

# NiemanReports

---

June 1963

**Vietnam: American Dilemma**

**Francois Sully**

**Red Editor: Adzhubei**

**William J. Eaton**

**Westward The Times**

**Kenneth E. Wilson**

**Story Behind Prestige Polls**

**Oren Stephens**

**Prune Journalism Schools**

**Norval Neil Luxon**

**Finding Reporters in N. Y. State**

**Kay Lockridge**

**Journalism Goes Scientific**

**John C. Merrill**

**Our Infirm Critics**

**Roland E. Wolseley**

***Harvard Faces—Cartoons by Gene Graham***

**Reviews—Letters—Nieman Notes**

# NiemanReports

VOL. XVI, NO. 2

JUNE, 1963

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council. Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Washington, D.C.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; John O. Emmerich, Jr., McComb, Miss.; Saul Friedman, Houston; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, University Park, Pa.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; William G. Lambert, Los Angeles; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Joseph Loftus, Washington, D. C.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Philadelphia; Charlotte F. Robling, Evanston, Ill.; Dwight E. Sargent, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, Berkeley, Calif.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, New York City; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

## Prune Journalism Schools

By Norval Neil Luxon

For five years I have been closing my letters to a few friends "Yours for F&BSOJ" which to the initiated means "Yours for Fewer and Better Schools of Journalism."

This campaign has been singularly unsuccessful.

In the five-year period the number of schools and departments of journalism listed in *Editor & Publisher International Year Book* has increased from 110 to 146. The number of schools and departments reporting enrollment data to the *Journalism Quarterly* each autumn has risen from 95 to 109, and the number of four-year institutions listing journalism teaching staff members in *American Universities and Colleges* has grown from 178 (Seventh Edition, 1956) to 204 (Eighth Edition, 1960).

Faced with these facts and compelled to read frequently of the establishment of a new department or school of journalism or communications, a less stubborn soul long since would have bowed to the inevitable and would have retreated to his study muttering imprecations against state newspaper associations which urge and college and university officials who blithely approve additions to a teaching area already suffering from the malnutrition of low enrollment. Being of a determined nature, I have not given up the fight.

In 1957, in my presidential address to the Association for Education in Journalism meeting at Boston University, I said: "If professional education for journalism . . . is to achieve the objectives I have set forth . . . , the number of schools and departments must be reduced drastically, a

reduction comparable to that accomplished by the medical profession with medical schools after the publication of the Flexner Report.

"Forty or fifty truly professional schools of journalism, located at institutions with outstanding libraries, with nationally recognized departments in the humanities and the social sciences, with rigid requirements for the first two years' work in the liberal arts, with adequate budgets for the journalism units, with staff members interested and actively engaged in research as well as in teaching and service, will serve the nation's newspapers and the other media of mass communication far better than 150 to 175 schools many of which are inadequately staffed and supported."

It must be recorded that the 163 teachers of journalism from 78 colleges and universities attending the convention greeted this suggestion with something less than enthusiasm. I concluded my remarks by requesting my colleagues to return to their campuses, re-examine their standards, study their curricula, check their admission and graduation requirements and then ask themselves two questions:

"Are the journalism standards on my campus as high as standards in other departments? And specifically are they as high as standards in other professional schools?"

If they found the answers to be "No," I suggested that they ". . . immediately set about raising the standards or take steps toward the termination of journalism instruction . . ." at their institutions.

In the five years I have seen little evidence that the marginal schools or departments have raised their standards and no evidence of voluntary termination of journalism instruction.

In one state—Florida—the Board of Control in 1958 decided to concentrate journalism and communications instruction in the state universities in one institution and to terminate effective June 30, 1959, journalism instruction in another, acting upon recommendations of a team of consultants composed of two journalism professors and one newspaper editor.

How many schools of journalism are needed in the United States?

Can the expenditure of public funds for journalism instruction be justified in 15 public-supported institutions in Texas, eight in California, five in Ohio in these days of a highly mobile college population?

Do the communications media today need 204 schools or departments? Do they need the "40 or 50" suggested in my 1957 speech? Are the 103 sequences in 47 schools and departments on the 1962 accredited list of the American Council on Education for Journalism needed? Would 20 or 30 truly professional schools better serve the needs of the media?

(Continued on page 19)

# Vietnam: New American Dilemma

By Francois Sully

"...The war is a grim one. It is a strange and elusive struggle, a shadowy war without battle lines. It is a war of sudden raids in the night, of parachute drops on scattered supply dumps, of interminable patrol actions, of ambush, terrorism, and sabotage.

"It is fought in dense jungle, in remote mountain passes, and in the great river deltas. There are now vast green seas of rice, shoulder-deep in monsoon rain. This kind of war favors an enemy whose tactics are hit and run, plunder, and retreat. To a considerable extent it neutralizes the mechanized equipment which the army possesses. For years now it has been a stalemate. The casualties mount; but positions remain relatively the same."

These vivid lines were written in April, 1953, by four U. S. Congressmen then visiting battle-torn French Indochina. Ten years, 250,000 casualties and three billion dollars later, the same words still strikingly apply to the ordeal faced by 400,000 green-uniformed Vietnamese soldiers and 12,000 U. S. GI's engaged in a protracted, inglorious and inconclusive struggle against coarse and crafty guerrillas deeply ingrained among the country's millions of swarthy rice farmers. As in 1953 during the French war against the Vietminh, the army continues to dominate the large cities, the main roads, the rubber plantations, port and air strip facilities. The Viet Cong hold the rural areas (two-thirds of Vietnam's 17,000 hamlets are reportedly guerrilla infiltrated), the forests, the mountains and, at night, part of the rice-producing Mekong delta fringing the brightly-lit capital of Saigon. Behind its barbed wires and police check-points, the city recedes deeper and deeper into an atmosphere of siege and frustration.

Duplicating the past military errors of the French the Vietnamese generals and their U. S. advisers still insist upon fighting a Viet Cong army which hardly exists. The real problem: to enlist the active support of the rural masses behind local leaders against the small guerrilla bands roaming the countryside, is neglected.

Aware that they cannot achieve a decisive military victory over the more numerous and better equipped Vietnamese forces, the Viet Cong are waging a long attritional struggle in the villages—a tactic that forces Ngo dinh Diem to make war against his own peasantry to ferret out guerrillas hid-

den, fed and comforted by farmers alienated by Diem's family oligarchy. Leading his army against the sullen villages, Diem is making himself increasingly unpopular and politically isolated. The Viet Cong and their Hanoi-based supporters hope that Diem's American well-wishers will one day realize the hopelessness of the whole situation, decide to cut the U.S. losses in South Vietnam, and agree—as in Laos—to a facesaving political settlement favorable to North Vietnam's objectives. Nationalist elements in South Vietnam would then be so discredited by their past association with Diem that the country would be ripe for a gradual communist take-over.

## Scorched earth

Almost entirely dependent on American financial assistance for his survival, Diem does not feel the need to go to his people for real support. He relies instead on more military operations and a thinly disguised scorched-earth policy to starve out the guerrillas and subdue the restive peasantry. For the toiling Vietnamese farmers, every military operation is a new agony. In many areas, soldiers are under distasteful orders to destroy granaries of paddy and to slaughter water buffaloes that might feed the rebels. Peasant huts are sometimes burned down to clear the ground for helicopter landings. In the delta areas where rivers and canals are the only means of travel, aircraft use their machine guns to sink the farmers' canoes before they can be used to transport insurgents in the night attack of an army post. To prevent ambushes, U.S. supplied planes spray chemicals along the roads to defoliate the surrounding bush. But the vagaries of the tropical wind often carry the oily weed killer over the cultivated fields and orchards of innocent peasants. In their daily mop-up of suspected villages, grim, steel-helmeted soldiers round up male and female peasants at gun point for hours of tough questioning by intelligence officers looking for infiltrated *Can-bo* Communist cadres. For all their troubles and hardship, the peasants receive little compensation, and are not even adequately represented in Diem's rubber-stamp National Assembly. Nobody has recourse against the government for damages caused by soldiers, nor can obtain a small pension for a father or a son accidentally killed by gun fire.

Farmers see little difference between the Viet Cong who order them to sabotage roads and bridges and the government soldiers who burn their villages to force them to join the government sponsored *Ap Chien Luoc* Strategic

---

Francois Sully of *Newsweek*, has had extensive experience as a correspondent in Vietnam.

Villages. The Strategic Villages are the main feature of the pacification plan drawn in 1961 by the American Dr. Eugene Staley to restore security within 18 months. While the U. S. saw it as a means to bring needed economic and social reforms in the countryside, Vietnamese officials use it mainly to control the lives of peasants. As it is conceived, the whole system is psychologically self-defeating because it encourages an over reliance upon static defense without a parallel emphasis on initiative and aggressiveness. Its well-intentioned allies may be rendering Vietnam a disservice by providing more material support than Vietnamese can efficiently use. This abundance of paraphernalia stifles the soldiers' ingenuity and leads to a barbed-wire and sandbag mentality. The U. S. forgets that the minds of men are the most powerful weapon and most efficient resource in a revolutionary war, and this is one.

Many of the *Ap Chien Luoc* are little more than Potemkin villages offering nothing but the bogus evidence of a non-existent security. As in the days of Catherine the Great, impeccably dressed Vietnamese dignitaries visiting the new settlement are met by throngs of cheering and happy looking villagers. Nightfall brings the return of gloom and insecurity.

The sullen peasants will not tell on the local Viet Cong. Vietnamese troops lack the endurance to carry out deep penetration raids against jungle camouflaged guerrilla hide-outs. The result is that Vietnamese army commanders increasingly rely on large mop-up operations involving thousands of heavily armed men to periodically sweep whole areas the government no longer controls. Troops are brought in by swarms of U. S. helicopters; transported by fast amphibious vehicles, or even parachuted. The flaw is that the net of troops is rarely tight enough to prevent the elusive Viet Congs from slipping through, or simply disappearing like shrews into caves, tunnels, and caches where they hide until the foraging soldiers are gone. Since in Vietnam a man is rarely promoted for gallant action in combat, young Vietnamese officers do not press their men too hard to find the enemy. The number of Vietnamese army defectors and deserters to the Viet Cong is a well-guarded secret but is believed to reach 1,200 men every month.

U. S. helicopter raids, effective at the beginning because they brought elements of surprise and increased mobility into the struggle, are now becoming as obsolete as the brave cavalry charges of the Civil War. To defeat helicopter tactics, the Viet Cong operating in the flat, open deltas have fragmented their forces into even smaller teams indistinguishable from the black-clothed, barefooted peasants. Said a U. S. airman returning from South Vietnam: "We are like a man who strikes the river with a sword in a vain effort to spear a small fish." In all the hopeful talks by U. S. generals of a military victory "within three years,"

the conversation sooner or later gets down to a doubtful revival of patriotic consciousness among the Vietnamese ruling elite.

### *What went wrong?*

Diem patriotism, so brilliantly displayed in the early years of his rule, has turned into a rejection of outside ideas in favor of the comforting suggestions of his family and of flattering courtiers. Diem presents the pathetic image of a lonely man parroting the lofty oracles of his erudite and shrewd brother. Nhu's philosophy of Personalism has become the ideological base of a regime rigid in timidity, lacking in nerve, shrinking from risk and capable only of window-dressing solutions. Such "reforms" are typified by the recent ban on contraceptives, of twist music in Saigon's teahouses and against 120 "sad" Vietnamese songs.

Diem's lack of trust in his ministers paralyzes the administration, while his unwillingness to give field commands to the most vigorous officers for fear they might turn their guns against the palace cripples the army. As one Vietnamese intellectual remarked: "This is a country of unlimited impossibilities." What started in 1959 as a terrorist action of a handful of desperate Communists has now evolved into a rebellion of a people against the social inferiority and humiliation brought to them by the mandarin caste identified with Diem. Viet Cong is an oversimplified term for a hodge-podge of 23 rebel groups and factions cemented only by their common opposition to a regime which no longer functions in harmony with the nation.

Many of Vietnam's problems can be traced to the increasingly sectarian character of the regime's in-group. Thus the alienation of the intelligentsia whose enthusiastic participation would set the administration on the right track. In recent months many of Diem's closest associates, filled with discouragement and bitterness, have deserted him, men such as National Budget Director Vu Van Thai (whom the U. N. has recruited for work in African countries) and Vietnam-Press News Agency director Nguyen Thai. According to Thai: "By proclaiming democracy and implementing dictatorship, Diem has destroyed the ideological superiority of a free society without obtaining the reputed organizational efficiency of a totalitarian regime. . . . Even a well-trained and well-equipped Vietnamese army cannot effectively fight the Communists today because leaders of the regime consistently refuse to stamp out the roots of corruption and inefficiency. It no longer matters whether Vietnam's leaders are actually corrupt, since a large segment of the nation believes that they are. Diem's one-time image as an honest leader has been shattered by unkept promises of reforms."

No longer able or willing to inspire sacrifice, Diem is



losing the loyalty of many elements of his people and army. With its rigid Confucian protocol, his regime has become a curious re-creation of the Manchu imperial court. As such it is resented and opposed by the more outward-looking Vietnamese nationalists. U. S. Ambassador Frederick Nolting, Jr. still has to convince Diem that neither blue laws against dancing nor parades of blue-uniformed amazons in the tamarin-shaded streets of Saigon will be enough to win the war. Unless Diem realizes this, the U. S. will continue to sink men, money, and resources in the bottomless drain of a swamp war.

No matter how good a man he is, or was, Diem is tragically out of touch with a people tired of his seven years of autocratic rule and worried by his ineffectiveness to restore peace. For many Vietnamese, the only prospect offered by a continuation of Diem's patriarchy is a prolonged war in which 30,000 Vietnamese perished last year.

"The saddening paradox in South Vietnam," writes Dr. Wesley R. Fishel of Michigan State University, "is that at a time when the United States has finally decided on a total effort to keep that young Republic from being destroyed by the Communists, popular support for the Ngo dinh Diem government in Saigon has reached its lowest level since 1954."

A genuine friend of Diem who contributed more by his advices than any other American to Diem's supremacy over dissident religious sects in 1955, Professor Fishel today remarks with disillusionment: "The brief spots of progress which were clearly visible only a few years ago have faded into a background of insignificance because the regime has consistently failed to mobilize the hearts and loyalties of the people. For all its authoritative overtones, it is not basically

vicious or predatory or oppressive. It is rather a clumsy, bumbling regime which has missed almost all its opportunities." Fishel's considered remarks show that Diem's helplessness lies not in the military sphere but in the area of political ideas and social transformations required to stop the creeping decay of a fossilized regime still living in the age of Plato and Confucius, Diem's scholastic mentors.

Ironically, the deteriorating situation plays in Diem's favor, for many of his would-be challengers now hesitate to compete for the inheritance of a colossal mess. More important to Diem, the U. S. is also discouraged from looking for alternative solutions because of Washington's fears that Diem's removal would create a power vacuum that pro-Communist elements might fill. In the meantime, the necessities of his anti-Communist crusade against the Viet Cong allow Diem to disregard friendly criticism and to crush his nationalist opposition without the risk of a U. S. let-down. The staunchly pro-Diem attitude of top U. S. officials in Saigon has a cooling effect on the few capable nationalists who would otherwise take the risk of telling Diem where the flaws of his rule are.

Other observers who do not share Washington's apprehensions that Vietnam would fall overnight to Communists (who are only a minority and have little support in the cities, within the army and the administration) believe that the only positive alternative is a new leader who will combine political with military initiative, and go to the people as a well-meaning man, not as a cold demi-god. There are such men in Vietnam, even today in Diem's entourage. Their very ability and success were the cause of their political undoing by a suspicious regime mainly preoccupied to perpetuate itself.

## Finding Reporters in New York State

By Kay Lockridge

"Good newspapermen are scarce, always were, probably always will be. Yet I have never seen the day when there was a shortage of reasonably qualified kids who wanted to have a whirl at it."

This comment by a New York State daily newspaper editor generally sums up the results of a study of daily newspaper editorial personnel recruitment practices and problems in New York State. This survey was conducted under the auspices of the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors and the Syracuse University School of Journalism.

These same results indicate that New York State editors place a great deal of emphasis on education, both in journalism and the liberal arts. Reporters of today are ex-

pected to exhibit excellence in three key areas: Education, ability and accuracy.

The study also showed that while newspaper executives of today expect more from young people, they know these youngsters also expect more than before in the way of a job; specifically in salary, job security and promotional opportunities.

Editors responded in the questionnaire that they were prepared to meet competition from radio-television and public relations by going out to interview and talk with high school and college students and by setting up scholarships and summer and part-time programs for students.

New York State editors can be proud, we think, of the advances in salary which have been made by many of the

state's daily newspapers. The following tables present weekly salary ranges for beginning reporters and those with experience:

Education	Men		Women	
	Low/High	Average	Low/High	Average
Journalism Graduate	\$65-110	79.28-87.78	65-110	78.50-87.22
Liberal Arts Graduate	65-100	72.49-87.50	65-100	71.44-85.00
Some College	50- 90	69.83-78.60	50- 90	67.99-75.00
No College	50- 75	61.81-73.33	50- 70	61.19-70.00

  

Sex	Two Years or Less Experience		Two Years or More Experience	
	Low/High	Average	Low/High	Average
Men	\$65-120.50	92.55-107.59	65-169.00	102.81-118.70
Women	60-120.50	90.35-106.93	60-169.00	100.46-117.54

While 28 respondent newspapers, or 65 per cent, indicated there was equal opportunity for both men and women, another 15 papers, or 35 per cent, said there was not. This inequality was based on possible physical or emotional limitations ("There just are some places where you can't send a woman") and the fact that some men would prefer to work with men. However, most editors added that a determined, capable woman could make the grade. And once she had made that grade, the salary would be the same.

Many New York State newspaper editors, 71 per cent, consider advertising the most useful source for recruitment. Application files, journalism schools and other newspapers provide the next most valuable sources, according to the survey.

Most newspapers use the expected tests for prospective personnel: writing, typing and spelling tests. A few, three papers, use psychological tests for new employees.

The study found there is a constant turn-over of editorial personnel on most New York State daily papers and this occurs most in the news-city side department. Sixty-one per cent of the replies indicate that ability to handle a camera is of definite value—a fact which journalism educators should note.

Most editors in New York consider working conditions, promotional opportunities, job security and salary (in that order) their newspapers' best selling points. Editors generally seem to believe it is valuable to "sell" their papers to prospective employees although a few (4 per cent) saw no reason to do so. As for the old standard of a newspaper career—that of excitement/glamor—one editor merely commented "Phooey!"

As mentioned before, a number of New York State newspapers sponsor scholarships, writing awards and internships on the papers for high school and college students. This is a strong point for the newspapers because

such activities introduce young people to journalism as a career.

With regard to the basic question of whether or not there is a scarcity of qualified young people, 78 per cent of the editors said, yes, there is. The following statements represent the sentiments of various New York State editors on the subject:

"We are amateurs when it comes to recruiting. Small newspapers have to 'beg, borrow and steal' help because salary scale is too low to make jobs attractive. Publishers are still operating a wage concept for small papers that went out two decades ago. I think this is one of the major reasons skilled newspapermen are hard to find. They can make double that as P-R men."

"Small paper recruiting is very much a 'catch as catch can' process. We are particularly interested in obtaining and training local people, but the supply is limited. Pride in craft and evidence of a strong, aggressive newspaper are as important to getting and holding people as money, although the latter can't be discounted. I have a theory about small papers: They need people just as good (and as well-paid) as the *New York Times*; they just don't need as many."

"I need outstanding practitioners, and newsmen considered capable by some newspapers are not good enough for me. Like the situation in most other professions and businesses, there never are enough fully competent persons in journalism. On the other hand competent folk are available, and can be recruited, by any agency willing to pay reasonably well and to spend sufficient time implementing sound hiring practices."

"(I) find most young writers too anxious to get ahead and unwilling to work for it. They want to start at the top."

"So much depends on the individual. Our major problem on this small paper has been to keep trained personnel. We have tried to solve this in the last year by hiring only locally bred people. Of course this meant no experience, but we hope the local ties will be more than an initial asset—that they'll keep more of them with us longer."

"We rarely lose people to other newspapers, but we do lose them to public relations firms, company publication staffs and the like. It isn't only glamor, of course—we can't compete with the salaries in these fields."

"Because of our size we find it difficult to entice employees so have to resort to either training our own—as we have and are doing—or to convince them a small town paper is more interesting and can be a better all-around life. Also we reluctantly tell new comers this size paper makes a great stepping stone to bigger things."

"We have had some success in shifting assignments. For instance we hired a man for the sports department. He was weak on makeup. Shifted him to a police beat. He's

doing well. We had a girl assisting in women's pages. She did the job, but didn't like it. Turned her loose on a labor story. She did well. It's a case of an editor working directly with an employee in an effort to find the kind of job he can do best even though the employee does not realize it. I've also had a lot of success sticking with an employee, that is, not giving up on him if he doesn't click in his first few months. He's probably scared to start with. Patience (which produces gray hairs) will frequently pay off."

The above are among the most pertinent comments given by respondents. They show an awareness of the recruitment situation and reflect enthusiasm and initiative in tackling the problem. It appears that small circulation newspapers have the most difficult time in recruiting—and holding—good people, but recruitment itself is a never-ending process on all papers, regardless of size.

Overall, this study shows that the newspapers of New York State are doing an adequate job of recruitment. A better job could be done, however, by all newspapers, in promoting journalism as a career among young people.

Newspaper executives and journalism educators can do much cooperatively to improve the recruitment situation. They are—or should be—a natural combination, one which could draw many promising youngsters into journalism as a profession.

---

Kay Lockridge, graduate student at Syracuse University school of journalism, is assistant to the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors.

## Our Infirm Critics

By Roland E. Wolseley

Theodore H. Parker, a critical writer for the Hartford *Courant* for many years related that he once knew an art critic who was color-blind. This journalist, aptly designated by Mr. Parker as a "dichromatic reporter," managed to hold his job so long as his wife, who had normal vision, accompanied him to the art exhibits.

But other reviewers appear not to have solved their health problems so neatly. Most critics, as we learned when we had to listen to them during the newspaper strike in New York, have difficulty speaking clearly. But this is a minor

affliction, compared with the troubles of numerous writers, whether they speak or print their views. Five classes might join that dichromatic reviewer, as follows:

*The tone-deaf music critic.* Often this is a lady writer. The evidence of her trouble is revealed by the fact that she says more or less the same thing about all recitals and concerts she attends. What she writes invariably is complimentary, especially if it's a local artist's effort. The soprano's voice always has either "a bell-like quality" or "bird-like sweetness;" the ensembles seem never to produce anything but "enchanted harmony."

*The bow-legged or knock-kneed movie reviewer.* This writer, generally a man, cannot sit comfortably, especially these days of the wall-to-wall screen, which also makes his neck ache. The result is that he gets to see only part of the film and jounces around in his seat constantly, tiring himself so fast he must go home early. This unhappy condition may explain why he seems, apparently, to hate all motion pictures.

*The art critic with mirror-vision.* Only thus can we understand some of the odd reactions he describes so impressionistically. The soldiers in Lebrun's "Alexander the Great Entering Babylon," he complained, violated historical fact because they were running away from, instead of toward, the city. He had Antaeus strangling Hercules when he looked at Pollaiuolo's bronze, brought here on a visit from Florence.

*The myopic television critic.* Known to inhabit the eastern areas of the United States for the most part, this reviewer is a journalist who has evidently not seen the same TV shows as the rest of us, although the titles and casts are identical. He (frequently it is a she) is given to commenting only on the stars, evidently never seeing the supporting entertainers or artists; the settings scarcely ever are mentioned, either.

*The hypermetropic drama critic.* Almost exclusively a New Yorker, this one is a gentleman critic every time. His trouble, which has nothing to do with the Tropic of either Cancer or Capricorn, can be detected at once, for in reviewing musical shows, it is especially obvious. For instance, his farsightedness has made him miss one or more of the principals, since his comments are chiefly on the supporting cast or on the sets.

The managing editor ought to assign Myo and Hyper to cover their arts together.

---

Roland E. Wolseley is professor of journalism at Syracuse University.

# Vaguely Realizing Westward—The Times

By Kenneth E. Wilson

On October 1 of last year the New York *Times* produced its infant Western Edition and sent it out into the rough-and-tumble newspaper world of the Far West.

Arrival of the offspring of such an illustrious parent aroused a natural rustle of anticipation and curiosity among the Pacific Coast populace. The curiosity was not confined to the shape and fate of the infant itself. There was just as much parlor and newsroom debate about what the blessed event would do to the local press. Much of the debate persists.

So now, with the fledgling Western Edition entering the twilight of its first year, it is perhaps pertinent to examine a few of the more specific effects it has had on resident journalism. For practical reasons of personal geography, this examination will be focused on the San Francisco Bay Area.

★ ★

To set the scene, San Francisco has three newspapers—the *Chronicle* (independent) and *Examiner* (Hearst) in the morning field and *News-Call Bulletin* (Hearst) in the evening.

Competition between the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* is fierce. In the last 10 years the *Chronicle* has come from far behind to overtake the *Examiner* in circulation in what has been a battle royal. Both papers are combat sharp, very much a part of and attuned to the community. Both are lively and, in most respects, good newspapers.

(The *News-Call* figures in our examination only slightly. It is in the evening field, holds a poor third place in circulation and generally is not noted for its news coverage.)

In the course of the *Chronicle-Examiner* fight for first place, both discarded old looks and old concepts. Typographically, both have taken on a more open look—their body type is larger, the headlines cleaner and sharper, displays of the news bolder and more attractive. In content, both papers are devoting more space to news, both have added news and picture services and both are more interesting and informative. In short, *Chronicle* and *Examiner* readers are getting more for their dimes now than they did 10 years ago.

---

Kenneth E. Wilson is an assistant news editor on the San Francisco *Chronicle*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1953.

All of this happened *before* the *Times'* Western Edition—not because of it—and it is into this climate the Western Edition made its bow in the San Francisco area.

★ ★

The *Times*, being the *Times*, was not a complete stranger in what is considered one of the more sophisticated areas of the U. S.

It is ironic, however, that many *Chronicle* readers were familiar with the *Times* because it was the *Chronicle* that for many years carried and made excellent use of the *Times* News Service. Aggressive and imaginative in its approach to the news, it was not uncommon for the *Chronicle*, as an example, to display a James Reston article on Page 1—the same Reston column the *Times* played far back under an unobtrusive label head on the editorial page.

It can be fairly said that the *Chronicle* did more to promote the *Times* in San Francisco than the *Times* itself. And I have it on good authority that there was a recommendation from within the *Times* organization to let the *Chronicle* keep the *Times* News Service after the advent of the Western Edition. I don't know how seriously this was considered, but the decision was "no."

In this connection, it's no secret that at the *Chronicle* many of those on the news staff, at least, were more concerned about the *Times* News Service than they were about facing up to whatever additional competition the Western Edition would offer.

★ ★

When rumors of the *Times'* invasion of the West became fact, both the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* took aggressive steps to meet the challenge.

The *Examiner* somewhat earlier had acquired the *Herald Tribune* Service. It also started making more use of its own Hearst Headline Service, which even now is undergoing a major overhaul and sprucing up.

The *Chronicle*—already loaded with news services, including AP, UPI, Reuters, *Chicago Tribune* and *New York News*—added the *London Times* and (Manchester) *Guardian* services, the *Washington Post*—Los Angeles *Times* wire, the *Chicago Daily News* and Copley News Service. Additionally, the *Chronicle* set up its own stable of foreign correspondents who write daily newsletters from major cities around the world.



More important, both the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* opened up the daily news hole and are printing more hard news than ever before.

★ ★

The philosophy of selling this bigger and better product, however, hasn't really changed very much from pre-Western Edition days. Both papers continue to scrap for every dime with big and bold eight-column banners on their street editions. These headlines don't always advertise the most important or significant news of the day. They are often calculated for mass appeal—to grab attention and sell newspapers.

In this area, the Western Edition has had little or no effect on the San Francisco press. The *Chronicle*, having fought a long and uphill battle to finally overtake the *Examiner* in circulation, is not about to risk its tenuous lead by looking over its shoulder very long at the Western Edition. Similarly, the *Examiner* is too busy chasing the *Chronicle*.

★ ★

But even if the local newspapers seem determined not to be diverted from their own fight by a New York paper that's printed in Los Angeles and then delivered 500 miles away by the postman, the fact remains that the *Times* is, after all, the *Times*. It's here, its important and it's not going to go away.

The working newspaperman more than anyone else understands this solid-rock structure of the *Times*. And no matter how valid may be the current vogue for criticizing Mr. Sulzberger's product there is still a good deal of fraternal reverence for the great tradition of the great newspaper with its great staff.

It is in this area—professional respect for the *Times*—that the Western Edition exercises its deepest effect on the San Francisco press.

When good editors and good reporters see something in the Western Edition their papers didn't have they react instinctively: "We should have had that . . . let's try to get it." Or perhaps it will be a particularly important story out of Washington or Paris or somewhere that the wire services kicked around and the *Times* did right by: "Did you see what the *Times* did with that one?"

The point is that the San Francisco papers are watching the Western Edition—not following it or copying it—and taking a hard look at it in the day-to-day business of getting out their own papers. And because the *Times* is the *Times* is the *Times* this can only be a healthy influence.

★ ★

From the resident circulation managers' point of view, the Western Edition hasn't yet, at least, been any cause for

panic. When the Western Edition got off the ground last October 1 it claimed 100,000 circulation. This figure, according to John B. Olson, general manager of the Western Edition in Los Angeles, was still basically accurate to his best information this Spring but subject to ABC audit figures as of March 31. (An article in the April 16 *Wall Street Journal* said the net paid circulation of the Western Edition was 90,000.)

Asked what percentage of the 100,000 was in the San Francisco area, Mr. Olson said the closest breakdown he could give was 50 per cent in Southern California, 30 per cent in Northern California and the balance in the other Western states.

If there are 30,000 people buying the Western Edition in the *Chronicle-Examiner* bailiwick—which, depending on how you define the boundaries of "Northern" California, is probably giving the *Times* much the benefit of the doubt—this is not yet serious competition.

My information indicates that circulation figures for the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* since last October are up. How much more they would be up if there were no Western Edition is academic. But great numbers are not dropping their *Chronicle* and *Examiner* subscriptions and switching to the Western Edition. It's fair to say at this point the Western Edition has not changed any newspaper reading habits in the San Francisco area.

The reasons are clear.

The *Times* never intended the Western Edition to compete with the local press in the sense, for example, that the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* are in competition in San Francisco. The Western Edition's role is that of supplementary reading.

Nor has the *Times* increased its West Coast reportorial staff. It has two men in San Francisco, two in Los Angeles and one covering the film industry in Hollywood—the same as before the Western Edition. These are the only full-time *Times* people this side of Chicago. (This does not count the Western Edition production crew in Los Angeles, which is new.)

So for the bread-and-butter local news, the sports, society doings, business, TV logs, advertising and all the rest, the local resident must still take the local papers.

If you want the *latest* national and international news you have to take the local press. (The Western Edition goes to press in Los Angeles at 7 p.m. and follows with chaser pages at 10 p.m. (If you want a paper on Sunday morning and on national holidays, when the postman doesn't work, you have to take the local press.

If you want to see what Reston, Krock, Sulzberger and the other big names in the *Times*' stable are saying; if you are interested in the additional and excellent reporting of the national and international scene—the Western Edition is, of course, first-rate.

If your special interest is high finance or big-time culture the *Times* may well be satisfactory. If complete texts of presidential news conferences and other important speeches and documents are your dish, you can count on the Western Edition. (This edition is not, however, the "newspaper for record" its New York parent claims to be.)

Another reason for the newspaper status quo in San Francisco—a reason which may be more difficult to nail down but is probably more basic than any other—is that the Western Edition *looks* different. And its look is one of a stranger to the great mass of readers in the San Francisco area.

Next to the *Chronicle* and *Examiner*, the Western Edition's makeup is dull and gray. Next to the *Chronicle's* and *Examiner's* sprightly presentation of the news, the Western Edition is often heavy-going and long-winded.

The *Times* is not aimed at mass appeal. It's not No. 1 in circulation in New York and for the same reason it's not likely to be No. 1 in San Francisco.

★ ★

There was some talk around—probably generated by resident admen—that the *Times* was pretty unhappy and even downright disillusioned about the reception the Western Edition received from West Coast advertisers.

This is not true, according to the *Times'* Mr. Olson.

"We have had a good response, all things considered," he said. "In planning this operation we had aimed at an 18-page average newspaper with a 25 per cent advertising, 75 per cent news ratio. We are hitting right around this, despite the bugs of getting the new operation started, the New York strike and other factors."

This checks out closely with some figures compiled by the *Chronicle* which show the Western Edition for three weeks in February averaging 16 pages with 23 per cent advertising and 77 per cent news.

Whatever the Western Edition is doing with its advertising—on purpose or not on purpose—it's obvious that the incumbent press is not going to lose any appreciable volume of business to the invader. The Western Edition is simply not set up to be a major advertising threat. The local admen, always wary, have so far shown no inclination to lose sleep over the Western Edition.

The 25 per cent advertising versus 75 per cent news Western Edition formula is interesting. I don't have enough counting-house knowledge to assess what it means. But it doesn't sound like riches to one who has been raised on 60 per cent ads and 40 per cent news and the accompanying poverty groans of management.

But when it comes to the *Times* one learns to have faith.

The kind of faith that tends to confirm the alternative Edwin A. Lahey suggested in his fine piece in the last issue of *Nieman Reports*. "If it (the *Times*) did not exist," he said, "the Ford Foundation would have to start one."

## Journalism Goes "Scientific"

By John C. Merrill

Journalism as a profession and as an academic field of study faces a recurring and unpleasant problem: To define itself. Just what is it—a science? a pseudo (social) science? a branch of the humanities?

Presently academic journalism, and to a slightly less degree professional journalism, is going "scientific." Journalism as Humanism is fading; journalism as Science is pushing restlessly onto the contemporary scene. Even before it has framed a satisfactory definition of "news" (supposedly its main staple), it has begun masquerading as a science.

Those persons who were in journalism schools ten to fifteen years ago would hardly recognize them today. The change, say many journalism school administrators, has been good. I am not so sure. Undoubtedly, many beneficial changes have come about, but it has not yet been established that the rather abrupt shift to science is really progress. Journalism educators generally have caught the "Science" bug; they are talking the language; they are basing their researches on "scientific foundations"; they are statistically-oriented. They have less and less time for "art" in writing; they have more and more time for "communications." They are evolving into weak-sister social scientists, replete with the same gobbledygook, and evincing a kind of alarm for the "wordy" and "subjective" student who uses a semicolon or makes a value judgment.

With their lunge toward Science and the fat research grants abounding there, the journalism educators are fast forsaking the academic area most urgently needing their support—the humanities. Journalism educators and journalists are creating themselves a Science God; not only are they fascinated themselves by flashing lights, humming tapes, clicking computers, purring calculators, and a host of mechanical gadgets, but they have glorified and emphasized to a fantastic degree in the mass media the Scientist and the "scientific approach."

The New Journalist, armed with the Semantic Differential and Chi Square, brandishing the questionnaire, and spouting statistical formulae, is taking over from the older humanities-oriented journalist. He now has acquired high-sounding names like "mass communicator," "behavioral scientist," "communications specialist," and "communications researcher." If he teaches, he probably is instilling in his students the idea that if they are not "scientifically-minded," they will amount to little in the bright new journalistic world of tomorrow. Especially is the New Journalist mimicking the social scientist; and like the social scientist he is losing the sensitivity necessary to distinguish his own writing from English prose.

The professional journalist, in my opinion, should re-

fuse to be drawn into this conspiracy fomented mainly by academic journalism; he should refuse to have a part in the de-humanization of his profession. He should not abandon the conception of himself as an artist—or friend of the artist. He should insist on “style” in writing and not place too much reliance in short sentences and paragraphs and “personal” words. He should help the musician, philosopher, novelist and poet get their messages to the public.

Recently a faculty colleague, safely tucked away in the Scientific-Technical disciplines, informed me that the American people need to know all about scientific advances, new weapons and the like. When I asked why, he said: “Because they will be affected by these if war comes.” Agreed. They will be affected if war comes and they *know*; they will be affected likewise if they *don’t* know. I am certainly not opposed to a well-informed citizenry, but I feel that my colleague’s reason leaves much to be desired. Actually, I have no real need, nor desire, to know about the latest ICBMs or jet fighters or bigger and more destructive nuclear bombs. Knowing about them may be interesting and may serve as a basis for conversation, but really will do me little good “if war comes.” In fact, it may simply serve to take my mind off things of much greater import to me *now*—before “war comes.”

Certainly there is nothing wrong with the scientific approach; the scientist, although he is fast de-humanizing himself and others, is really an admirable fellow in many ways. What I feel is needed, I suppose, is a more humanistic scientist, and not a more scientific humanist. A more “humane” approach in our academic programs of journalism is needed as well as a de-emphasis in the press of scientific sensationalism (“Will we beat the Russians to the moon? “Will we all die in atomic holocaust?”). The press must give more emphasis to “humanistic” news and views. Those who may wonder what is meant by humanist news and views simply show their ignorance of the humanities.

In the lives of our young people being educated for journalism and of the people consuming the press outpourings, there is a great need for this humanistic editorial content. The reader cannot have his whole self satisfied without this humanistic stimulation. Why? Because part of a person cares nothing for wealth, power or speed, bigger and more automatic houses. Part of him rebels against machines and machine-like men; part of him cherishes knowledge for its own sake and values and ideas which seem unusable but fascinating to the mind and spirit.

How much news are we getting in our press about “ideas” (not scientific discoveries) in our countries? How much space is given to what philosophers the world over are saying about our world today? What is happening in music, art, literature in the rest of the world? Why, you may ask, should we know these things? Because they are needed to make us better, noble persons; they lift our eyes from the questionnaire and the kinescope and focus them on permanent and humanizing aspects of our existence; they cause us to think of and strive for brotherhood rather than creating in us a fear which drives us into underground shelters and mental darkness. There are probably many vacuums in our press today, but one of the most serious—and it appears to be getting worse—is the humanistic vacuum.

The journalist must recognize his responsibility: to champion humanistic values—or at least to transmit them to as many people as possible. He should make sure that he retains or develops a philosophical orientation in his thought, a literary dimension in his writing, and a humane frame of reference in his social consciousness. In short, he must take his stand with the humanities and insist that the future belongs not to machines, but to men.

---

**Dr. John C. Merrill**, associate professor of journalism at Texas A. & M., has done newspaper work and taught English.

# Red Editor: Aleksei Adzhubei

By William J. Eaton

In the atmosphere of the Khrushchev regime, a 38-year-old Russian journalist has managed to initiate near-revolutionary changes in the traditionally stodgy Soviet press. He also has made a breakthrough in personal diplomacy through lengthy discussions with President Kennedy. And he is an intimate of Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

The accomplished journalist, Aleksei Adzhubei, has one major advantage over his colleagues: he married the boss' daughter—Rada Khrushchev—just as her father was consolidating his control of the Soviet state. Yet virtually every Western observer credits him with enough ability and energy to have climbed to the top in Russia without such formidable family credentials.

What has Adzhubei achieved as editor-in-chief of *Izvestia*, the official government newspaper in the Soviet Union? How did he rise so far so fast? How is he regarded in Washington? Does he have a future once his 68-year-old father-in-law is no longer in command?

Aleksei Ivanovich Adzhubei was born in Samarkand, in Soviet Central Asia, in 1924. The standard biographic reference works tell virtually nothing about his parents, childhood or youth although he apparently moved to Moscow at an early age and grew up there. He served in the Red Army during World War II and later enrolled in the Moscow University Institute of Journalism. Adzhubei was graduated in 1953 after completion of the five-year course.

His future wife—Rada Khrushchev—also attended this school but it is not clear from the sketchy Russian sources whether they were classmates. The journalism training apparently supplemented her education as a chemist.

Adzhubei was a student-correspondent for *Komsomolskaya Pravda* while at the university and joined the staff on a full-time basis after graduation. One source said he began with an "ordinary desk job" on the Young Communist League's publication. Other reference works indicate that he began as a "foreign correspondent" or "editor."

A recently published "Who's Who in the USSR" compiled by the Institute for the Study of the USSR in 1962 said that Adzhubei became a member of the editorial board of the *Komsomol* paper in 1953 and later was named editor of its literary and arts section. Only in 1958-59, according to this source, did he become editor-in-chief.

He married Rada, an attractive blonde, in 1954. "That began his meteoric career," according to one British writer. Other Western observers said that even if Khrushchev

opened the door to advancement for his son-in-law, Adzhubei has demonstrated a professional competence and drive that could win promotion to high posts on merit alone.

There seems little question, however, that being a member of Russia's first family was a great advantage in Adzhubei's pioneering efforts to bring more zest into Soviet journalism.

Two years after he joined the staff of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*—at the age of 31—Adzhubei toured the United States with a group of Russian journalists. They visited New York, Washington, San Francisco and other cities as well as traveling extensively in the West on that 1955-56 tour.

One Cleveland newspaperman recalls that Adzhubei—of all people—was singled out by the Russians as an example of a journalist who had succeeded even though he was not a member of the Communist Party! He was a *Komsomol*—young Communist—at the time.

Later accounts of the trip said Adzhubei's study of American newspaper reporters at work impressed him very much. He was said to admire the type of aggressive, first-hand pursuit of news and the colorful, lively papers written to appeal to a mass audience.

He saw many facets of American life, including the showgirls at Reno, and tried his luck at the blackjack table in Nevada. With his characteristic tendency to jest, he said: "I probably shouldn't do this—I might win a million dollars." (He didn't.)

Adzhubei's American trip was the first in a series of journeys to Asia, Europe and Latin America that probably make him one of the relatively few Russians that could be called world travelers. On many of the trips, he accompanied Khrushchev and directed the Soviet press coverage of the trip, including the famous U. S. visit in the fall of 1959. Adzhubei has returned to the United States at least five times since his first trans-continental tour.

In addition, he traveled to Latin America in 1958, visited Baghdad and Cairo in 1959, accompanied Khrushchev to India, Afghanistan, Burma and Indonesia in 1960 and was again in Khrushchev's party on the January, 1962 trip to East Germany.

Early in 1960, he and his wife visited Paris so Adzhubei could participate in a mock summit conference with journalists from the United States, United Kingdom and France. This occasion seemed to be more of a holiday than a business trip, however.

The Adzhubeis indulged in French food, went night-

William J. Eaton of the UPI Washington bureau, is on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard this year.



clubbing at the Lido and took sightseeing excursions to Versailles, the Louvre and Napoleon's Tomb from their \$40-a-day suite at the Crillon. Almost as an afterthought they visited the traditional Communist stronghold of Saint-Denis, outside Paris, three days after their arrival. Aleksei "really lived it up," an American magazine reported, and took back many gadgets to play practical jokes in Moscow.

More recently, Adzhubei visited Pope John XXIII in Vatican City in a remarkable display of Soviet flexibility toward one of the world's strongest anti-Communist citadels.

The Russian journalist and Khrushchev's daughter, Rada, chatted with the Pontiff for 18 minutes in the Papal library in the first meeting of a Roman Catholic leader and a top Russian official.

This session was widely interpreted as laying the groundwork for a Vatican visit by Khrushchev later in 1963. It followed a general audience for newsmen—also attended by Adzhubei—on the presentation of the \$51,000 Balzan Peace Prize to the Pope. Adzhubei said later they talked about peace but declined to give details. One newsman speculated that the meeting might lead to the liberation of Cardinal Mindszenty, now confined to the American Embassy in Budapest.

After some of his more serious travels abroad, Adzhubei frequently collaborated with other Soviet journalists to produce a book about Khrushchev's experiences on the trip. He was a co-author of *Face to Face With America* and *The Awakening East* following Khrushchev's visits to the United States and Asia, respectively.

Adzhubei's greatest advances came after his father-in-law defeated the Malenkov-Molotov forces in the intra-party battle that raged in June, 1957. He apparently became editor of *Izvestia* two years later and was elected a deputy to the Supreme Soviet from the Kropotkin district, Krasnodar province, in 1959. The far greater honor of membership on the Party's Central Committee was bestowed on him in 1961.

In his own field, Adzhubei became a member of the executive board of the journalists' union and editor of its monthly organ, *Sovietskaya Pechat* (Soviet Press). He received the Lenin Prize for Journalism in 1960 (at a time when he was a member of the USSR Council of Ministers' Committee for Lenin Prizes). The prize for journalism was created in that year when Adzhubei and a famous Soviet author, Mikhail A. Sholokov, both were nominated for the Lenin Prize for Literature. This possible conflict was averted by having two prizes to award.

Although he seems to have led a charmed life, Adzhubei is not immune from criticism. He received at least an implied rebuke from the Party's Central Committee in 1959 when it chided *Komsomolskaya Pravda* for "sensationalism." Adzhubei was editor at the time and the

action was interpreted as a "stern warning" by a British journalist.

Judging by Adzhubei's later career, however, the critics of 1959 may have won the battle and lost the war against popularization in the press. He was to smash all precedents in Soviet journalism or U. S. presidential history by obtaining an exclusive interview with the American chief executive and printing it in full in *Izvestia*. This occurred in late 1961 and although the reaction was not entirely favorable in the Soviet Union, Adzhubei received the Order of Lenin in 1962.

Creed Black, executive editor of the Wilmington, Del., newspapers who went to Russia with American editors in May, 1962, described the *Izvestia* editor as a "take-charge guy" who "obviously carries a lot of weight and doesn't hesitate to throw it around."

Black's group was a target of Adzhubei's humor. On the editors' first night in Moscow he advised them to keep slamming the doors of their rooms to interfere with Russian listening devices.

After dinner that night, Adzhubei decided to take the visitors to the Kremlin. "All right, you're not in America now, so line up two-by-two and march off," he said with a chuckle. And they did march through Moscow's streets with Adzhubei at their side.

Wisecracks poured forth from Adzhubei throughout the editors' stay. When he was asked the location of the nearest nightclub, he replied: "In Copenhagen." On a Moscow-by-night tour he called attention to the darkened foreign ministry and chortled: "That means we are not writing any sinister notes to your government tonight."

The changes in *Izvestia* under Adzhubei must be seen in relation to the historic attitude of the Communist Party toward the press. The principle is simple: the press is the tool of the party. The party line on this is virtually unbroken since it began with Lenin.

The Communist concept of self-criticism calls for newspaper exposure of shortcomings and mismanagement, but this has its limits since the Party and its strategy are beyond the pale of criticism—only errors in effectuating the Party's views are open to the journalist's fire.

This rather nebulous line between legitimate and irresponsible criticism must be difficult to draw, as a recent example illustrates. The chairman of the Uzbek Central Committee complained to *Izvestia* about a travel article in *Novy Mir*, a literary magazine, that was critical of shoddy housing in Uzbek and reported the old-fashioned ways of the villages. The chairman said the article may have been accurate but it did not place the faults in perspective or take cognizance of the province's great advances under Communism.

In an editor's note, *Izvestia* commented:

"Party journalism rests on the assumption that one must boldly uncover shortcomings and passionately criticize everything that impedes our confident and mighty advance. But such criticism is necessary not for the sake of criticism. . . This criticism is necessary in order to perceive shortcomings as quickly as possible, to find ways for their swiftest elimination and to hold up isolated negative facts against the vast positive experience accumulated by our society. A Soviet journalist is not a mere chronicler or indifferent observer; he is a fighter actively interceding in life, a soldier of our press, a helper of the party."

Thus Adzhubei, whose dedication to Communism has never been questioned, works within a limited framework in his attempts to modernize the press. And he is treading in a sensitive area of Communist ideology.

His own reports from the United States painted a familiar picture to Russian readers—the hard-hearted capitalists contrasted with the deeper yearning for peace of the working man. But he did provide some fresh metaphors for old ideas, observing at one point: "Just as you cannot squeeze extra speed out of an automobile with a played-out motor, no matter how much gas you give, so capitalism has no reserve vitality."

When he returned to Moscow from his 1955-56 trip to America, he put his new knowledge to quick use at *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. Using a true-confession style to warn of the pitfalls of religion and a "muckraking" approach to expose corruption in sports, Adzhubei pushed up circulation. He made the paper what one expert termed "by far the brightest" in the Soviet Union within the space of five years. He also doubled its circulation from 1,500,000 to 3,500,000.

In mid-1959, Adzhubei was promoted to the post of editor-in-chief of *Izvestia*, the government newspaper that had been primarily a dreary compilation of official notices and lengthy speeches by the Communist elite. One writer said it looked more like the *Federal Register* or the *Congressional Record* than a newspaper. Government decrees at times covered from 75 to 95 per cent of the front page.

Changes occurred fast and frequently once Adzhubei took over. Since *Izvestia*, along with *Pravda*, is a nationally circulated paper it set the pace for all other Russian editors.

Harrison Salisbury, Pulitzer prize-winning New York *Times* correspondent in Moscow, wrote in May, 1959, that both *Pravda* and *Izvestia* report everything in the "same dreary, overworked form that has prevailed for so many years." He complained that the new spirit of relaxation and ease in Russia since Stalin's death was not reflected in the Russian press at all. Salisbury hailed Adzhubei's accomplishments at *Komsomolskaya Pravda* but found nothing good to say about the leading papers.

A few weeks after this report was published, Adzhubei was appointed editor of *Izvestia*, succeeding Konstantin A.

Gubin, who had held the job for the preceding 10 years.

"The elevation of Adzhubei is a move to revitalize the Soviet press," Salisbury said. "He is not afraid of breaking with the clichés of Soviet journalism in an effort to bring real-life stories to the minds and hearts of his readers."

The change of command was evident on his first day in office. *Izvestia* came out on June 3, 1959 with a front-page cartoon—an innovation—showing Uncle Sam cowering in a fallout shelter as a nuclear bomb hangs over New York city skyscrapers. Although it was once required reading only for Russian bureaucrats, *Izvestia* quickly came under scrutiny by foreign diplomats looking for Adzhubei-inspired clues on foreign policy shifts. It quickly became the most talked-about newspaper in the Soviet Union as the following changes startled the sedate Russian press:

- The traditionally dull, gray front page was spiced up with snappier headlines, boldface type and a bigger masthead insignia. A "News in Brief" column was started and each page contained two or three illustrations.

- A weekly Sunday supplement, emphasizing features and human interest stories, began publishing in January, 1960.

- *Izvestia*, once a four-page paper, published six days a week, became a six-page paper published seven days a week. It changed its publication time from morning to evening on June 1, 1960 to get the jump on *Pravda*, its rival in a developing race for circulation and prestige.

- Readers' letters were stressed to relate the human side of Soviet life. They had been arriving at the rate of 100 a day and this shot up to 500 a day in six months. Now the paper reports it got 314,568 letters in 1961—about 900 a day.

- *Izvestia* reporters were sent to the scene—farm, factory or virgin lands—to do first-hand, close-up news gathering.

- Catchy headlines—"Bonn Flirts with Madrid"—and first-person accounts of how "I Visited the Vinnista Spy Center" became the order of the day.

- A traffic accident was reported in *Izvestia* for the first time since the end of World War II, breaking a Russian embargo on news of auto, rail, plane accidents and other disasters.

Circulation soared under Adzhubei's deft leadership. Although precise figures are difficult to obtain, *Izvestia's* circulation apparently has climbed from about 1,500,000 to 5,500,000 in the past 3½ years.

Only a short time after Adzhubei took over at *Izvestia*, the Soviet Journalists' magazine (also edited by Adzhubei) praised the changes made in the government paper. A writer for *Sovetskaya Pechat* said *Izvestia* had "perked up" through the use of better headlines, more original writing, flexible makeups and more imaginative photographs.

"The members of *Izvestia's* creative collective have demonstrated . . . that it doesn't take many months to improve a newspaper and make it interesting and pithy . . . The example has proven contagious," he wrote. But one headline, held up as an example of the livelier style, indicated that progress did not mean perfection. The headline cited ran over the text of a party decree on pre-school instruction and said: "Do a Better Job of Bringing Up Our Youngsters."

The unofficial declaration of a mild circulation war against *Pravda*, the sacrosanct Party publication, triggered similar changes in *Pravda's* makeup and content. Adzhubei got his managing editor, Daniel Kraminov, from the *Pravda* staff where he had been foreign editor. Other young, able journalist helped raise *Izvestia's* circulation and prestige. *Pravda's* circulation seems to have held steady at 5,000,000 or 5,500,000 during its opposition's upsurge. The competition between the two papers may be somewhat artificial. One Western observer said there is such a great demand for newspapers that both are sold out at newsstands and subscriptions are limited. But the rivalry could lead to expanded allocations of newsprint to the paper that is creating strong public interest. And the competition—no matter how fancied or real—has affected other newspapers and encouraged editors to adopt the "new look" too.

One of the most interesting developments in *Izvestia* under Adzhubei has been the emphasis on letters from readers and worker-peasant correspondents. The letters have added human interest and a crusading element to the paper. Arriving at the rate of 900 a day, the letters are sorted, answered and relayed to ministries for replies by a staff of 15. The writers sometimes reveal mismanagement or shortcomings in factory or farm or at the lower levels of the Party and government. They get credit for their detective work if the allegations are true and the culprit is punished. The letters' column appears to be the court of last resort for some victims of Soviet bureaucracy, as this account by Adzhubei to the 22nd Party Congress reveals:

"A legless invalid with a third floor apartment wishes to change places with someone with a ground floor apartment," the editor told the 22nd Party Congress about one letter-writer. "For months he's given the runaround although a man living in the ground floor of the same building would be glad to move to the third floor."

Adzhubei noted that such lack of sympathy and indifference were not criminal offenses but should be indictable at the bar of Communist opinion. *Izvestia's* letter column often can make it possible to discuss publicly a situation that may be irritating many Soviet citizens who are reluctant to air their grievances. In the fall of 1962, for example, a Russian worker protested against the "tedium and grayness" of recreation in the evening. He deplored the formal atmosphere of workers' clubs, banners and posters

with full-production slogans posted in parks and self-appointed moralists who police dance-floor behavior. Why can't there be small cafes where a tired toiler could sip coffee and listen to light music, he asked. *Izvestia* used the letter to open its columns to other readers on the subject of how to liven up Soviet night life.

Adzhubei seems to be the spearhead of a many-sided campaign to attack the complacency and stuffiness of the Soviet press. Late in 1959, Premier Khrushchev told editors that: "There is still much dull stuff in our papers. Sometimes you take a paper, finger it through and put it aside. Afterward you cannot even recall what it said."

Khrushchev spoke to a National congress of Soviet journalists composed of 750 representatives of 60,000 Russian newsmen. They heard speakers tell how Lenin listed his profession as a "journalist and writer" even after he became the Soviet ruler. But a new note crept into the familiar themes.

The Communist Party Central Committee noted in a 1959 resolution that an "exceedingly" large number of newspapers were going unsold. This indicated a lack of demand and those newspapers or magazines that did not attract an audience would be abolished, the Committee said. It also appealed for more lively writing in the press.

"The Soviet authorities have discovered that an educated public will not read political primers lacking both luster and variety," a British observer wrote. He added that Adzhubei was the only leading Soviet editor who was a trained journalist and not a political watchdog appointed to keep tab on a newspaper's ideological content.

Adzhubei's argument inside the Party was simple: A more popular paper is better propaganda. He defended the competition with *Pravda* on grounds it would improve both papers and attract more readers than either paper could secure by itself.

Another development that seemed to be part of Adzhubei's "new look" policy was the series of regional conferences of journalists convened early in 1961 by orders of the Party's Central Committee. In appraising the results, a Soviet spokesman said too many newspapers and magazines were still dull even though strides had been made in weeding out "quotationitis and pedantry that fettered live, creative thought." A total of 8,000 journalists who took part in the sessions were encouraged to be critical of mismanagement but reminded to check the facts carefully before publication.

Editors in Kirgiz, for example, were denounced for not exposing misfeasance or non-feasance in the death of 609,000 sheep on collective and state farms. The Kirghiz editors only noticed the situation after the Party's Central Committee acted, the writer said. But a reporter who tried to show alleged corruption in a construction trust



was reprimanded for not being 100 per cent accurate in his facts.

Another innovation at *Izvestia* was the establishment of a book publishing business to turn out cheap books on popular subjects at the rate of one a month. A book about the Russians' space exploits has been a best-seller already.

Adzhubei also was active in creation of a new, unofficial press agency, called Novosti, in February, 1961. It was to supplement Tass, the government news agency, and concentrate on providing non-governmental information about Russia to other countries. It also was to tell Russians what is going on overseas. Adzhubei was named one of three co-chairmen of the agency's council. Pavel A. Satyukov, editor of *Pravda*, emphasized that Soviet writers would have to present their material in a lively, interesting way to combat a "torrent of lies and misinformation."

During the period 1959 to 1961, Adzhubei also was laying the groundwork for introduction of Western views into *Izvestia's* columns as part of the peaceful coexistence campaign. That effort was to be climaxed by President Kennedy's message to the Soviet people—transmitted through Aleksei Adzhubei.

Gradually, after Khrushchev consolidated his control, dissenting opinion from Western leaders was given an airing in the Moscow press. It still happened infrequently enough to be "news" in the West, for example, when American author Charles Neider's 1,100-word letter defending "The Autobiography of Mark Twain" was published in Moscow's *Literary Gazette*.

An interview with Iowa Corn Farmer Roswell Garst, a favorite of Khrushchev's, was reprinted from *U. S. News and World Report* even though it contained many criticisms of Soviet agriculture. More significantly, perhaps, speeches by then-Secretary of State Christian Herter and his predecessor, Dean Acheson, showed up in *Izvestia*.

A New York *Times* correspondent said these were the first uncensored, unedited statements by American leaders to appear in the Soviet press. About the same time, Khrushchev told Russian journalists that he read more Western newspapers than Russian newspapers so he could keep up with Western thinking.

"Surely," the *Times* Correspondent wrote, "one was tempted to surmise a major decision had been made to offer more complete information on what was going on in the enemy camp . . . instead of merely giving Soviet readers the official view on what was going on abroad."

The Herter-Acheson speeches were followed by lengthy rebuttals full of "scathing commentary" on their theses by Soviet writers. Yet this is not dissimilar to the U. S. press practice of running an interview with Khrushchev one day and then tearing into him editorially the next day.

In the fall of 1960, Khrushchev's speech at the United

Nations occupied 80 per cent of the space in Soviet papers. But *Izvestia's* special addition included critiques by Western officials. The policy of examining the enemy's ideology instead of ignoring it was defended by Adzhubei during his appearance at the 22nd Party Congress. He recalled how Khrushchev spoke to the Economic Club in New York, a group of big businessmen, during the 1959 tour.

"Contacts with people of this kind are, from the standpoint of orthodox squeamishness, something seditious," Adzhubei said. "But these are the people who run the greatest capitalist state in the world; we must talk to them, we have to have dealings with them. Self-isolation is easy. Contacts are harder."

Perhaps this explains why Adzhubei was receptive when Lucy Jarvis, a member of the National Broadcasting Company's news staff, invited him to participate in a televised debate with Pierre Salinger, press secretary to President Kennedy. Mikhail Kharlamov, press chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry at the time, and Harrison Salisbury, former Moscow correspondent for the New York *Times*, also took part in the program late in June, 1961. The Russians held close to their Party line on the TV show. Adzhubei said, for example, that the New York *Times* was barred from the USSR because it printed unacceptable stories of murder and love scandals. In a wry understatement, Salisbury said it was the first time he had heard that complaint about the *Times*.

But the off-mike talk was candid and free of propaganda. Salinger invited Adzhubei and Kharlamov to be his guests for the weekend in Washington and they accepted. They stayed at the Russian Embassy but Salinger was host at an outdoor barbecue and later took the Soviet editors on a Potomac River cruise aboard the Presidential yacht, *Honey Fitz*.

The discussion was wide-ranging but Salinger kept stressing the inequities in press coverage of the Soviet premier and President Kennedy in the United States and the USSR, respectively. Salinger told Adzhubei that Khrushchev could have his views reported extensively and accurately in the American press at any time he wished by granting interviews with prominent American journalists. In fact, Salinger said, this had happened several times since Kennedy took office. But in contrast, Salinger noted, there was no day for the President to speak in similar fashion to the Russian people through Soviet journalists. Adzhubei seemed to be sympathetic. They also talked about the prospects of an exchange of television appearances by the two leaders and an interview with Kennedy for publication in Russian newspapers. Nothing definite was decided but the machinery had started to whirr.

Salinger met Kharlamov in New York in late September, 1961 and they again discussed the problem of one-sided



press coverage. Karlamov replied by charging that the U. S. government was blocking visas for 20 Russians who wanted to cover the United Nations. Salinger ran down the complaint and the visas were issued the next day.

Three days later, Salinger recalls, he received word from Georgi Bolshikov, counselor of the Soviet Embassy, that Khrushchev liked the idea of giving Kennedy an outlet in the Soviet Union. Either Adzhubei or his colleague, *Pravda* Editor Pavel A. Satyukov, would be sent to interview the President. About Nov. 1, the Russians notified the White House that Adzhubei would conduct the interview. An appointment was arranged for later November at the President's Hyannis Port, Mass., home.

The conditions laid down by the White House were brief but explicit: The transcript of the interview must be published in full and a representative of the U. S. government must share in, and approve of, the translation from English into Russian. The Soviets agreed.

Kennedy's regular Russian interpreter, Alex Akalovsky, and Bolshikov were selected to do the complicated job of translating the questions and answers.

As Salinger remembers the scene in Hyannis Port, Adzhubei and Kennedy were seated in the living room of the house with interpreters and stenographer present. Adzhubei was respectful, composed and showed a sense of humor as he interrogated the President. He had a sheaf of cards with written questions but during the interview he ad-libbed his arguments in reply to Kennedy's statements.

(Adzhubei had brought along two Russian dolls as gifts for the Kennedy children and told a reporter the night before: "It's better to light a candle than to hate each other in the dark.")

The discussion with Kennedy lasted two hours. The President expressed concern that this was too long but Adzhubei assured him that Russian readers were accustomed to lengthy stories. American reporters interviewed Adzhubei following the interview and he said it would contribute to better Soviet-American relations. He was "very impressed" with the president.

When one newsman implied that the interview might be edited or cut, Adzhubei bristled and said it was American newspapers that did that sort of thing. American officials said later they were glad to have this assurance of full-text publication to bolster the pre-interview agreement.

True to their word, the Soviets printed every word as the President said it. But they edited one of Adzhubei's questions to insert criticism of U. S. policymakers for their role in the U-2 affair that led to the collapse of "summit" talks in Paris in June, 1960.

In reference to Khrushchev's 1959 visit to the United States, Adzhubei had said: "But unfortunately the results of that trip were not completely satisfactory." This was

changed to read: "But the positive results of that trip were wrecked and brought to nothing by the well-known actions of the then American administration." The edited version alludes to the U-2 spy plane incident but does not cite it specifically. American experts believe the change was made to avoid giving the Russian reader any impression that Khrushchev might have been at fault because the trip was not an all-out success. Considering who was involved, it does not seem unlikely that Khrushchev himself may have acted as editor on this occasion. Or perhaps Adzhubei corrected his own "mistake." For now, the explanation must be a subject for speculation.

When the text of the discussion was made public, *Life* and *Time* magazines said it showed that Adzhubei was "argumentative and patronizing" and "arrogant and provocative." An editorial in the *New York Times* said Adzhubei's impromptu defense of the Communist position showed the President had argued the U. S. position very effectively.

Kennedy termed the interview a "marked step forward" in Soviet-American understanding. Salinger said the publication of the President's views was a "daring departure" for the Soviets that indicated a "real effort" to improve relations. American reports from the Soviet Union were "enthusiastic" about the results from the U. S. viewpoint, he added.

The appearance of the interview in *Izvestia* apparently stunned, then fascinated Russian readers. It was spread across the bottom of the first page and continued on an inside page. That day's edition of *Izvestia* was a sell-out both in Moscow and in 18 regional centers where it is printed from mats flown from the capital by jet.

Reporting from Moscow, Harrison Salisbury told how crowds lined up on a raw winter day at hundreds of outdoor bulletin boards where copies of the paper were posted. Most seemed to follow the article to the end although it took about 15 minutes of exposure to the day's blustery weather. Salisbury wrote that the average Russian seemed to be favorably impressed by Kennedy's statements. Reactions generally could be summed up in the phrase: "Kennedy wants peace, too." Soviet journalists interviewed by Salisbury said the precedent-breaking interview presented American views in a way that would not be offensive to the Soviet reader.

There was no reaction from *Izvestia* or other Soviet publications to the Kennedy interview for the first 48 hours. On the third day following publication, an *Izvestia* writer attacked the United States on the ground that it was trying to, in effect, Americanize the world.

The same day, however, a Soviet literary newspaper said Kennedy suffered "political delusions" if he believed that Russia was trying to communize the earth. But the journal—*Literatura i Zhizn*—said the dialogue undoubtedly would

be continued. A television panel composed of three leading Soviet journalists also disputed Kennedy's view.

Two days later, *Izvestia* printed a 3,500-word unsigned rebuttal to Kennedy which termed his remarks about world domination the same "cock and bull story which is nigh 44 years old." The article noted, however, that Kennedy had expressed several reasonable ideas.

In a turnabout from the oft-repeated American demand, *Izvestia* called for deeds and not words from the U.S. leaders. The relative haste in publishing a reply was taken by some observers as a sign that Kennedy's ideas had a significant impact.

Khrushchev's opinion, obtained at a diplomatic reception by inquiring newsmen, was mild. "It was a very interesting interview but I could not agree with everything he said," the premier said. "When Mr. Kennedy becomes a Communist we shall then speak a common language but that will not happen for a very long time."

Discussion and criticism of Kennedy's remarks focused attention on them. Copies of *Izvestia* containing the interview soon became collector's items in Russia. An American reporter travelling in Siberia three weeks after the story was published said it was still fresh news there. Torn, smudged copies of the paper were circulated from hand to hand in remote areas. Readers generally received the impression that Kennedy was as eager for peace as Russian leaders, the reporter found.

Adzhubei conferred again with the President late in January, 1962 at the White House. But he was wearing his diplomat's hat this time and no story emerged from their second two-hour discussion in two months. The appointment was arranged when Salinger learned that Adzhubei and his wife, visiting Cuba, wanted to stop in Washington en route to Moscow. Kennedy immediately invited them to lunch at the White House and they were guests of Salinger at dinner. During his talk with the President, Adzhubei said he hoped Salinger would visit Russia. Kennedy agreed and the trip was scheduled for mid-May. They also discussed the need to improve the flow of news and information between their two countries. The Russian editor said it was vital to take many small steps to improve relations although the time was not ripe for major advances. As one small step, presumably, Adzhubei asked the White House correspondents to stop writing about Molotov since he was an old man with no significance in Soviet affairs any longer. (After the Hyannis Port interview, Adzhubei also lectured reporters by telling them to treat Soviet problems seriously and not as if they were writing about the divorce of Marilyn Monroe.)

Kennedy, who has taken a friendly public attitude toward the editor of *Izvestia*, introduced him at a news conference on Jan. 31, 1962 and said the United States would continue its valuable informal contacts with the

Soviet leadership. The President described the visitor as one who combined "those two hazardous professions of politics and journalism," by now a familiar refrain. Adzhubei lunched on hot dogs at the home of Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy, the President's brother, during his January visit. Robert Kennedy's announcement that he would not visit Russia on his round-the-world trip in February of 1962 undoubtedly was a disappointment to the Soviets and may explain why the invitation was extended to Salinger.

When the White House spokesman went to Moscow, he was entertained by Adzhubei and stayed at a dacha for distinguished guests. Khrushchev came to the dacha and spent eight hours on his first visit, then returned for an additional six hours of conversation with Salinger! The latter declared he was not a diplomat but would gladly listen to Khrushchev's views. And he listened for hours while the Russian premier talked on Berlin, nuclear testing, the situation in Laos and other world trouble spots. Salinger commented when he felt competent to do so.

At the end of the first day, Khrushchev suggested that they have a similar conversation on the following day. Adzhubei said that he was giving a lunch for Salinger that would conflict with the Premier's plan. "I'm always defeated by my son-in-law," Khrushchev said with a laugh. But another appointment was arranged and another six hours were spent in Khrushchev-Salinger exchanges. During this time, the Soviet Premier rejected the proposal for a Khrushchev-Kennedy television appearance or debate. The Premier said that because of deteriorating Soviet-American relations, he would be compelled to attack Kennedy and he did not want to do that.

Reviewing the Moscow visit, Salinger said he felt Khrushchev spent the time with him for two reasons. First, Salinger was a direct pipeline to Kennedy and would relay the substance of the talks. Second, Khrushchev was "overwhelmed" with gratitude because his daughter was received at the White House for lunch by the Kennedys. Khrushchev felt no other President would have been so gracious to the daughter of the Soviet prime minister. During his visit, Salinger addressed the Moscow Journalists' Union at Adzhubei's invitation and became the first Western spokesman to appear in that forum. His remarks were ruled off-the-record, disappointing Salinger's hopes of scoring another breakthrough in the Moscow press. In the question period, Adzhubei rose to denounce Salinger and told the audience the White House spokesman was not telling the truth about U. S. policy. Salinger was amazed to hear such an outburst from his "friend." Adzhubei was a perfect host during the rest of the visit, however, and even took Salinger on an impromptu tour of the Moscow subway and housing projects when his homeward-bound plane was delayed by mechanical

trouble. Since that time, Salinger and Adzhubei have corresponded in a friendly fashion but no new initiatives have been undertaken by either side.

Kennedy Administration sources said nothing was heard from Adzhubei during the Cuban blockade crisis in October, 1962 although his interpreter played a role in the opening rounds. Georgi Bolshikov told Atty. Gen. Kennedy early in October that he had been called for a private talk with Khrushchev and Anastas Mikoyan, his deputy, on Oct. 1. The two men told him to let the President know that the Soviets never would send any weapon to Cuba that was capable of striking targets in the United States. This was regarded by U. S. officials as part of the deception scheme to conceal the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

During the crisis, *Izvestia* and *Pravda* misled their readers on the presence of missiles in Cuba but finally they said Khrushchev had saved the peace by removing weapons that were considered offensive by Kennedy. The text of the President's original statement on Oct. 22, disclosing the existence of the missile sites, never was published in the USSR. The episode showed that "news is what serves the interest of the Soviet regime," concluded British writer Edward Crankshaw. He concluded that the publication of verbatim statements by Western leaders on other occasions did not represent any softening of the traditional Communist attitude toward the press. Rather, Crankshaw felt, it simply reflected Khrushchev's intentions of "building up a new image abroad and encouraging a changed spirit at home." The press may be used to instill a spirit of respect for the capitalist world if Soviet policy requires it, he noted.

But Crankshaw believes there are possibilities of a greater demand for more information by the Russian people. For one thing, he says, the regime is using truth as a weapon on domestic matters to spur farm production.

"In reports of the international scene the deadly anti-American propaganda is now relieved by flickers of truth, occasionally quite strong flickers, flickers which must appear to the Soviet reader almost dazzling, though dim enough in our eyes. And it seems to me true to say. . . that one can't touch truth without receiving light."

How does Adzhubei fit into this picture? There has been no suggestion that he deviates in the slightest from the doctrinaire Communist view of the world. Yet he is more willing to experiment and introduce Russian readers to Western opinions if only to bolster their own beliefs. He seems to have played a key role in raising the prestige of the Soviet journalist and the influence of the press in the USSR.

A Soviet newsman has called him "the Khrushchev of journalism— fresh wind blowing through the pages of our press."

## Prune Journalism Schools

(Continued from page 2)

These questions are of concern, or should be, to college and university presidents, to advertising, radio and television executives, and to taxpayers who support the 107 schools or departments located in and sponsored by publicly-supported four-year colleges and universities. And I suggest that the presidents and governing boards of the 97 private institutions teaching journalism might do well to examine their journalism educational units with a critical eye.

All university administrators know and any editor who wants to know can easily find out that while college and university enrollments have climbed some 43 per cent in the past decade, enrollment in journalism has remained almost constant. This fact should give pause to those who plan new journalism instruction units or who oppose closing existing ones.

Whatever the optimum number of units may be, and there will be no agreement on this point among either the academicians or the practitioners, it is apparent that too many schools and departments of journalism are operating today and that this oversupply of teaching units, many of which are below par academically, will eventually have, if indeed it has not already had, the effect of Gresham's Law.

The better schools of journalism are far superior to those of the early twenties when I was a journalism student. Many of the 204 listed in the 1960 edition of *American Universities and Colleges* are in nowise professional and are in far too many instances providing poor preparation for careers in the communications media.

What is the solution?

It lies somewhere between the frequently voiced proposal of Robert Maynard Hutchins who would close them all forthwith and the plans of the promotion minded state newspaper associations and ambitious college administrators who continue to establish schools and departments.

The land-grant colleges and the state universities in the Middle West nurtured the first schools and departments of journalism. The journalism curriculum at the University of Wisconsin in 1905 and the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri in 1908 blazed the path for professional work in the field although scattered courses in journalism had been taught (but not continuously in any one institution) since 1873.

If more states had a central authority over state-supported institutions of higher learning, similar to the Florida Board of Control, if more college and university administrators would impose the same academic standards on journalism unit staff members as are generally required in other teaching disciplines, and if newspaper, radio, and



# A '62-'63 NIEMAN REPORT ON...

ARTHUR SMITHIES,  
NIEMAN COMMITTEE



"TO  
AULD  
NIEMAN  
FELLERS!"



-SOCIAL  
SCIENCE-

DAVID RIESMAN  
EXAMINES THE  
LONELY CROWDS  
OF HARVARD  
AND RADCLIFFE



HENRY KISSINGER & TH  
FRAN



SOCIAL  
RELATIONS



LOUIS HARTZ, GOVT, POL. SC., ETC.,  
RELATES FASCISM TO THE  
LIBERAL TRADITION IN AMERICA



A LECTURE  
ON CALVIN  
NOW  
WITH...

... CARL J. FRIEDRICH

ERNEST MAY, HISTORY...OTTO ECKSTEIN,





STANLEY HOFFMANN  
PURSUES A FAVORITE

THEME  
WHILE...

... V.O. KEY..  
EXPLAINS THE  
DYNAMICS  
OF GROUP  
POLITICS

MERLE  
FAINSD  
SOVIET  
STUDIES

OS. SCHELLING

MARK FREIDEL

HISTORY-  
(LARGER  
THAN  
LIFE)

MAH  
FRANS

ROBERT  
MC CLOSKEY  
MEASURES THE  
CRANIUM OF THE  
SUPREME COURT  
(FOUND WANTING)

MARK  
VAN DOREN, ENG.  
VISITING FROM  
COLUMBIA...

..AND  
THAT'S  
TH' NEWS!

... AND SAM BEER, GOVT.

GENE  
BOSTON

television groups would recognize that weak schools produce incompetent graduates, there might be some hope for improvement.

Among the 204 schools and departments of journalism listed in the most recent of *American Universities and Colleges*, 107, as mentioned earlier, are in publicly supported institutions. Of the 107, 40 schools, located in 31 states, have been accredited by the American Council on Education for Journalism. Only seven of the 97 schools in private institutions are on the accredited list\*. There would be no great loss to professional education for journalism if the 90 remaining private institutions decided to terminate journalism instruction when their current freshman classes are graduated in 1966.

The fact that 85 per cent of the accredited schools and departments are in state-supported colleges and universities—40 schools in 31 states—makes the next proposal somewhat easier to execute than the sweeping suggestion that the 90 private schools close their journalism units.

Governing boards or budget authorities in these 31 states might well solve this problem in two stages.

First: Careful consideration should be given to concentrating professional education for journalism and communications in one publicly supported institution of higher learning in each of the 31 states which now have accredited schools. Florida, as stated above, took this step in 1958.

Such a course of action would require exhaustive study in each of the eight states which have more than one accredited school. Obviously, in Texas it would result in reducing the number of publicly supported schools of journalism from 15 and the number of accredited schools from three to one. It would mean a reduction from eight to one in California, seven to one in Wisconsin, and from five to one in Ohio.

Second: A much more difficult step, but one by no means impossible, would be to terminate journalism instruction in certain states where despite its accredited status it is none too strong and to designate institutions in adjoining states as regional centers in journalism education.

Such a proposal has ample precedent in the field of professional education. Medical schools at several universities, for example, accept and train students from neighboring states through contracts entered into between the respective states. The same plan is followed by schools of dentistry and veterinary medicine and to a less formal extent by schools of pharmacy and law.

State borders mean little to the undergraduate of today in spite of the higher out-of-state tuition fees universally charged by state universities. Many schools of journalism in state universities draw from 13 to 30 per cent of their undergraduate enrollment from other states. In the small

school which I head, students are enrolled this year from nine states outside of North Carolina; a year ago 11 states were represented in a student body of 78.

With the out-of-state financial differential removed or paid by the state in which the student lives, no logical reason other than local pride would remain for the existence of some schools of journalism.

Journalism instruction is expensive. On most campuses, the per student-credit-hour cost is high—not as high as in medicine or dentistry but usually three, four or five times higher than instructional costs of departments in the humanities, social sciences, or sciences. A number of factors bring this about, chief among which are small classes, fairly expensive equipment, and a salary schedule for journalism staff members significantly higher than that paid in some of the other disciplines.

The media of mass communications—newspapers, magazines, radio, television—unquestionably are in need of the best minds which can be recruited from the nation's colleges and universities. Those of us in professional education for journalism believe that schools and departments of journalism bear a responsibility to prepare a fair share of these recruits.

Education for journalism in the professional sense has just passed the half-century mark. But the rapid proliferation of schools and departments since World War Two has brought into existence too many which are undermanned and poorly equipped.

Reiterating my 1957 suggestion that the number of schools be drastically reduced, I venture five years later to add the suggestion that one of the foundations, all of which for one reason or another have shied away from examining or assisting schools of journalism, instigate an investigation of the educational and professional programs of schools and departments of journalism in the nation and come up with recommendations for strengthening professional education in this field.

My proposals will not be greeted with cheers by the majority of my 925 colleagues in the Association for Education in Journalism. Many among the "high-standards" group will say the proposals are unworkable and altogether too drastic; my colleagues in the "be-kind-to-everyone-they're-doing-the-best-they-can" camp will charge that I am proposing to put the small schools out of business. To the latter charge, I reply that my objective has been and is to maintain and strengthen the better schools, be they large or small.

In my opinion, the 204 now in existence constitute an unrealistically large number. Hence, my personal slogan includes the word *fewer* as well as the all-important *better*.

---

**Norval Neil Luxon** is dean of the school of journalism at the University of North Carolina.

---

\* Boston University, Columbia, Marquette, Northwestern, Stanford, Syracuse, and Washington and Lee.

# The Story Behind "Prestige" Polls

By Oren Stephens

My desk is littered with critical editorials and irate letters coming in the wake of the latest news and feature stories about the "prestige" or "popularity" polls of the U. S. Information Agency. Editorials complain of a waste of taxpayer's money in a vainglorious and frivolous attempt to chart the President's or the nation's popularity abroad. The irate letters express the indignation of the American women who read or heard of a study of their "image" in Western Europe.

The anger of the women is understandable. They were exposed to stories playing up the unfavorable descriptions of them and playing down or ignoring such favorable adjectives as "vital, confident, free, independent, open-minded, public-spirited, industrious, efficient, and well-organized." The stories also failed to explain why the study was made, a failure that added mystification to the resentment.

The press is not so understandable. With one exception, the exception being the estimable *Courier-Journal* and *Times* of Louisville, the press did not bother to accept an invitation to delve into a research program which has provided much copy since the summer of 1960 when "prestige" polls got caught up in the Presidential campaign. Curiosity of the critical editors did not reach the point of asking the traditional press questions. What is the research program in USIA? How does it further the national interest? Why does it use opinion polls? Who conducts these polls? Is all this really necessary? Curiosity of the reporters was also limited. When they concluded that the released studies were politically stale—the "Confidential" reports were at least two years old—they decided sex was more stimulating and loaded the wires with sensational stories based on a paper titled "The Image of American Youth and American Women in Western Europe."

One wire service writer followed up a few days later with a suggestion to American women that they flood Edward R. Murrow, Director of USIA, with calls, telegrams, and letters of protest. It speaks well of the American women that only about 50 of them fell for such tainted bait.

Since USIA research is my present responsibility, I wish to answer the unasked questions for this journalistic audience which can distinguish between the significant and the sensational. My purpose and hope is to gain greater understanding of the vital role of the overseas information pro-

gram in supporting the American position in a world fraught with promise as well as peril. And since it is people who are moving this world, we need support for research efforts to know these people better and to reach them more effectively.

More than any previous information director Ed Murrow is being called upon to inject the public opinion factor into foreign policy decisions, statements, and actions. Being an acknowledged master in communications, he then bends the USIA machine to the task of presenting and explaining these policies and the nation and people behind them to foreign audiences.

These audiences are many and complex, ranging from the illiterate campesinos of Latin America to the sophisticated elites of Western Europe, from the regimented workers to their ideological masters in the Communist world.

To speak with authority in the highest foreign policy councils and to improve his own highly-complicated information program, the Director needs and demands the best research support possible.

As the big issues arise, he poses many questions about foreign reactions. He expects quick and accurate answers in order to advise the decision makers and to guide the informational response abroad.

What is the world-wide reaction, he will ask, to Soviet resumption of nuclear tests? What will be the reaction when and if we resume tests? How are the Soviet people reacting to this and other high-tension issues? How is Communist propaganda handling these issues in external and internal output, and are there significant differences?

Just how influential, again, is Castro and Castroism in Latin America? Is it Castroism or Communism with which we should be most concerned? What will be the reaction when the United States demands removal of Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba?

When the Director asks the questions, his Research and Reference Service gives him estimates based on available evidence analyzed by area and other experts. These estimates are confirmed by scientific surveys if we have the time and capacity to use these methods.

The question of the influence of Castro was pinned down early in 1961 by multi-national public opinion polls in Latin America, for example. (The recent revival of interest in USIA surveys came when the President cited these studies in his press conference to substantiate a point he was making about the decline of Castro's influence.) In the fast-moving Cuban crisis, press and other analyses of

Oren Stephens is director, Office of Research and Analysis, USIA. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1943.

world-wide reaction had to be produced twice-daily for USIA participation in the almost-continuous meetings of the Executive Committee of the National Security Council.

Attitudes of foreign students, a priority target group, are a major concern. Prime activities today, they will be rulers tomorrow. In Africa, for example, where there is such a dearth of educated men to run the new countries, students will receive their diplomas one day and take important jobs the next day, more often than not in government agencies. Hence, they are a key audience, just as they are in other developing areas, and we need to know what they are reading, hearing, thinking, hoping, fearing, planning. Lately, we have been asked to study high-school-level students.

In these studies as in all others we are deadly serious in a deadly serious world.

On the operational side, the media side, the demands are equally heavy. What are the best channels for reaching a given audience? Radio? Press? Books? Movies? Television? Personal contact? What techniques are best for informing and persuading? Is this magazine reaching the right readers with the right material? Is the Voice of America attracting target listeners? And how many, where? Is this film actually conveying our message to the viewers?

An editor (I could also say a broadcaster, telecaster, book publisher, movie producer, an exhibitor, and other media directors) has much in common with the Director of USIA. They both need to know and have a feel for their audiences.

What changes drastically in this comparison between the American editor and the USIA Director is the nature of the audience. Suppose, for illustration, the American editor inherits a newspaper in Southeast Asia and decides to go there and publish. On arrival, he finds a largely illiterate population with a sprinkling of highly-educated men who studied at Oxford, Harvard, or the Sorbonne. The familiar American middle class is missing. Instead of holding religious or moral values in common, his readers include Buddhists, Moslems, Christians, and animists. Indifference about the outside world would be a major problem. And to compound everything, there is competition from a dedicated and subsidized operator who runs a Red flag on his masthead.

This approximates conditions and complexities USIA faces in not one community or country or region but in a great many areas of the world.

Supplying answers to a multitude of questions dictates research in six main areas of inquiry:

1) The basic beliefs and motivations, the values and aspirations of the world's peoples.

2) The current preoccupations, the hopes and fears of the world audience.

3) The specific attitudes of target groups we are attempting to reach and influence.

4) The channels and methods of communication with foreign groups.

5) The evaluation of USIA programs and products used to convey our message.

6) The evaluation of the world-wide Communist propaganda mechanism designed to remake the world in the Marxist image.

There are many traditional sources of information—academic, journalistic, diplomatic—on the basic beliefs, the present views, rumor, and the specific attitude of various foreign populations. We fully use these sources. Much of this information, however, is subjective rather than objective. An unbiased, impersonal source was needed to supplement the traditional information.

Drawing upon polling experience in this country, the U. S. Armed Forces started conducting public opinion polls in Europe during World War II, the first study being made in Aachen, first German city liberated. During the occupation period in Germany and in Japan, a number of studies were made. When the State Department took over the information task, public opinion polls continued in Europe and Japan, but it was not until formation of the U. S. Information Agency that the survey research program speeded gradually to all areas of the world outside the various curtains.

Similar methods began to be used in finding how foreign peoples get their information, ideas, conceptions, and misconceptions about America and Americans. Going a step farther, we began asking about their communications habits. What radios did they listen to and why? What publications did they read? Did they believe what they read? What subjects interest them most?

Much of this attitudinal and media research material, produced solely for use in the information effort abroad, is collected in the field. Local research organizations, many of which are affiliated with the Gallup Organization in Princeton or International Research Associates in New York, conduct the interviews and tabulate the responses for analysis by USIA staff researchers.

USIA studies have never been intended for publication and have in many cases been withheld from publication, a policy both Republican and Democratic administrations have tried to follow in protecting an essential research tool.

While USIA research has been going on for several years, it is still in a pioneering stage in the developing areas of the world. Methods have had to be adapted to local realities. Using our regional research officers as monitors, we try to insure that foreign research studies come up to standard, although some have been indifferent in quality and a few have been washouts.



For fiscal 1962 the Research and Reference Service had about \$190,000 for world-wide contract research. For the current fiscal year we have about \$215,000. For next year we are asking for about \$400,000. This is not enough, but there are limits to what can be done wisely and well under present conditions.

Surveys or polls attract most attention but constitute only a small part of the total effort to provide research and reference support to USIA policy and operating officers in developing programs that are carried out in more than 100 countries around the world. (Out of a staff of 125, only 15, including clerical help, are concerned with polls. Most of the others are area analysts or reference librarians.)

In addition to countless spot reports, some 650 studies of varying subject and magnitude have been prepared in the past five years. These deal with various aspects of communication, including studies of basic values and current opinion. Other reports assessing world response to our acts and policy statements are distributed throughout the government.

Communications fact books have been prepared covering all major nations of the world. These are basic reference works and contain information on population, education, literacy, religion, language, communications channels and target groups. Seventy-six such fact books have been completed. In many instances, fact books, particularly those on Africa, provide the only existing compiled reference work on national communications.

USIA's research unit analyzes Sino-Soviet and satellite propaganda output and studies its implications. This mass of material is examined continuously and spot developments reported at once. Annually the total Red program is detailed at book-length in a unique source document.

Returning to that study of the image of American women, this was a small part of a major effort to re-program USIA material in Western Europe in the wake of Russia's Sputnik I. We tried to find out what aspects of American life interested Europeans most and how they felt about these aspects. We asked about science, living conditions, business practices, economic system, leisure-time activities, labor, education, family life, women's activities, religion, architecture, literature, politics, art, music, and youth activities. Interest in American women and American youth was high, but misconceptions obviously needed attention. The paper cited in the beginning was a further spell-out of the data for planning corrective information programs. For example, the theme of our exhibit at the Berlin Fair the next year was "Youth USA." We made a before-and-after study of visitors, interviewing a sample before they entered and a sample after they saw the exhibit, and found that impressions were improved. The exhibit was successful because, through research, we knew in advance exactly what we were trying to do.

## The Columnist in India

By Chanchal Sarkar

The Indian newspaper columnist has come to stay. He isn't indispensable—probably nowhere is he that—but he has begun to do something which no one else can. Mind you, I can think of a situation in which a columnist could be, if not superfluous, largely unnecessary.

If every citizen followed national and international events with care and discrimination, if he could pick his way confidently through complicated sets of facts and opinions, and if he had the time and the resources to get most of the available background, then the columnist could probably be retired.

If newspapers were small, well-knit organizations, allowing perfect freedom to the writers of editorials and full opportunity for free expression to the individual journalist, if the pattern of ownership were such that the proprietors' preferences didn't intrude into the papers' attitudes and views, then again the columnist could go on permanent holiday.

But, as everyone knows, the situation isn't like that at all. Too often the ordinary citizen is alarmingly ill-informed. Newspaper offices are steadily growing bigger and more impersonal. And the proprietor's grip gets ever tighter.

Besides, the subjects about which an enlightened citizen should have some awareness are now impossibly varied: international affairs, with the problems of obstinate trouble spots thrown in—Berlin, the Congo and Algeria, for instance; Science; Economics; Government and Political Science; Ideological Controversies; Labor questions and a whole brood of unclassifiable domestic issues.

Then there are problems, like Disarmament and Defense, which straddle several disciplines at the same time. No modern citizen, barring, of course, the most exceptional, could have a grasp over all of them. But, with the help of knowledgeable advisers he can, if interested and a little painstaking, be aware of the major issues and their implications.

This is where the columnist comes in. The area between straight news and straight editorial views is vast, with ample acreage for information, interpretation and comment. And, adequately guided, the intelligent citizen can be nursed along to having a *speculum menti*, to hold up a receptive mental mirror to the world's problems and

---

Chanchal Sarkar writes politics on *The Statesman* of New Delhi. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1961. His discussion of the role of the columnist was a broadcast on All-India Radio.

aspirations. As the most distinguished of living columnists, Walter Lippmann, has said, the modern journalist "has to teach himself to be not only a recorder of facts and a chronicler of events, but also . . . to be a writer of notes and essays in contemporary history."

Well, that is the scope. I am not suggesting that all columnists, Indians or others, are fulfilling it or even that they all accept the scope to be so. But that is the peak to be scaled. Now what sort of climbing tackle should the columnist carry for the assault? First, and most important, a clear and distinctive point of view. Next, he should be very scrupulous about facts. Third, he shouldn't allow himself to be a pipeline for anyone's personal grievances or ambitious unless they have some national significance. A fourth quality would be a composite one—wide-ranging interests, the ability to frame fundamental questions and to attempt logical, informed and impartial answers.

The recipe for a good column is "Take news, interpretation and comment, shake, and serve in not too much space." No one knows the correct proportions. The two Alsop brothers, who together used to write a distinguished column in America, said that they aimed at having at least one significant and unpublished bit of news in every column they wrote. A Drew Pearson column might have nothing but some inflammable news. Lippmann or the late Anne O'Hare McCormick might serve no news at all. Marquis Childs might mix the two. Only a reader can tell whether a column is a digest of news, a straight editorial or that indefinable something else besides.

Style has more than a little to do with his verdict. The editorial, however well written and persuasive, has to keep within a certain framework; the column is immensely more flexible. Every column is in many senses a very personal product and almost always the kind of person the writer is shows through, but the scrupulous columnist should take care to keep his ego firmly muzzled because what he is writing about matters much more than himself. Personally I don't fancy the columnist with committed views and much prefer the uncommitted liberals of open mind.

Having laid down the specifications of the sieve let's pass Indian columnists through it. Countries come to have their own newspaper characteristics and the columnist, as you know, is largely an American institution. In India,

the leader-writing tradition is older, the columnists comparatively new. And, being new to the game, they have certain failings.

They are not, I think, as industrious or fastidious in collecting all the available facts before submitting them to the mould of interpretation. There is too little research, rooting in facts which, seemingly unconnected, often provide clues to a pattern.

A reason for this is that, quite often, Indian columnists do other work besides writing their column. Not that they couldn't shed some of the load—they are usually senior enough to be able to do this without difficulty and also to have research assistance—but perhaps there isn't adequate realization that writing an effective, constructive column is very demanding work, needing undivided attention.

Because of the casualness there is a tendency either to make the column a string of news snippets, not always significant, or to fall back on the generalities which mark a second-rate editorial. This is not true all the time; occasionally the major Indian columnists turn out very good pieces indeed, but it illustrates one of my regrets—that there isn't consistency in the punch or in the confident analysis of hard, incontrovertible facts. Nor is there enough good writing. As a reader I have a weakness for style.

I should have spoken about the myth that columnists have got to be political. Nothing of the sort. There could be as many kinds of columnists as there are subjects to interest the intelligent citizen. But in India we do seem to have given exaggerated importance to the political column and, nowadays, to the economic. So a wide field remains—for the science columnist for instance and the legal and constitutional—not forgetting that the true column must have interpretation and comment.

The Indian columnist, as I said at the start, has come to stay. However strong the editorial tradition, it is on the decline—partly because of the trend in the ownership of the Indian Press. The columnist is not, of course, untouched by this. But if he can establish his integrity and win the confidence of the public then, even without syndication, nothing can keep him from stimulating the minds of the newspaper-reading citizen—whose number will inevitably grow, million by million.

## The Absolutes of Justice Black

By Louis M. Lyons

### ONE MAN'S STAND FOR FREEDOM:

Mr. Justice Black and the Bill of Rights. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Irving Dilliard. Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y. 504 pp. \$0.00.

As he did a decade ago with *Learned Hand (The Spirit of Liberty)*, Irving Dilliard has brought together those judicial pronouncements of Justice Black which assert the rights of man and illuminate Black's own independence of mind and philosophy of freedom.

This is not a biography of Hugo Black, though it includes a profile of 24 pages; but a compendium of his decisions and dissents in cases testing the Bill of Rights, during the first 25 years of Justice Black's term on the Supreme Court.

There are some 86 cases, taken in order, as they came before the Court over the years. In nine-tenths of these, the majority of the Court agreed with Black in finding Constitutional protection for the individual against whatever official authority was threatening him. In his early years on the Court Black was usually with the majority, or vice versa. It is when we came into the McCarthy period that Black's dissents pile up as he refuses to compromise with the Constitution as he reads it. He reads it, as he keeps repeating, "for what it says." It says "no law" "no abridgement" "no person." Black's interpretation is always absolute. He has been criticized, most recently by Dean Erwin Griswold, for his absolutism. Black himself proclaims this, most emphatically in an interview, which Dilliard makes his final chapter, entitled: Justice Black and the First Amendment Absolutes. This was by Professor Edmond Cahn of New York University Law School only last year at a banquet in honor of Justice Black. This interview has called attention to the literal interpretation Black puts on all the articles of the Bill of Rights, most emphatically on the First Amendment. He goes so far as to say he believes the makers of the Amendment intended there should not even be laws against libel or defamation.

"It is my belief that there are absolutes

in the Bill of Rights and that they were put there on purpose by men who knew what words meant and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes.'"

Black's opinions, particularly his dissents, ring with such statements. One of the most recent is the prayer case of last year (*Engel vs. Vitale*) which is the final case in Dilliard's book. Here, of course, Black spoke for the majority. Since then, with the appointment of Arthur Goldberg on the retirement of Felix Frankfurter, Black has again often found the majority with him, as in his earlier Court days. But through the fifties, Black's uncompromising assertions were most often given in dissent. He was usually accompanied by Justice Douglas, and very often also by Chief Justice Warren, and latterly Justice Brennan.

But Black has been most consistent of any, and of course has been there longest, since 1937. He had been a Senator ten years, and before that was a police court judge at 25, county prosecutor at 29. Then, after serving in the army through the first World War, he practiced law about eight years, much of the time as counsel for labor unions. This at a time when unions weren't doing too well in Alabama. If one looks for clues in Black's background to his intense feeling about the Bill of Rights, this chapter of fighting labor's cause would suggest one part of it. Further, his very earliest elective office confronted him with police brutalities that must have been rare even for that time in that area. His first public service was to launch a grand jury investigation into the lawless and inhuman practices of the local police.

But even back of that, if Dilliard's too brief biographical exploration had carried him further, one suspects he would have found an uncomplicated man. Seeking a parallel, one thinks of George Norris in Congress, whose career was a simple straight line of assertion of the people's rights against whatever complications or equivocations might prove more expeditious for a sophisticated economic society. Over and over, Justice Black refuses to accept the notion that the needs of govern-

ment must be balanced against the rights of the individual. "This so-called balancing test means," he said, (*In Re Amastaplo*, 1961) "that the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, religion and petition can be repressed whenever there is a sufficient government interest in doing so. . . ."

This is a handsomely printed and beautifully organized book. Each case in the table of contents has a one sentence explanation of its significance. Each decision is preceded by a brief summary of the case, and a statement of how the justices divided.

Black's philosophy about the Bill of Rights is spelled out in his James Madison Lecture of 1960, which with the Cahn interview makes a frame for the 430 pages of the decisions in Black's plain and vigorous prose.

In time's pendulum swing, Black's period on the Court peculiarly called for the emphasis he gave to the First Amendment. With Holmes and Brandeis gone, the forties and fifties would have seen individual rights go further into eclipse without his stand.

What has so obviously appealed to Dilliard about Black he puts in the title of the book: *One Man's Stand for Freedom*. It suggests the title of his book on Lerner Hand: *Spirit of Liberty*. These two books are Dilliard's appreciation of the vitality these two so different but such great judges have given to the Constitutional guarantees of individual rights, in a period when they came under serious attack. Dilliard sees the greatness of Justice Black in his absolute, undeviating uncompromising stand, whether he stands with a unanimous Court or stands alone.

This says something about Irving Dilliard. Though most of Black's years on the Court, Dilliard served on the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (1923-1957), the last eight years as editor of its vigorous editorial page. Through all that time and since, no American journalist more closely followed the work of the Supreme Court or more consistently discussed the importance of its decisions. Through the fifties, the era when Black was delivering many of his ringing dissents, Irving Dilliard's editorials similarly voiced urgent defense of the Bill of Rights and anxiety at its frequent subversion. In his own role, Dilliard was as uncompromising as Black.

But a newspaper, or any other lay institution, does not provide permanent tenure for dissent. Unlike a chief justice, the chief of an editorial page cannot join the dissent. He must speak always for the majority, which means the management. The uncompromising man cannot also be the organization man. It is a part of the record of the Pulitzer paper that the dissenting opinions of Irving Dilliard were published there for 34 years. But it was only in the final years as chief that his dissents created a serious institutional problem, resolved only by his departure. Dilliard has since refused all efforts to realign him with an institution. He has used his freedom in such ways as this book, in many visiting lectureships, as trustee of the University of Illinois, his alma mater, through a newspaper column, and as persistent publicist in championing the Bill of Rights. As in the different case of James B. Conant, Dilliard's larger service has come since his departure from the institutional life by which most of us live with more or less compromise.

## Age of Khrushchev

**THE NEW FACE OF SOVIET TOTALITARIANISM.** By Adam B. Ulam. Harvard University Press. Cambridge. 233 pp. \$4.95.

The obsolescence of Marxism and the difficulties for Communism in its own success runs through the seven articles that make up this attempt to fit the Khrushchev years into Soviet history.

Professor Ulam sees an "enlightened totalitarianism . . . groping to retain mastery over a changing society," which no longer needs the ideology that created it. Citizens are told to blame their troubles on a dead dictator's criminal personality. The weapons of terror are kept, unused but ready, but the enemy is erosion not opposition, agnosticism not apostasy.

Similarly, spread of Communist power brought the inadmissible divergence between ideological and national interests. In an impressive Kremlinological exercise, Ulam concludes that Khrushchev is more referee than faction leader, and that a "Chinese" wing among nationalistic Russian Communists is unlikely.

Professor Ulam's special field commands general interest. His interpretations are significant. His style will win its greatest acceptance among fellow ponderers.

Dan Berger

## Inside Katanga

By William J. Eaton

**TO KATANGA AND BACK: A UN Case History.** By Conor Cruise O'Brien (Simon and Schuster, New York), 370 pp. \$5.95.

This is an insider's view of the United Nations' first, unsuccessful attempt to end the secession of Katanga from the Congo in 1961. O'Brien, a former Irish diplomat who was chief UN representative in the Katanga capital during this effort, tells his story with keen sensitivity to the politics of the world organization and the realities in Elisabethville. He was sacked by the UN for what he thought was obedience to UN policy and concludes that he had to be sacrificed to bolster the organization's standing in a critical hour. The late Dag Hammarskjöld, O'Brien believes, felt it necessary to appease the British, French and Belgian governments by retreating from a hard line designed to end the Katanga secession. O'Brien's memoirs throb with vivid portraits of his colleagues, the Congo and the colorful Congolese rulers. His view is that European mining interests were the real strength behind a Katanga facade represented by Moise Tshombe. Firm UN action to rout the mercenaries and impose all-Congo rule on the Congo, he believes, would have ended the secession in 1961. (Similar measures, with UN forces used to back them up, did just that early this year.)

O'Brien, discussing the September, 1961 street fighting in Katanga, says the world got a false picture of alleged UN "atrocities" because of press distortion. He blames this partly on correspondents who he said often quoted Europeans in Katanga without disclosing their anti-UN bias. "Thus even objective reporting—since the background had NOT been situated—necessarily turned against the United Nations," he laments. O'Brien also regrets that the UN's own statements were muffled and inconsistent since it had to placate its critics.

The well-written memoirs build to a climax with the death of Hammarskjöld in a plane crash while he was en route to meet Tshombe. O'Brien speculates on the possibility of assassination and comes up with a suspect—menacing Godefroid Munongo, Katanga's bully-boy Minister of Interior. The denouement of O'Brien's resignation-dismissal follows. Perhaps the UN action last January will provide material for a preface or a second edition.

## What About TV

By Nguyen Thai

**THE PEOPLE LOOK AT TELEVISION.** A Study of Audience Attitudes. By Gary A. Steiner. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 422 pp. \$7.95.

This book is a study of "the attitudes and feelings associated with the television set and what is on it." In a scholarly way Dr. Gary Steiner, who is associate professor of psychology at the University of Chicago, attempts to answer a number of controversial questions about television viewing in the U.S.

What is the importance of television as a mass medium in American society? What satisfaction does it give the viewing public? How do viewers feel about viewing? What part does TV play in the daily life of Americans? How do people evaluate TV programs? How do they react to the commercials? These are the questions which are answered in Dr. Steiner's book with the backing of a vast amount of facts and figures derived from an empirical survey of the TV audience.

The impressive wealth of empirical data presented (nearly half the book is devoted to appendices, questionnaires and charts) surely enhances the methodological prestige of the study in the eyes of the social scientists concerned with the intricacies of communication research. But by the same token the non-expert reader may be less interested in the paraphernalia of "scientific" social science research than in the general findings of significance that the author can draw from his empirical data. As an expert in his subject the author could very well present his findings without the array of detailed charts, curves and tables that only make the book less



readable and more expensive for the average reader not concerned with the "scientific" data. This indeed is the dilemma of all scholarly studies of a general interest subject.

But Dr. Steiner's study of TV audiences has several interesting findings to present. From the point of view of the non-expert reader, it is regrettable that the too short "commentary" has not been expanded. In these few concluding pages the author makes a number of highly significant projections based on the empirical results of the study. Here a number of controversial questions about TV seem to find their answers. What do American TV viewers want to see? They like programs that are fun and worthwhile, says Dr. Steiner. They want to learn something, to be gradually introduced to the higher level culture and to "participate" more when watching TV. They want to see TV programs improved in such a way that the "improvement would go farther, spread to more people, more often."

On the whole, Dr. Steiner's book makes its scholarly contribution to the field of TV research, which in his words "has had more critics and supporters than scholars." To the specialists in the field of communication research, the study is recommended by such eminent experts as Bernard Berelson and Paul L. Lazarsfeld, who both contributed respectively a foreword and an afterword. To the non-specialists, Dr. Steiner's book could have been more interesting if he had expanded his "commentaries" to the detriment of the charts and curves.

#### Our Reviewers:

Book reviewers in this issue are:

Francois Sully, Far East correspondent, *Newsweek*; Christopher Rand of *The New Yorker*; William E. Henthorn, University of Leyden; Louis M. Lyons, curator, Nieman Fellowships; and the following current Nieman Fellows:

Dan Berger, Indianapolis *Times*.

William J. Eaton, UPI, Washington,

Shelby T. Scates, AP, Oklahoma City,

Patrick J. Owens, editor, Pine Bluffs

*Commercial*.

John W. Kole, Milwaukee *Journal*,

Gene Graham, Nashville *Tennessean*.

## Intellectual in Politics

By Gene Graham

THE POLITICS OF HOPE. By Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. 298 pp.

Professor Schlesinger is a brave soul. Surely, he feareth not his enemies, if one is to put stock in the axiom, "O, that mine enemy would write a book!" For the professor keeps on writing them, and in this, his latest, he has taken more than the usual number of risks.

This because *The Politics of Hope* is a collection of Mr. Schlesinger's essays, written from 1949 to the starting point of the New Frontier. Placing together for critical comparison his writings of a decade would seem enough for a scholar to risk. But Mr. Schlesinger invites a doubled search for the inconsistencies which are bound to appear in such a collection simply because he is who he is.

And who is Mr. Schlesinger? Ah, this is an interesting question. It is also one which is not as readily answerable as it may, at first blush, seem. But this collection of the author's essays may provide as good an answer to that question as will ever be provided.

For in *The Politics of Hope*, Mr. Schlesinger emerges as each and all of the types of intellectuals he discusses in an article written in the dark and hopeless days of 1956 (when Eisenhower was in office).

In the essay "Time and the intellectuals" Mr. Schlesinger types intellectuals as follows: The Intellectual as Analyst (a Sumner or a Veblen); The Intellectual as Activist (a participant such as Jefferson, Hamilton, etc.); the Intellectual as Prophet (Emerson, Dewey); and finally, the Intellectual as Gadfly (Mencken).

And in essays on either side, both in point of date and in physical arrangement in the volume, Mr. Schlesinger demonstrates his capabilities in each of these areas of intellectual pursuit.

It is Mr. Schlesinger, the Prophet, who predicts in 1960, for *Esquire* magazine, that Hope is just around the corner now that the American nation has finished with the mediaeval 50's.

It is Mr. Schlesinger, the Analyst, who probes—with the analyst's objectivity, we must presume—into conditions as they

exist today, and finds, in the introduction to this volume, that almost everything he prephesied before the election of 1960 has now come true.

In a sense, it is disappointing to recognize that Mr. Schlesinger, the Prophet, and Mr. Schlesinger, the Analyst, is also Mr. Schlesinger, the Activist, participant in the New Frontier, who, having predicted what it would do, now finds affirmation of his own prophecy.

And because he is all these things, one is tempted sorely to place Mr. Schlesinger in the final category he created—the Intellectual as Gadfly. Perhaps he will not object since, in 1956, he held "... the personal conviction that, of the varieties of intellectuals, the sort of America most needs at this moment ... is the Intellectual as Gadfly."

Mr. Schlesinger is a brilliant as well as a brave soul. He reasons with overpowering logic, in a straight and well documented line, as long as his article lasts. And there is, to be sure, even a cohesive over-all consistency in his work. But it is a partisan's consistency.

When it serves the purpose of his current theme, Mr. Schlesinger is willing to declare his belief in the "existence of a cyclical rhythm in our national affairs."

He is able to offer the cycle to explain America's return to the politics of "Memory (Ike again) after two decades of active and exhausting Hope." Or, if one chooses, he can blame the stagnation, again with the help of Mr. Schlesinger, on the lack of national leadership.

Some might unkindly call this intellectual analysis by multiple choice. But I think the thing that disturbs me most about this book and its author is the realization that Emerson was not Jefferson was not Veblen was not Mencken.

Put another way, how can a passionate political activist purport at once to be just that, plus objective analyst and dispassionate prophet? As a colleague asks, can a newspaperman hire out to write a candidate's campaign speeches while objectively reporting the same campaign?

*The Politics of Hope* is magnificent reading; but it should be read with some of these questions in mind.

## The Book of Ralph McGill

By Patrick J. Owens

THE SOUTH AND THE SOUTHERNER. By Ralph McGill. Atlantic-Little, Brown, Boston. 297 pp. \$5.

The coincidence of Ralph McGill and his times is turning the man into a national monument. He is the Horace Greeley of the middle nineteen hundreds; the spokesman for the national aspirations of his day.

The old approve the man because he manages (in the Harvard phrase) a synthesis between their antique values and the real world.

The young prize him because he says things they yearn to believe but cannot bring themselves to hope are true.

Yankees value him because he hates the right people.

Many Southerners bless him, and are eased in difficult journeys by him, because he hates the right people in the right style. (McGill differs from most who cuss Ross Barnett in that his is a compassionate and an informed outrage. He is a brotherhood advocate whose definition of the human tribe encompasses the governor of Mississippi and Rev. Rep. Adam Clayton Powell.)

So it is that Atlanta will one day dedicate a statue to McGill that is ten foot high, that will cost fifty thousand dollars of Cola Cola money. There will be Ralph McGill Memorial Lectures, a Ralph McGill School of Communications, a McGill Medal for Courage and Humanity in Journalism.

There will even, take it or leave it, be a Ralph McGill Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Personally, I cherish McGill because he has beat the system. He is a newspaperman who had something to say and who is getting it said.

He tells some of the story in his book, but much of it must be conjectured.

Born in East Tennessee to a family whose Civil War loyalties were divided, he grew up in sharply limited affluence and went to Vanderbilt. There he ran with some of the Fugitive poets and became a part-time sports writer. Next he

was a reporter-political hatchet man for E. B. Stahlman's Nashville *Banner*. At this work, he was a success. But he moved on to Atlanta, and a sports editorship. Eventually, he became editor of the *Constitution* and a regional voice of increasing consequence. It was not, however, until 1957, about the time of the Little Rock crisis, that McGill became the spokesman of Southern conscience who is today so generally esteemed. Something happened at that point—to the man? to his paper? McGill doesn't say—and the most eloquent newspaper advocate of racial justice began, day-to-day, to speak his full mind.

It is customary to view McGill as a Southern wonder, and he is that. Yet it may be questioned whether many non-Southern newspapers have mustered comparable conscience or permitted comparable social courage. To be fair, it must be said that much of the Northern press has been almost as outspoken as McGill concerning civil rights in Georgia. But some of McGill's Southern admirers await the day that a paper in Chicago manages an equal incisiveness in discussing the special challenges that automation poses to capitalism. And the day that one of the Boston papers (having rightly evaluated unchecked population increase as a greater world menace than racism) launches the Big Crusade for birth control.

*The South and the Southerner* is half McGill autobiography and half Southern history. One way to describe it is to say that it is about the South as one Southerner has experienced and perceived the South. There are more profound explanations of the region (but not, perhaps, a great number of them). The strength of McGill's book is in what it tells us about McGill. And in the language of the telling.

McGill is not exactly a slouch as a newspaper writer but he has not often written as well for his paper as he writes here. The book is spare and sensitive, a triumph of moods caught and orchestrated.

Here again, the man has beat the system. No one who turns out six or seven columns a week should be able to moonlight a book of this quality.

## DeVoto

By John W. Kole

FOUR PORTRAITS AND ONE SUBJECT: BERNARD DEVOTO. By Catherine Drinker Bowen, Edith R. Mirrieles, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Wallace Stegner. Houghton Mifflin. 206 pp. \$4.

Since Benny DeVoto died in 1955, his Easy Chair column in Harper's magazine has been in search of an author. It has been batted around by Editor John Fischer and a parade of guest writers, but no one has been able to match the quality of DeVoto's polemic.

So it is with considerable nostalgia that one reads these four vignettes which were delivered Oct. 1, 1960, at the formal opening of the collected DeVoto papers at Stanford University.

In a collection of his columns in 1955 ("twenty years of shooting my face off in Harper's"), DeVoto undertook to explain why the Easy Chair was considered so controversial.

"... the adjective is inaccurate," he said. "I have deliberately precipitated only one controversy, the one over the public lands ... and I precipitated that one as a reporter. It took me some time to understand ... why the Easy Chair has produced so much more heat than it has carried. ..."

"... there are ... judgments that require you to commit yourself, to stick your neck out. Expressing them in print obliges you to go on to advocacy. They get home to people's beliefs and feelings about important things, and that makes them inflammable."

A few months ago, Dwight Macdonald, trotting out his hackneyed theme of American nonculture, asked of DeVoto: "And why such labors over that middle-brow?"

This kind of criticism had been flung at DeVoto for years when he spoke of it in 1955:

"The condescension seems superfluous, a waste of energy. It is fully visible that I respect reality-judgments as requiring more intelligence than fantasy and think

them a better instrument for critical analysis. . . .

"Long ago I got used to seeing ideas which were first expressed in this column, or in my books, turn up as the invention and fee-simple property of literary thinkers who scorned and denounced them when I published them."

As Schlesinger points out, the facts that DeVoto was a Westerner and a Populist are vital in understanding him. He fled to Harvard after a year at the University of Utah when four professors were sacked for their unorthodox opinions. Although he eventually settled in Cambridge, he never lost his devotion to the west. As Mrs. Bowen notes:

". . . for the rest of his life, no matter where that Ogden boy might travel, to the Ultima Thule or the seven radiant cities of Antilia, he could not forget those startling deep canyons, that mountain air, and the glowing peaks where walked the Gods of the Utes."

His eloquent pleas for conservation of natural resources—a subject still widely ignored by the American press—spanned four decades. However, some may remember best his stirring demands for civil liberties, especially the remarkably prophetic column, "Due Notice to the FBI," published four months before Senator McCarthy started his wave of hysteria at Wheeling, W. Va. DeVoto deplored police state methods, contending that "there is loose in the United States today the same evil that once split Salem Village. . . ."

Mrs. Bowen sees DeVoto's success as a historian of the West—climaxed by the magnificent trilogy, *The Year of Decision*, *Across the Wide Missouri* and *The Course of Empire*—as talent honed on the corpses of ten rather pedestrian novels, four under his pen name of John August.

Because these four essays were written without collaboration, there is some repetition. DeVoto admirers may complain that they are too little (they run only 108 pages; it takes a startling 98 pages to list all of DeVoto's writings). But what there is they will enjoy.



## House-breaking Scientists

By Christopher Rand

MANAGERS AND SCIENTISTS, by Ralph H. Hower and Charles D. Orth 3rd. Published by Harvard Business School Division of Research, 310 pages plus notes and bibliography. \$5.00.

This is a group of inside stories—case studies—about life in research-and-development plants such as exist on Route 128. The material was gathered for use in the teaching of executives, future executives, etc. in the Harvard Business School, but the book should be of interest to the general reader too. It concerns, essentially, the problem of turning scientists into organization men. Scientists are trained up, through all their years of study, to be members of a dedicated professional caste with a strict code of scientific method. Then when you put them into a money-making firm they must undergo a transformation, unless the firm's own management can make subtle adjustments to their ways. These accommodations have been studied in various real-life situations by Professors Hower and Orth, who have presented their findings with almost the vividness and readability of fiction. Often they have used direct quotations. For instance here is a snatch of conversation between a young scientist (Waters) and one of his superiors (Dr. Skinner), who has been trying to move him to a more managerial, less pure-science job.

WATERS: You think this position has more advantages than a job in research then?

SKINNER: Yes, it is a new thing, a challenge, and it puts you in closer contact with management than either regular development or certainly research work would. Therefore, you will get greater recognition more quickly. Although I recognize your work in your present job, others in management just don't understand research and they wouldn't be able to appreciate what you were doing.

WATERS: Maybe I had better reconsider here. (sighs)

SKINNER: I don't want to influence you.

I just want to be sure that you understand the situation. . . .

There are two reasons, at least, why newspapermen should like the book. First, it is a virtual scoop on a main development in U.S. intellectual life. Second, the struggles between scientists and managers have much in common with those between journalists and their front offices. The researches of Messrs. Hower and Orth can help journalists understand their own profession better.

## All About Pegler

By Dan Berger

PEGLER: ANGRY MAN OF THE PRESS. By Oliver Pilat. Beacon Press. Boston. 288 pp. \$5.

When a New Jersey man was fined \$100 for wishing loudly in the presumed security of a tavern that the President get shot through the "——," James Greenleaf's *New Daily Advertiser* responded: "Can the most enthusiastic Federalists or Tories suppose that those who are opposed to them would feel any gratification in firing at such a disgusting target as the —— of John Adams?"

This was typical for the age and of the giants from whom we are said to be descended. Today we stand accused of undue good manners, a blandness to reality (and sometimes, in the same breath, of unfairness). But the great tradition of uninhibited political invective never died; scurrility, thy name is Pegler.

Using newspaper space for a private grievance is a betrayal of trust. Westbrook Pegler made it a national institution. Most of us probably have been tempted, and many have succumbed at least once with great self-righteousness. A Pegler lurks within, scratching to get out.

For us, and for all who share with Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. a "growing

mellowness" for Pegler as individualist dissenter, Oliver Pilat's biography should hold interest.

It also offers one who left New York in 1950 a nostalgic reacquaintance with the New York *Post* exposé: liberalism, sex when possible, co-conspiracy by association, solemn psychology of the poor-kid-he-had-a-childhood school, gliding references to "The True Believer" and "The Authoritarian Personality." Pilat did Pegler for the *Post* that year, and his further research grew into this book.

Pilat seems to have read everything Pegler wrote, which should be worth a prize for perseverance. He has devised a technique, blending New Criticism with Kremlinology, for extracting autobiographical truths. He has done a lot of digging elsewhere, and received at least some cooperation from the subject.

We meet little Francis W. Pegler, the block loser, who grew into a teen-age school dropout getting some breaks through nepotism. As a young reporter he so antagonized his sources that the U.S. Army threw him out of France in World War I. He earned great success in the twenties as an iconoclastic sportswriter, knocking almost everything except fixed fights.

He began as a serious columnist for United Features in 1933, defending a lynch mob and tangling across the New York *World-Telegram* section page with Heywood Broun. Three strong people influenced his views. They were his father Arthur, prominent itinerant rewrite man, his devoted first wife Julie, and (negatively) Broun, stable-mate, neighbor and enemy.

Pegler's rupture with Scripps-Howard in 1944, his refusal to conform to a moderating Hearst line and his denunciation of "Junior and the Baby Sitters" (which was pulled out of a secret Christian Crusade session by *Newsweek* in 1962 and cut him loose from Hearst and syndication), all establish Peg as a man who meant it, not just somebody's hatchet.

The same may be said for his famous assaults on Quentin Reynolds, growing out of the Broun feud, and Drew Pearson. In ensuing libel actions, virtue, or at least Reynolds (spectacularly) and Pearson, triumphed.

Pegler gunned after Hitler, Franco and

Father Coughlin in the thirties. In the sixties he called for the "Conservative Revolution" and compared the John Birch Society to "the early Fascisti," with approval. This intellectual progress is not unique; yet it is sad to see the thunderer who knew "the bitter loneliness of the True Crusader of the Press," reduced in his 69th year to a soldier in the little monolith of Robert Welch, writing monthly for *American Opinion*. Here is death enough to make Pilat's biography timely.

It is not an overly good book. Its references to a "squad car" in 1899, Theodore Roosevelt "slurring over his party's deviation from old-fashioned Jeffersonian trust-busting," and the New York *Daily News* "surge toward the largest daily circulation in the world" suggest interesting revisionism in American history.

When Pegler recalls infecting himself with poison ivy to get out of school, Pilat comments: "If it really happened, it could only be explained in terms of a morbid need for self-punishment. If it were fantasy—excluding a tall tale in his father's tradition—it certainly implied alienation, despair and an extreme distaste for the educational process." Gosh.

But Pegler isn't Hearst, and doesn't require Pulitzer Prize quality biography. Pilat tells us as much about him as anyone should want to know. (Too many critics insist that T. E. Lawrence, a colorful figure without whom history would have been the same, needs to be "understood," and that the Arab rising does not.)

Pilat persuades us that Pegler was an antagonizing perfectionist, struggling for hours to make a column say just what he meant. Pegler, in turn, demonstrates the absurdity of assuming an automatic inverse ratio of readability to sentence length. Peglerian sentences can be long and intensely readable.

Future historians dealing with the past three decades may well want to sprinkle Pegler epigrams about, as contemporaries do with Finley Peter Dunne. No pungent analyst succeeded Mr. Dooley, so denunciation will have to do, and Harold Ickes' range was limited.

To help those historians, and to give Peg the durable monument he perversely deserves, I suggest that some publisher put out a quality paperback, *The Worst of Pegler*. Pilat for editor.

## Asian Mystique

By Francois Sully

SOUTHEAST ASIA. By Stanley Karnow and the Editors of Life. Life World Library. 160 pp. Illustrated. Time Inc. N. Y.

Stanley Karnow's *Southeast Asia* is a fascinating mosaic of many people of bronze, brown and yellow faces with black almond eyes. It is a huge jigsaw puzzle of nine tumultuous countries and territories; a cluster of 10,000 palm-fringed serene islands, 7,000 of them form the colorful Philippines and 3,000 others comprise troubled Indonesia. Some four centuries ago, these spice islands fragrant with the heady scent of pepper, cinnamon, cloves and with the rancid smell of copra, attracted the predatory European merchants to the Far East. Ever since Marco Polo, the human, cultural and geographic diversity of Southeast Asia has inspired vivid writing from travelers, trying to evoke the mysterious charm that the fabled Far East operates as an intellectual opium on the Westerner with a romantic soul.

A fascinated Stanley Karnow writes: "The complex human fabric of Southeast Asia is a source of its enigmatic charm, its constant excitement—and the romantic images flicker past, as if in some endlessly fascinating film." Complex and enigmatic as the land, are also the colorful leaders of Southeast Asia, most of them believing that their own God has entrusted them with some supernatural power to rule. President Sukarno, although he is a Moslem, is partial to thaumaturgists and frequently asks his personal spiritualist for advice. He has also been known to pray to his kris, the ceremonial Malay dagger that symbolizes vitality and strength. Former Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, although an internationally prominent Buddhist, always lays out offerings of food for the spirits when he travels around his country. Marshal Sarit Thanarat of Thailand is advised by a personal astrologer (astrology, to the great confusion of Western diplomats, plays its role in Asia's politics). Also a devout Buddhist, the Laotian Prince Boun Oum Na Cham-



passak wears an amulet supposedly made from a human fetus—which is said to be capable of rendering him invisible.

Even Thailand's King Bhumibol Adulyadej—a native of Massachusetts—has served several months as a head-shaved monk in a Buddhist monastery and so does still occasionally his neighbor Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia. South Vietnam's Roman Catholics firmly believe that President Ngo dinh Diem has been entrusted by the Blessed Virgin with the mission to save his embattled country from the enmity of North Vietnam's atheist President Ho Chi Minh, a fact which would explain Diem's survival of several close attempts against his life. Communist Ho Chi Minh himself sees nothing wrong in the efforts of his propagandists to identify him as a sort of new Confucius.

Stanley Karnow, who wrote the interpretive text for this latest volume of the *Life* World Library, has been a foreign correspondent for *Time*, Inc. since 1955. After reoprtng from Europe, Africa and the Middle East, Karnow, in 1959, became chief of the *Time-Life* China and Southeast Asia Bureau. From his Hong Kong base he has since traveled through the nine effervescent countries and territories of Southeast Asia, with the exception of Ho Chi Minh's North Vietnam, a restricted area to American correspondents. To gather the material for his well documented book, Karnow has navigated the pungent Saigon river in a canoe, flown many miles over the guerrilla infested Mekong delta in American combat helicopters, sipped jasmine tea with the chic Mrs. Ngo dinh Nhu and iced champagne with Prince Norodom Sihanouk. In Asia, Stanley Karnow is known for his tireless efforts to get the facts, even if it means driving his own staff of *Time* Incers with the ruthless hand of an oriental potentate. Complained once one of Karnow's hard-pressed and disheveled Hong Kong staffers, "Slavery has been abolished in Asia but Stanley does not know it yet!"

What makes Karnow work so hard? Maybe the fact that he is a 1947 graduate of Harvard. After a taste of the Sorbonne in Paris, Karnow returned to Harvard in 1957, a confirmed journalist, to study the problems of underdeveloped countries as a Nieman Fellow.

Karnow writes of Southeast Asia's hazardous and painful process of adjustment to the economics of the twentieth century: "That these young states have not achieved a healthy measure of international progress is perhaps less surprising than the fact that they have somehow managed to survive. In Southeast Asia, as in other underdeveloped areas of the world, this is a time of change. In their individual, often puzzling ways, these countries are trying to transform their traditional societies into modern, sophisticated nations. In contrast to the nation-states of Europe which matured slowly over the centuries, the countries of Asia were abruptly set free to shift for themselves. They have groped and stumbled in their efforts to adjust to the contemporary age."

After putting in the last touch to his impressive text on Southeast Asia, Stanley Karnow has returned to his little paradise of Hong Kong as a special correspondent for *Time*, Inc. publications in the Far East. His enjoyable and informative book not only helps the reader and student to understand the multiple aspects of the area but also imparts a satisfying sense of emotional and intellectual involvement in its wonders and mysteries.

What Stanley Karnow failed to say, or repeat with enough emphasis, the reader will discover himself while contemplating some of the striking color pictures and portraits taken by *Life* ace photographers John Dominis and Howard Sochurek. Among Southeast Asia's chief splendors are its lissome maidens who personify more than anything else the romantic charm of this beautiful part of the world suffused with magic and glamor, as a *Life* publication should.

## The Diem Problem

By Dan Berger

IS SOUTH VIETNAM VIABLE? By Nguyen Thai. Manila. 314 pp. \$2.95 paperback, \$5.95 hard cover. Carmelo & Bauerman, P. O. Box 65, Manila.

This highly informative analysis of the Ngo-dinh Diem regime combines the saddened wisdom of an early Diem supporter,

the inside knowledge of the former director of the government press service and the footnoted discipline of American post-graduate scholarship.

We are shown a mandarin elitist Ngo family dictatorship and an impotent civil service, corrupted and paralyzed, unable to reach the peasantry. American policy faces a predicament for which the Chinese and Laotian precedents are disheartening in the extreme.

But Thai, a Vietnamese patriot and an Associate Nieman Fellow in addition to his other attributes, refuses to give up hope for a better Vietnam.

## The Luck of Albania

By Shelby Scates

ALBANIA AND THE SINO-SOVIET RIFT. By William E. Griffith. The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1963, 423 pp. \$7.95.

Albania is a small Balkan country once best known for its blood feuds and excellent brandy, but now as a symptom of trouble inside the group of Communist nations.

The source of that trouble, suggests William Griffith in this valuable addition to the increasing body of literature and documents on the conflict between the Soviet Union and Red China, is nationalism.

By deciphering and analysing a flood of Communist communications, Griffith has detailed Albania's break with the Soviet Union and its subsequent alliance with the Chinese Peoples Republic. It is an enormous task of scholarly research. The result—a book divided almost equally into his analysis of the affair and documents—will be appreciated most by close students of Communist Party intra-bloc relationships.

Albania's realignment inside the bloc serves as a key cleavage through which non-Communist observers can trace a break-down in Communist solidarity since the death of Stalin.

Tirana's break with Moscow is certainly not the cause of the dispute which since the publication of this book has

brought Red China and the Soviet Union to the verge of a total ideological rupture. But it has, suggests Griffith, been a factor in that discord.

Albania's role as an instrument in Sino-Soviet polemics was most obvious to Western newspaper readers in the aftermath of the October Cuban crisis. Vivid attacks on "N. Khrushchev and gang" by the Albania party leadership last winter were a direct reflection of the Chinese view of their Moscow comrades.

At several East European Communist Party meetings last winter the Chinese delegates were called upon to repudiate the Albanian blasts at Moscow. Their reply was a reaffirmation of Chinese-Albanian friendship.

National interests aside, the Albanian leadership appears to share the hard-nosed Chinese view that Khrushchev has pushed his foreign policies beyond the limits of Marxist-Leninist doctrine into "revisionism," or ideological heresy.

One upshot is that Albania may no longer be the most obscure of the East European Communist countries, but it remains the poorest, most isolated and most primitive of the lot. As such how has it successfully defied the unmitigated wrath of the Soviet Union unleashed by Khrushchev at the 22nd Party Congress in October, 1961?

To begin with, Griffith indicates, Enver Hoxha, the first and only head of the Albanian Communist Party, and his prime minister, Mehmet Shehu, have been lucky.

Stalin's expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform in 1948 throttled an apparent attempt by Tito to absorb his tiny neighbor into a Balkan Federation. In 1956, says Griffith, Hoxha and Shehu were almost certainly saved from Khrushchev by the outbreak of the Hungarian revolution.

Behind the luck, however, has been the fanatic determination of Albania's ruling elite to maintain national independence combined with the country's geographic isolation from Russia and its support from Peking.

With a touch of pride, reports Griffith, Shehu recently described Albania's plight of encirclement by capitalists and revisionists and the economic blockade imposed by Khrushchev. Despite the difficulties, Albania has remained since 1960 internally

stable and economically somewhat on the upgrade.

Replacement of Soviet and East European bloc aid by the Chinese has enabled Albania to meet the needs of its key deficit items while trade with the West and uncommitted nations has increased.

Griffith is wary about conclusions. For one thing, the Albania affair, like the Sino-Soviet conflict, is far from over. But several lessons of the recent past—if not portents of things to come—seem implicit in this book.

Communism as an ideology has definite pretensions of universality. But the fact—as shown by Albania—is that one can claim to be Communist and dissent from the viewpoint of what is supposed to be the leading party.

And with the Soviet Union and China at odds on the correct ideology, one can do it with impunity.

## Korean Symposium

By William E. Henthorn

DEVELOPMENT IN FREEDOM (Chayuha-ui paljon), Kim Yongkoo, editor, 135 pp. 26 plates, Sasanggye-sa, Seoul, 1962. 160 won.

In April of 1961, a veritable galaxy of distinguished Korean authors, educators, and scientists were host to an international conference of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Sixteen of the participants in the conference presented papers as a basis of discussion and subsequent publication, as Chairman O Chongsik points out in his preface, both to commemorate the founding of the Korean Committee of the CCF and to act to support and strengthen the struggle against the many forms of totalitarianism prevalent in the world today. As such it is an important and a most timely contribution. Fittingly, the editor of this excellently programmed volume is Mr. Kim Yongkoo, well-known editor of the *Korea Times* and currently a Nieman Fellow at Harvard University and who, with O Chongsik and Cho Chihun, has been active in opening a Korean chapter of the CCF since 1960.

In a stimulating introductory article, Dr.

Lee Sangeun, Professor of Chinese Philosophy and Director of the Asiatic Research Center, Korea University, has drawn the philosophical guidelines with a very learned discussion of the philosophical currents wide-spread in the world today. Professor Lee suggests the views of the nature of man as held by the philosophers Kung and Meng (Confucius and Mencius) be profitably re-examined today and the principles they advocated could well aid in resolving some of the current world dilemmas. Prof. Lee makes it clear that in speaking of Confucianism he does not mean Confucianism as it developed at a later time—undoubtedly referring chiefly to the Sung neo-Confucianism of Chu Hsi whose views prevailed and finally stifled Yi Dynasty society. Addressing himself to Korea, Prof. Lee concludes, "Our nation, as it has been greatly influenced by Confucianism since ancient times, shall be able, I believe, to make many contributions in pursuing this responsibility (to the development of cultural freedom) if we simply are self-conscious and endeavor."

In such a brief space, I cannot expect to do justice to the views of either Professor Lee or the fifteen other authors whose articles are also contained in this publication. The magnitude involved is revealed by the mere mention of the contributors.

Under the sub-heading Politics, Hongik University's Professor. Pak Tongun writes on "Communism" centering on the 1949 Declaration of Human Rights by the UN and the continuing communist erosion of its principles in word and deed ranging from Hungary to Pasternak; Prof. Yuk Chisu of Seoul National University discusses "Development in Freedom as Seen from a Geopolitical Viewpoint," and Yonsei University's Prof. So Soksun, in a probing article entitled "The Second Republic: In Which Direction," discusses the political experience that Korea has had in the past decade and asks some penetrating questions. In speaking of the "freedom" that the Korean people have enjoyed under past governments, Prof. So comments that it was chiefly "freedom to be hungry" or "freedom of unemployment" while the "freedom" the people are waiting for is more in the way of "freedom to have a full stomach" or "freedom to secure em-

ployment". The question, of course, is whether the Korean people can apply themselves and can wait for these freedoms, and this is the direction of Prof. So's inquiry.

Prof. Kwon Yongdae of Seoul National commences the section on Society with an article tracing "The Development of Science in Freedom"; the subject of "Government and Mass Communication: Their relationship in a Democratic Nation," is analysed by Kim Kyuhwan, an editor of *The Orient Press*; while Prof. Ha Sangnak of Seoul National writes on "Social Illnesses and Free Development." Yonsei's Prof. Hong Isup concludes this subsection with an article on "Koreans—Centered About Freedom."

The third section, Arts, opens with Kim Chungop, an architect, writing on "The Development of Art: Freedom and processes." Pointing out that while each age has its ideology and has made its own particular artistic contributions, freedom of creative expression has remained essential to the development of such diverse movements as expressionism, neo-classical art, etc., etc., which continue to influence contemporary art. Prof. Yo Soggi of Korea University has an interesting article entitled "The Drama of Tomorrow"; the noted—musicologist Prof. Yi Hyegu of Seoul National writes on "The Current Movements in Korean Music," and Prof. Cho Chihun of Korea University has written on "Literature and the Preservation of Freedom."

In the final subsection, Thought, Prof. Kim Kyongtak of Korea University discusses "Peaceful Methods of Mutually Affirmative Thought": Prof. Yun Songbom of the Methodist Theological Seminary writes on "Development in Freedom from the View of Christian Faith"; Prof. Cho Kagyong of Seoul National in a timely article discusses "Modern Science and Philosophical Speculations," while Prof. Cho Myonggi of Tongguk University has written on "The Establishment of Racial Culture by Means of the Original Ideas of Buddhism."

When such an influential group of learned men write on any subject it is noteworthy; when they address themselves to a major world topic their views demand our attention.

## Deadline Arrivals

**THE POLITICS OF JOHN W. DAFOE AND THE FREE PRESS.** By Ramsay Cook. University of Toronto Press. 305 pp. \$5.95.

This is a political biography of the intense Liberal Nationalist who built the character and influence of the *Winnipeg Free Press*, of which he was editor from 1901 to 1944.

**FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS IN AMERICA.** By Edward G. Hudon. Public Affairs Press, Washington. 224 pp. \$4.50.

Justice Douglas, in a foreword, says this history is in the tradition of the late Zechariah Chafee . . . in many respects the best analysis in English of the anatomy of our First Amendment rights. Morris Ernst, in the preface, takes issue with the author on his belief in Natural Law and a good deal else, but finds it a provocative book.

**THE RADICAL RIGHT.** Edited by Daniel Bell. Doubleday, N.Y. 395 pp. \$4.95.

Nine social scientists and historians deal with three decades of the Radical Right, from McCarthy to the Birch Society, seek to account for the sources of such extremism in American political life. Solid scholarly analysis by Richard Hofstadter, David Riesman, Peter Viereck, Talcott Parsons, Alan F. Westin, Herbert H. Hyman, Seymour Martin Lipset, and Daniel Bell.

**THE INDEPENDENT REFLECTOR.** By William Livingston. Edited by Milton M. Klein. A John Harvard Library Book. Harvard University Press. 458 pp. \$7.50.

This is the entire issue of the first periodical in New York, 1752. It lasted one year, 52 weekly issues, before its printer quit under pressure of the politicians and clerics of the colonial Establishment whose oxen were regularly gored by the vigorous crusading of William Livingston, poet, polemicist, organizer of New York's first law society, later a member of the Constitutional Convention, first governor of

New Jersey after the Revolution. Dean Klein of Long Island University tells the lively story of the fights the *Reflector* got into that proved finally too hot to print.

**PROPAGANDA AND THE COLD WAR.** Edited by John Boardman Whitton. Public Affairs Press. Washington. 115 pp. \$3.50.

Professor Whitton of Princeton makes a strong argument for a stronger American propaganda effort, with sharp criticisms of our present information agency. A baker's dozen contributors generally agree, with variations. This was a Princeton symposium.

**MANIFEST DESTINY AND MISSION IN AMERICAN HISTORY.** A Reinterpretation. By Frederick Merk. With the collaboration of Lois Bannister Merk. Knopf. N.Y. 266 pp. \$5.95.

Mr. Merk's westward movement is impelled by more than just the expansionist drive of Manifest Destiny. It is inspired also by a moral force, a sense of mission to spread the gospel of democracy and convey the benefits of freedom. He says of his new book that it is "a study in public opinion. It appraises American opinion regarding expansionist projects in the United States in the 19th Century."

**JUSTICE HOLMES: THE PROVING YEARS, 1870-1882.** By Mark DeWolfe Howe. Harvard University Press. 293 pp. \$5.

The second volume of Mark Howe's biography of Holmes, which Harvard has distinguished by the imprimatur of its Belknap Press. It carries Holmes to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

**THE COMMON LAW.** By Oliver Wendell Holmes. Edited by Mark DeWolfe Howe. 380 pp. \$5.

This new edition of Holmes' classic on the common law is another revival in the John Harvard Library. Holmes' biographer, Mark Howe, in an introduction, tells the story of Holmes' great study into the roots of our law, and describes the philosophy that Holmes brought to the law.



**STRIKE IN THE WEST: THE COMPLETE STORY OF THE CUBAN CRISIS.** By James Daniel and John G. Hubbell. Holt, Rinehart, Winston, N.Y. 180 pp. \$3.50.

Two roving editors of the *Reader's Digest* have given a graphic and comprehensive report of the October crisis over the missiles in Cuba. They conclude that "the American military machine performed flawlessly" and the world learned "a new respect for the will and skill of the Amer-

ican President . . . that the American people and their allies will not panic under Russia's nuclear threats."

**STALIN'S FOREIGN POLICY REAPPRAISED.** By Marshall D. Shulman. Harvard University Press. 312 pp. \$6.50.

Even under Stalin Soviet foreign policy had shifted toward "peaceful coexistence" to meet the external necessities of Western strength.

## Letters

### From Arthur Sylvester

To the Editor:

I have read with great interest *Nieman Reports*, March 1963. I was particularly struck by "Government by Fait Accompli" written by Donald Zylstra, who covers the Pentagon for the American Aviation Publications.

To read Mr. Zylstra, things are pretty bad news-wise in the Pentagon. But some of his observations appear highly imaginative. I refer to his account of Air Force Secretary Zuckert's meeting with the press after his return from the Far East. Because I know you are interested in accurate reporting, I am sending you a copy of the transcript of Mr. Zuckert's appearance, together with an analysis of it. The transcript is taken from a tape by a commercial company in Washington.

I was also interested in the article "Danger from Within" by Lord Francis-Williams. I take it that the former Mr. Williams, now a "Lord," is not automatically freed by this elevation from respect for the facts. And so, when he speaks of "the voice of Assistant Secretary Sylvester from the Pentagon proclaiming that the deliberate generation of news by governments to be a legitimate part of the weaponry of the world," one wonders what he bases that on.

"Generation of the news" is propaganda and I am against it. I have always been and always will be. But news generated by actions or activities of the government is entirely a different concept. It is the activi-

ties and actions that make the news and not the other way around.

ARTHUR SYLVESTER  
Assistant Secretary of Defense

### The Transcript

Secretary Sylvester conducts a briefing for the regular Pentagon correspondents every week-day, at noon, unless other commitments prevent his doing so. Therefore, it can hardly be said that he was "present"—at his own news briefing on January 8, 1963—to "introduce" Air Force Secretary Zuckert, as the article states.

Further, the transcript of the briefing attended by Secretary Zuckert shows no "introduction" as such, as Secretary Sylvester is well aware of the fact that Mr. Zuckert is well known to Pentagon newsmen because of his present and past positions (he was formerly Assistant Secretary of the Air Force and a member of the Atomic Energy Commission).

Rather, the transcript reads: "MR. SYLVESTER: Gentlemen, as you know, the Secretary of the Air Force has been around the world recently. He has kindly consented to come down here and give you some of the impressions of his trip. It is on the record and attributable to him. Mr. Secretary, we are happy to have you here. Will you take over?"

From this point on, the next seven pages of the transcript show that Secretary

Zuckert continued to speak and answer correspondents' questions uninterrupted and unaided until he was asked about the strength of the Air Commando Group in Viet Nam.

Here Mr. Zuckert asked Major General William Martin, Director of Information for the Air Force, to answer the question, which General Martin did, with the help of an aide, Col. Spencer, who also answered other related questions.

Mr. Zuckert then continued to answer questions, for another four or five pages of transcript, until a question arose as to whether information on the type of airplane being used for air cover in Viet Nam was classified, or whether it had been released.

Mr. Zuckert said he'd prefer not to be made the custodian of classification but if the information had been released, the reporters could have it.

Secretary Sylvester, rather than falling back on "classification" declared: "If there is any doubt (about the information having been released) about it, General Martin can answer right now. General Martin than gave the reporters the aircraft specifications.

On only one occasion during the briefing did Secretary Sylvester suggest that it would be best to first check on the security classification of a proposed answer before Secretary Zuckert or his aides responded.

Secretary Sylvester would be remiss in his responsibilities if he were arbitrarily to release information the security classification of which he questioned.

In the first instance, above, he knew the information had been released, in the latter instance, he did not, thus his need to check it out.

In his article, Mr. Zylstra stated: "The press secretary (Mr. Sylvester) continued to intrude throughout the press conference." The dictionary defines "intrude" as "to come in without invitation or welcome."

This definition hardly fits the situation of Mr. Sylvester's assisting Secretary Zuckert, a guest at Mr. Sylvester's own briefing, not only with the guest's concurrence but with appreciation for such assistance.

As a matter of fact, it wasn't until the 14th page of the transcript that Mr. Sylvester's name first appeared (other than



in connection with his opening remarks) and that was in the action described above, in approving identification of the aircraft.

Actually, the transcript shows that the cited questions, in which Mr. Sylvester participated, were the only two in connection with Secretary Zuckert's account of his visit to the Far East.

## News Management

To the Editor:

The Symposium on Management of the News in the March issue was interesting and well done. But the more I read of the individual comments from Washington, the more puzzled I was at the introductory summary by Bruce Galphin.

Anyone reading just the Galphin summary would think Nieman Fellows in Washington were agitated by managing of the news on the part of the Kennedy Administration. Mr. Galphin finds successive Fellows disturbed and concerned. He reports also, toward the end of the summary, self-criticism of the laxity of the press. But the overall impact of his report is that the former Niemans here think there is a novel news management problem and are worried about it.

I put it to you that the actual published replies in the survey are to the opposite effect.

John Steele says: "Governmental news policies have not inhibited us to any great degree, and I find important sources somewhat more available than at certain periods in the past." Dick Dudman: "In the Eisenhower Administration, officials were hard or impossible to see, and when you did see them they often wouldn't tell you much." (Implying, I think, that things are easier now.) Julius Duscha: "The Kennedy Administration has tried to manage the news, but so did the Eisenhower Administration." Dave Kraslow: "We have always lived with such problems. We fight them instinctively—and relentlessly. We gain a little ground; we lose a little ground. But in the net, I think, we manage to stay on top." Alan Barth: "The nub of the matter is not that the press is 'controlled' but that it is excessively complaisant and cooperative." Richard Har-

wood: "I have not observed that this Administration has made any greater effort to control the news to its own advantage than other levels of government with which I'm familiar. In some ways, the opposite is true." John Lindsay: "The big difference between the Eisenhower Administration's news handling and this one is the availability of those who know what is going on and, in most circumstances, their willingness to discuss it candidly. \* \* \* I believe the management of the news is going to be with us forever. I think there is less of it now than four years ago."

Hear hear. I think most sensible people would agree with those gentlemen that all governments try to promote a good image but that things are no worse now and probably better. Why not report what your correspondents say?

ANTHONY LEWIS

New York Times, Washington.

## Nieman Notes

1940

Weldon James, associate editor, Louisville *Courier-Journal*, produced a lot of copy for the paper and for lectures all over from a tour of duty with the Marine Corps Comandant, in Japan, Okinawa, Vietnam and Thailand.

1941

George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu *Advertiser*, flew to the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington in April, flew over to Atlantic City to pick up a Headliners Award the day after the convention, and back to Honolulu for a banquet the same night.

William J. Miller of *Life* editorial board is author of *The Meaning of Communism*, a 190-page primer on communism prepared for schools. He had the collaboration of Prof. Marshall D. Shulman of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and Prof. Henry L. Roberts of Columbia's Russian Institute. It was published by Silver Burdett Co.

1942

Neil Davis, editor of the *Lee County Bulletin*, was one of the Alabama editors who lunched with the President during the Birmingham crisis. Next day he discussed the Birmingham situation in a long distance telephone interview with Louis M. Lyons in a broadcast over the Eastern Educational Network.

1943

Robert C. Elliott, assistant to Henry J. Kaiser, encountered a volcanic eruption on Bali while en route to a Pacific Area Travel Conference, and reverted to his reporting days. The Associated Press asked him for an eye witness account and wirelessly it to the U. S.

Kenneth McCormack was one of the lecturers in the short course for newsmen on crime news analysis and reporting at Northwestern University in May, the fourth year he has been on the staff for this course. Former Pulitzer Prize winner on the *Detroit Free Press*, he is advertising and public relations director for the Michigan Gas Utilities Company.

1947

Fletcher Martin, who is Edward R. Murrow's USIS agent in Ethiopia, reports from Gemu Gofu in Southwest Ethiopia, "noted for elephants, bananas and people who haven't heard about clothes."

Father Bill McDougall is now the Very Rev. William H. McDougall. They've made him a monseigneur. In his preclerical days Bill McDougall was a top reporter on the *Salt Lake Tribune*, a UP war correspondent, prisoner of the Japanese, author of two books: *Six Bells Off Java* and *By Eastern Windows* that grew out of his war experience and were done during his Nieman Fellowship.

1950

The Atlantic Council has launched *The Atlantic Community Quarterly* for discussion of developments within the Atlantic Community. One of its editors is Richard J. Wallace, director general of the Atlantic Community Council. Its editorial office: 1616 H St. N. W. Washington 6, D. C.

## Nieman Notes

1953

The New York *Times* has moved Don Janson out of Chicago to establish a new *Times* outpost in Kansas City. Janson has just published a book, *The Far Right*.

After a tour of foreign duty in London and India, Watson S. Sims is news editor of the World Service Division of the Associated Press. This took him on a seven week swing through 11 Latin American countries last winter and to the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association directors at Montego Bay.

1954

Richard Dudman, back from a tour of Southeast Asia for the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, writes about China in *The Progressive* for May. "Only two people expect China's collapse," he concludes, "Chiang-kai-shek and Joe Alsop."

Douglas Leiterman of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was producer-director for the NATO film, "Balance of Terror," produced by David Susskind and Talent Associates-Paramount for National Educational Television, released in mid-May. He also produced a documentary this spring on integration in the South, "One More River," which CBC selected as its contribution to Intertel for showing in Europe, Canada and Australia, as well as on the National Educational Network and the Westinghouse stations.

1955

Sam Zagoria, administrative assistant to Senator Case of New Jersey, lectured at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton this spring on relations between the Executive and Legislative branches.

1956

Julius Ducha of the Washington *Post* met a March 15 deadline for a book for Little-Brown on Billie Sol Estes and the Farm Problem.

Richard E. Mooney is preparing to move his family to Paris in July, when he will take over the New York *Times* assignment as economics reporter in Europe, swapping places with Edwin Dale.

## David Edward Botter, Jr.

1916-1963

David Botter died May 10th after a long siege of being in and out of hospital. One of the last things he did, in a brief release from the hospital, was to write a warm endorsement of a candidate for a Nieman Fellowship.

He had been professor of journalism at the Medill School, Northwestern University, since 1959, when he left the assistant managing editorship of *Look* Magazine for teaching.

Born in Palestine, Texas, Oct. 12, 1916, he was graduated at the University of Texas in 1937 and worked on the Palestine *Herald* four years. Then he returned to Austin to take a master's degree. The University held him for three years helping with their public relations while he worked on the Austin *American-Statesman*. For the university he published "A University Goes to War" a statement of war aims for education, and "Fine Arts in a Total War."

In 1943 he joined the staff of the Dallas *News* and won a Nieman Fellowship from there, at age 27, for the 1944-45 year.

He returned to Dallas as political reporter

and two years later was appointed to their Washington bureau. In 1950 he joined the staff of *Look*. When they launched the pocket magazine *Quick*, Botter was made assistant managing editor. On its demise he became assistant managing editor of *Look*.

He was married, Sept. 18, 1951, to Betty Jane Knighton in Washington. They had a daughter, Mary Louise.

Dave Botter's Nieman associates remember him as a big cheerful Texan, a lively participant in all their activities, an enthusiast about journalism and a devotee of politics. A young man in an older war-time group, and the only bachelor, he was popular with all the children of his Nieman colleagues and regarded himself as an uncle to all of them. One of the keenest minds among Nieman Fellows, he was a natural newspaperman and took to magazine editing with relish and high talent. He proved an effective and enthusiastic teacher, held in the highest esteem by his faculty colleagues and journalism students at Northwestern.

The Oregon *Journal* of April 16 announced wedding plans for Don Sterling, its associate editor, to Julie Ann Courteol, who has been club editor of the Portland *Oregonian* the past three years.

1957

Anthony Lewis of the New York *Times* Washington bureau won the Pulitzer Prize for national reporting for 1962, his second Pulitzer award. The citation:

"his distinguished reporting of the United States Supreme Court during the year, with particular emphasis on the coverage of the decision in the reapportionment case and its consequences in many of the States of the Union."

Tony Lewis says "This started with my Nieman year in the Law School where I

did a paper for Paul Freund on reapportionment."

1958

Houghton Mifflin Company of Boston published Dean Breilis' third novel this Spring, *My New Found Land*.

Returning from a hitch in Britain on an English-Speaking Union fellowship, J. Wesley Sullivan and his wife Elsie visited in Cambridge on their way back to his job as news editor of the Oregon *Statesman* in Salem, Ore.

1959

Phil Johnson, promotional director of WWL-TV in New Orleans, does a daily editorial on the air that is telecast three

# NIEMAN NOTES

times a day. "The television editorial is the coming thing especially in towns where there is a single newspaper ownership. In New Orleans two television stations present editorials, ours and WDSU-TV, which began editorials the day after the *Item* closed in 1958." [This left a single newspaper ownership in New Orleans.]

When Nashville city councilman, Gene Jacobs, was convicted of vote fraud in the 1962 election, his lawyer argued that Jacobs was "the victim of a Spanish inquisition conducted by the Nashville *Tennessean* . . . the victim of the most gigantic witch hunt ever perpetrated in this community under the guise of journalism." Chief hunter was John Seigenthaler, editor of the *Tennessean*, which made a point of cleaning up the vote frauds. Six were jailed.

## 1960

Howard Sochurek, with his *Life* cameras, reported in successive months from Outer Mongolia, Arctic fishing waters and Latin America.

## 1961

Ralph Otwell, Chicago *Sun-Times* news editor, received the Page One Award of Chicago Newspaper Guild last month for his editing of the special Sunday section that the *Sun-Times* calls its "dignified section."

The Press Institute of India was established January 1, with Chanchal Sarkar as director. One of its first operations was a seminar for senior journalists from all over India.

Henry Raymont of United Press, in an informal report from Haiti:

"If only the Caribbean people were given a chance to enjoy their blessed nature. Haiti is a breath-taking scene of lush vegetation, superb colors, blissful climate. Its politics is an equally astonishing spectacle of corruption, brutality, autocracy, with a dash of voodooism to boot."

## 1962

Gene Roberts has moved from his post

as Sunday editor of the *Releigh News and Observer* to labor reporter for the *Detroit Free Press*.

Roberts, after a Virginia tour, reports: "Jack Hamilton (1962) (of the *Lynchburg News*) is the most effective and progressive editor in Virginia now, I think."

Others evidently think so, for Hamilton received the Ernie Pyle Award for 1962, and for the second successive year the Virginia Press Association award for editorial writing.

In April Murray Seeger left the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* where he was state political reporter, to handle politics and public affairs discussion programs for the Cleveland television station, KYW.

## 1963

Paul Kidd, Hamilton *Spectator* (Canada) feature writer, for the second successive year won a distinguished achievement award in the Western Ontario Newspaper Awards competition. His winning entry was a series of articles on Cuba.

## Harvard Faces

The cartoons in this issue are Gene Graham's impressions of the Harvard professors who interested him most on his Nieman Fellowship this year. When he isn't drawing pictures, he writes editorials for the Nashville *Tennessean*, where he won a Pulitzer prize last year, shared with Nat Caldwell (1941).