wrote a book called *Sports Page*. In it he describes some of the top newspaper brass thus:

"In every newspaper office there is a corps of older men, frequently serving as top editors, who can't take it with them (a) because of the natural difficulties involved, and (b) because they never had it . . . Fortunately, most sports departments do not fall in the line of vision of the gallant

comma-fighters who uphold newspaper stuffiness so gloriously. Usually the sports department is stuck off in a corner somewhere, out of small-arms range. Moreover the traditionalists seem to feel that there is something not quite nice about sports. Therefore they don't read it. Unless some thunderous big-wig or some apple-polishing upstart calls to their attention a variation from the norm, there is practically no chance they will see it."

And, later on in his book, Mr. Woodward remarks that "it is surprising how many years can go by before a newspaper catches up with ineffective operations in the sports department."

I believe that the editors and publishers ought to catch up a little faster than that. It seems to me that they ought to be as concerned about misrepresentation, distortion and editorializing on their sports pages as they would be about such departures in the business, society or straight news sections.

How long would a business page writer remain in his publisher's good graces, do you suppose, if he regularly referred to the operators of the Weyerhauser Lumber Co., or the Bon Marche, or the woodworkers union, or the chamber of commerce, as "dudes, chowderheads, liars, daffodils and power-drunk tankers?"

It seems to me that the evidence from California suggests that a double-standard of performance as between the sports department and the rest of the newspaper is practiced down there. I have no similar evidence to suggest that it is practiced up here in Oregon. But it ought to be the responsibility of every publisher, wherever he operates, to take a little closer look now and then to see that there is no double-standard in his shop.

The sports page has a new role these days. But that new role should not be an unworthy one. It must be kept within the framework of ethical and responsible newspaper performance.

---



# Culture and Coffee Breaks: U.S. Is Reviewed in Japan

By Kazuo Kuroda

When Kazuo Kuroda returned last summer to the *Japan Times* from a year at Harvard as an Associate Nieman Fellow, his paper began publishing his impressions of

America in a series. Parts of six of his articles are collected here. The subheads are the titles used in the *Japan Times*.

## Blondie in Japan

Some Americans I met tried to refute the impressions given by Blondie. I thought the refutation was not necessary. Though these comic strips are very popular also in Japan, I do not think Japanese newspaper readers believe that Dagwood is a typical American husband.

I think the popularity of Blondie in Japan shows that family life everywhere in the world is not too different. Despite difference in etiquette and the basic ethical view toward women, family problems seem to me fundamentally the same: a wife widowed by golf, a miserly husband, a squandering wife and so on. The mother-in-law problem, however, takes on a much different outlook in Oriental families, when the in-laws live with a young couple.

I was fortunate in being able to visit some Americans married to Japanese girls. While I know there are some Japanese war brides whose marriages have failed, I was glad to see these very happy couples. One American told me that American girls are pretty but Japanese girls give more. It may be, I thought, that the Japanese upbringing makes a girl more modest and frugal.

But it seems that the high status of American women has made them more efficient when they work. In ordinary Japanese offices, the status of working women is rather low. Their work is sometimes simple, easy and boring. It is generally believed that women are more patient in that kind of simple but tiring work. Even in America, I think, the work assigned to women is not always equal to what men do. But I saw many women secretaries who are highly efficient. The work of women reservation clerks at airline offices is also pretty strenuous.

After learning the status of women in some other Asian countries, I am wondering whether the betterment of women's status is roughly proportionate to the degree of industrialization. The hard fact that free enterprises, and also state-owned enterprises for that matter, need female help seems to be more effective than abstract doctrine on equality of sexes.

In a European city, I saw many couples sitting and talking on benches in a park while the sun was high. It is very difficult to see anything like that in America. The popular use of automobiles in America has certainly made

the sidewalk benches obsolescent. But I believe the time reserved for love-making is usually after sunset.

The typical American woman, to me, is a working woman, even though they find their ultimate niche in homes. Even when they are a helpful wife and good mother, they retain the character of an efficient worker. And they have necessary devices to keep up their efficiency—cars, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and so forth. I would like to view even the high divorce rate in the same context. The economic status of American women is high. And the busy pace of efficient American life may make them impatient also in their quest for happiness.

The number of working women is increasing in Japan and if the future of economic expansion augurs well, I think it is quite possible that we may see more Blondies right here in Japan.

## America Leads the World

During my 10-month stay in the United States, the question put to me most frequently was whether I like America or not. Other modifications of the same theme were: "Do the Japanese like Americans?" Is there anti-American feeling in Japan?" and so forth.

I soon reached the conclusion that Americans nowadays are pretty much conscious of their role as the world's No. 1 nation. Even the commonest people have a sense of responsibility involved in their role.

Some 20 years ago, when Japan was driving at what was then called the Greater Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, the Japanese were not asking that kind of question. The predominant Japanese attitude was keyed by the idea that the Asians were obligated to cooperate with Japan and its war of "liberation."

In America one Indian student told me: "I used to think Americans were self-righteous. But they are no longer self-righteous." I do not know whether the word "self-righteous" is adequate to describe the American attitude to the world. But if there has been any favorable change in American attitude, it is, I think, somehow connected to the growing sense of responsibility. I think I have found that Americans nowadays have a great deal of readiness to study foreign peoples with an open mind.

But we cannot rush to the conclusion that Americans do possess a good understanding of world affairs. On the contrary, it seemed to me that knowledge of foreign affairs among the American people is not quite satisfactory.

In the first place, ordinary American newspapers do not give sufficient coverage to foreign news. From newspapers you can easily get the illusion of an isolationist America, though there are some exceptional, good newspapers like the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune* and the *Christian Science Monitor*.

As for knowledge of Far Eastern affairs, you should not expect too much from the average American. I have the impression that their knowledge of European affairs is not much better. Anyway, you should not expect too much from an average citizen of any country.

One outstanding characteristic of the American people, however, is that they have a firm confidence in themselves and in the American way of life. A Japanese or a German, however proud he may be, is aware that he belongs to a particular culture. But Americans tend to think that the American way of life is universally valid. Italians, Irish, Germans, Swedish and even Orientals like Chinese and Japanese are happy and prospering in America. It is quite natural that Americans have a firm self-confidence. One American said, "We have no fear of communism. We have only contempt."

Americans, however, seem to be watching with an uneasy feeling what is going on in the world. Despite their self-confidence and their tremendous influence, they are not slumbering in self-contentment.

It seems that the ethnic groups in America have retained little of their original characteristics. It was a very interesting experience to speak to a second generation (or third or fourth generation, for that matter) Japanese in America. They are not only legally Americans but their thinking is typically American. America may be multi-national, but it is still a nation. It is not a universe. When Americans look out beyond the border, they see something really different. World War II helped the knowledge of foreign countries seep down to the people.

When the American people want to know whether a foreign nation is "pro-American" or "anti-American," it is perhaps because they do not have sufficient knowledge about the nation. It is always difficult to discuss foreign relations in such terms as "like" or "dislike," "pro-American" or "anti-American."

Though the Americans are acutely conscious of the division of the world into two camps, there is no doubt that the thinking of most Americans is based on goodwill and love of peace. My friend in London said, "America is a nation that is much misunderstood." And I agreed with him. I think many Americans cannot understand why there are some people who suspect the motives of American policy.

America is prospering and is secure. Americans do not want to forego this prosperity and security. They do not want another Korea. They exemplified this attitude when Hungarians rose up. Americans love peace, perhaps too much.

## When America Is Complete

During my 10-month stay in the United States, I saw many highways under construction and many new buildings going up. "They are always building something. When this country is completed, it will be wonderful," said a Chinese visitor. But it seems that America will not reach completion, as far as the near future is concerned.

I can easily say that the roads in America are excellent. From the American viewpoint, however, some of their roads are not wide enough and there are too many traffic lights hampering traffic. They want to build more super-highways and "freeways" with no traffic lights.

I met one American professor who was trying to figure out means of transportation in the event the new freeways become obsolete. He was afraid that there would be soon just too many automobiles and the roads would be clogged with cars. In that case, he proposes to discard, as a matter of principle, all means of private transportation and, in lieu of it, make public transportation, e.g. subway trains, available free of charge.

When America is called the land of liberty, it is usually taken to mean political freedom. But I think American liberty is beautifully exemplified in American free enterprise. The Americans are enjoying maximum freedom in producing something new and something better. They are making progress in every front.

When I reached America, a new habit of employes taking a "coffee break" was spreading like wild fire. Soon it was reported that at least 80 per cent of American enterprises had adopted this new custom. At first, some employers grumbled but nowadays they are buying and installing specially designed coffee urns to cut down the loss of time that might otherwise result from "coffee breaks." I think it shows American adaptability and pliability. Where there is no rigid tradition, you are free to start something new. It seems that America is remarkably free from economic and social impediments to progress.

Under the circumstances, it seems safe to say that Americans will continue to feel the urge to produce something new and better. It seems also safe to say that they will not reach any completion in the foreseeable future.

American achievement in material progress, though it is still going on, is already tremendous. When I visited the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc. in New York, I was really amazed by the size of this research establishment.

They have 10,000 employees, of whom 3,000 are professional men and women. This shows the magnitude of research work going on in America, which in turn shows the magnitude of industrial activities there.

The Bell Laboratories have a unique organization in that the researchers are divided into three categories—basic research, research on applicability of the fruits of basic research and research for practical application. This system allows basic researchers a free hand without restraints from financial or practical considerations. The Electric Communication Laboratory of Japan has the same constitution, borrowing the idea from Bell.

American industrial efficiency has its roots in the magnitude of operation and the organization of operation suitable to its magnitude. I saw many examples of this type of industrial operation.

In American industrial operation, labor is a very important factor. In contrast with the abundance of labor and low wages in Asia, labor is rather scarce and wages are high in America.

The endless expansion keeps America always busy. They are so busy that I sometimes wonder whether they have time to enjoy life. They have, of course, television, motion pictures, vacation and even love-making. But life does not stop there and it is rather difficult for a casual observer like me to see something beyond there in American life. But I have the impression that the people in the South are enjoying life more than the people in the industrial North.

There is no end to material progress and there is no ceiling to material well-being. Progress can keep the American people on the go, forever. In that sense, there will be no completion. But the American standard of life is already high enough that they can afford more time for real enjoyment of life. Some day, America may well give the impression of serene completion instead of bustling activity of growth.

## Americana

During my stay in the United States, there were some phenomena that struck me as particularly American.

First of all, I saw many churches of different denominations in America. I think it is difficult for a foreign visitor to familiarize himself with the names of so many churches including some new religious movements. And despite this diversifying trend, I have also noticed mass conversion or mass appeal as attempted by Billy Graham and Bishop Fulton Sheen, which seemed to reveal a remarkable uniformity in religious experiences.

The influx of immigrants of various faiths certainly accounts for the existence of so many churches. But there are also many other originally American movements. Uni-

tarianism, Mormonism (Church of Christ of Latter Day Saints), Seventh Day Adventists, Christian Science (Church of Christ, Scientist) are now all influential, well-founded churches.

This diversification and multiplication of churches is the outcome of dissent and is, I think, a development that is quite natural in the New World where men are free from shackles of tradition.

On the other hand, the American people seem to be susceptible to a sort of mass religious experience. Crowds are jampacking Madison Square Garden to hear Billy Graham. People are also turning on their TV sets to hear Bishop Sheen, who turns out to be a good performer on the screen. Certainly, modern means and technology are helping them. But the mass religious appeal still remains as something remarkable. Perhaps you must be a good psychologist to understand this kind of phenomena. Incidentally, psychology and psychoanalysis seem to be much in favor in America.

I would place in the second place in my list of Americana the excellent cultural facilities made available and also adapted to the people. But I do not know how frequently these facilities are actually used by the people. In Rome or Paris, there may be more cultural treasures. But in America, most museums are free to the public. Most universities seem to be dedicated to the education of the wider segment of people rather than the elite. Symphonic music is appreciated by the people also through tremendous sales of music records. And in this land of jazz, even classical music can be adapted to popular taste. Nobody seems to feel it a sacrilege.

I am contrasting this American scene to what I saw in Europe or right here in Japan.

Usually you have to pay admission fees to enter museums.

If I may attempt a rather bold comparison, I would say culture in Europe or Asia is something that must be sought by the people, while in America it is something that must be made available to the people. Each ethnic group in the United States may embody some cultural tradition. But America as a whole, I think, has almost no particular American culture. There is not as yet a mature cultural tradition that is handed down to posterity by the entire American people. Before such tradition is born, culture must be, so to speak, thrust upon the people through various cultural facilities. It must be made available and accessible to the people.

America is a large melting pot of different peoples and different cultures. We see today already something entirely new in this New World. I heard some critics say America has no culture in the traditional sense. But we can expect to see it tomorrow. The New World is still shaping itself. The outcome will be a new chapter in the history of man.

## Freedom From Fear

The American political climate is largely free from fear. The threat of McCarthyism is now gone, though the occasional outbreak of racial violence still mars the general picture of democratic freedom.

In the United States, I have found that McCarthyism is far less powerful than I used to think in Japan. Prewar Japan saw some professors expelled from their universities by verbal attacks from legislators and demagogues. This prewar experience, I think, has made Japanese intelligentsia very sensitive to McCarthyism.

Nowadays the majority of Americans seem to be free from almost any fear except perhaps the fear of an ICBM with a nuclear warhead.

The price of freedom, however, is high. Where the rulers prefer love of the people, they must be ready to express themselves always in popular terms. Their policies, especially foreign policies, tend to be pegged to the level that is easily understandable to the people. I think diplomatic policies of a democracy are always open to criticisms from experts. And the role of experts has become more important even in a democracy, as modern politics are highly technical.

It is quite impressive to see how different peoples in America live side by side peacefully. I think, however, race relations are still a problem, the solution of which is part and parcel of democratic processes. In Boston and vicinity, I noticed large communities of Irish, Italians and Armenians. In other cities, there are communities of Polish, Germans, Hungarians, Swedish, Chinese, Japanese and so forth. It is so easy in America to run into a community of "hyphenated" Americans.

The problems involving colored Americans attracted so much attention that race relations are sometimes taken to mean the relations between the colored and the white. My visit to the United States made me realize that the relations among other ethnic groups are equally important.

Despite the composite ethnical nature, it is remarkable that Americans share a common outlook, political or otherwise. This can be, I think, both a compliment and a criticism. A compliment, because the national unity of America is thus maintained. A criticism, because the points of view in America, a land of liberty, seems to be pretty much uniform.

## Segregation in U.S.

The Japanese popular conception of segregation is not entirely free from the image of "cruel" whites wielding whips on Negro slaves. A certain Japanese scholar con-

fided to me that he had discovered that the Negro problem cannot be understood in terms of class struggle or socialism. Even a learned scholar can imagine something vastly different until he actually visits America.

"Those Supreme Court decisions hardly scratched the surface of the problem," my friend in Richmond said. He is a native Southerner and devoted much time at Harvard to the study of segregation issue. I think he does not need my approval. But I agreed with him completely, because I think segregation has its roots in the low economic, educational and social status of Negroes. And it also dates back into history. It is not a simple question of color as such. Even if the court pronounces its judgment on so many cases, the fact remains that you cannot solve the problem by pronouncements.

For the sake of fairness, I must say that I met many colored Americans who are well educated and highly intelligent. But I have the impression all the same that real equality between the whites and Negroes will not materialize without a long and assiduous effort to raise the economic, educational and social status of the colored. And it seems that the improvement of economic status should come first. At present, education at good private universities, for example, is too high for Negroes.

When I consider the history of segregation, I think I can note a parallel with postwar Japan.

After the American Civil War, all slaves were emancipated and they were given the voting right. But they were not prepared for this new freedom. Life in the Southern states was threatened with excesses arising from the ignorance of those new citizens. The result was the rise of the Ku Klux Klan movement and the pendulum swung back. And in some states, Negroes are still being discouraged from voting.

After the Pacific War many democratic reforms were undertaken in Japan under American guidance. But the Japanese were not necessarily prepared for the newly established democracy. Communism flourished in various quarters, especially in trade unions. The pendulum is gradually swinging back. This reverse process is sometimes branded as "reactionary." But it is rather difficult to tell whether it is really reactionary.

Nowadays Southerners feel that the U.S. Federal Government is stepping out of its rights and meddling in the affairs of the Southern states. At any rate foreigners may remind themselves that segregation is an internal affair of the United States. Only so far as it involves basic human rights can outsiders add their voice.



*In Darkest America***Guthrie and the Missionary**

Note: Last November the grand jury of Whitley county, in the hill country of Kentucky, discovered that *The Big Sky* was available to borrowers in the public library at the town of Corbin.

On the complaint of a missionary whom news stories identified only as a Mr. Davis, the grand jury read passages which Mr. Davis had underscored as examples of "lust" and thereupon decided that neither adults nor children should be allowed to read the book. It asked the librarian

why it was being circulated. It recommended that the next panel investigate further.

The state Library Extension Division naturally was upset. It feared that its whole program might suffer as a consequence of this one instance. And so it asked A. B. (Bud) Guthrie, Jr., the author, for a statement that might widen understanding.

For the sake of the program and its participants—and with what good nature he could summon—Bud made the following reply.

**The Peter Rabbit Library?**

By A. B. Guthrie, Jr.

To each, his opinion.

On that principle we Americans have operated and do operate well, indeed at least as well as people anywhere.

But the principle does not imply that uninformed and bigoted opinion should weigh equally with that which is informed and dispassionate. Quite the contrary! Out of the conflict of sentiments, foolish and narrow and thoughtful and broad and in-between, we believe that our people can and largely do choose courses that are wise and good. Our history, our legislation, our judicial decisions all support us, if not wholly, in that belief. The censors, the book-burners, the people who would impose their own fears and faiths on all of us—we put them eventually in their places, for there exists a hard sense in the American people. They like the climate of freedom. They know, if not always consciously, that censorship is indoctrination. Each cherishes the right to do his own thinking, to choose his own reading, to defy the extremists who, in their exclusive wisdom, would make him a copy of themselves.

All this is by way of preface to some reflections on my own work and the Whitley county grand jury's criticism of *The Big Sky* and its presence in the Corbin Public Library.

I am not writing for my own sake. The Whitley jury has done me a favor. Its report means increased sales. But other people are involved; and the issue is important aside from personalities and personal advantage.

The writer of fiction, if he is serious and conscientious, strives to re-create and illuminate experience. It is not his right to falsify. He has to be honest to his materials. He has to be honest to himself. He operates in the conviction

that if anything is important it is truth as he has been led to see it.

Critics, like the Missionary Davis who brought the complaint to the Whitley grand jury, disagree. They would have authors prettify experience. They would have the writer make a doll house out life, though by Mr. Davis' very calling he acknowledges it is not a doll house but a house, so to speak, of hovels as well as mansions. With no understanding of the office of serious fiction, these critics ask the fictionists to be dishonest—as if morality were promoted by misrepresentation! Mr. Davis obviously does not believe, with *The Book*, that the truth will set you free.

I can defend *The Big Sky* as an accurate representation of a time and a place. There is not a word in it that cannot be supported by reference to sources. Fifteen years of thinking and study went into it. I believe I can say that all the prime as well as many secondary sources were consulted. My notes fill half a dozen drawers. Authorities on the fur trade are virtually unanimous in acclaiming it. It has been translated into I don't know how many languages, a dozen at least. The library is rare in which it is not available.

I am embarrassed to recite these facts, for the recital smells of immodesty. Yet the facts are important to a judgment that I wrote the book in the conviction that an honest novel of the fur trade never had been told.

With these points behind us, I would ask the jury: Was anyone, man or child, ever corrupted by a word? A word, after all, is only a sound on the tongue or symbols on paper. To the vulgar and profane ones, most of us have been and are exposed, and without apparent ruination.

Then if words don't corrupt people, what in writing does? Attitudes perhaps, just perhaps. The false. The cheap. The trashy. The deliberately mischievous. *The Big Sky* never has been accused of these, never at least

until now if it is now so accused. It is almost embarrassing-moral. Through it runs the theme of atonement. It is the story of a man who reaps what he sows. If anyone can find in it any profit in evil, let him speak! But if any defender asserts the converse, that it shows virtue always rewarded, let him think twice!

The news stories report that Mr. Davis underscored what he thought were objectionable passages in my book and that the grand jury based its criticism on his samples. It ought not to be necessary to remind anyone that expressions taken out of context carry no authority. It is the blunder of the ignoramous and the trick of the cheat to characterize a man or his work by divorcing words from those that precede and follow. By this device almost any writer and almost any speaker can be damned. So I would ask members of the next Whitley grand jury to examine all the evidence—that is, to read the book in its entirety—before reaching a decision.

An adverse decision, even then, would be wide open to attack, for it is a part of our system that judgments like these need be supported by evidence. *The Big Sky* has been in print for more than ten years. I don't know how long the Corbin Library has carried it, but long enough

surely for numbers of people to have read it. Has any single one of them been corrupted as a consequence? Until, under rules of evidence, such an instance is proven, the book stands clear. Without such enforcement any judgment against it is and would be subjective and infirm.

If *The Big Sky* is to be banned for what is called its "lust," what is the library to stock? I ask the names as they pop into my head. The Bible? It chronicles some sinful doings. Shakespeare? He isn't always what Mr. Davis would term wholesome. Voltaire? Dreiser? Sinclair Lewis? Hemingway? DeVoto? Steinback? Cozzens? Who? This random scattering of questions represents but a fraction of a list far too long to enumerate. Remove from the shelves all volumes that can be so listed, and Corbin will have no library, or at best one that might appropriately be named "The Tale of Peter Rabbit" Library.

Finally, it is the business of librarians to operate libraries. They qualify by experience, training, special education, study of function and so are above the crowd, as the banker or mechanic or accountant or farmer is above the crowd in his specialty. Thus it not only appears brash, it is brash for people who have no particular qualifications to challenge the book selections of those who do have.

## Guthrie Blasts Charges By Legion's Committee

Montana's Pulitzer prize-winner, A. B. (Bud) Guthrie Jr., Wednesday sharply criticized the state American Legion committee's charges against speakers who have appeared at Montana State University and Montana State College.

Guthrie, nationally known novelist who lives in Great Falls, is a former member of the State Board of Education to which the Legion committee on counter subversive activities appealed last week. The presidents of the two institutions, Dr. Carl McFarland of MSU and Dr. R. R. Renne of MSC, strongly opposed the Legion committee's stand.

The Legion committee charged four speakers at MSC and MSU had "extensive" records of association with subversive organizations." The speakers named were Dr. Harold Urey, MSU graduate and world-famous scientist; Dr. Edward U. Condon, former head of the Bureau of Standards; Alan Barth, Washington editorial writer, and Bayard Rustin, Californian, who spoke at a recent Montana Insti-

tute of International Relations at MSC.

Guthrie and Barth are former Nieman fellowship winners who studied at Harvard University. Guthrie said:

"I cannot believe that the membership of the Montana American Legion is represented by the eight patrioteers who went to the State Board of Education to protest the appearances on Montana campuses of men to whom they do not stand knee-high. Surely the Legion is better than its spokesmen.

"A discussion of the protest needs be preceded by assumptions. We assume that the protestants are men of physical courage, of sincerity, of the right to speech and attitude that all of us enjoy—but may not if they have their way. These items are beyond dispute.

"It is the minds of these men, their emotions, and the relationships between the two that promote despair among people who cherish and rejoice and have confidence in this greatest of countries. What harries these eight characters? Freedom? The very thought of freedom? Is theirs the

only door of grace, theirs the only loyalty, theirs the only wisdom? What would they have said in those times of Jefferson and Lincoln? Why can't they see? Did they not learn something of humility from experience with that professional liar, Mat-usow, whom kindred sentiment inflicted on the state?

"Brave and dedicated as they may be, these men are afraid of liberty, afraid of thought, afraid of ideas. They would make us all like them, fixed in mind, rigid in attitude, resistant to difference—and that would be the end of us.

"So let us say to them—and I am sure I speak for the great majority of my own generation and for older people and younger and for the great majority of students on Montana campuses—let us say to these small and fearful men: You shall not impose your hot little fears and your tight little faiths on the rest of us! Sirs, we are Americans!"

Great Falls Tribune  
Feb. 20

# The Plus and Minus of Newspapering

## A Penn State Survey

By Robert M. Pockrass

Newspaper editorial work still holds first place in its attraction to college journalism majors, despite the well-publicized temptations of other communication fields.

A current survey of alumni of the Pennsylvania State University School of Journalism since 1930 reveals that about 42 per cent of the working graduates who have majored in editorial journalism are now employed by daily or weekly newspapers.

An additional 27 per cent of the Penn State alumni formerly worked for newspapers, but most of these have switched to related types of work.

The survey questioned all Penn State journalism graduates about their employment records, salaries, job satisfaction, and attitudes toward their college experiences. Replies have been received from more than 45 per cent of them.

Although the survey reveals the daily newspaper as the No. 1 employer of journalism graduates it also seems to point up that newspapers are not hiring and retaining all of the journalism students who were interested in newspaper careers when they graduated.

Asked what they considered their professional goal when in college, more than two-thirds of the news majors who answered the questionnaire replied that it was some kind of newspaper editorial position. Asked what they consider their professional goal *now*, about 40 per cent of the same respondents mention newspaper work.

However, this drift away from newspaper work does *not* seem to be gaining momentum. As a matter of fact, a considerably smaller percentage of the graduates of the period 1948-52 are now employed by newspapers than those of the years since 1953.

Perhaps significant, too, is the fact that newspapers continue to employ a substantial percentage of the alumni with good academic records. These figures may be encouraging:

Of the Penn State journalism graduates *now* working on newspapers, 62 per cent ranked in the upper half of their college graduating class; of those who have left newspapers for other employment, 54 per cent ranked in the upper half of their class; of the graduates who have *never* worked for newspapers, 51 per cent ranked that high.

---

Robert M. Pockrass is assistant professor of journalism in the College of Liberal Arts at Penn. State University.

The survey attempted to get at the problem of finding out why alumni remain with or leave newspapers by asking them to tell what they like and/or dislike about newspaper work.

The chief reasons given for liking newspaper work were the interesting, varied, challenging, or creative nature of the work; and the opportunities offered to meet and work with people and to serve the community. Other advantages cited were the satisfaction of knowing about events firsthand, the fast pace or excitement, and prestige.

Comparing the "likes" about newspaper work of two groups—those who continue to work for newspapers and those who have left newspaper work—it is notable that members of the latter group are most likely to mention "working with people" as the top advantage of newspaper work. Those who still work for newspapers, while frequently mentioning that they like meeting people, just as often list the varied and challenging nature of the work as an advantage. And they are twice as likely as the former newspaper employees to list "service to the community" as a reason for liking newspaper work.

Here are typical comments on "what I like" about newspaper work:

"The satisfaction of knowing 'what's going on' in one's community—or at least attempting to have such knowledge as completely as humanly possible. Also there is the feeling of accomplishment when some community improvement is forthcoming or accomplished due to editorial support of one's paper."  
—a small town editor.

"I feel as though I belong here, and often get satisfaction out of knowing that at least a few souls in our area honestly depend on my newsgathering and writing for information on subjects vital to them."  
—a reporter.

"The personal satisfaction of learning and writing. The prestige of being a newspaperman."  
—a reporter.

"The feeling of knowing what's going on in a community. Working with people who are alert and alive."  
—a former reporter.

"The flexibility of hours, duties, situations. The lack of daily rigidity and monotonous routine. The chance, which

increases with experience, to make things happen and express opinions.”

—a copy editor.

“The variety of work, and meeting different types of people. Getting a good story or exclusive to beat competition. Sometimes being able to help people or projects through your stories.”

—a large city reporter.

“The pleasant feeling, the satisfaction of being part of a community and its activities, of having a part in working out community problems; of being able, over the years, to win the respect and confidence of community leaders.”

—wire service editor.

“The pleasure of vicarious participation in all types of situations and opportunity to become familiar with all types of human endeavor.”

—large city reporter

“Seeing each day something I have helped create; enjoying making friends and talking to the public; and of course, being on top of a good story.”

—city editor.

“The day-to-day challenge and the feeling of personal accomplishment when the challenge is met.”

—telegraph editor.

“The feeling that at the end of a day I have accomplished something worthwhile not only to myself but possibly to others.”

—city editor.

“The opportunity to raise hell, poke fun at ‘stuffed shirts,’ laugh at the ridiculous occurrences, weep at tragedies, and be forever startled by the obvious.”

—large city reporter.

“The feeling that my job is the most important in my community.”

—assistant city editor.

These comments indicate that there is certainly a hard core of journalism graduates who enjoy the satisfactions of newspaper work and would prefer not to desert it. Remarks such as these are not confined to those who now work for newspapers. Many of the alumni who have left newspaper work say that they did so with some reluctance, but that they felt it impossible to pass up better opportunities in other fields.

There is another side to the story. Both those who now do newspaper work and those who have left it also list some of the disadvantages. . . .

The most frequently cited “dislike” about newspaper work is the low pay. But here there is a significant differ-

ence between the present and former newspaper employees. Three times as many former employees cite low pay as cite any other disadvantage of newspaper work. On the other hand, those who *now* work for newspapers mention almost as frequently an evident lack of appreciation by management for the work of the editorial department and the obstacles in the way of doing significant news work.

Other dislikes of newspaper work mentioned by alumni are poor promotion policies, unusual or long hours, pressures of deadlines, dull routine at times, discrimination against women, and the uninformed attitudes of the public about the role of the press.

Here are the typical “dislikes” about newspaper work, both from present and former employees:

“The constant battle a news staff has with people who should be on the side of the reporter—the publisher, for instance—to recognize that most people buy his paper for the news it gathers.”

—small city reporter.

“The poorly educated, ill-advised, indifferent or hard-shelled employers with whom one must deal.”

—former small town reporter.

“The sometimes mossbacked attitudes of some executives. Their emphasis on providing the best about mechanical facilities and buildings, but caring little about giving employees material encouragement. Comparisons with other professions are discouraging.”

—rewrite man.

“Lack of advancement opportunities due to family ownership in many papers.”

—news editor.

“The trend toward one-newspaper towns, the stifling of incentive to go out and dig up news in controversial subjects, such as government, schools, race relations.”

—former reporter.

“The lack of opportunity to do thorough or significant work.”

—former reporter.

“The frustration arising from the inability of those in the field to progress, and the essentially conservative approach of the press in general.”

—graduate student.

“Short-sighted business management which sacrifices editorial perfection and integrity for the benefit of the cash register. Newspaper standards still need upgrading. We need better reporters and editors, but the front office must be willing to pay for them. Too many good men leave the profession—or avoid it—because of publishers’ refusal to face facts.”

—former editor.



"The differences in pay scales and opportunities for men and women."  
—woman, former reporter.

"The fact must be faced that the majority of newspapers are declining in quality and in importance in American life."  
—large city reporter.

"The necessity of writing some stories that hurt people. Night hours that sometimes clash with my family life."  
—city editor.

"The dull routine inherent in about 75 per cent of the stories you must report and write. The phenomenal repetition of events that must be reported by a small town paper."  
—former reporter.

"The low pay. A man wouldn't mind working odd hours, chasing fire trucks in his spare time and coming to work at seven in the morning if he were paid as much as a bricklayer."  
—former reporter.

"Too much family ownership, hidebound adherence to outmoded methods, failure to pay worthwhile salaries."  
—small town editor.

"The prejudices of newspapers against employing and promoting women."  
—woman reporter.

"The attitude of much of the public toward newspapers and newspapermen. Many misunderstand the function of the press and the responsibilities of the newspaperman."  
—reporter.

"Embalmed political attitudes, and the paper's growing tendency to be a blotter rather than a telescope."  
—former editor.

"People on the staff who should be salesman or housewives."  
—copy editor.

"The lack of initiative in people in supervisory positions who do their best to knock all of the initiative out of young reporters."  
—reporter.

"Constantly meeting people who are duller, more stupid, showier, and more dishonest than newspapermen, but a hell of a lot richer."  
—large city reporter.

These complaints about newspaper work point to the conclusion that it isn't only low pay that drives some college graduates from newspaper work. As a matter of fact, the criticisms of salaries are more likely to come from

older alumni, who are not aware of the improvement in pay scales since they left college. The present reasons for dissatisfaction with newspaper work are more likely to deal with the frustrations felt by young newspapermen who sometimes get the impression that the editorial department is tolerated as a necessary expense by the management.

A note of idealism runs through many of the comments of the journalism graduates who continue to work for newspapers. They want the opportunity to do significant work of professional caliber. Their comments suggest that if newspapers can provide an atmosphere in which this type of work can be done, they will attract and hold an even larger number of college journalism graduates.

As Wilbur Schramm writes in *Responsibility in Mass Communication*, it is essential to "reward able employees, not only with money, but even more with professional recognition for jobs well done, with initiative and freedom and responsibility they can act on."

## Nieman Fellowship Committee

Harvard University announced the appointment of three newspapermen and a magazine editor to serve on the Selecting Committee for Nieman Fellowships for 1958-59.

They are: Carl E. Lindstrom, executive editor of the *Hartford Times*; William J. Miller, chief editorial writer of the New York *Herald Tribune*; Don C. Shoemaker, executive director of the Southern Education Reporting Service and former editor of the Asheville, N. C., *Citizen*; and Steven M. Spencer, science writer and associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*.

They will serve with three members of the University: Carroll M. Williams, Professor of Biology; Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships, and William M. Pinkerton, News Officer.

Mr. Miller, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Lyons and Mr. Pinkerton are former Nieman Fellows at Harvard.

Ten to twelve fellowships are awarded annually to working newspapermen for a college year of resident study at Harvard on leave of absence from their jobs.

The deadline for applications to the Nieman Foundation at Harvard is April 15. Awards are announced early in June. Applicants must have at least three years of news experience and be under 40. Their studies are subjects of their own choice for background for news work.

This will be the 21st annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard since the fellowships were started in 1938 by a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*.

# Reporting on Radiation Fallout

By Arthur J. Snider

Any discussion of press responsibility in reporting implications of radiation fallout should begin, for reason of perspective, with the moment the subject of atomic energy burst into the press—as a weapon of war—12 years ago.

The mantle of secrecy under which atomic energy was prepared for its spectacular debut persists to a degree today because of the cold war. The blackout of information over the years has proved a handicap to the press, and to the public, in understanding *fully* the implications of good and evil that have come through splitting of the atom.

In many other fields involving national security, it is possible to draw a rather sharp line between technological information and political or policy information. It is possible to be sympathetic toward protection of technical secrets while insisting that matters involving policy is the public's business.

But the atomic energy field does not lend itself to this convenient separation. Here the technological and the political are intertwined.

The atom, in *this* sense, is indivisible.

Since the function of the press is to present information, the press must stand in loyal opposition to any government agency that either necessarily or unnecessarily engages in secrecy. I *believe* that this is a *desirable* alignment in a democracy. In the continuing cross pull between secrecy and information, the press must array itself on the side of *information* because there will always be plenty of pressure on the side of secrecy. The greater danger is not that the press will reveal secrets of potential value to the enemy, but rather, that it will default in its obligation to maintain a balance of forces by constant pressure in the opposite direction. There is a growing tendency to regard secrecy as a sacred cow to be accepted without question by the American people. At times, in our present climate, one is almost made to feel a sense of guilt in questioning security policies.

This entire philosophy has been crystallized by the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the phrase, "the right of the people to know." One of the presidents of that organization, Basil L. Walters, has punched it into even a terser phrase—the need to "audit government."

Newspapers have always looked behind closed doors,

---

**Mr. Snider** is science editor of the Chicago *Daily News*. This is from a talk to the American Association for the Advancement of Science at the December 30th meeting in Indianapolis.

even though official guardians keep them out and assure them that all is well. Through tradition and heritage, it has been the business of the gadfly press to see for itself. True, poking and prying offer the opportunity for abuse, but perhaps this is the small price we must pay for the type of vigilance that is offered by the American press.

Few presidents suffered more from attacks by the press than Thomas Jefferson. And while he said bitter things in retaliation, he always maintained his belief about the essential service of the press in a democracy. After he retired from the presidency, he spoke 14 words which have come to be almost a maxim: "Where the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe."

Jefferson, in all his wisdom, could not begin to foresee the complexities and confusions of issues that would come to pass in his country. During the last three or four decades, the expansion of this country's horizons and responsibilities, both at home and abroad; the growth of industry and finance, of population; the conflicts of labor and capital and of social and racial groups, the revolutions in transportation and communication, the developments in science, education and culture, have presented American newspapers with a challenge in reporting that is taxing their capabilities and ingenuity.

The introduction of the problem of radiation fallout adds another challenge. The task has not been made easier by the mystery and uncertainties that surround it.

There was a humorous anecdote circulating at one time about the AEC public information specialist who was visiting at Princeton on AEC business. During the course of the visit, he was introduced to Dr. Einstein, who inquired as to the young man's occupation. He replied he was a disseminator of public information for the AEC. "Oh, yes," replied Einstein. "Then you are practically unemployed."

The fact is, a very *large* quantity of information emanates from the AEC. Newspaper offices receive releases with regularity. Their annual reports to Congress contain a wealth of material. Many of the speeches of AEC commissioners are given wide distribution.

Much has appeared in the press about the brilliant achievements in the fields of nuclear power and radioactive isotopes, to name but two areas. Much has been done by the AEC, and sooner than might reasonably have been expected, in advancing the cause of the peaceful atom. This has been reported quite fully by the press.

Yet the public concern seems disproportionately focused on the piece of the informational pie that is missing. There

is anxiety as to what this gnawing void holds in terms of their future, of life and death.

Psychologists tell us that fear of the unknown is a greater barrier to peace of mind than overt recognition of a known danger. Wars, fires, floods and other disasters have shown that people can accept dangers calmly and courageously but tend to break up emotionally when faced with uncertainties that play cruelly upon the imagination. Nature abhors a vacuum and human nature can't tolerate a vacuum of understanding. If there are not facts upon which comprehension can be based, human nature will fill it in with rumor and misconception, if necessary. There is a ready willingness to believe the worst.

As psychiatrist John Spiegel of Harvard points out, lack of knowledge is all the more disheartening in a country like ours that places unprecedented importance on knowing all the answers.

"We can't 'muddle through' like the English without losing self-esteem," he says. "We can't bow to fate with Oriental calm. Our insistence on being able to blue-print a solution for every problem requires the means to tolerate an increased charge of anxiety whenever the problem resists solution."

I cannot say that the AEC has not issued all information compatible with national security. No one but the AEC knows what information is in its possession. But I would like to suggest that perhaps more confidence could be instilled in the press and public through wiser timing of *release* of information. It has seemed to many in the press that the AEC, in discharging its responsibility of protecting vital information, is operating under an expedient policy of "too little, too late," of keeping the information under its official hat until it leaks out from other sources. Perhaps a policy that would judiciously anticipate the probability of informational developments and surmount them with forthright statements might do much to restore full faith and trust in the AEC on the part of the public.

Representative Holifield pointed this up when he, as chairman, issued a summation of the Congressional subcommittee hearing on radiation fallout last June. Mr. Holifield said it should not be necessary for a Congressional inquiry to squeeze information out of the AEC. It should not be necessary for Commission releases to come in forbidding technical form or dribblets through speeches of Commission members or other high-ranking personnel. Time after time, he said, there has been a long delay in publication of facts.

This was evident in the story of radiation fallout at Bikini on March 1, 1954. The first ominous indication of the magnitude of the Bravo bomb came not from the AEC but from distorted versions that leaked out before official announcement. A review of press files will show that the AEC's immediate report was only that a "device" had

exploded. Ten days later, the AEC mentioned radiation in connection with the disclosure that 28 Americans and 236 natives unexpectedly were exposed to it and issued assurances that none was burned.

Meanwhile, rumors began building up to the effect that the Bravo bomb was no ordinary bomb test. A Marine corporal described his impressions from 300 miles away. Then came the startling information from a Japanese captain that the crew of his distant fishing vessel was burned by radioactive ash. Japanese scientists began reporting technological details, including the fact that strontium 90 was found in the ash fallout.

It was not until February 15, 1955, that the full story was released to the American people by our officials. Dr. Ralph Lapp, who has been one of the severe critics of government information policy, pointed out that the year of secrecy was a year of paralysis with respect to civil defense. "Imagine what would have happened," he said, "had we been catapulted into a nuclear war with our civilization completely unaware of the menace of fallout."

The February statement of the AEC was certainly a helpful one, but once again it represented a policy of "too little, too late." There are indications the AEC had known considerable about fallout before the Bravo test. According to Dr. Libby's testimony before the Holifield committee, fallout had been a subject of much interest to the AEC since the first atomic bomb exploded in 1945. Dr. Libby's testimony advises us that in 1952, the Rand Corporation had been given a contract to make an independent study of fallout. This culminated in the birth of Project Sunshine, which has developed a good deal of data with respect to world-wide fallout.

When this data was not forthcoming from the AEC, scientists outside of the government began to speak out in terms of long-range hazard. Not until the issue was forced again were there releases from the AEC. Here once more was a suggestion to the public of a grudging reluctance to yield information.

Let me be more specific in the matter of press responsibility in the fallout problem. Perhaps a point of departure is the statement of Senator Hickenlooper, made during the hearing of the Holifield committee, to the effect that some press reports were sensational. Senator Hickenlooper even applied the phrase "hysterical journalism" to some of the stories he had seen. He spoke of headlines and stories "which seek, or which do, in effect, create fear and minimize the actual facts."

The word "sensation" has come to have a stigma when applied to the press, but if one follows the Webster definition of a sensation, namely, something "producing excited interest or emotion," then the fallout story was indeed a sensation. It is news, sensational news, when grayish-white flakes swirl down from the skies on Japanese fisher-

men who had been considered to be in a safe zone. It is news that in contrast to the first bombs exploded, when radioactive debris came down comparatively quickly, the radioactivity of the superbomb may remain suspended in a stratosphere reservoir for possible world-wide consequences.

It is news because the public has not been informed about these things before.

In the absence of proven facts with respect to implications and consequences, it is news to quote Dr. Selove, for example, to the effect that the danger may be exceeding permissible levels in some areas, or Prof. Crow, to select another name at random, to the effect that there is no safe dose of radiation genetically. It is news to publish a statement by the British Atomic Scientists Association that H-bomb explosions may eventually produce bone cancers in 1,000 persons for every million tons of TNT or equivalent explosive power, even though it cannot be proven, or disproven, at the present state of knowledge.

Similarly, it is news, to quote Dr. Libby, as the press has frequently, that there is no cause for concern; or Dr. Eisenbud, who sees only a small, safe level of radioactivity accumulating in the body from strontium 90 fallout.

When Dr. Schweitzer warned of harmful effects from bomb tests in a message to the Nobel Prize committee, and Dr. Libby challenged that, both stories were news. When Dr. Mark Mills and Dr. Harrison Brown gave differing points of view in simultaneous appearances before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, both made news. When Dr. Pauling released a petition signed by 2,000 persons calling for an end to bomb tests on the part of all countries because of fallout hazards, it was news, and so was the challenge to his statement issued by Dr. Hildebrand and Dr. Beadle.

What this means is that in a confused and highly controversial area, the press can discharge its responsibility *only* by printing views on *both* sides of the question. This is not to say that newspapers can be edited with a yardstick to make certain equal space is given to both sides. Information must be edited on the basis of a difficult-to-define standard known as "news value." This is dependent on many factors, including timeliness, prominence of event or subject concerned, reader interest, availability of space, whether the information is actually "new" or has been said many times before, etc.

While I cannot prove it, it might be a fair guess to say that if all the stories on both sides of the question were totaled, the result would represent a fairly even division of space.

It indeed adds to the reader's turmoil to see two antithetic stories in the same newspaper on successive days or even in the same issue, and this will often lead to the comment, "Why can't the press make up its mind?" But the basic

source of confusion, of course, as Prof. Barry Commoner put it, is: "The public is accustomed to associating science with the truth and is dismayed that scientists appear to find the truth about fallout so elusive."

Until the issue is resolved, the responsible newspaper can only continue to print all responsible views. Whether the stories be classed as hysterical or sober, understated or overstated, will probably depend to a large extent on the preconceived position of the reader.

Out of the free-for-all of fact and opinion, presented in the daily press, usually emerges when needed the basic information required by a democracy to govern itself. In his book, *Freedom of Information*, Herbert Brucker recalls these words of Milton in 1644:

"While truth might assume more shapes than one, we could yet find it and make it serve our needs." For practical purposes, Milton went on, finding the truth is simple. All you have to do is let all versions fight it out among themselves, and let all men, no matter how highly colored an opinion they might have as to what is the truth, utter it without hindrance.

And Mr. Brucker adds:

"In this country, we want no court of the star chamber to say beforehand what is truth and what is error and to permit for printing only that which they certify as the truth.

"The Anglo-Saxon society has gotten where it is by permitting substantially all facts and opinions as to what are facts to compete openly in the market place for public acceptance. By and large, the truth, somewhat battered but still recognizable, eventually emerges triumphant."

Let us have too much news rather than too little news, too much criticism rather than no criticism at all.

Human institutions are rarely perfect and the press is no exception. But perhaps, in the welter of confusion, some benefits already have emerged from press stories.

I refer to the greater understanding on the part of the public and the medical and dental professions of the evils of over-use of conventional X-ray. There is new interest in preventing exposure of persons without some useful purpose being served.

There are obstacles in presenting information about high energy and low energy irradiation in the press. And these same obstacles pertain in dealing with all areas of science.

One is the background of the reader, who lacks the education or training fully to absorb the complexities of technical information.

Another is the difficulty in translating the precision of science into correspondingly accurate lay terminology. Where scientific accuracy is carried out to perhaps five decimal places, the newspaper report must settle for round figures.

Another obstacle is the overenthusiasm of the scientist who seeks objectivity but is unconsciously accentuating the



positives and minimizing the negatives of his work.

And then there is the difficulty presented by the creative scientist who may be so constituted that he cannot explain simply what he is trying to say.

Another limitation is certainly the format of the newspaper, with its sharp headlines that may strip the scientific report of qualifying material and reservations.

Perhaps this would indicate that the press is not an adequate medium for conveying the word of science. But as long as newspapers continue to serve as the public instrument for presenting the day to day story of mankind, with its hopes and fears, strengths and frailties, accomplishments and defeats, science will continue to be reported in the press.

It thus becomes incumbent upon all of us to seek methods by which the scientists and the newspaperman can work more closely. Too many scientists still refuse to descend from ivory towers to cooperate with the press.

Such cooperation would yield mutual benefits. It would help curb irresponsible reporting by the press and bring about better public understanding of the scientist who today is alternately lionized and feared.

As Dr. Brock Chisholm, the psychiatrist, says: "No one can remain acceptable if separate from other people. From the point of view of other people, he (the scientist) does not belong. He is some kind of a stranger who is unpredictable and cannot be trusted. The scientist must make himself a human being if he is to be understood by the people of the world."

Only through the teaming of knowledge as provided by science and communication of that knowledge by the press and popular media can the vast public learn to understand the intellectual force that is science and to use it properly so that it may serve us and enrich our appreciation of the world around us.

## The Creative Process

By Gerard Piel

(This began as a memorandum from the publisher of *Scientific American* to his staff.)

Our single-topic September issue, this year, will be devoted to "The Creative Process."

Of course, every issue of this magazine is concerned with that process and with its yield of new understanding. We are prompted now to consider the creative process itself by the stir of public discussion about science that has been excited by recent spectacular developments in technology. We hear on all sides expressions of concern about the condition and quality of American science. The drift of public discussion raises in our minds a more serious concern: There appears to be widespread misunderstanding of the real nature of science and its role in our culture and civilization.

Science is so closely identified in contemporary life with its immense practical consequences in technology that we lose sight of its equally profound identity with the arts and letters.

A scientific discovery is as truly a human invention as a sonnet or a symphony. The little that we know is not what nature has told us but what scientists have asked. The asking of the question is the creative act in science; it is the question that determines what line the investigation will take. Though a particular research may engage a large staff and a big machine, success turns upon the thinking that goes on inside a brain. A scientific discovery must therefore be the individual creation of the scientist, no less than a work of art is the expression of the artist.

But here the resemblance between art and science ends. The truth disclosed by the artist can only be apprehended. The truth discovered by the scientist is subject to verification by experiment. In this confronting of theory with fact, the creative process takes nature in its grasp. The scientific discovery yields control as well as understanding.

All of the processes of modern industrial technology that have transformed the world around us are but repetitions in the large of a scientist's original experiment. The dynamo that powers and lights the 20th Century world is merely an improved version of the contraption of cast iron and copper wire with which Michael Faraday demonstrated his discovery of electrical induction in 1832. The same glass envelope in which J. J. Thomson discovered the electron in 1897 is today's vacuum tube, refined in details only for its multifarious functions in communication and control. Tomorrow, most of the world's power will be generated by fusion reactors, terrestrial models of the pressure and temperature systems which contemporary astrophysicists like Hans Bethe and George Gamow have calculated for the interiors of stars. And, for the day after tomorrow, who can predict what practical consequences may flow from the creation in the Berkeley cyclotron of particles of anti-matter that complement and annihilate the particles of matter?

Considering the enormous role that the creative process of science has assumed in the life of civilization—in the wealth and power of nations, in the situation and prospects of individual men—we have urgent need to understand it better. It is not enough that we have come to appreciate the

utility of science. There are signs, especially in our country today, that enthusiasm for the end results of science may lead to undue emphasis upon technology at the expense of the creative process from which technology grows. There is a grave question whether the individual freedom essential to the creative process can survive the increasing centralization of economic and social power which attends the progress of technology.

As the Table of Contents of the issue appended hereto indicates, the distinguished scientists who are to be its authors will consider the creative process in four major aspects:

The article on "The Creative Process" will consider the similarities and differences between the sciences and the arts, and, from the historical point of view, will show how science itself must be regarded as the most significant invention of the creative process.

The authors of the next four articles will seek to define what constitutes truly important discovery and invention in each major field of science. Taking one or two specific examples, they will develop a "before and after" picture of the impact of such work on the outlook and the material welfare of mankind.

The articles on the physiology and the psychology of the imagination will review the little that we know about how the creative process goes on in the human brain and will explore the several promising lines of investigation that have opened up in this field.

Against this background, the last two articles will consider what our country has done and what it ought to do to create the kind of environment in which the creative process may flourish.

"The Creative Process" will have enduring interest as reference and guide for the policy-makers of government and industry concerned with the fostering of progress in science. Its timing, in terms of public interest and discussion, ensures that our September 1958 issue will find the same welcome reception as our eight previous single-topic issues.

Anticipating demand, we are planning a large overrun of our print order. Each year in the past, however, we have completely exhausted the supply of our single-topic issue. We have also learned that these issues are kept

as definitive references by our readers. *Automatic Control*, *The Planet Earth* and *The Universe* are finding substantial sales even today, republished in book form by Simon and Schuster.

Here is a sketch of the Table of Contents:

1. "The Creative Process"—A distinguished physicist and philosopher of science will define the central theme of the issue.

2. "Innovation in Mathematics"—Mathematics in the past 50 years has immensely extended the reach and grasp of the human mind and equipped scientists in other fields for the discovery and comprehension of previously unimagined subtleties in nature.

3. "Innovation in Physics"—Physics today is characterized by an immense accumulation of experimental knowledge and correspondingly profound controversy in theory. The time is ripe for a new synthesis in the great tradition of Isaac Newton, Clerk Maxwell and Albert Einstein.

4. "Innovation in Biology"—The life sciences tend to move forward on a broad front of observation and experiment. The data are still too immense for the kind of theoretical generalization that makes sense out of physics.

5. "Innovation in Technology"—Through the mediation of technology, the advance of fundamental knowledge won by science transforms the industrial economy in which we live.

6. "The Physiology of the Imagination"—Physiologists are beginning to answer the question: Where in the brain is the mind?

7. "The Psychology of the Imagination"—Experiment and observation in the laboratory have begun to verify the subjective impression of scientists and artists that the subconscious plays a major role in the creative process.

8. "The Patronage of Science in the U. S. 1945-1958."—The overriding demands of technology (combined with the shrinking of the lead time between a discovery in science and its application in industry) have been crowding the work of science in our country.

9. "The Encouragement of Science"—Now that science is dependent upon public support, the American people must develop new methods and institutions to provide that support on terms compatible with the nature of the creative process.

## The Newspaper Job

(Continued from Page 2)

makes a mockery of every Chamber of Commerce pronouncement about city pride and city progress, or in demonstrating that what the Governor said he would do and what he is doing are two quite different things.

These are substantial joys, and I contend that there are not many businesses that pay you for sheer enjoyment. Someone has said that a good editorial writer is one who, by nature, likes to tell people off. To be *paid* for this human failing is really quite something when you stop to think of it.

The pleasures of the reporter are perhaps even more substantial. He is the shock trooper of the entire operation. His work is the foundation of all journalism. He is the one who is there—asking the mayor what he proposes to do about the teacher shortage, or the President what he proposes to do about the recession if his strictures fail to cure it.

Before I become rapturous, let me move to the topic of the best preparation for journalism. Here I encounter a prejudice, one that has become so firmly fixed I like to call it a conviction.

I am not a great believer in journalism schools. I believe the things that beginning journalists should know are to be found in a good curriculum of liberal arts. I know of no better place in the country to train for journalism than here at Harvard, and Harvard has no school of journalism.

A good city editor greeting a cub reporter would look for these things: First, an inquiring mind and anxious willingness to work, to dig, to find out what things are really like, to explore the difference between reality and the public appearance. He would want also a good understanding of English grammar and the ability of concise, simple expression. He would want some knowledge of literature, of economics, of government, of history, of sociology.

He would also want a keen knowledge of current events. The city editors I know would not relish assigning a reporter to go to the airport to interview a Hubert Humphrey or a Krishna Menon and have the reporter ask, "Who's Hubert Humphrey?"

I have mentioned broad subjects in the liberal arts curriculum. They are vital, but they should be carried a step further where preparation for journalism is concerned. City rooms are increasingly centers of specialization. You will find relatively small newspapers now have labor reporters, education reporters, religion reporters. There always has been specialization in government and politics.

A potential newspaperman would do well to develop a particular area of interest, and build up a particular body of knowledge, in some field with which newspapers are regularly concerned. It might be science—recent devel-

opments in this complex and fast-moving realm have shown the press that it is sadly lacking in the ability to explain and interpret scientific developments, interestingly and accurately, for the janitor or the bus driver.

It might be public education, or municipal or state government. It might be labor. I doubt if there are half a dozen really topflight labor reporters in the entire country—reporters of the quality of an Abe Raskin, an Ed Lahey or a Murray Kempton—although the field could hardly be more vital in its impact upon the rank and file citizen.

Such knowledge, beyond the ordinary, might occasionally help a person to get a newspaper job. It almost certainly would help him to rise later in the common pool of newsroom talent.

This specialization should be pursued both inside and outside the classroom. For instance, the Massachusetts Legislature could be observed with great value by anyone particularly interested in state government. A number of labor leaders are enrolled in the Littauer program and would be available to students; more come into Cambridge constantly for seminars and special appearances. The problems of both public and parochial education can be observed firsthand in this area.

Anyone who is going to make a career of writing should make every effort to read good writing and study good writing. Pick authors who are first of all fine craftsmen—a Hemingway or a Faulkner, for instance—and examine very carefully their style and their technique of making words do for them what they want done.

Study the best newspapers as carefully as you would approach an algebra problem. Examine the technique of a Scotty Reston in simplifying for public understanding the rather broad problem of Presidential disability. Glean everything you can from the best work of the best reporters, such as the piece Meyer Berger did for the *New York Times* on the murder of Albert Anastasia. I know of no better ways for a person to improve upon original writing talent than (1) to write and continue writing and (2) to study carefully the finest product of his betters.

If I am not a lover of journalism schools, I certainly have a high regard for the training potential of the collegiate press. Everyone who is eyeing journalism from a campus should try to work on the college or university paper. Its editorial problems are, in a substantial sense, those of the general press in miniature. There is no basic difference between covering a speech by Senator Kennedy in Emerson Hall and covering the same Senator before a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Washington. A deadline is the same demanding thing in Cambridge as on Times Square.

I think a stint on a campus paper can tell an aspiring journalist—usually but not always—whether he really has printer's ink in his veins or whether he should take Pop's advice and come back home to run the lard factory.

## Harry Ashmore's Book

By Simmons Fentress

AN EPITAPH FOR DIXIE. By Harry S. Ashmore. W. W. Norton & Co., New York. 189 pages. \$350.

Early last fall Harry Ashmore (Niemans '42) was winding up a book about the South in process of reluctant, disorderly transition. He had about nailed things down when events chose to add to his story one more notorious bit of disorder. This significant footnote landed, rather appropriately, smack in Ashmore's lap at Little Rock, Ark., where for the past ten years he has been executive editor of the old *Gazette*.

So now comes the book, fresh from the fires that have been burning around Central High School and coloring the whole of the racial picture in the South. It is a book that, from the vantage point of Little Rock, looks back to measure how far the South has come and ahead to guess how far it probably will go in the years immediately ahead.

Ashmore is far from optimistic. He is distressed that Southerners of responsibility, particularly those who hold political leadership, have abdicated that responsibility and delivered the future largely into the hands of extremists. The men who call the shots now, who present the region's face to the rest of the country, are the Jim Eastlands and the Orval Faubuses. Behind them, highly organized and wildly vocal, are the thin-lipped haters. Off to the side, displeased but cowed, are the reasonable souls who know that things simply cannot go on this way.

"I don't know how white Southerners would behave," writes Ashmore, "if the default of responsible leadership permits the dead-end zealots to force upon them this dread choice (of segregated schools or no schools at all). Before it happens, I hope, the muted voice of reason will be heard. . . ."

He can only "hope." The real tragedy within a tragedy is that things have deteriorated so far that he, or anyone else, cannot really know.

There is, however, one bright sign. It has nothing to do with morality, but a good deal to do with money. Ashmore

feels that the Southern industrial revolution is bound to alter the region's racial attitudes even as it transforms the economy. It is a simple matter of the balance sheet. A region that is panting after Northern industrial plants cannot lure them with chaos and ignorance, however attractive the tax rates. An industrial manager likes order and stability. Presumably he likes public schools. Certainly he would hesitate to mark a mill for a town in which bayonets are drawn up at the school door.

In Arkansas, Winthrop Rockefeller is boss of an industrial program by which he hopes to lift the state out of relative poverty. "Two days before the governor (Faubus) launched his military maneuver at Central High School," says Ashmore, "Winthrop Rockefeller got wind of what was afoot and descended from his mountain to plead with Faubus not to do it. After it was done, Rockefeller read into the record of a national television broadcast his own appraisal (which it is reasonable to assume is also that of the Rockefeller Brothers and the Chase Manhattan Bank) that great damage had been done to Arkansas's industrial development program."

Even in Mississippi the dollar can sometimes speak louder than the segregationists. There, in 1956, the state was confronted with the choice of an 11-million-dollar veterans' hospital at Jackson—integrated throughout—or no hospital at all. "We've got the tiger by the tail," said Gov. Coleman, but the hospital came.

Money talks when the Negro, who makes up 80 per cent of the intra-city bus clientele, demands that Jim Crow be forgotten in Montgomery, the capital of the old Confederacy. It talks when a department store owner is reminded of the Negro's purchasing power and then of segregated drinking fountains in the lobby.

So far this power of the dollar has served chiefly to keep down organized violence, so embarrassing when a Southern industry-seeker takes his charts and his promises to New York. No one can know how far it may go in working toward a more basic solution.

Ashmore gives the Southern press its credit for "a reasonably good job of accurately and fully reporting developments on the race front . . . in the face of sustained emotional pressures the like of which their contemporaries outside the region rarely encounter."

He makes, however, the fully justified charge that, "like politicians, the great majority (of papers) have defaulted in their corollary role of leadership." He indicts them for "undue caution" and remarks that Southern publishers, like their colleagues everywhere, "are prone to stand in the bar of the country club and assume that they are listening to the voice of the people."

"The result is a steady watering down of the strength of their own position in the community; the loudmouths quickly discover that they will panic under the threat of pressure or even unpleasantness, and proceed accordingly. . . ." Perhaps it should be noted that Ashmore, under withering fire at Little Rock, piled up excellent credentials for such criticism.

His book is, by every standard, an excellent one. It is written powerfully and written from an impressive knowledge of the Southern past and the Southern present. It is not the classic that W. J. Cash offered almost two decades ago in *The Mind of the South*, with its deep probing and its enriching detail, but it is certainly the best treatment of "the Southern problem" to come along since.

---

### Our Reviewers

Reviews in this issue are by the following Nieman Fellows:

Simmons Fentress of the *Charlotte Observer*, David Lawson of the *Auckland Star*, N. Z., Dean Brelis, formerly CBS and *Life*.

---

### Too Late for Review

Germany and Freedom  
A Personal Appraisal  
by James Bryant Conant  
Harvard Press. 116 pp. \$3.

The 1958 Godkin Lectures at Harvard by the recent American ambassador to Germany.



## George Kennan's Views

By Dean Brelis

**RUSSIA, THE ATOM AND THE WEST.** By George F. Kennan. Harper and Brothers. 116 pp. \$2.50.

Reading George F. Kennan is to be in the presence of a highly developed mind. He writes with logic, ethic, and spiritual clarity to be found only in those who represent the vanguard of any age's most noble political philosophers.

When these lectures were first given over BBC, they claimed the attention of newspapermen the world over. As always happens, a good part of what Mr. Kennan said was lost, due to inept editing, unconscious dismemberment of logical sequence of thought to fix reader attention on eye-catching headlines. Thus some of the news accounts made Kennan sound hollow, if not brutal, a man isolated from reality. Nothing could be further from the truth, and Harper's is to be congratulated for here publishing the full lectures, plus one additional essay on Anglo-American relations which was not heard over BBC.

In these essays, Mr. Kennan has assigned himself the difficult task of raising not only the most pertinent questions of our day, but also to attempt answers. It should be made clear that his answers are filled with some of the most meaningful and profound thinking to be found in the Western World today. Whatever one thinks of Mr. Kennan's answers, and some might be tempted to describe them as blasphemous, they point towards one end: the hopes of man to live in peace.

The pipe-dreamers to the contrary, Mr. Kennan describes the all-important progress of the Soviet Union's economy in the twelve years since the end of the Second World War, a progress of which the Sputniks are but one testimony. Clearly, the Soviet Union has emerged from the growing pains and adolescence of industrialization, and should be accorded full-grown status. Though the Soviet economy has achieved maturity by Western standards, Mr. Kennan suggests that it will be no easier for the Soviets to solve the problems of a modern economy than it is for us. While the course of Soviet economic

life can be estimated and its problems predicted, the same cannot be said of political life within the Soviet Union. There are various kinds of people aspiring for power in the Soviet Union, and they are not all Party members. The post-revolution generations have indicated restlessness, questioning, and curiosity. And this suggests the very real possibility that a struggle may be prompted within the Soviet Union between those who follow the Party blindly, and those who are not so close to it. Thus, Mr. Kennan reflects that the real competition is not between the economies of the Soviet Union and those of the West but rather, something more subtle—human beings in Russia, and in the West, taking moral and decisive steps towards strengthening those values of their culture which are worth keeping, and developing new values which they now lack, and need.

Mr. Kennan considers some of the "external attitudes" of the Soviet leaders; when confronted by a representative of the West, they react with hostility, suspicion. In the record of our relationship with the Soviet Union, we have made mistakes in strengthening the hostility. In the face of this Soviet hostility, we have fallen into an attitude of all-absorbing over-militarization. This, suggests Mr. Kennan, is much too simple a response on our part.

Mr. Kennan writes that this over-militarization on our part is not surprising. It has not helped that the Russians make no attempt to speak with accuracy. Indeed, their diplomats, journalists, Party members are trained to lie. Overnight, there is no expectation, no reason to believe that the Soviet leaders will be "capable of seeing world realities as we do." Hence, why function diplomatically as we are now doing? Why hold up the summit meetings as the shining way to peace? Out of deep conviction and careful analysis, Mr. Kennan suggests that we look again and think in terms of a radically different foreign policy. He suggests that we be prepared, however slowly, to bear the burden of breaking down the tensions between the Soviet Union and the

West by discussion and action "into a number of specific problems." He does not think that NATO or the United Nations by themselves will be able to undergo the slow, laboring kind of diplomacy which would break down the problems which confront the Soviet Union and the West. As an illustration of what he implies, Mr. Kennan suggests that disarmament talks will get us nowhere until first the sources of tension are under discussion between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

One of the key sources of tension is, of course, Germany.

"The German question," writes Mr. Kennan, "still stands at the center of world tensions; . . . no greater contribution can be made to world peace than the removal of the present deadlock over Germany, and that in fact, if it is not removed the chances for peace are very slender indeed."

Then soberly, earnestly, he proposes his now famous disengagement policy, a mutual withdrawal of troops from Central Europe. The thoughtful citizen is advised to read Mr. Kennan's presentation as he wrote it. Its central idea is this—some kind of price must be paid for untangling the present impasse in Europe; some policy, other than a purely military one, must be instrumented in order to lessen tension. Never, says Mr. Kennan, has humanity been so dwarfed by the vision of a force so deathly in its implications. With militarism the predominant theme in our policy, is it not reasonable that the actual danger of nuclear war is greatly increased?

To give the Western European nations atomic weapons is to lower their usefulness in the future. To give them atomic weapons is to heighten the tension between them and the already hostile USSR. Does this kind of situation produce any verdict but one—war?

Mr. Kennan is not suggesting that we do away with NATO; but we cannot go on emphasizing NATO as an instrument of policy and with it a military cast of mind, and not attempt to develop other useful and fruitful lines of foreign policy. This present conviction, wholly in favor of NATO, without any other line of policy, is almost to say that there is only one solution, and that is war. Already suspicious, the Soviet Union responds to a

military diplomacy with its own version of the same.

The refrain of these lectures is not to tell us that we are far ahead of the Russians, nor to warn us that the Soviets are so far ahead of us, but rather to impress upon our thinking that an armament policy means to seek the suffering and the

suicide of a nuclear war. Nor does it follow that Mr. Kennan advises us to wallow in a second-rate do-goodism. What he does say, frankly and honestly: we must explore, with courage and vision, new ways towards avoiding war. He does not think war is inevitable. His point is just that. War is inevitable when your beliefs

and your values are based upon its inevitability.

These essays, written with clarity and responsibility, filled this reader with awe and respect, and a renewed faith in the intellect wrestling with the problems of his world, not willing to concede that the death of mankind is imminent.

## Review

# Toward Strength and Unity at the Center

By David Lawson

POWER AND DIPLOMACY. By Dean Acheson. Harvard University Press. 137 pp. \$3.

A visitor to the United States in these anxious times would be dull indeed if he failed to note how widely shared and intense is Americans' interest in their nation's role and place in the world power struggle. This awareness of new responsibilities is tinged, inevitably, with self-doubts and questionings.

Perhaps it is a measure of these things that two books of a type which once might have found places only on a few Washington and university library bookshelves have lately rubbed jackets with Baruch and *Where Did You Go? Out on the nation's best-seller lists*. Nor can it be more coincidence that both call into serious question established and seemingly immutable attitudes of the present Administration.

Dr. Kissinger's provocative *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* maps new directions in strategic thinking for our age. The former Secretary of State's short but incisive contribution made a briefer appearance among the transient literary stars, but that it should have done so at all will be regarded by many with satisfaction.

*Power and Diplomacy* consists, in essence, of the four William L. Clayton lectures which Mr. Acheson delivered last October at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. In it he paints the world picture with bold and sweeping strokes. His thinking is comprehensive, his language crystal-clear and his fondness for controversy inconcealable.

In his attitude to power relations, Mr.

Acheson never loses sight of the fact that the current world struggle is essentially a struggle for survival, and that what is at stake is nothing more nor less than that. It is odd to reflect how all too easily so basic a consideration can be submerged in the evasions of the diplomat and the theorizings of the pundit.

Properly, Mr. Acheson makes this the insistent counterpoint to his major theme, which is the need to create, through a policy of maintaining strength and unity at the center, a workable and secure non-communist world system in a stable international power relationship.

Foreign policy must change with the changes in the world around us, he says, noting the most significant of these changes—the decline or disappearance of Western and Japanese empires and the emergence of the pre-eminent power of the United States and the Soviet Union, the advent of nuclear weapons and the Afro-Asian revolution against alien control. Confronted with such upheavals in human affairs, the United States must “accept the leadership and the laboring oar . . . in creating a workable system of free states, with the military forces necessary to protect them, with the arrangements necessary for their economic development, and with sufficient community of ideas and purposes for their political cohesion.”

Mr. Acheson has no use for talks “at the summit” at present, feels that the only disarmament agreements possible now would be disadvantageous to the West and is contemptuous of any talk of disengagement in Central Europe. He scorns Washington's repeated insistence on “deeds, not words” as a test of Soviet sincerity, for he asserts that the Russians

have provided ample of both to leave no doubt about their intentions.

Thus, Mr. Khrushchev in 1955:

“Our smile is real and not artificial. But if anyone believes that our smile means we have given up the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin they are badly mistaken. . . . We are supporters of peaceful co-existence, but also of education for communism. . . . We do not need a war to ensure the victory of socialism. Peaceful competition itself is enough.”

When the object of such competition is so clearly the triumph of the communist system, “sincerity” is a silly and, indeed, a dangerous word. The only course open to the American people, Mr. Acheson argues, is for them “to use their vast productive power, along with their own hard work, to maintain their pre-eminence and to fashion a system by which they and all who have the will to do so can emerge strong and free from the period of competitive coexistence.”

But, as St. Paul wondered, “If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?”

Mr. Acheson does not disappoint those who look to him for some strong words about the leadership in Washington. Importantly, however, he does not exempt leaders in business and labor from the responsibility to inform the people of the nature of their task.

He is at his best when he speaks of the broad and challenging issues. His call for leadership, strength and political cohesion can be ignored only at the peril of all of us. The following passage is typical, and the more telling because it names no name:

On one thing only I feel a measure of assurance—on the rightness of contempt for sanctimonious self-righteousness which, joined with a sly worldliness, beclouds the dangers and opportunities of our time with an unctuous film. For this is the ultimate sin. By representing that all is done which needs to be done, it de-

nies to us the knowledge that we are called upon for great action. . . ."

There is much wisdom, too, in what he says on such specifics as India ("If Mr. Nehru did not exist, our greatest hope for Asia would lie in inventing him") and the role of conventional military power ("History and the dictates of common sense deny this dichotomy of destruction or appeasement").

It seems to this reviewer, however, that in trying to fashion out of the Suez crisis a club with which to beat the Administration, Mr. Acheson is long on politics and short on realities. Indeed, in his references to the "military seizure of the Suez Canal, probably supplied and encouraged by the Soviet Union" and his implied approval of the motives, but not the method, of the Anglo-French escapade, he strikes a discordantly Blimpish note. It is surely erroneous and unfair to attach the major share of blame for this disgraceful affair to Mr. Dulles.

Mr. Acheson has lately made plain his scorn for the suggestion for mutual withdrawals of troops from Europe, such as Mr. George F. Kennan made in his Reith Lectures for the B.B.C. The present work was prepared before those controversial broadcasts, but Mr. Kennan's views had long been familiar to the former Secretary of State. In this book he goes to some length to dispel the "illusion of German neutrality" and insists on the closest possible military and political alliances between the United States and Europe's free nations.

To reject the feasibility of ending the present division of Europe and to endorse Mr. Acheson's view, it is necessary to accept two of his basic premises. These are that "without the association with the United States, the European powers cannot prevent the leaders of the Soviet Union from having their way in Western Europe;" and that "without American association with Western Europe, independent national life in Eastern Europe cannot revive."

It might equally be argued, however, that a) present safeguards against Soviet Westward aggression could be relaxed without loss of efficacy; and b) that no revival of national independence in Eastern Europe may, in fact, be possible as long as the United States and its NATO

allies strike seemingly warlike poses from across the Elbe.

It is impossible to quarrel with the principles on which Mr. Acheson would base a European policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, principles which are not substantially different from those on which Mr. Dulles is stuck fast. One supports them much as one opposes sin and infla-

tion. It is for the means of giving life to those principles that there is a great yearning throughout the Western World.

Mr. Acheson would have pleased his admirers, and attracted many more, had he concerned himself with the possibilities of taking the Cold War initiative away from the Russians, of forcing them to say "No" for a change.

## The Road Not Taken (in Old Russia)

By Dean Brelis

RUSSIAN LIBERALISM, By George Fischer, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 240 pp. \$4.50

The author of this scholarly book explores legal liberalism in Tsarist Russia of the nineteenth century. It was a movement, an expression of the profound grievances which foretold the future. Mr. Fischer has documented his case admirably. His work is built upon a solid foundation of organized research and carefully weighed fact. His starting point is the period after the Great Reforms of Alexander II. As a part of these Reforms, Russia received its first real experience with a limited form of self-government, the so-called zemstvo. In effect, this was a territorial assembly.

Monopolized by the land-owning gentry, the zemstvo was nevertheless an arena for the high level opinions of thoughtful gentry. Their main concern was education, welfare, and administration of their area and this they did with a moral integrity bent to develop and guarantee civil liberties, of which the peasant enjoyed none. This was a clean direction toward the constitution which Russia so desperately needed. Mr. Fischer states the case for the zemstvo with concise clarity. He outlines the failure of the Tsar and his advisers to develop the zemstvo. By 1890, the zemstvo had been made impotent, its slight powers usurped by the Ministry of the Interior and government-appointed administrators. Mr. Fischer points out that though they were moderate in their demands, too often willing to compromise, afraid to rock the Tsar's boat, the gentry still were motivated by a genuine concern with the unhappy lot of the Russian peasantry. They were loyal

to the Tsar but they also recognized the need of a constitution in Russia. They wanted support from above, and support from below. And this was a part of their failure. The peasant was not too cooperative. He, too, was loyal to the Tsar and projected all his hate and distrust against the bureaucrats who, he believed, separated the Tsar from his people.

Mr. Fischer describes what he calls the emergence of middle class liberalism in the 1860s. This was a major shift in the Russian internal political scene. Now, the aristocrat with a conscience took a back seat to this new spokesman for Russia's future. This new spokesman was what we today call the egghead, what the Russians termed the intelligentsia. They were the university educated, teachers, scientists, civil servants, journalists, all greatly disturbed by the lack of basic freedoms in Russia. By 1897, there were about a half million of these eggheads in Russia. Their desire for action was symbolized by the students' riots (not unlike present day student disturbances in the Middle East, Poland, and Hungary). But again the Tsar and his government ignored these demonstrations, ruthlessly put them down. In 1894 when the Tver zemstvo paid its allegiance to the Tsar, then requested that the representatives of the people (the zemstvo) be heard by the Tsar, the Tsar unwisely called this request a "senseless dream," and reiterated a firm and uncompromising belief in the principle of autocracy. This constant rejection was finally to force the liberal elements to a more left position, and so isolate them that the inevitable result would be secret conspiracies, to result finally in the disaster of the early twentieth century which brought down autocracy in Rus-



sia and replaced it with a totalitarian dictatorship.

The point that Mr. Fischer makes with supreme irony is that there were many voices in Russia, pleading for a legal kind of democracy which they too often could not articulate. What they wanted was a responsible and legal voice in government. Had they been given this responsibility, Russia and the world would have benefited.

## Review

### Democracy and News

PERIL AND PROMISE: AN INQUIRY INTO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, By Gerald W. Johnson. New York: Harper & Brothers. 110 pp. \$2.75

By Robert C. Bergenheim

The temptation to write a rebuttal rather than a review of Gerald W. Johnson's *Peril and Promise: An Inquiry Into Freedom of the Press* is strong. This proves the success of his book, however. He wants controversy. He enjoys an argument because in this way good ideas become stronger.

Such a rebuttal undoubtedly would begin, "Yes, you're right, Mr. Johnson, BUT . . ."

Mr. Johnson appears as a most cynical optimist. He could have named his book "The Frailties of Human Nature," since it deals with the weaknesses of 25 per cent of all Americans, some of whom are newspapermen. Mr. Johnson estimates that these people are the "loud minority" which cause the book burnings and library purges and are disposed to bracket natural scientists only slightly above pickpockets.

Mostly, he says, they act out of fear and a guilty conscience. Mr. Johnson gains much of his optimism through a formula of balances. When he finds one evil getting out of hand, he discovers another to wipe it out.

For example, he says that the trouble with all but the best newspapermen is that they have two weaknesses—servility and selfishness. Individually, these weaknesses are poison. Combined, they neutralize each

Robert Bergenheim is city editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1954.

other like salt and allow the pleantries of public opinion to keep the reporter on the right track as a champion of liberty and freedom of the press.

As a reporter of 30 years' experience and author of 19 works of nonfiction plus two novels, Mr. Johnson's warnings should not be taken lightly.

The Constitution, he says, guarantees freedom of the press only as long as the people demand it. Unless there is a change of attitude in the United States, he sees possible governmental control within ten years.

He calls upon publishers—especially in the communities where they have a news monopoly—to be objective in their reporting and editorializing. Eighty-one per cent of the communities in the United States are covered by monopoly newspapers.

On the question of influence by the press, Mr. Johnson seems troubled. At one point he shows that newspapers have no more influence on the voting public than "any other industrialist." At other times he refers to the power of the press as one of the great molders of public opinion.

On this subject of influence on public opinion, he refers to Adlai Stevenson so often that one wonders if Mr. Stevenson didn't win the last presidential election. References to President Eisenhower place him in the role of hero, not thinker.

Except for emphasis on the press in the title of the book, Mr. Johnson could have dropped his last chapter on "Personnel" and used the space to expand on his provocative chapters on the perils threatening democracy in general. The final chapter makes it appear that the movies have been right all along about the typical newspaperman.

Mr. Johnson paints him as a frustrated semicycnic who can't stand routine. He deserts his wife to cover a fire and if he is told "no comment" he fakes the story to please his money-grabbing publisher.

Still, Mr. Johnson says the public gets the kind of newspapers it deserves. The saving grace is that if papers get too bad, they cut their own throats, Mr. Johnson says. When the American public shakes itself free from its shackles of fear and servility, however, Mr. Johnson forecasts

that the press will be the most effective instrument "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

*Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 13.*

## Letters

### From Walter Millis

To the Editor:

I was gratified by Phil Kerby's review of my pamphlet, "Individual Freedom and the Common Defense," in your January issue, not only because of the good things he said about it but because he took the trouble to express a disagreement.

He found it "contradictory" in that, while indicting the excesses of our drive for security, it accepted "one of the major assumptions that inevitably produced" these excesses. And he cited my statement that those committed, like the Communists, to the destruction of the Constitutional guarantees "need not, as a matter of principle, be granted all the immunities enjoyed by free men."

I recognize the force of Mr. Kerby's position, and must perhaps plead guilty to at least an apparent contradiction, since this was my attempt to deal with a contradiction inherent in the problem. When, in a constitutional, free government, may the Constitution be violated in order to ensure its survival? Mr. Kerby's answer is apparently the heroic one: Never: *Fiat justitia, ruat caelum*. By recognizing in principle that dangers may become so great as to warrant departure from the constitutional letter, one frees one's self to argue (as my pamphlet goes on to do) that the specific dangers apprehended are ridiculous and that there is no necessity for the violence being done to the Constitution. Mr. Kerby's position, on the other hand, is open to attack so easily made against any absolutist stand. Since he would still strip us of our "security" measures even though the heavens should fall, his demand that present security measures be laid aside is unlikely to carry much popular conviction.

This is not to say his position is wrong, or that my attempt to resolve the dilemma is valid. It is to point out that there is a basic issue here, of exactly the kind which the Fund for the Republic is seeking to discover and expose to rational debate.

WALTER MILLIS

New York City



## From Phil Kerby

Should the heavens—or the hydrogen bomb—fall, freedom v. security will no longer concern anyone. What we should do in that hypothetical, but not unimaginable, situation is irrelevant. Our only real hope of lasting safety or freedom lies in the prevention of war, in a healthy, democratic society led toward that goal, not in a wacky security system obsessed with the repression of dissident political ideas.

PHIL KERBY

---

## Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* editorial page, received the second annual Florina Lasker award March 1. The award was established last year to recognize courage and integrity in defense of civil liberties.

1941

Millard C. Browne, chief editorial writer of the Buffalo *Evening News*, has been on a six-week world trip meeting leaders of many countries.

The Feb. 8 issue of *Editor & Publisher* presented the editorial philosophy of William J. Miller, chief editorial writer of the New York *Herald Tribune*.

1942

Don Burke, covering the Middle East out of Athens for *Life*, reports seeing Charlotte and George Weller at the Afro-Asia Conference in Cairo. "I have been travelling steadily since last Summer—Turkey several times, Lebanon, Jordan and Egypt on a milk run basis, and a side trip to Tanganyika and Kenya. Helen and I had our second child, Patrick David Malinowski Burke, born Jan. 20."

1943

William A. Townes is now managing editor of the Baltimore *News-Post*, a move from the Miami *Herald*. "A greater challenge and a harder job" he writes. He is in charge of both news and editorial pages. Address: 418 Dumbarton Road, Towson 4, Md.

## Nieman Notes

1946

*Time*, Inc. has named Robert Manning chief of its London bureau. Manning has served as chief of the Bonn bureau and in recent years has been a senior editor of *Time*.

*Time* has announced the opening of two new bureaus, one for Eastern Europe and the other for North Africa.

The North Africa bureau will be headed by Stanley Karnow when he completes his present Nieman Fellowship studies in Cambridge. His headquarters will probably be at Rabat. Until this year he had served in the Paris bureau.

1947

Fletcher Martin reports on an address to the Mound City Press Club in St. Louis on his last Summer's tour of the Middle East for the Chicago *Sun-Times*.

1948

The *New Yorker* in March ran a two-article profile of Alfred B. Nobel by Robert M. Shaplen.

1949

Grady Clay, real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, has been named associate editor of the American Society of Landscape Architects. "Of course I am not leaving the *Courier-Journal*," Clay writes.

Tillman Durdin of the New York *Times* has been covering Indonesia's troubles, keeping an eye on China through Hongkong and making such side trips as to the SEATO Conference in Manila.

1950

Pressing the cause of freedom of information, Clark Mollenhoff of the Cowles publications represented Sigma Delta Chi in an appearance before the House Committee on Information, headed by Cong. Moss. On March 21 Clark, along with Moss, discussed this issue at symposium at Mt. Holyoke College.

1953

Watson S. Sims is now chief of the Associated Press bureau in New Delhi, a move from the London bureau.

Henry Tanner joined the foreign staff of the New York *Times* in February. For several years he had done a foreign news analysis for the Houston *Post* and in the past year had toured the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

1954

Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Farrell announce a daughter, Katrina Luba, in Paris, last Dec. 23, Robert Farrell is in the Paris bureau of McGraw-Hill publications. He was on the United States team in the 4th international skiing competition for journalists in West Germany in February.

William Woestendiek has been named editorial director of *Newsday*. He has been three years on *Newsday*, as editor of its weekly review section and as editorial writer. Earlier he was Sunday editor of the Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel*.

1955

Henry Shapiro, chief correspondent of the United Press in Moscow, was in Cambridge on vacation at the end of February and provided one of the most interesting Nieman seminars of the winter before going on to Arizona for some March sunshine. Henry's daughter, Irena, is a senior at Buckingham School in Cambridge.

Another seminar of high interest was with James Bryant Conant, former ambassador to Germany, while he was at Harvard to deliver the Godkin Lectures.

1956

*Inflation and Recession*, a Doubleday Headline Publication (Doubleday & Co., Inc., \$1.50), is edited by Richard E. Mooney, with Edwin L. Dale, both of the Washington bureau of the New York *Times*.

The *Oregon Journal* has made Donald J. Sterling assistant city editor.

## Notes (cont'd)

1956

Tragedy struck the family of **Desmond Stone** in Invercargill, New Zealand, one day in February. Their little girl, Carolyn, was killed by a truck while riding her bicycle near their house. Carolyn had a little brother, Howard. Des Stone is literary editor of the *Southland Times*.

*Nieman Reports* readers will remember several charming articles by Des Stone about life at Harvard, and his solid piece on the Press of New Zealand (July '56), and a condensation of a series he did for his own paper on his impressions of the American scene (Jan. '57).

1957

Anne and **Robert Campbell** have a daughter, born January 24 in Winston-Salem, where Bob continues editorial writing on the *Journal* and *Sentinel*.

**Morris Heads Southern Assn.**

The Southern Association of Nieman Fellows elected **Hugh Morris**, State legislative correspondent of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, their president, at their meeting in New Orleans, Feb. 7-9. He succeeds **Sylvan Meyer**, editor of the *Gainesville (Ga.) Times*. Elected vice president was **Paul L. Evans**, public information director of the TVA; and secretary-treasurer, **Clark Porteous** of the *Memphis Press-Scimitar*.

The association held a two-day seminar on problems which a dozen Southern newspapermen had gone abroad to study on grants awarded by the association. These ranged from the Japanese textile industry to Scandinavian cooperatives.

**Decisions**

Of eight articles announced by the *Chicago Daily News*, on "Eight Great Decisions of 1958," five are by former Nieman Fellows. They are:

**Ernest Hill**, '43—"Can We Deal with Russia?"

**George Weller**, '48—"Middle East—U. S. Responsibility?"

**Edwin A. Lahey**, '39—"What U. S. Economical Policy for Survival?"

**Peter Lisagor**, '49—"Awakening Africa—Promise or Threat?"

**Keyes Beech**, '53—"Should U. S. Trade with Red China?"

***Nieman Scrapbook*****Research In Russia**By **Howard Simons**

A VERY QUIET debate was being carried on between an American newspaper editor and the score of Western scientists who have visited the Soviet Union. The editor said that he was puzzled. Western scientists, he explained, were returning from Russia and warmly, if not wildly, applauding the scientific research being carried on behind the Iron Curtain.

He said that he had always understood that scientific research was dependent on a free climate, an environment in which the scientist was unrestricted in his research and way of life. If Russia was a police state, heavy with fetters and generating a poor climate, why was their research advancing along far enough to bring rave notices in the West?

I had the opportunity of putting this question to Dr. D. Yu Panov, director of the All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information of the Soviet Academy of Science, when I was in Moscow. After my careful and somewhat lengthy explanation, Dr. Panov smiled knowingly, and said, "Wherever there is good research, there is good climate."

To be sure, where the scientist in Russia is concerned today, there is both "good research" and "good climate."

Much has been written of Russian science and technology of late. For the most part it has been written by Western scientists who have visited the Soviet Union by invitation. But, some general summing up is needed.

There are some vital questions that both Western scientists and Western governments have to face. Perhaps the most crucial of these is the fact that the rapid progress of Red science, both in basic and applied research, presents the West with a spine-chilling Cold War icicle whose drip could be deadly.

What is so frightening about Russian advances, and an aspect that has received little vocal attention, is that the West has no means for effectively "containing" Russia's scientific progress.

The West cannot threaten Soviet science

with policies of "massive retaliation." What can the West do?

Can the West embargo the Red educational program?

Can the West send geniuses circling the globe in a show of strength?

Can the West beam anti-science over the airwaves?

Can the West build bigger and better human minds any faster than the Russians?

Can the West pick a parallel in scientific progress and warn the Russians that by crossing it, we will act?

This, I think, is a problem that presents the West with a far greater potential danger than economic, political, military or philosophical warfare.

The present Russian political leadership has either been convinced (most probably by this country's excellent example) or has done the convincing that scientific and technological leadership is the trump card in the game of world domination. To insure this conviction, they have gone almost the limit permitted in a totalitarian state—they have created scientists in their own image. They have granted their scientists unbelievable rights and privileges. A new class has emerged, equal in social and economic riches to the once sacrosanct military and political classes. The president of the Soviet Academy of Science, for example, is the highest paid scientist in the world.

The relative avalanche of recent information on Russian science should not, however, be misinterpreted to mean that prior to a few years ago Russian scientific work was all but dormant.

What has happened is that the Russians themselves have made available more information about their own work since the death of Stalin than at any time since the 1930's. Russian science news hit the streets here only a few years ago. Western scientists were invited to Russia and then Russian scientists were invited to the West.

Alexander Topchiev, secretary of the Soviet Academy of Science, describes the "revival" of interchange in this way, "Unfortunately, during the period after the war, mutual prejudice and lack of confidence hampered traditional scientific contact. Even during this period we hoped that contact would be re-established and extended." Unfortunately, Academician Topchiev's pat explanation for the lack of communication between Russian and Western scientists slides too easily over thin ice.

He neglects, for example, to point out that under Stalin the Russian scientist was compelled to be a do-it-yourself researcher.

There is strong evidence to indicate that Russia is now moving from this do-it-yourself direction to a learn-it-from-the-West attitude. I think it was best expressed by Prof. Olga Akhmanova of the University of Moscow, who was an exchange don at Oxford University.

She summed up her British experience with the new line, "I came to England 'to notice' the good things, to see how I can profit by what people there have achieved and what they may be proud of. The main task at present is to find ways and means for personal peaceful collaboration and for this it is of paramount importance that people should not only be clever and enterprising, but also pleasant and easy to get along with."

Here I think Western scientists who have had contact with Russian scientists will agree that their Communist counterparts have been "clever and enterprising," as well as "pleasant and easy to get along with."

There is still another important factor in the warming up of relationships in the scientific fields. Russian science was hurting from a lack of direct contact with Western scientists. To be sure, the Russian scientists have been kept very well informed about Western scientific research all along.

It is not surprising, for example, for a Russian researcher to know all the research work his Western counterpart has been doing, although the Russian has never met nor communicated with the Western scientist. This is easily accomplished in the Soviet Union today, where scientific information is centralized and

where Dr. Panov is in charge of an army that literally translates all the world's scientific information for use by Russian scientists. But even for the Russians there is no substitute for personal contact between thinking men.

As pointed out earlier, there have been some glowing reports made by Western scientists on returning from Russia. Some have been over-enthusiastic and others mollifying, but there is a unanimity in the fact that Western observers have been impressed. Perhaps this is because Western scientists were kept in the dark too long by the Russians. Or perhaps too, the Russians have only shown and reported those aspects of their research that would impress their Western colleagues.

There are still many areas of Russian science under Red wraps.

The Russians are currently safeguarding information about their work on electronic computers with the vigilance of a Manhattan Project security chief. Why? Possibly, the Russians are farther along than we are, but more plausibly, they might be behind our efforts and will make their work known for the world to oh! and ah! over when it is on a par with our work or better. This has its distinct propaganda value. The more the Russians show off their best to the West and receive favorable comment in return, the more we can expect "fringe" nations, and especially the so-called underdeveloped countries, to be impressed.

What I have been saying is not intended to show the overwhelming brilliance of Russian scientists, or even to say that the Russians excel in all fields. They do not. It is generally agreed that where Soviet scientific research is good, it is very good. But there are areas where it can be graded as only passing or downright poor.

Either/or, this does not negate the nervous feeling on the part of some observers here that Russia is pushing and will continue to push its scientific research all across the scientific board.

To do so, the Russians employ a number of techniques that the West has employed only miserly. One technique is crash programming and another is the mass attack. Of course, it is much easier for a totalitarian state to employ these methods than a democracy where debate,

hearings and interests all have their say.

The crash program in Russia today is by no means restricted to applied research. It has its field day in theoretical research as well, and has paid off handsomely. It has paid off in the launching of an earth satellite. It has paid off in the announcements about Red breakthroughs in thermonuclear research made by Dr. I. V. Kurchatov at Harwell, England. It has paid off, too, in applied research with the development of the world's best jet passenger plane currently flying a regular schedule, the TU-104, and in a revolutionary oil drill Western industrial men are bargaining for with the Russians.

One observer here has described these achievements as "anachronisms," and this might be true.

In aircraft, for example, one has a choice when flying from Prague to Moscow of taking the TU-104 jet or a two-engine propeller-driven plane that looks and rides as if it is going to fall apart at any moment. The Reds had nothing in between, and this was uneconomical.

Hand in hand with crash programming is the technique of the mass attack. Surprisingly, the Russian scientist's use of mass attack on a problem is no different from that employed by the Red military in World War II or the Korean conflict.

It seems to work this way. The Academicians convince the political leadership that the Russians need the world's largest synchrocyclotron—as they have done. The O.K., or "da," is given and a target date set. The buttons are pushed and all the men, material and money necessary to get the job finished on time are provided from a cup that seems always full, at least for the present. There is little haggling.

Where this scientific path will lead the Russians, the West or the world, I cannot say.

I think it is safe to predict that there will not be a slackening of the Russian scientific effort in the foreseeable future. Any change in this situation would have to come from within Russia itself and take the form of a general chaotic upheaval.

—Science News Letter, November 2, 1957

Howard Simons is managing editor of *Science Service*. This is one of his News Letters.

# Why Proportional Representation Is Declining

By Myron M. Johnson

Six of our cities had PR; came a referendum, and then there were five. After more than three decades of experience with proportional representation, Cincinnati dropped it last year. That left five communities in the United States remaining in the PR column: Hamilton, Ohio; Hopkins, Minnesota; Oak Ridge, Tennessee; and Cambridge and Worcester in Massachusetts. Worcester—third city in size in New England, with a population of over 200,000—is the largest city in the United States now under PR.

More than 20 American communities have used PR at one time or another in the past 40 years. Why has PR failed to catch on? Why is it languishing?

One reason is that PR is complex. It is not so complex as its foes charge, but it is not so simple as some of its friends claim.

PR says that a group of voters of a certain size has the right to be represented on a council or committee or board. Therefore, it sets a quota, which is the smallest number of votes which a candidate can receive and still be elected. This quota is thus also the smallest number of voters who can be sure of electing their own representative.

The quotas are filled by preferential voting. The voter marks 1, 2, 3, and so on beside the names of his first choice, second choice, third choice, and so on. If a candidate receives more votes than the quota, his surplus votes are distributed among other candidates according to the choices listed on the ballots.

Each voter has one vote—a single, transferable vote. Although the voter can mark as many preferential choices as there are candidates running, in the end his vote counts for one candidate, and only one. The voter's ballot may land in the pile or tray or bin of the candidate of his first choice, or in that of the candidate of his second choice, or far down the line. But a ballot cannot, by itself, serve more than one candidate; it cannot come to rest in more than one bin, for the simple and obvious reason that a body cannot occupy two spaces at one and the same time.

Some of the overenthusiastic friends of PR have implied that the voter has as many actual votes as there are candidates; that if a voter is lucky, he may elect all his choices. That is an error. For if a voter's choices are all successful, it merely means that he guessed the outcome correctly, or

that many other voters had the same list of preferences as his. When a ballot reaches its final destination, it counts one for the candidate receiving it. A first-choice ballot is no better than the second-choice; the 23rd-choice is as strong as the third, in the final receptacle.

The system may seem clearer if we assume that each voter, after marking his ballot, keeps it in his hand and delivers it himself. He will go to the bin of the candidate of his first choice. If that candidate already has a pile of ballots enough to win, the voter will take his ballot to the bin of his second-choice candidate. If that candidate is already elected, or if he has so few votes he has been counted out, the voter will continue the search, until he finds an unelected candidate still in the running.

In effect, this preferential voting means that the voters within a group have agreed on a candidate; it is much like a series of primaries and run-offs. But it is all done indirectly, on one ballot and in one process.

Assume the following: Twelve voters are to elect a board of three. Eight of these voters are Democrats and four are Republicans. The Democratic slate: Truman, Stevenson, Acheson. The Republican slate: Eisenhower, Saltonstall, Knowland.

Under ordinary or plurality voting, the board would be Truman, Stevenson, Acheson. Under PR, however, the ballots, reading vertically, would be something like this:

Truman	.....1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4
Stevenson	.....2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	5	5	5	5
Acheson	.....3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	6	6
Eisenhower	.....4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	2
Saltonstall	.....5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	1
Knowland	.....6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	3

In the words of the Worcester city charter, the quota "shall be determined by dividing the total number of valid ballots by one more than the total number of candidates to be elected, and adding one to the result, disregarding fractions." Thus in this case, divide 12 by four, and add one. The quota is four. A quota of three would permit four candidates to be elected—and there are only three seats to be filled. A quota of five for each of the three winning candidates would require 15 ballots—and there are only 21. So four is the magic number.

Truman his eight first-choice votes and is therefore elected, with four votes to spare. His surplus of four is distributed as follows: Stevenson is second choice on six of eight Truman-first ballots. So Stevenson is second choice on

---

Myron Johnson is on the editorial staff of the Worcester *Telegram* and has lived with PR.



three-fourths or 75 per cent of those Truman-first ballots. Consequently Stevenson should get three-fourths of 75 per cent of the Truman surplus of four. That gives Stevenson three votes. Acheson is second choice on two of the eight Truman-first ballots. So Acheson gets one-fourth or 25 per cent of the four Truman-first ballots. That gives Acheson one vote.

Another way of figuring the transfer: Since Truman has eight first-choice votes, he can spare four. Four is one-half of his total. So Truman can spare half of his total of eight. Stevenson is second choice on six of the eight Truman ballots, and Acheson is second choice on two. So Stevenson gets half of his six, or three votes. Acheson gets half of his two, or one vote.

After the transfer of the Truman surplus, the result will be:

Truman .....	4	Elected
Stevenson .....	3	
Acheson .....	1	
Eisenhower .....	3	
Saltonstall .....	1	
Knowland .....	0	

Acheson and Saltonstall are low men and must be counted out. On the lone ballot in Acheson's bin, Stevenson is marked third choice. Therefore, Acheson's ballot goes to Stevenson. On Saltonstall's lone ballot, Eisenhower is marked second choice. So this lone ballot is Saltonstall's Bin is transferred to Eisenhower. The final result:

Truman .....	4	Elected
Stevenson .....	4	Elected
Eisenhower .....	4	Elected

Thus two-thirds of the voters, being Democrats and voting as Democrats, elected two-thirds of the board. One-third of the voters, being Republicans, elected one-third of the board. So proportional representation is achieved.

That, in substance, is all there is to PR. It is not abstruse or devious. Nothing more than a knowledge of elementary arithmetic is required to understand it. It is not, however, as simple as a-b-c. One has to "stay with it" in order to grasp and retain its meaning and its operation. The counting is no mere routine job. The correct transfers of the ballots require expert supervision.

Friends of PR maintain that people drive automobiles and enjoy television and use other machines the nature of which they do not fully understand, and that they do not need to understand the details of PR in order to receive its benefits. That claim is true enough, but it is not quite relevant. There are signs that many voters shy away from PR because they instinctively dislike and distrust its complexity—that is, its complexity in comparison with the ordinary method of voting.

PR tends to reduce popular interest in elections. Worcester had its fifth PR election last November. The vote was larger than in the previous three PR elections, but it was several thousand smaller than in the first PR election in 1949. Under PR the voters votes for, rather than against, someone. There is no actual battle between two antagonists. In one Worcester election, two Irishmen were supposed to be slugging it out for the same seat. The fight was strictly unreal. Both men were elected. Last November two Jews were supposed to be killing each other off. Both were elected. PR eliminates most of the fireworks in campaigns. That is doubtless a good thing, but apparently it fails to impress the public. Americans, it seems, want a slam-bang element in their political contests.

Americans are conservative, politically. Although their nation was born of revolution, they have not been friendly to new political ideas, at home or abroad. They are fascinated by automobiles and television and airplanes and countless machines and gadgets, but they have little use for political gadgets—and PR is a political gadget.

Perhaps a more important factor in the decline of PR is the patronizing attitude which many of its supporters take toward politicians. The PR boosters—who in many cases are young men and young women of enthusiasm, zeal, and high principles—tend to be too scornful of the "old-line politician"; too ready to distrust the motives of the PR critics. In Worcester, the Citizens Plan E. Association seems to be a little too conscious of its own wisdom and integrity. Some of its members apparently fail to realize that the "old-time politician" may have some fairly high ideals of his own. The game of politics is tough. If a representative stands against the roar of the crowd, he is denounced for stubbornly ignoring the wishes of those who elected him. If he represses his own ideas and bows to the demands of his constituents, he is accused of being a mere weathercock.

Characteristic of many supporters of PR is their hostility toward party government. They are obsessed with the idea that there is a great, inherent virtue in nonpartisanship; that there is something discreditable in party activity and party loyalty. In this they are guilty of two inconsistencies. (1) They reject party government in local affairs, but accept it in state and national affairs. (2) In their own conduct, in their aggressive activities in campaigns and between campaigns, they more and more take on the characteristics of a regular political party.

Contrary to many of its supporters, one can believe in PR and in party government both. So why not use PR to improve party government in local affairs, not to abolish it? Let the PR nominations be made as usual, by mere petition of a specified number of voters. This does away with caucuses and primaries and conventions. PR, with its at-large

voting, also eliminates all unfairness and controversies and legal entanglements in the fixing of the boundaries of city wards—so far as city elections are concerned.

Let the candidates run as Democrats and Republicans, whenever they wish to do so. Let the regular city committees of the existing parties endorse slates, and campaign for those slates.

Then we could have party government, plus the benefits of PR—which guarantees rule by the majority while giving the minority a voice in the government in proportion to its numerical strength.

---

## Science Writers Seminar

A two-day science symposium for staff members of New England newspapers was held in Cambridge March 6-7. The symposium was presented jointly by scientists at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard, at the request of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors. It was sponsored by the Nieman Foundation and financed in part by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. Twenty-five newspapermen attended. A few were editorial writers, most were reporters and some of them were just starting on assignments to cover science and medicine.

The first day was on the physical science at MIT, the second day at Harvard on the biological and medical sciences. Two former Nieman Fellows, Volta Torrey of MIT news office, and William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard news office, arranged the programs.

The Program:

### Science Symposium

Thursday, March 6, Program at MIT

#### *The Physical Sciences*

#### *Mathematics*

9:30-11 a.m.—Prof. Philip Franklin and Associate Prof. Francis B. Hildebrand of MIT Department of Mathematics

11-12:30 —MIT Computation Center  
Prof. Philip M. Morse and staff of the Computation Center demonstrate work done with the IBM 704 computer

1 p.m. —Lunch—MIT Faculty Club  
“The Science Reporter’s Job”—Alton Blakeslee, AP, Science Editor

#### *Physics*

2:30-5 —Prof. Martin Deutsch, chairman of the directing committee of the Laboratory for Nuclear Science; and Associate Prof. David H. Frisch of the Department of Physics; and Dr. Francis Bitter, Assoc. Dean, School of Science

6:30 p.m. —Dinner

#### *Space Discussion*

Prof. Charles S. Draper of the Aeronautical Engineering Department, director of the Instrumentation Laboratory; and Prof. Thomas Gold, Astronomy Department, Harvard

Friday, March 7, Program at Harvard

#### *The Biological Sciences*

#### *Chemical Synthesis*

10-11:30 —R. B. Woodward, Morris Loeb Professor of Chemistry

#### *Viruses*

11:30-1 —Dr. Bernard D. Davis, Professor of Bacteriology and Immunology, Harvard Medical School

1 p.m. —Lunch

#### *Hormones*

2-3:30 —Dr. Roy O. Greep, Professor of Anatomy, Harvard Medical School, and Dean of Dental Medicine

#### *Basic Research and Medical Practice*

3:30-5 —Dr. John P. Merrill, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, and Senior Associate in Medicine, Peter Bent Brigham Hospital

6:30 —Dinner  
“Reporting Science”—Earl Ubell, New York *Herald Tribune*

#### *Science Education Discussion*

Fletcher G. Watson, Professor of Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education; and Alexander Korol, MIT Center for International Studies

## Press Freedom vs. Privacy

There is a lot of confusion, even among newspapermen, about the true meaning of secrecy in public affairs.

One of our biggest problems in the communications field is to secure information from government officials, especially federal people. The national bureaucracy has grown so large that most news has to be in the form of mimeographed hand-outs. Otherwise, the press could never make the rounds in the nation's capital.

But there are many occasions when reporters feel that the entire story has not been told in the hand-outs. When they try to dig for facts, they run into closed doors and locked files. Or they are given the ridiculous answer that "this material is classified"—which often means "this material, if published, would embarrass our office."

Last November we attended a convention that dealt with the problem, and we came up with a slogan, "Fight Secrecy; Inform the People."

That presents one side of the argument.

The other side is what leads to confusion. Many public officials, civic leaders, and policy-making journalists like the "off the record" conference. Most reporters look upon it as a red flag. They are trained to get the facts, and they want nothing to stand in their way.

Something more than bare facts are needed in many cases. Understanding is important, too. This comes when a writer can probe the mind and the reasons that lead up to decisions. Joseph C. Harsch and a dozen other highly-placed journalists in Washington hold periodic dinners for leading officers—one at a time. They get a world of information by which they can interpret the complex issues that lead to society's well-being, or even to war and peace. Walter Lippmann has these leaders to his home day after day for a meal and a conversation about the problems of our age. Coupled with extensive reading, he thus secures the background necessary for the articles he writes for newspapers.

This same thing is happening in Colorado. Men of affairs are meeting privately with editors to explain a problem or to debate it in the presence of two or three dozen persons. These are raw ideas, not

yet near the policy stage. Being "off the record," no official attempts any grandstanding in order to win votes. He is looking for honest solutions from people of different experience and with varying interests.

We have attended hundreds of such meetings, and we cannot recall one that had any other goal than the public's welfare.

At times, this sort of thing goes on in a school board meeting or the executive session of a city council or board of county commissioners. A delicate matter, perhaps involving an employe's morals or the purchase of land, is up for discussion. Nothing has been decided, but a discussion is called for. Such meetings need not be common, and when they do occur the officials should always make the final decision in open meeting.

Freedom of information is a treasured thing in America, but we also treasure

privacy for the individual. A man—even a public official—is entitled to a degree of privacy when he wants to test his ideas at a social gathering or relax after office hours.

There is nothing wrong with having "off the record" talks at invitational meetings, but it is silly to ask that nothing be reported if the meeting is public. Long ago, we hit upon a formula when someone began to tell us a story "off the record." Our answer has been this: "We shall keep the confidence until we hear the news from some other source."

Unluckily, there is no formula that can be applied to the thousands of situations confronting a public servant or a journalist. The best question for a man dealing with information is to ask himself, "What is in the public interest?" How honestly he answers that in his day-to-day living will determine how good an official or newspaperman he is.

*Arapahoe Herald* (Colo.) Feb. 26

## Quigg Imposes Lid On Freedom Talk

By Jack Gaskie

Boulder, Feb. 19—A secret discussion of freedom was conducted Wednesday night by a hand-picked group of Colorado University faculty members and guests.

The meeting, sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, was designed to pinpoint some of the weighty problems affecting freedom.

CU President Quigg Newton imposed the rule of secrecy, declaring the discussion off the record. This followed by moments a plea by an official of the Fund for as general a discussion as possible, and his denunciation of secrecy in Government.

Newton's rule came as a surprise even to the CU political science department, which was in charge of arrangements.

Official explanation for keeping proceedings off the record was to allow the CU faculty and guests to speak freely.

The Fund for the Republic is a creation of the Ford Foundation, which Newton served as vice-president before appointment to the CU presidency.

It has issued several publications on problems of freedom. Appearances of several of its officials at CU Tuesday and Wednesday signalled the start of an announced program of finding out what other citizens think those problems are.

Three meetings over two days were held before audiences totalling some 260 persons. They dealt with freedom as affected by the need for national defense. Three other series of CU meetings over the next three months are scheduled to deal with unions, corporations and churches.

While proceedings Wednesday were still unveiled in secrecy, Walter Millis, Fund expert on defense and freedom, touched on a number of points. Among them:

Secrecy in Government has hampered our scientific and military development, but apparently has not hampered the Soviet efforts.

Under J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI has moved from detecting criminal acts to detecting belief and opinion.

A "curious security system" that screens millions of Americans not only has reduced Communists to second class citizens, but has had a great impact on liberty.

Ideals derived from the text of the Constitution are stereotyped—the real meaning of the Constitution has been much modified by growth of modern institutions.

Newton's secrecy ruling went into effect before the CU faculty and guests could say what they thought of these notions, or give their own ideas on current problems of freedom.

—*Rocky Mountain News*, Feb 20.

### Wanted: Back Numbers

University of Wisconsin School of Journalism is missing the following issues of *Nieman Reports* from its library. It would much appreciate receiving any of these, will pay a reasonable price for them and keep them in bound volumes in its Bleyer Memorial Room, Journalism Hall, for the use of students:

#### Desired Numbers:

Vol I 1, 2, 3, 4

Vol II 1, 3, 4

Vol III 1, 3

Vol IV 4

### Nieman Lectures

To mark the 20th year of Nieman Fellowships at Harvard, the Nieman Foundation has presented two public lectures in journalism at Harvard. The first was given February 21 by Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*. The second was given March 20 by Mark Ethridge, publisher of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. The Ashmore lecture is published in this issue. The Ethridge lecture will be in the next issue.