NiemanReports

June, 1964

The Press and Foreign Policy

Robert J. Manning

NiemanReports

VOL. XVIII., NO 3 JUNE 1964

Published quarterly from 77 Dunster St., Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription $3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

A Case of Imbalance

Canada and the United States

The 25th American Assembly at Arden House, Harriman, New York, dealt with Canadian-American relations for four days in April. At its conclusion the group issued the following statement as their consensus:

The Canadian-American relationship is conspicuous for both its stability and its vitality. It is also characterized by intimacy, basically complementary economies and the candor of its dialogue. Geography and history, and other component elements of the relationship, have created out of two sovereign states a unique international system with an individuality and an existence of its own. There are many international relations but no other such relationship.

The vitality of this relationship is attested by both the character of its problems and the transcending commitment of both countries to deal with these problems through the daily processes of civilized agreement, and disagreement—processes which are increasingly more private than official.

It is profoundly important to every aspect and problem in the relationship of the United States and Canada that the two countries deliberately accept the independent existence of each other and their equal sovereignty. The disparities of power between the two nations are such that awareness of these principles must pervade every American policy, every American act and every American attitude toward Canada. We affirm this to be the bedrock premise on which the relationship stands. Our ability to be hopeful about the problems we face rests on our confidence that this "fact of life" is today a premise of American life itself, not merely a policy of United States diplomacy.

We believe that the most pressing current problems in the relationship are in specific areas of commerce, finance and labor affairs, and more generally in our cultural relations.

Since the basic concern of each country after its national survival is the economic well-being of its people, trade is a matter of central, continuing consequence to both. Together the two countries enjoy the largest bilateral trade in the world. But as in so many other aspects of the relationship, the American market is more important to Canada than vice versa. Over 60 per cent of Canada's exports are to the United States, while about 20 per cent of United States exports are sold to Canada. However large this disparity, Canada is still the United States' most important single market and the decisive consideration is that this two-way trade is critical to employmnet and living standards in both countries.

The well-being of both countries requires that they extend their existing policy commitments to freer trade. For the United States we believe it is clear that this can best be done by energetically pursuing its present effort to achieve the multilateral reduction of trade barriers on a non-discriminatory basis through the so-called "Kennedy round" of negotiations under GATT.

We do not see an opportunity now for an American initiative to establish a genuine free trade relationship between Canada and the United States. We believe that such a step would require, in addition to deeper American understanding, a further clarification of fundamental national purposes on the part of Canada. We urge that the United States be prepared to respond to any possible future interest and initiative of Canada in a bilateral free-trade arrangement as an extension of our world-wide free-trade efforts.

The scale and intimacy of American industrial and financial involvement in Canada are unique features of the relationship which are at once good, troublesome and perplexing. This involvement has come about through the efforts of private citizens on both sides of the border. Its very extent is itself strong witness of a real need. The evidence at hand is abundantly clear as to the great benefit these American contributions have brought to Canadian economic development. The record to date does not demonstrate disadvantages to Canadian self-interest from the presence of these American resources and activities. There can be no doubt however that there is a continuing Canadian concern about the question.

(Continued on page 18)

Crossed Swords and Spilled Ink

The Press and Foreign Policy

By Robert J. Manning

Information gaps are probably inevitable in the best-informed societies and ours is no exception, however clearly defined the issues of foreign policy may be. What I have been struck by in the past few years are the special reasons for such a gap today—and the special peril it holds.

The reasons lie, of course, in the nature of our world. We live at the flood tide of change in all the continents. We are confronted with a totalitarian ideology that seeks our destruction. And we are riding the crest of a revolution in science and technology.

Each of the challenges we face would tax the wisdom, the ingenuity, and the patience of any generation of Americans. Together they pose a test greater than any our nation has confronted. Most acutely, they pose a test of public understanding.

Since World War II we have catapulated to a position of world leadership and full world responsibility. Yet our training as a nation for such leadership and responsibility has been minimal. The great and complex problems of this age are difficult enough for our policy-makers to comprehend. How then are they to be adequately explained to—and contributed to—the general public?

This republic is in great peril when the public is inadequately informed. We see in many parts of our country today the results of public confusion on questions of foreign policy—a growing sense of frustration, among some groups, that has given rise to extremism; a quest for easy, quick "answers"; a search for scapegoats; a demand for such contradictory "solutions" as smaller budgets and "total victory," higher tariffs and freer trade, cheap security and reckless venture-someness.

Without question, the subject matter of foreign policy is growing more complex. A great deal is happening all the time in foreign affairs all around our planet and, with the advent of rockets, in outer space as well.

We have our own national interests, our own set of foreign policies and foreign crises. These are diverse and complicated to a degree that frequently agonizes the most knowledgeable experts. But ours is a world of 121 other countries, of 121 other foreign policies, of 121 other sets of national goals or national appetites. Keeping track of what is going on and translating it into terms understandable by large numbers of citizens is a task that challenges both the press and the government departments concerned with foreign policy, primarily, of course, the Department of State and White House.

The relationship of the press and the government in our open society is not a simple thing. It is at least as variegated as human nature, and vulnerable to human frailty. The traditional stance of the press confronting government is the adversary relationship; its heraldic sign is crossed swords with bar sinister on a field of spilled ink. In domestic political matters excessive coziness between any element of the press and a reigning political group quickly and properly draws criticism.

In the sense of foreign affairs, however, I question whether the old-fashioned adversary relationship is sufficient to the delicate task our nation faces these days on the world scene. When the press prints the news, to an important extent it makes the larger facts. What the press chooses to emphasize frequently becomes the postulates of public opinion (though I have some reservations on this point) and as such can become an important ingredient of policy. In such a situation is the public interest best served when the press and government stand on separate pedestals and snipe at each other across a mythical abyss? I think that the answer is, "No"—and that journalism as well as government is aware of the need for something more. I suggest that accurate reporting perhaps requires a closer relationship than may have been traditional, perhaps a closer one than some would consider wise or possible.

On the basis of long experience in journalism and two years' experience in government, I suggest a direct cross-fertilization between American journalism and American government. Let me be as precise as possible, so as to avoid misunderstanding: the separation of journalism and government is as basic and as advisable as separation of church and state. Government intrusion into the functioning of journalism—whether by censorship, by regulatory controls, by economic penetration or political manipulation—would represent serious jeopardy to our political system.

That accepted, there is more to be said about the subject. Countless times in these last two years I have wished that officials in government knew more about journalism, its

---

Robert J. Manning, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, used to cover the State Department for the United Press, later headed the *Time-Life* London bureau.

needs, its practices, its uses and its shortcomings. Even more convinced am I that journalists—most of them—need to know more, much more, about government, how it works, why it works and, sometimes, does not work; how decisions are made and how they are not made; what are the facts as against the myths and misconceptions.

There is one direct way to accomplish this. Journalism should encourage some of its top established hands, and some of its more promising new hands, to take leave for intervals of a year or two in government service. The government would profit from the infusion of versatility, energy and enterprise that makes a good newspaperman. The newspaperman would become a wiser and more valuable craftsman. On his return, the newspaper reader would be better served and better informed.

The opportunities for newspapermen in government are not by an means confined to information work, (which in many ways is the least demanding and least rewarding of the many activities for which a competent newsman is fitted). The government careers of men like Carl Rowan, William Attwood and John Bartlow Martin, to name a few, suggest the high quality of service and imagination that a journalistic background can produce.

I suppose there are still some editors and publishers who will shake their heads and maintain that a newspaperman who enters into public service somehow taints himself for further journalism. It seems unfortunate that such thinking should survive the kerosene lamp and the automobile crank. I can think literally of no activity that has been more educational to me as a journalist than these past two years in government. In a time when, as H. G. Wells says, "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe," I heartily recommend a few semesters in Washington or at an Embassy overseas.

Whatever steps might be taken to alter or improve the old "adversary relationship," one point must be emphasized from the outset: it should neither suggest nor require any abdication of the critical faculties of the reporter and editor. Quite the contrary, the more thorough knowledge which skilled reporters today accumulate about what is happening in foreign affairs serves to invigorate, not weaken, the function of responsible criticism.

Irresponsible criticism is, of course, a different matter but there is a very high correlation between misinformation, or lack of information, and the kind of wild criticism that graces the hate-sheets of the right and reveals itself in the latent paranoia of a few newspapers and correspondents around the country. The reckless charges that pass for comment in these forums cannot survive exposure to information. It is no coincidence that with rare exceptions the writers who regularly produce the most startling accusations about the State Department do not call my office or any other section of the Department to ask questions or check conclusions. Apparently they feel their concoctions will clang more loudly if not muted by the facts.

Leaving aside this category—in which, by the way, I place none of the regular State Department correspondents—it does seem to me that on the whole the job of communicating information about foreign policy is one that the press and the government have in common, not one in which our interests are opposed. The basic elements of my present job are remarkably similar to that of a reporter: to get out the news—fast, accurate, and as complete as possible. Nearly always my associates—several of whom are also former newsmen—and I are in the position of working *with,* not against, the reporters who cover foreign news and call us daily, if not hourly.

Information flows from the State Department in many ways. In testimony last year before Congressman Moss's subcommittee on Government Information James Reston of the New York *Times* described the Department as a "gabby outfit." Ours is a house with many windows, and its daily information output is enormous. Anyone who, as I have, has served as a correspondent in a foreign capital will vouch for the truth of the statement that nowhere in the world are reporters given such complete and unfettered access to the makers and shapers of foreign policy. As a practical matter, every State Department reporter has a government telephone directory which tells him what every officer in the Department does, and who's in charge of what desk, area, or section. A reporter is not confined to a few known sources. Whatever the subject that arises, he can quickly pinpoint the individuals with responsibility and can call them directly, by direct dial, without having to filter through a central switchboard. Even home telephone numbers are provided—and are regularly used by reporters with late-breaking deadlines. The newsmen assigned to the State Department make wide use of this access-by-telephone every day. It is a source of information at least as important as the regular press briefings by the Department spokesman and the Secretary of State. Naturally, as in any area, he has to build his own network of sources who are able and willing to serve him. But the sources are there to be cultivated.

In addition, considerable use is made of background briefings. This is the device, treasured by reporters everywhere, whereby a high official will discuss subjects, but not for direct quotation and not for attribution. The stories that result are generally authoritative and accurate, and they contribute greatly to the supply of information publicly available about United States foreign relations. They provide important guidance on the government's thinking on a given topic.

I have listened to a lot of nonsense about the so-called iniquity of the background briefing, but most of it comes

from distant critics who make me agree with Josh Billings that "it is better to know nothing than to know what ain't so." Anybody with experience in reporting knows two things. One is that a reporter is only as good as his ability to separate fact from fancy, bogus from real. Another is that there is no such thing as goldfish-bowl diplomacy. Show me a businessman who conducts his business in a high-pitched voice at noon on Main Street and I'll show you a diplomat who does his work by talking out loud on the front page of the Washington *Post*.

Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty in nuclear physics has a close analogy in foreign relations: it is usually not possible to describe a diplomatic situation publicly, however accurately, without changing it and making it different. The public comment itself becomes part of the situation. An on-the-record statement by the Secretary of State, be it a prepared speech or a response to a question, is instantly filmed, recorded, printed and otherwise communicated, with all the speed of modern telecommunications, to a mixed audience of friends, partners, skeptics and enemies all around the globe. Many are ready to seize on a single ill-considered word and blow it up for propaganda purposes. As a consequence, important comments issued formally on the record by high officials often must be planned as carefully as a surgical operation, so that no listeners anywhere can have reason to misunderstand or abuse what is said.

That is why most newsmen highly value the background device, which permits a policy officer to speak freely and informally to let reporters in on his thinking without giving our cold war adversaries the same access. At the briefing conferences conducted twice a year at the Department for the press and other media a mixture of on-record and background discussions have been used. After the most recent conference we asked the participants to comment on this point; the 800 replies we received favored background briefings by four to one.

In a sense the background rule makes it possible for the government to take a reporter into its confidence. This calls for good faith on both sides, and it is nearly always present. The exceptions are happily infrequent, though no less irritating when they occur. It is a procedure that can be abused. It is an abuse, for example, for the government to use this method to float trial balloons, as a way to sample public opinion without choosing sides in advance, or in any way to mislead or misinform. It can be abused by reporters who fail to maintain the distinction between it and on the-record briefings. But despite these pitfalls, its over-all utility is great. The fact that a knife can be used to kill is no reason to eat with our fingers. The best safeguard against misuse of backgrounders lies in the skill and integrity of the reporters themselves. What is said on background or not for quotation is subject to the same acid tests of accuracy and relevancy as any other government pronouncement, and rightly so.

Let me examine another aspect of the government-press relationship. It is frequently argued that it is government's responsibility to keep secrets, the responsibility of the press to get and keep them. "The press lives by disclosure" opined *The Times* of London in 1851. If a foreign agent came into the State Departmet and managed to procure secret information, he would be liable to prosecution and a heavy sentence. When a reporter does the same thing he wins praise from his editor and gets nominated for prizes. The story is printed, and either way our enemies can read it.

In the year 1964 I think that this simplified traditional view of the role of the government and the role of the press is out of date. I prefer to think that the responsibility both for informing the public and for maintaining certain areas of nondisclosure is one which is shared by the press and the government. To be sure, the press's responsibility is heavily weighted towards full disclosure: I would not wish it otherwise. But I believe, and I think I speak for the majority of reporters, that we would lose an important ingredient of the relationship of trust that is basic to how the press gets along with government if the press did not recognize its responsibility in circumstances of great national importance to help us keep some secrets.

I feel that I am on solid ground when I say this because I know from my experience in the past year that with rare exceptions the reporters who regularly cover the Department of State do recognize this responsibility. I know one reporter, for example, who is still sitting on a dramatic first-person story of his involvement in a recent great international crisis. Many others have happened upon or otherwise uncovered information which if immediately divulged would have caused us serious difficulties. They did not immediately rush it into print, recognizing that to do so would not serve their own interests as responsible journalists seeking to report the news accurately and fully, and might seriously prejudice American foreign policy objectives or national security.

The responsibility for getting the news out is also one that we share. A great many things happen each day only a few of which come to public attention—not because they are kept secret, but because they are not considered news. The press itself is highly selective. Only a fraction of the information that pours into a typical city room survives the cutting and paring process called editing and makes its way into print. Douglass Cater has written that the power of the press:

> Stems from its ability to select—to define what is news and what isn't. In Washington on an average

> day, a good many hundreds of thousands of words are spoken, tens of dozens of "events" occur. The press decides which of those words and events shall receive the prompt attention of millions and which, like timber falling in a deep and uninhabited forest, shall crash silently to the ground.

Several independent studies show that an average of 3 to 8 percent of general news space in American newspapers is devoted to foreign affairs items. The average daily newspaper content of foreign news is 4 to 8 columns. Foreign news actually sent by the Associated Press on its main ticker averages 22,000 words per day, or 27 columns. If non-duplicating items from other wire services plus special reports are included, it can be calculated that the average American daily newspaper provides its readers with well under 20 per cent of the foreign news actually reported each day. I simply do not think that is enough.

The problem of making manageable the vast outpouring of news on foreign policy that becomes available each day challenges journalism in many ways. The press often still practices methods of make-up, construction and play that were in use half a century ago. As a result, editors often seem to be overwhelmed by the torrent of events and their readers have served up to them a daily collection of fragments. That approach to foreign affairs may have made sense when the United States was involved in only one crisis at a time. It no longer suffices today when we are participants or ring-side spectators to 15 to 20 crises at a time. The frequent result is that each day's news on each topic is apt to be so brief, so fragmentary as to be more misleading than no news at all. Too often, each day's fragment remains a fragment. As a result, in the words of the late Joe Liebling:

> Our present news situation, in the United States, is breaking down to something like the system of water distribution in the Casbah, where peddlers wander about with goatskins of water on small donkeys, and the inhabitants send down an oil tin and a couple of pennies when they feel thirst.

Ironically this comes at a time when the national thirst for foreign policy information is rising. The American people want to know what is happening, how it affects them, what we are doing about it. By any indication, including public opinion polls, more people are concerned about foreign policy than at any time in our history. Still one hears editors insisting that "the people" don't want to read a lot of foreign affairs guff. I do not believe it.

The inability of the daily media to keep abreast of this rising level of interest is reflected in the success of other enterprises, particularly magazines, which give at least the impression of providing a fuller, connected account of foreign news. Volume of information is not the problem; what is needed rather is a more reflective approach to foreign news which relates the snippets to one another, which locates an event in history as well as geography, and which takes more profound account of the fact that other people's domestic policies often influence their foreign policies.

Another more general characteristic of journalism today should cause more concern than it seems to be causing. The press today suffers from a bad case of complacency and self-righteousness, and is noteworthy among all fraternities that perform public services for its lack of self-criticism.

Our press today is keenly, sometimes even stridently, assertive of its rights and prerogatives, but it has a bad case of laryngitis when it is time to talk about its responsibilities. If Congressman Moss will excuse me, I would like to say that the intellectual quality of a great deal of the testimony delivered to his subcommittee after the Cuban crisis was so low as to remind some of us of the old description of the Platte River in midsummer—two inches deep and a mile wide at the mouth.

When it somes to actual performance, I think the press in this country can be described as not only the freest and most imaginative, but also the most responsible and best in the world. (One could make some reservations; for example, I would say that the very best in British journalism surpasses most of the best in ours,) But we cannot afford to stop where we are and be satisfied. There is still too much tendency among editors to operate on the old-fashioned presumption that the reader has the I. Q. of a 12-year-old child. There is still that ancient reflex that is mindful of the old Chicago city editor who once in anger called his staff together and said, "What this newspaper needs is some new cliches." There is great truth in the indictment that the press is generally too greatly preoccupied by entertainment, by what it takes to reach the easier side of reader interest.

I have the impression that journalism is not doing enough to recruit and properly train top-level people. I have been struck in years since the war to find that newspapers and magazines, even some very good ones, have to go out and cajole people into journalism. The tendency to call it a profession and pay as if it weren't is still strong once you get away from the metropolitan areas.

As for the long vaunted "power of the press," where does that stand today? I confess that I am in a somewhat ambiguous state of mind; there are moments when I believe too many in government attach too much power or influence to the press, then there are mornings when I question that this is so. I think we have to concede that the power is indeed very great, but that in general the

press today is powerful more as an exciter than a provoker, and for the most part a channeler of other peoples' ideas and arguments. There has been a vast increase in analytical and interpretive reporting since the war, but still not a great deal of political, intellectual, theological or philosophical inspiration comes with the average newspaper in America.

Coming back to my homeground, the handling of foreign policy news, I would like to comment if I may on two other tendecies that seem to me to create problems for all three elements—the newspapers, the readers and the government.

One is the newspapers' feverish preoccupation not with what has happened, but what is going to happen tomorrow. I know State Department correspondents who spend literally hours trying to learn the names of new ambassadorial or other appointees before candidates have even been selected. One prestigious newspaper over a period of several months had two separate "exclusive" stories reporting that a certain official had been picked as Ambassador to two different capitals. The diplomat did not go to anyone of those posts, and when he was actually appointed to his present post the newspaper neglected to report it. This over-preoccupation with getting ahead of events, to be the first to report what is *going* to happen results in a lot of wasted motion, a lot of incorrect or highly premature stories and any number of woes for government officials. More than that, however, it takes journalism's eye off the big part of the game—what *has* happened, what does it mean?—to the detriment of us all.

Even the best writers and reporters—and I believe that the corps that covers the Department of State and foreign affairs in Washington is by and large the most diligent and most talented group in journalism— are not always able to rise above the mixture of bugaboo and custom that dictates the structure and the play of stories. They are seriously handicapped by their editors' assumption that it is still possible to report the world's major convolutions as if they were innings in a ball game.

Nothing is easier, and few things are more misleading, than to chart the tides of foreign relations with a limited set of phrases taken from the vocabulary of the sports page. The relations of nations in the world arena are not like a ball game; victory and defeat are not determined by the number of times a ball goes out of the park. Evaluating progress in the Cold War—forwards, backwards, sideways, up or down—is a subtle process, one which the most penetrating analysis usually avoid. They see all too clearly the folly of trying to pick out who's ahead from day to day or week to week.

One of the occupational hazards of trying to keep score in foreign affairs is that it sometimes makes the practitioner look silly. Not even on the AP's weekly top ten listings do teams plunge from victory to defeat and back again with the erratic swiftness ascribed to U.S. policy.

A reporter must always guard against reporting the plausible as the actual, and this is certainly true in foreign affairs. What is likely or logical does not always happen in foreign policy; reporting likelihoods as facts before they come true is not far removed, it seems to me, from other kinds of misreporting.

There is an important difference, it seems to me, between the right of a reporter to pursue information about foreign policy or any other subject, and the responsibility of his newspaper to print all the data thus uncovered. The right of the reporter to try to find out what is happening is limited only by his enterprise. I do not think any check beyond present security restrictions should be placed on a reporter's right to cover the news, which should be limited solely by his enterprise. But the obligation to disclose by publication is not so absolute.

The press discloses in the name of the public's right to know. But the public also has a right to have its interests defended and advanced in the field of foreign policy and national security. These two rights may come in conflict, and when they do, the public may well prefer success to disclosure. There have been many episodes in the past two years—of which the Cuban missile crisis was the most dramatic—where the success of American policy depended very directly on the preservation of a period of privacy during which the policy could be formulated and carried out, where disclosure wouud have spelled defeat.

Where in these cases does the public interest lie? The public, I submit, has a right *not* to know when knowledge can gravely compromise our security or damage our foreign policy. Many reporters, among them the most able, respect both these rights. But their responsibility is less great than that of their editors, who are the ones who finally select what is printed—and is thus disseminated to the world at large, as well as the American people. It is not an easy responsibility to live with; it raises questions to which no single answer is right.

It is not for a government official to presume the right or the wisdom to settle this problem; it is journalism's to contemplate, and I am sure that many of you have pondered it.

We Need More Sharply-Pointed Newspapers

"The Danger Today Is Too Little Involvement, Not Too Much"

By Dwight E. Sargent

The term "playing politics" has an unsavory connotation. My colleague and old friend, Bob Bates of the Meadville *Tribune*, wrote to me recently about another matter but felt compelled to start his letter by saying that he didn't agree with me that editors should play politics. In the context in which his mind was moving *I* would have to agree with *him*. But there are many ways for editors to play important roles on the political field.

Editors can play politics the way 400 hitters play baseball: effectively, consistently, productively and for the good of the entire team. Also, we all have known those of the sand lot variety who play the game *un*productively and *un*professionally, and selfishly.

But at least in baseball you have rules to follow. In editing a newspaper you don't. What one editor's conscience dictates, another's may deny, and each in the context of his own newspaper, his own community and his own mission, may be right.

All I am trying to say in arguing that editors should play politics is that we have a traditional and clear-cut obligation not only to be spectators in the arena where political decisions are made, and reporters of those decisions, but participants in arriving at those decisions. A troublesome problem for every newspaper editor is, and always will be, to determine the extent of that participation and the nature of it. Too *much personal involvement* can be destructive to objectivity; too *little involvement* leads to the bland neutrality of "on the other hand" journalism. The danger today is too little involvement, not too much.

History provides us of some excellent examples of what to do and not to do. It has chapters on every conceivable type of political relationship between newspaper men and political men. Some of them are glorious chapters, others are inglorious. They all hold clues to proper professional conduct.

One of the brightest chapters was written by a fighting writer, John Milton, who wasn't afraid to dirty his hands in politics. To him we are indebted for history's great fight for freedom from government censorship. His protest against the Presbyterian Church's disapproval of his divorce (from his 17-year-old wife) led eventually to his battle against parliamentary intrusion of the writer's rights. He fought what he called "the illiterate and illiberal," who wanted to license books. He wrote *Areopagitica,* which remains today the greatest sermon ever preached on literary liberty. (If he had not given it such an obscure and formidable name more newspaper men would read it.)

In the colonial days every editor worth his salt became involved in the battle to free the colonies from British rule. One of these was John Peter Zenger, German printer who came to New York to establish the New York *Journal.* To his newspaper and those who helped him in his fight against Gov. Cosby, we today are indebted for the greatest legal turning point in the history of journalism. As a result of his trial in 1736 it was legally established that truth was a defense against charges of libel.

Henry W. Raymond, one of the founders of the New York *Times*, served as Secretary of the Navy. Horace Greeley's lists of political involvements are long and legendary. They culminated in that sad conclusion to his brilliant career—his defeat for the Presidency in 1872. Far be it from me to downgrade one of the truly historic and distinguished men of our profession, but there was many a day when the New York *Tribune* would have been better off if Uncle Horace had been sitting in his editor's chair rather than traveling the hustings playing politics.

Louisville's Henry Watterson was another great editor who served as a politician as well. He was a member of the 44th Congress and served as a delegate to Democratic national conventions.

More recently, Charles Sprague, the editor of the *Oregon Statesman,* was for eight years Governor of the state of Oregon. Mr. Thomas M. Storke, that doughty old fighter of the Santa Barbara *News-Press*, which he has just sold to Mr. Robert McLean of Philadelphia, served as a United States Senator from California in 1938 and 1939, and he is proud of it.

These, of course, are but a few examples of newspaper men who have served time as formal politicians. They have played politics in the literal sense of the term. Is this good? I would say that it is not necessarily bad. It depends on the character of the man, the tenor of the times and the ability of the editor-politician to conduct himself in a way to ennoble the cause of politics without tarnishing the cause of journalism.

Many of the men I have just mentioned got into politics simply because they were such conscientious and dedicated editors they couldn't stay out. They wouldn't know what you meant by an ivory tower. None of us would wish to argue that John Milton should have stayed out of politics,

or John Peter Zenger, or Elijah Parish Lovejoy. None of us would argue that Henry Watterson in any way dragged Kentucky's distinguished *Courier-Journal* down by his political adventures. Or that Oregon's Charles Sprague should not be listed among the great editors of this generation because of his two terms as Governor.

All these were special men working in special situations and achieving special results. Despite these great achievements by these great men, however, I would argue that editors, except under special circumstances, should not play politics in the formal sense but should play politics in the broader sense and play it up to the hilt.

We have heard enough about "conflict of interest" in recent months, in connection with the ethics code in New York, in connection with the President of the United States and television stations, in connection with Bobby Baker. So we know how serious this problem can be. But while we are fighting against "conflict of interest" let us recognize and daily remember the "community of interest" which exists between people of the press and people of politics. Let's remember that our concern with this "community of interest" determines to a great extent the quality of political candidates and the effectiveness of political machinery.

The American newspaper will have much to say about who the Republican presidential candidate will be this year, and how the American public will judge the Democratic ticket. I am not talking about endorsements here. Politicians love to point at years in which 70 or 80 per cent of the American press endorsed one candidate and the other candidate won. They say this suggests that the so-called one-party press has no influence. This is nonsense. It would be a sad day for America if the American press controlled elections by endorsing candidates.

Newspaper influence works in more subtle ways. Honest reporting and vigorous expression of opinion are the basic ingredients of maintaining an enlightened electorate. Day in and day out these are what prompt the voters to make up their minds about the conduct of a President Johnson, or the capacities of a Rockefeller, the ideology of a Goldwater, the stature of a Cabot Lodge, the potential of the impressive and promising Governor Scranton.

I am not speaking here of one news story, or one editorial, or one newspaper, but of the entire pattern of journalistic expression throughout the nation over extended periods of time. It is this pattern that determines voter opinion far more than formal endorsements of candidates. The American press was a factor in the nomination of Wendell Willkie in 1940. It was a factor in the nomination and election of Gen. Eisenhower in 1952, and in his re-election four years later. It was also a factor in the nomination and election of John Fitzgerald Kennedy in 1960. Although this latter statement may seem strange to those who automatically think of the American press as largely Republican it is really not strange at all. And it speaks well for the press.

Mr. Kennedy received wide publicity and honest reporting from the so-called Republican press. I think the press also handled itself well in connection with the issue of religion. There was a tendency, of course, in some quarters, to say that religion should not be an issue in that campaign. This was wrong. Responsible newspapers said it was wrong, and Mr. Kennedy himself, after a shaky start, admitted that it was a legitimate issue, faced up to it intelligently and by his conduct in the presidency eliminated it.

Newspapers that played politics, if I may use that term again, by wrestling with the issue of religion openly and frankly, performed an historic public service. Those who said "let's keep religion out of this," did not.

The assassination of President Kennedy presented the American press with another test of its sense of responsibility in the world of politics. In my opinion, some newspapers flunked the test. I am speaking of those that rushed hysterically into print with conclusions that this is a sick, neurotic and unnerved nation.

I think the general reaction to the Dallas tragedy proved quite the opposite, but there were those, happily a minority, who tried to tell 180 million Americans that somehow all of us must share in the guilt of Mr. Kennedy's death.

It is silly to say when a president is killed that the nation is ill . . . or when a man is stabbed in Central Park that our cities are not safe . . . or when juvenile delinquency is uncovered that our teenagers lack the decency of their parents. We should judge ourselves *not* by the number and depths of tragedy, but by how we react to them. Not by the number of juvenile delinquents, but by our concern for their rehabilitation. Not by the extent of bad news, but by our capacity to create good news.

Every generation lives with trouble, but to suggest that we suffer from a national neurosis because one left wing neurotic commits an act of assassination is illogical. Happily, the nation did not seem to accept the sermons of those who said that we are a people consumed by hate. On the contrary, a great many of our leaders and the vast majority of our citizens responded to this emergency bravely, calmly, and with a demonstration of maturity so necessary in time of crisis.

Every editor who kept his perspective under that great pressure contributed to the stability of our nation. While much praise is due a majority of our press in this respect, I feel that those editors who shouted that just about everything ought to be renamed in memory of Mr. Kennedy, were temporarily shorn of reason. This was childishness of the first order. This is where our neurotic side was showing. The hasty homilies urging name changes reflected a naive lack of respect for institutions and traditions which *can* never and *should* never be associated with the name of one

man. President Kennedy himself had a classic appreciation for the dignity and destiny of the Office of President, and would have rebelled at these instances of national instability, however flattering they might be to him as an individual.

If the foregoing thoughts and comments seem a trifle disjointed and unrelated, perhaps we have too narrow a concept of the word politics.

At first glance politics relates to somebody running for office or somebody holding a position in government. In our business the word politics embraces just about every kind of activity and event that an editor comments upon throughout the year: our colleges and universities, our theatres, our operas and our orchestras, professional football and ballet, medicine, transportation, and, as I have just pointed out, even religion. All of these things in one way or another are a part of or are influenced by the world of politics. We can't escape it.

The list of American newspapers which have molded the political destiny of our nation, directed its political course and influenced its political stature is long. It includes many great newspapers of the past and many fighting newspapers of the present, newspapers with a keen sense of their political opportunities.

The Pulitzer Prize awards this Spring say as clearly and as convincingly as anyone can that American newspapers are not without devotion to the great traditions of yesterday and not without the resources to live up to them today, not without an understanding of their civic duties.

The evidence is nationwide—in Philadephia, where the *Bulletin* won a Pulitzer Prize for exposing a number racket. In New York, where a 30-year-old reporter for the *Wall Street Journal* did an amazingly thorough job of uncoving the multi-million dollar fraud in vegetable oils. In St. Petersburg, Florida, where Nelson Poynter's *Times* ripped open a corrupt Florida Turnpike Authority. In Lexington, Mississippi, a state whose leaders some of us find easy to criticize from afar but where it takes genuine courage for an editor of conscience to stay with his typewriter on the firing line. In that state, Mrs. Hazel Brannon Smith publishes four weeklies fighting the inertia and ignorance around her in such a way as to make enemies and lose friends for the time being, but in such a way that in the long run she will have made us all prouder to be members of this great profession.

But to mention a few is to exclude the many. Some of the best journalism ever to come out of New England came from the pen of John Strohmeyer editor of the Bethlehem *Globe-Times* then of the Providence *Journal.* Investigative reporting as practised by him and the *Journal* may have given some of the rest of us inferiority complexes, but it raised banners of public service to which editors who really believe in duty may repair.

The story of J. D. Heiskell of the *Arkansas Gazette* in Little Rock needs no re-telling nor does the story of the St Louis *Post-Dispatch* and the Chicago *Daily News,* who joined, around a decade and a half ago, in exposing 41 editors in Illinois who apparently saw no harm in a little bit of moonlighting on Governor Dwight Green's payroll while supposedly working for their publishers at the same time. Those Illinois editors were playing politics of the *worst* kind. Their shenanigans were exposed by two newspapers playing politics of the *best* kind.

All this may sound obvious, but as we know perhaps better than our reading public, it is not easy. Playing politics the right way demands not only competent reporters and conscientious editors, but aggressive publishers. The publisher is all too often the forgotten man when the prizes are handed out but, as we all know, it is he who has made possible this endless list of journalistic achievements. It is he who made possible a record more than 300 years old of journalistic performance second to none in the world today . . . second to none in the history of civilization.

Frequently we hear talk about the well-rounded newspaper man. To that I say that there may be a danger of some of us becoming so well rounded that we aren't pointed in any direction. We need *fewer well-rounded newspapers* and *more sharply-pointed newspapers* if we are to leave marks on our generation that the Miltons and the Zengers, the Lovejoys and the Greeleys left on theirs.

When your readers write in and say that you are meddling in politics too much, that's when you are entitled to an afternoon off. You are probably doing a sharp job of reporting, a pointed job of interpretation, and with the help of the two, a courageous job of leadership.

This is a good year for all of us to play more politics. Not by running for public office, but by putting the fear of God into those who do. Hegel once said that "the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom." We might say that the history of journalism is none other than the progress and the stimulation of the consciousness of civic duty.

This is an address by **Dwight E. Sargent,** editorial page editor of the New York *Herald Tribune,* to a joint meeting of the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association, the Pennsylvania Society of Newspaper Editors and the Pennsylvania Women's Press Association, May 16. That was one week after his appointment as curator of the Nieman Fellowship program at Harvard.

Interpreting the Soviets

A Criticism of Reporting from Moscow

By Henry Shapiro

Since the fateful day of November 7, 1917, when Lenin's Red guards stormed the Imperial Winter Palace in St. Petersburg, the Soviet Union has dominated the headlines of our press and still claims the lion's share of our newspaper space.

With all allowance for the Chinese inroads on the once monolithic Communist camp, Signor Togliatti's plea for polycentrism and Marshal Tito's so-called revisionism, Moscow remains the epicenter of international communism and we have had the opportunity of studying it for almost half a century.

Yet 46 years later, today the Soviet Union to the average newspaper reader, despite the revolutionary advance in our communications facilities, largely remains a terra incognita, a veritable darkest Africa of the time of Dr. Livingstone and Stanley.

In the past two or three decades the Western world has been astonished and jolted, unnecessarily I submit, by a succession of events which *could* and *should* have been anticipated by any serious student of Soviet affairs.

To name just a few: the Red Army's effective resistance to the German onslaught, Stalin's post-war political offensive and the economic recovery of the Soviet Union, the significant domestic reforms of the Khrushchev era, the pioneering achievement in space, and the veritable explosion in Soviet education and science—not really an explosion but the end result of a cumulative process set in motion in the early days after the Revolution.

In our more recent experience let me cite a few examples of what I consider the uncritical and unjustified dissemination of journalistic speculation about Soviet realities:

1. Premier Khrushchev's alleged intentions to resign or that he may be forced to abdicate his office. Where the speculation was not based on mere irresponsible rumor, it presumably stemmed from the fallacious application of Western political reasoning to an inapplicable Soviet situation. The missile pullout from Cuba, it was argued, was a humiliating defeat for Khrushchev. The October Caribbean crisis, it was further said, followed a number of pressing domestic crises which Khrushchev had failed to solve, in industry and agriculture, in the Sino-Soviet conflict, on Berlin. Hence a crisis of leadership in the Kremlin, and pressure from the armed forces and a mythical opposition in the Party Presidium for Khrushchev's resignation. Did not Anthony Eden resign after the Suez fiasco, it was asked, and could any Western prime minister responsible for such a catalogue of alleged failures remain in office?

The argument ignored a number of peculiar facts of Soviet life, known to any serious foreign observer abroad or any cub reporter in Moscow. Although Khrushchev is the dominating figure in the Kremlin he is not the absolute tyrant that Stalin was and does not run the country by terror. There is an element of "advise and consent," to borrow a phrase from the United States Constitution, and the blame or credit for any single failure or success of Soviet policy cannot be pinpointed on Khrushchev alone.

Secondly, it was overlooked by the exponents of the Khrushchev resignation school, that since the ouster of the Molotov-Malenkov group and of Marshal Zhukov in 1957, there has been no effective opposition to the first Party Secretary. Moreover, he has concentrated all the instruments of power, the party and state machines, the armed forces and the security organs in the hands of the Central Committee and obviated any possibility of the development of autonomous organs of power.

Further, between the 20th Party Congress in 1955, when Molotov still controlled the Presidium, and the 22nd Party Congress in 1961, more than one-half of the party and state apparatus had been changed and new men had been appointed or elected to office under Khrushchev's personal supervision. Who was there to challenge his leadership?

Some color was lent the notion of Khrushchev's resignation by an impromptu remark of Khrushchev's at a recent conference of industrial executives, to the effect that he was 69 years old and could not be expected to remain party and government leader forever. It was forgotten that Khrushchev had made similar remarks in the past in entirely different contexts. On this particular occasion the

---

Henry Shapiro, UPI bureau chief in Moscow, has been reporting from Russia for 25 years. This is based on a talk to the meeting of the International Press Institute at Stockholm. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1948.

Premier's observation is best dismissed in the ironical headline of a British newspaper which said "Khrushchev is not immortal, it is now officially admitted."

2. Another recent example of fallacious interpretation of Soviet events which flies in the face of elementary facts is the speculation that the Wynne-Penkovsky espionage trial was merely a prelude to an extensive purge in the Kremlin, which would involve the falling of many key military and political heads.

Such speculation disregarded the simple fact that public trials in the Soviet Union are not the beginning but the end of any given case, not the prelude but the epilogue of a story. The trial, to the extent that it made certain public disclosures, did not reveal anything to the Soviet authorities that they did not know half a year earlier when Penkovsky was arrested. Chief Artillery Marshal Varentsov, a major-general and two colonels who were demoted for associating with Penkovsky, were not degraded as a result of the trial but many weeks earlier. The public airing of facts and views in the Soviet Union takes place after decisions and policies have already been framed and approved by the top leadership.

I have dwelt considerably on the foregoing two examples because they illustrate a common temptation to rush into print with inadequate considered comment and speculation on Communist events—a disservice, I submit, to the citizen of a free and democratic society.

Let me state it dogmatically, if not provocatively. The Western image of the Soviet Union is, in some respects, no less false, than the Soviet image of the West. And with much less justification or no justification at all. Closed, as Soviet society may be, it is not hermetically sealed. The Western journalist's critical faculty has not been blunted. He has access to an endless variety of materials covering the whole spectrum of political life from the extreme right to the extreme left. He rejects the Marxist concept that news is a weapon. And he can freely test his ideas and information in the market place of fact and opinion.

In attempting to interpret the communist world he may well ask himself "what is the function of a reporter?" I mean a reporter or commentator, as distinguished from an editor or a professional propogandist.

Is he to be a crusader for Western civilization, a cold-war warrior, a one-day historian and mere chronicler of events, or a political scientist, or a combination of one or more of such functions? How can he function in a communist capital?

I need not restate the well-known obstacles to the free and unfettered collection and transmission of news and comment from the communist area—the frustrations, the deceptions and even the dangers to which foreign correspondents are exposed.

But I shall take the liberty of indulging in a bit of what the Russians call "self-criticism." It seems to me that Western journalism has not taken full advantage of all the available opportunities to serve the reader a complete, balanced and accurate report of the Soviet Union, so essential to the moulding of public opinion in a democratic society.

The great newspapers of Europe, Asia and America, with some notable exceptions, followed the policy of their governments and for a long time refused to establish "diplomatic relations" with the Soviet Union. For many years the report on Moscow was based to some extent on rumor and gossip compounded with wishful thinking from some of the capitals on the Soviet periphery, Riga and Warsaw, for example. Some of the reporters lacked the necessary background of Russian and revolutionary history and did not always relate the day-by-day events to the social and political significance of the transformation occurring in one-sixth of the world.

There was an understandable reluctance to recognize *one somber fact of life*—the existence and viability of the Soviet regime. There was the common temptation to simplify the convulsive conflict, for example, between Trotsky and Lenin and later between Khrushchev and the Molotov group, as struggles for naked, personal power, and not as functions of the fateful political issues which shook the communist world. And the picture was compounded by the uncritical and adulatory reports of fellow-traveling and pro-communist writers who survived to write the story of "the gods that failed."

It was an attitude of neglect and of what a distinguished leader of the International Press Institute has described to me as *defeatism*. It was illustrated by the fact that on the day Hitler marched across the Soviet frontier on June 22, 1941, an event which the entire world had predicted almost to the minute, only four Western news organizations, aside from the Germans, were represented in the Soviet Union—Havas, the French agency, Reuters, the United Press and the Associated Press.

Similarly, when Stalin died in March 1953, making the advent of a new era in international communism, the only reporters present in Moscow were the representatives of the two American agencies, France-Presse, Reuters and the New York Times. The great newspapers of Scandinavia, of Germany, of Italy, France, Great Britain and Japan were conspicuously absent. No wonder that although the pseudo-science of Kremlinology or demonology was then at its apex, a not quite accurate journalistic quip had it "there are no experts on the Soviet Union, only varying degrees of ignorance."

I submit that there is no more dangerous concept in our effort to interpret the communist world than what might be called the fronzen concept of Soviet history. Soviet history does not begin when a particular reporter arrives in Moscow and it does not end

when he leaves, or in some cases when he is expelled from the Soviet Union. Khrushchev's Russia is as different from Stalin's as Stalin's from Lenin's or as Lenin's from that of his imperial predecessors.

Given certain almost immutable basic premises, Soviet society is in a state of flux and in similar flux is the attitude of the Soviet authorities toward the foreign correspondent and the opportunities for adequate coverage and sound interpretation.

The death of Stalin and the subsequent 20th and 22nd Party Congress have opened new vistas and new opportunities for the foreign observer in the Soviet capital. It will be a long time, or perhaps we shall never see the day, when Moscow or Peking will be as open as any normal Western capital, as Stockholm, Rome, Paris or Washington, for example. The door which Peter the Great opened to the West some 300 years ago was closed by Stalin. It was reopened, although not quite fully, by Khrushchev, who is now waging an intensive campaign against ideological coexistence with the West.

There have been significant improvements in the more than a quarter of a century since I began my career as a Moscow correspondent. There have been welcome changes even in the last five years. The highlight of improvement has been the lifting of preliminary censorship of our dispatches. New sources of information, still inadequate by our standards, have become accessible.

The academic world has been the first to take advantage of the new opportunities and an impressive volume of scientific works have come out of the great universities and research centers, out of Oxford and Munich, Harvard and California. The press has been rather slow in exploiting the new possibilities but the new era is reflected in the fact that instead of the four correspondents who were on hand to cover Stalin's funeral, there are about 50 Western reporters in Moscow now.

The occult practice of Kremlinology is now becoming a respectable political science to which Moscow correspondents are now able to make increasingly worthwhile contributions. In many respects we are still making bricks without straw, still waging an uphill fight for the free flow of information and comment, but to paraphrase a Stalin phrase, "there are no fortresses which journalists cannot take."

The Churchillian phrase which defined Soviet foreign policy as a riddle wrapped up inside an enigma has lost, I believe, some of its validity. The situation was better expressed a few years ago in the words of the distinguished American diplomat, Charles Bohlen, formerly Ambassador in Moscow and now in Paris: "Russia is a country of many secrets but no mysteries." The challenge to the Western press is the extent to which it is possible to probe and unravel the secrets of the Kremlin.

Local TV Tries More News

By Murray Seeger

All across the country this season, viewers are seeing more television news than ever before in the brief history of the industry. The word has spread from station to station—the 30-minute format for local news is "in" and the old 10-and-15-minute shows are "out."

A few pioneering stations have been carrying 30-minute and even 45-minute local news shows for several years. They were the exceptions, however. Now, the stations which cling to the shorter formats will be the exceptions.

Hesitant stations have been encouraged to expand their own news shows by the examples of the two dominant network news operations of NBC and CBS. By tieing their local shows to the new 30-minute program of Huntley-Brinkley and Walter Cronkite, network affiliates can present their viewers with a solid hour of television news in the prime, early-evening viewing hours.

The decision to broadcast more local news has not been easy for local stations, however. To gather and broadcast more news depending on their own resources has presented local stations with problems they have never before faced.

In general, news for a local television station has the same status as any other part of the program manager's domain. The question of adding more news time in the early evening means cutting a late-afternoon movie or dropping a short, pre-packaged program that involved little expense to put on the air and was a sure seller to advertisers.

News ranks lower than other programming to many executives because of the difficulties and expense involved. To put together even a 15-minute package of weather, sports and news is expensive compared to a cartoon show for children. The profit potential from news programs is greatly limited for that reason.

The program manager tries to see news as he thinks the "average viewer" does. In this theory, news has greater competition from other forms of programming in the same time slot than it does from news shows. Channel X may be showing news at the same time Channel Y is showing Huckleberry Hound. Father may want to watch the news but the kids want to see Huckleberry and mother wants to keep them quiet for 30 minutes. It is easy to see who wins that kind of argument.

Even after he is convinced that a longer news show should go on the air, an executive faces the problem of the time slot in relation to the network shows. Should local news run for 30 minutes ahead of Huntley-Brinkley or for the half

---

Murray Seeger is news director of KYW - TV, Cleveland He was a Nieman Fellow in 1962.

hour after? In either case no one is sure if the viewer will sit still for 60 minutes of news.

After the decision is made to air more news, other complicated problems arise immediately.

Television news is a compromise between show business and journalism. Since TV is basically an entertainment medium, most station executives are better versed in the essentials of show business than they are in the elements of journalism.

In the early days of the medium, little attention was paid to the news at all. Radio announcers were put in front of cameras to read the news as they had been doing in their own studios for years. In some cases, the announcers were not seen on homes screens at all—still pictures were displayed.

These announcers were pushed off the air in most areas by show business types who could read without seeming to read and convince the audiences they were reporters without ever covering a story first-hand.

It was enough to tear wire copy and read it with, or without, rewriting. News from the papers was used in the same way. "Eye-contact" with the viewer in his living room and vocal delivery became the essential ingredients for a successful television newscaster. Content of the programs was of secondary importance. The illusion of journalism was good enough and there was no one in the station to challenge the premise. An editor or two and a cameraman were all that were needed to supply the news "personality" with material for his performance.

To fill 30 minutes of news time, however, more than a "personality" is required. Reporters are needed to gather news and to interview sources for sound film or video tape.

More cameramen must be hired and editors have to increase their skills to work out new ways to tell stories on film. The staffs have to originate more stories and anticipate events. They must have men on the scene of a news happening instead of waiting for the next edition of the papers or the local wire reports.

In this situation, the show business types are no help at all. They find they must surrender part of their monopoly on time before the camera and try to work with other people. It is not an easy adjustment for them, however. The news show personalities know that television changes so rapidly that their days are numbered under any circumstances. If they can meet the new criteria demanded by expandded news coverage, the personality types can extend their professional careers and help the new programs. Otherwise, they will find that "the parade has left them behind," as a veteran program producer observed.

The journalism side of the television news scale is gaining weight steadily. There is little doubt that more and more real reporters will be going on camera to present their own stories. As they do, another problem will confront the station managements and the union that represents the news staff where they have been organized. This is AFTER, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists.

Since it is basically a union for performers, AFTRA has been most successful at representing the interests of the on-camera personalities and the off-camera announcers. The man who reads the news on the air is paid a "talent" fee for each appearance. In major cities this is about $50 for every 30-minute show. A newscaster with only five 30-minute shows a week will be guaranteed a minimum of $250 a week plus the AFTRA minimum salary for a newsman, roughly another $160 a week.

In contrast, an editor or reporter will get the AFTRA salary scale and little else. Editors get a token talent fee additional and reporters will be paid for each "spot" they do on the air or given a small guaranteed talent fee to cover all appearances. The air personalities, therefore, can make $20,000 to $30,000 a year for reading on the air. Reporters and editors are lucky if they can make half what the personalities get.

As television moves to hire more real newsmen and diminish the importance of the personalities, this pay disparity will have to be removed. There are regular rumblings among TV reporters and deskmen that they should break away from AFTRA and seek affiliation with the American Newspaper Guild which has had greater experience representing newsmen.

There is likely to be more movement of staff members between newspapers and television as the newer medium takes journalism more seriously. This would help elevate TV reporting, since the papers still are the best training ground for beginners. It might also serve to force newspaper salaries higher.

If this exchange develops, television may be able to provide the competition needed in monopoly newspaper cities. Real competition between reporters is the best way to improve coverage by both media. If a television station does a responsible job in a one-newspaper town, the paper will be forced to improve its own work. There is no doubt that television has the audience big enough to exert moral pressure on slipshod newspapers. The only question is whether television is prepared to make the effort and to keep it up.

Local TV stations will have to learn how to free themselves from excessive advertiser pressure to become true journalists for their communities. Many sponsors like to buy entire news programs for the prestige value of being identified with "public service." In return, they expect the anouncers of news at least to mention the product when a commercial is announced. They are even happier if the same man will do the news and the commercials.

Until very recently in Cleveland one newscaster was actually an employe of the advertising agency representing the program sponsor. Another newscaster, who still does com-

mercials, was under contract to give speeches before private audiences for extra fees.

So what happens when the sponsor is involved in a negative type of news story? These channels have been known to ignore the story—that's the safest thing to do. If the sponsor happens to be a utility company deeply involved with government regulations, the conflict can be serious.

There are other conflicts, however. In Cleveland, the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), known as Sohio, has a laboratory where scientists can track satellite launchings. Another oil company, Pure, is a news program sponsor. As a result, Sohio, engineers are not interviewed about satellite launchings on the programs sponsored by Pure Oil.

Some station managements have been adamant about rebuffing sponsor interference. Most have announced policies against any conflicts of interest. But the medium has yet to mature to the point where such integrity is a rule that staff members can be sure will back them up.

When stations first shift to longer news programs, the management is usually fearful that there is not enough material to fill the time. This is not a real problem. The difficulty is that the stations have learned to cover only the major stories that cannot be ignored or the minor items which come in the mail. In between these levels are enough stories to keep the voracious tube filled every day.

Every new reporter who starts work wonders if all the best stories have been written. Within a short time on the job, however, he discovers that the overwhelming variety of human experience provides all the material needed to fill the newspaper every day. The difficulty is for the reporters and editors to permeate their community to discover the less obvious stories. They must also understand their duties so that the huge world-wide stories can be related to local interests.

Local TV news is at the stage of development of the newspaper cub reporter in his first six months. The stations are just beginning to learn their way around and discover their abilities. The omnipresent public relations men have not really discovered TV news yet, but they will.

It is true, as A. J. Liebling pointed out during the New York newspaper strike, that a great limitation of broadcast news is the time schedule. You have to be in front of your set at the right time to hear the news. But, the audience is there. The strikes in New York and Cleveland last winter whetted appetites for more broadcast news. In those cities, television will never go back to the old ways of covering news and every other city will be close behind in the development of electronic journalism.

Television reporters will improve their abilities and techniques to remove the coarseness that makes them at times seem like a "bunch of tiresome pests or frustrated cross-examiners who think they have some heaven-sent authority to exact answers to untoward inquiries," as Jack Gould of the New York *Times* observed.

As television runs out of canned program material, a real fear for TV executives, it will turn more and more to news and public affairs. There are a great many clever people in television and when they turn their talents on the events around them in combination with trained journalists they may make great strides toward realizing the full potential of the medium. It may even be not too far in the future when television commentators will be critizing the newspapers as freely as the papers dissect the elecronic media.

Reporting Asia

By Chanchal Sarkar

My own actual experience of reporting Asia is inadequate. The one country that I can claim to have reported as thoroughly as a correspondent should is Ceylon. Otherwise, I can only say that I have visited and *written,* not *reported,* on Indonesia, Malaya, Pakistan, Singapore and Australian New Guinea.

But journalism is my consuming interest and that keeps my instincts about it sharp. An Asian myself, I try to follow the coverage of the continent painstakingly—and I have many friends who are correspondents in the area. With the help of my interests, and with my friends as crutches, I shall seek to cover up the gaps in first-hand experience.

The first question to ask, I think, is whether reporting Asia is any different from reporting well-covered continents like Europe or North America. I suggest that there *are* significant differences. In some powerful countries of Europe and North America there is a mainstream of news which the correspondent is always aware of. The sources are public, the news important and unflagging, and the correspondent can do very useful work by simply reporting and analysing this mainstream. In hardly any Asian capital does this happen. There are only runnels which can suddenly swell to a torrent and it is customary for the news to come in spasms and turbulences. The currents are often subterranean, the sources personal and contingent on the reporter's skill.

Some societies are articulate and self-analytical, not just in the sense that people talk freely—Asians can be spontaneous, even compulsive, talkers. By articulate and self-analytical I mean rather that much of the energy of universities and research organizations, for instance, is engaged in the study and analysis of society. The material churned out is, naturally, of immense value to the reporter. In Asia there is very little of this and a good proportion of even that little is often done by foreign individuals or

agencies, which only makes it that much less—"reliable" was the word I thought of using, but that would be unfair. Social investigation by outsiders can be remote and offbeam.

Not only is there a lack of research studies of all kinds in most Asian countries, but also a great shortage of basic statistics and both these are, usually, part of the staple diet of correspondents.

Then there is a difference in news values. A British correspondent posted in Italy spends comparatively little time on politics. Sport of all kinds, the cavortings of film stars, the tides and currents in the world of fashion-designing, these might well be his serious preoccupations. In Asia he would have, willy nilly, to be more engaged in politics though this, as I shall suggest later, can be overdone.

Always in the background is the problem of language. There are, I know, several views on this and in a world where correspondents are shifted from country to country and have to cover several at the same time, it is too much to expect them to learn new languages. A country like India has about 15 principle ones, which or how many is the correspondent going to learn? English is very useful in some Asian countries, but French in others. The drawbacks of not knowing the language can, I know from my own experience, be offset. But one can put it no higher than "offset." The correspondent who has the language of the country he covers is at an immeasurably great advantage over the one who hasn't.

In Asia the foreign correspondent is usually several eagues removed from the common man or woman. Correspondents generally live in a style considerably grander than they would at home. More significantly, he shares the way of living of a tiny fraction of the local population. While reporting Europe or America he would, by and large, live among the same class as at home. Not so in Asia, where he is usually among the plutocrats. "More or less on the level of maharajahs," is a corrspondent friend of mine said.

This cannot but have repercussions on reporting and approach. The extent can and does very much depend on individuals. But again "offset" is the operative word. A correspondent I respect said, "The first six months are the most important. If you don't do something within that time you are likely not to do it at all." What he meant was that the first six months settled the social pattern and the professional groove of the correspondent.

The foreign correspondent finds it hard to submerge himself unnoticed in the stream of Asian life. His own "way of life" is so isolated when compared to that of the mass of the people, that the correspondent is handicapped in reporting the "way of life" of the country where he is posted—a vital and indispensable aspect of reporting.

* * *

So much for broad, continental differences. Now for the special factors in Asian reporting. I know that you will raise eyebrows at this because reporting Pakistan is very different from reporting Burma, and reporting Japan vastly different from reporting Cambodia. Nevertheless, there are, I think, some characteristics which mark off reporting in Asia as a whole.

Almost everyone testifies to the easy accessibility of Ministers, politicians and civil servants in Asia. There are exceptions—as in Burma for all journalists today and in Indonesia for some. But, broadly speaking, the important people in Asia are accessible. This has disadvantages. According to one distinguished correspondent, in Asia the correspondent is faced with a much greater volume of propaganda than he would be elsewhere. And so his interviews and meetings have meaning only if he were on top of his work and were able to cross-examine and probe, point out contradictions and ask many supplementaries. Otherwise, he might have to be content with a statement—sometimes quite detailed—that everything is lovely in the garden.

Except in a few Asian countries, there are no well-ordered government information agencies, equipped and ready to help correspondents. Sometime there is no coordination between the information work of different ministries. Physical communications and tele-communication can be so unsatisfactory as to be major hindrance. "Suppose I hear about something which has happened 200 miles out of Rangoon, for instance," said a friend of mine, "how do I check up? I can't telephone, I can't easily travel up."

But within these generic limitations Asian news is often, in this century at least if not also in the coming one, likely to be of deeper consequence because it affects the lives, the minds and the aspirations of many more millions than news out of Europe or America normally does. Since the foreign correspondent has to be a window on an entire society his work is also much more difficult than if he were reporting from his own milieu.

* * *

We are all professional journalists, who regularly scan many newspapers and periodicals. Reading about Asia, what are our impressions, dissatisfactions and expectations? I shall speak in a little greater detail later about the coverage of Asia that one sees in India. But generally what I miss most is the writing that deals with the social texture of the country, the lives of the people.

At the risk of sounding a little pedantic I would say that the richest quarry of Asian news will, in the future, be that which falls within the realm of social anthropology. It is also my belief that an understanding of the politics of a country is difficult, if not impossible, without an understanding of its social anthropology. Rural development, religion, the inter-relation between town and country, amusements, caste, community development, vacation habits, the pattern of leadership, spending patterns, fairs and festivals—all these are grist to the correspondents mill if he is to report with insight. And these are aspects which are inadequately covered, or, I should say, are aspects of which I, at least, do not see nearly enough. I know that many correspondents and agencies would want to transfer the blame to news editors and chief sub-editors who don't use such pieces even when sent.

Wherever in Asia there is even a partially developed Press (and exclude Japan whose Press is as well developed as anywhere in the world) there is the likelihood of Asian news coming to local Asian papers from non-Asian correspondents, through foreign news agencies. To put it another way, the news of countries where colonial memories are still bitter and where anti-colonialism is still a strong motivating force is often presented as seen through the eyes of correspondents from formerly colonial countries.

Does this make a difference? There is no reason why a non-Asian correspondent, even those from former colonial countries, should not be objective and much more knowledgeable than an Asian. There are cases on record where this has been so. Nevertheless, I hold the, perhaps, prejudiced view that an Asian correspondent would more easily have the basic sympathy and compassion necessary to appreciate the social and human factors in Asia. This is by no means inevitable and there are Asians who know little of their own continent. But normally a certain affinity keeps breaking in.

I have heard one or two correspondents say that, except in countries formerly dominated by the British, like India, Pakistan and Malayasia, the Asian correspondent, rare though he may be, is at a definite advantage when compared to his European and American colleagues. I cannot assert this as an axiom.

* * *

The reporter in Asia has many difficulties. There are several governments which make it difficult for him to function. Their concept of the press and its role is very restrictive. And it may well be a point for discussion whether the press in newly-formed, underdeveloped countries should have the same role as in a developed social-democratic State.

I have spoken of the circumstances which keep the foreign reporter isolated from the man in the street. To some extent this applies to the local reporter, too. Either he is so much a part of the establishment in income and way of life as to be quite out of touch with the masses or he is in such a weak position economically that he has to rely on government favors and patronage for efficient functioning. This is particularly true of non-metropolitan correspondents and the only solution is for newspapers to stiffen their backbones by making these correspondents financially independent.

* * *

Let me try to bring matters to a point by dealing a little with the coverage of Asia by the Indian press. The major Indian news agency, the Press Trust of India, has a number of correspondents in Asia, in capitals like Tokyo, Colombo, Singapore and Rangoon. Several Indian newspapers also maintain their own correspondents. Some of the Indian papers, in Indian languages and in English, are among the best of their kind in the world.

But one must acknowledge some melancholy conclusions about the Indian coverage of Asia.

(1) In quantity it is thin, much thinner than the coverage of Europe, North America and the United Nations.

(2) Most of the coverage is about external relations, wars, hot or cold, and natural calamites. Politics dominates and social reporting takes a back seat.

(3) India's neighbors, barring Nepal, have been particularly neglected and the gap in sustained coverage of Burma, Thailand, Indonesia and even Ceylon is lamentable.

(4) Pakistan presents a special case. In terms of inches the coverage is considerable but when other criteria are applied the coverage perhaps wouldn't turn out to be very good.

(5) Much of the Asian news carried emanates from Geneva, New York, London or Washington rather than from Asia.

(6) The coverage of Asia by Indian language papers is far thinner than that by English language papers. This is sad because some of the language papers are the nearest we have to a popular press. All in all I would say that India's intellectual understanding of her link with Asia and her stakes in the continent is not matched by the coverage of Asia in her newspapers.

* * *

There is little more to be said except to draw on my own reporting experience in Asia and isolate some possible do's and don'ts. The correspondent must always give himself time to submerge in the life of the country and know what are the things that really concern, not him, but the people of that country. These things might well be irrational

and the general attitude of the people to them might be quite unlike the attitude of the correspondent's own countrymen at home.

In reporting a country over a considerable stretch of time I feel that the correspondent should approach it with some basic sympathy and liking, or else voluntarily give up his assignment if he can. In the long run the draining away of sympathy is bound to warp one's reporting.

There is another aspect which some foreign correspondents have told me about. In several Asian countries there can often be petty and unnecessary irritations over minor but essential things—a telephone, a car permit, the fluctuation of electricity voltage, customs regulations, and so on. These, too, can eat into one's soul and influence one's attitude. It is important to remind oneself about this in critical moments and be prepared to take a few days off to just get away from it all and retain one's perspective.

Sometimes foreign correspondents, like the foreign community, clan together and influence each other. This can be dangerous. Among the people of the country it is essential to have friends, not just *contacts,* and friendship is always a matter of give and take.

The correspondent must make an effort to know the social fabric of the country, its snobberies, its contradictions, its frustrations. He must have some idea of its literature and the themes of modern writers, at least in translation. He must have links with the people of no particular consequence—the petty clerk, the small tradesman, the school teacher. And, of course, he has always reason to be grateful to his firmest allies—the local newspapermen. In most Asian countries he must be prepared to know the essentials of rural problems first-hand and, as a friend of mine says, not judge Asian democracy or socialism through London School of Economics and British Labour Party spectacles. This was of course, meant for Indian correspondents.

Two final reflections. A correspondent must be able to appreciate points of view which run contrary to the interests of his *own* country and, above all, he must always be interested, deeply and enduringly interested, in the countries he reports.

Chanchal Sarkar left the staff of *The Statesman* of New Delhi in 1962, to become the first director of the Press Institute of India. He was an Associate Nieman Fellow in 1960-61.

Canada and the U.S.

(Continued from page 2)

Basically, this Canadian concern is a domestic issue to be settled by Canadian law and the considered judgment of Canadians as to their own self interest. But in the light of the substantial American investment such decisions should be taken after consultation with the United States. We urge a heightened and sustained awareness on the part of all American business and labor organizations that Americans involved in Canada neither be nor seem irresponsible or indifferent towards the Canadian national interest. We believe it is inappropriate for American-owned corporations in Canada to be used as instruments of American foreign policy.

These two great trading countries have a prime common objective to promote rather than suppress the creation of wealth and useful service. We believe the current attitude in both countries toward their economic relations is essentially healthy. However recent happenings strongly caution against complacency. The Canadian Budget proposals of 1963, the suggested United States Interest Equalization Tax of 1963 and the Seamen's International Union affair are proof that neither country nor any private interest is immune to ill-considered actions.

In the vital area of national self-interest, namely, defense of the homeland, Canada and the United States are firmly committed to the common defense.

Each country must discipline itself to accept the disparities in circumstance and contribution inherent in this joint effort. The discipline may be harder for Canadians because it involves the acute nerve centers of national pride and the need to participate actively in their own defense. Canada could let itself be weakened as a nation and as a partner in the common effort if it should yield to chronic peevishness with a more powerful, affluent partner who, in Canadian eyes, may sometimes seem to need Canada only for bases, U.N. votes and errands.

On the other hand the United States must discipline itself to bear the larger share of the common defense cost, and to understand its favored position. Above all, it must be responsive to Canada's need to count in its own defense, if there is to be a durable *common* defense.

We see no need for basic changes in existing policies and arrangements governing the control of security decisions and military commands in continental defense. Manifestly such matters will be adjusted from time to time to meet changing circumstances. The present situation involves a sensitive point. The United States cannot commit itself to prior consultation with Canada in all circumstances involving use of U. S. power.

We likewise see no immediate prospect for major changes in the handling of defense contracts as between the

two countries. This however is an area where persistent attention and resourcefulness can influence developments. It is in the interest of the common defense that Canada's potential for an effective contribution to the common cause be given sustained and sympathetic consideration. There may, indeed, be opportunities for more boldness in such ventures as a joint NASA institutional research program which might have a stimulating effect on Canadian technological and industrial capabilities to our mutual advantage.

There is only limited opportunity for a larger measure of significant consultation in respect to hard-core military defense. On the other hand we believe American diplomacy should be flexible in all matters which touch the world's peace and well-being. In such affairs, including especially the various international organizations in which both Canada and the United States participate, we suggest that there need be only two limitations on the mutual interest of the two countries in developing deeper, more sustained and better organized consultation with each other.

The first of these limitations is the hard fact that the United States both in its international negotiations and its internal democratic processes is stretched on the rack of global responsibilities as no nation has ever been before. In consequence those who are closest to us are apt to get less consideration than they might receive under other circumstances. Any less attention by the United States to the seemingly unlimited demands of the rest of the world for attention and action could produce results which Canada would regret more than she now deplores lapses in American solicitude for her interests and sensibilities.

The second limitation is that the United States should not seek to bind Canadian foreign policies into a pattern of conformity with United States policies. In the long run any attempt by the United States to achieve a total concert of policy is bound to fail. Moreover there is a positive reason for not doing so. Canada's status and effectiveness as a leader among the so-called "middle powers" is a growing asset. This may well be Canada's indispensable contribution to the common cause. Some form of police force for peace-keeping is now essential and no nation can lead this development better than Canada. Canada can play this role with maximum effectiveness only in so far as her independence and national integrity are respected throughout the international community.

This does not mean any weakening of the Canadian-American alliance nor does it limit the full and frank exchange of views between the two nations. Neither should refrain from urging its point of view on the other. United States officialdom and the American public should be constantly on guard against seeming to want to make Canada a satellite of United States policy. For example, while there is a strong case for American policies of non-intercourse with the Castro regime in Cuba and the Red Chinese, Canadian divergence from our position should not be treated as a form of disloyalty to our alliance and friendship. Honest divergences of policy are not manifestations of anti-Americanism or perfidy when they arise in the Canadian-United States relations.

There is a significant similarity between the economic relations of the two countries and their cultural relations. Both relationships reflect the difficulty endemic in the imbalance "in favor" of the United States. In the cultural as in the economic area, the American involvement in Canadian life is so great as to cause concern in Canada. The fear in Canada is that its culture and even the Canadian sense of identity are in danger of being engulfed by American influences through magazines, television, radio, newspapers, books, motion pictures.

We see no ready American answer to this Canadian concern. American culture, like all other cultures, has its full share of both the worthy and the worthless. The values of the consumer, either in the United States or Canada, largely determine his choice. Americans should encourage the export of the worthy and discourage the unworthy for either home or foreign consumption. But in this particular international relationship there is relatively little that can be done through United States official policy and action.

Both countries can serve their best interests in healthy cultural relations by the encouragement of the good rather than by repression of the shoddy. Specifically, we urge a more alert American approach to Canadian affairs and culture by our educational institutions, communications media, news agencies and by the endless variety of private associations that focus the attention of Americans in every phase of our life and work. Few actions will go further to meet the Canadian concern about the impact of American culture than a sincere, sustained demonstration by Americans of a greater interest in knowing more about Canada and her significant achievements.

Our focus has been on international aspects of the relationship, but the intimacy of Canadian-American intercourse inevitably touches affairs that are primarily domestic. Indeed, it is a mark of the maturity in this relationship that we can be concerned, as well as informed, about each other's essentially internal problems without offering gratuitous solutions from the outside.

The civil rights crisis in America and the critical challenge Canadian nationhood faces are both internal affairs which have deep implications for the general international relations of the two nations. Neither nation can properly involve itself in any way with the solution of the other's domestic travail, but it would be a great disservice to the cause of better understanding in the relationship not to

have people on both sides of the border fully and fairly informed about matters of such vast import to both societies. For our part, we commend the coverage which American magazines, newspapers and news services have given to racial affairs in the United States. We suggest the need for much more attention on their part to the crisis which has arisen in the relations of English and French Canada. The fact that the vast majority of Americans are still virtually unaware of this crisis contrasts sharply with the information available to all Canadians on a daily, even hourly, basis concerning the struggle in America to provide equal opportunity for our Negro citizens. This contrast is only one of the countless instances of imbalance that pervade the Canadian-American relationship.

We conclude that nothing is more essential to the well-being of this relationship than that Americans should understand the facts and implications of this pervasive imbalance. At the same time Americans should not make the unwarranted, and in Canadian eyes, the unforgivable, mistake of equating it with superior national worth. The bedrock premise of the Canadian-American relationship is the independent existence and the equal sovereignty of both nations. Whatever their other disparities, it must also always embrace two nations of equal worth.

Reviews

Newspaper Talk

By John M. Harrison

THE PRESS IN PERSPECTIVE. Edited by Ralph D. Casey. Louisiana State University Press. 217 pp. $6.

What is most remarkable about this compendium of speeches which Ralph Casey has assembled is that it doesn't read like a compendium at all. It adds up to a wide-ranging yet unified study of the problems confronting the American press during the period 1947-62, and a perceptive assessment of its successes and failures in dealing with them.

One comes away with the impression that the Twin Cities American Newspaper Guild and the University of Minnesota School of Journalism must have planned this series of annual lectures with just such a unified analysis in mined. To the extent that they exercised such discriminating choice, the sponsoring groups may be said to have planned it that way. They confined themselves to no one area of interest, interpreting "press" in the broadest possible sense. A historian (Henry Steele Commager) and a theologian (Reinhold Niebuhr) bring insights that help illumine the subject in important ways. Others come from all the media, having two things in common:

1) All are out of the top drawer of American journalism.

2) Each is proud of his calling and concerned about its failures.

The roster includes, in addition to Dr. Commager and Dr. Niebuhr: Joseph W. Alsop, Jr., Alan Barth, Herbert M. Block, Marquis Childs, Elmer Davis, George V. Ferguson, Doris Fleeson, John Fischer, James Hagerty, Gerald W. Johnson, Louis Lyons, James B. Reston, Pierre Salinger, Eric Sevareid and Thomas L. Stokes, Jr.

What aspects of press performance are of greatest concern to this group? Not unexpectedly, its role in reporting world affairs and its responsibility in relation to a variety of kinds of threats to individual freedoms occupy much of their attention. Since these were of overriding importance in the 15-year period covered by the lectures—and still are—their prevalence reflects a sound appraisal. Yet there is no sense of repetition. It is rather a matter of one discussion's complementing others.

One of the special delights in reading this collection is the way the style and personality of so many of the contributors come through. These are word men, and one suspects that they emerge even more convincingly on the printed page than they did in speaking the words. The reviewer can say positively that this is true of the one of these lectures he heard in the University of Minnesota's Northrup Auditorium—that by Herblock. It was a good speech on that cold November night in 1956; it is a devastating commentary on press foibles in the pages of this book.

Choosing "bests" in such a collection is fruitless. Because it departs rather sharply from most of its companions, and because it is such sharply-honed prose, Gerald Johnson's relatively brief plea on behalf of "Personality in Journalism" has its special attractions. Because of its typical candor, Louis Lyons' "The Third Reader," which puts squarely up to the Guild and to schools of journalism their shortcomings in helping elevate press performance, has particular impact. But, as one would expect, Sevareid, and Davis, and nearly all the rest have their particular rewards.

As editor, Ralph Casey has performed his duties well. If he has cut any of the speeches, he has done it expeditiously. He provides helpful footnotes where references may be obscure, and thumbnail biographies of all seventeen contributors. Finally, he has written a blessedly brief introduction which sets the stage for what's to come.

The Press in Perspective is much more than just another anthology of speeches. It has much to say about the press and its problems in fifteen eventful and troublesome years.

John M. Harrison, now professor of journalism at Penn. State, was long an editorial writer on the Toledo *Blade*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1952.

Book Titles

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. By J. K. Galbraith. Harvard University Press. 104 pp. $2.95.

Plain sensible talk about the hard business of making living standards tolerable in lands where they are not. By one who has worked at it.

FIRE BELL IN THE NIGHT. By Oscar Handlin. Little, Brown Co. 110 pp. $3.50.

The deepening danger to American democracy in the failure to end Negro discrimination.

THE BAY OF PIGS. By Haynes Johnson. Norton Co. 368 pp. $5.95.

A vivid account of the aborted invasion and an exploration of the background of its traversty. A non-political record from the participants.

DULLES OVER SUEZ. Herbert Finer. Quadrangle Books, Chicago. 538 pp. $7.50.

The crooked road to the Suez crisis of 1956 and its dismal effects. It is not without malice. Mr. Dulles is Finer's villain. But discounting for that, and some other biases, it is a very complete record.

REPORTING. By Lillian Ross. Simon & Schuster. 442 pp. $6.50

Half a dozen examples of Lillian Ross' vivid reporting in the *New Yorker,* including her profile on Hemingway and a long saga of a serious movie that became a casualty of Hollywood inner politics.

PEOPLE, SOCIETY AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS. By Lewis A. Dexter and David M. White. Free Press of Glencoe, N.Y. 593 pp. $7.95.

The impact of the media on people and vice versa. Comprehensive studies.

Nieman Books

TAXPAYERS' HAYRIDE. By Julius Duscha, Little, Brown Co. 309 pp. $6.

How Billie Sol Estes could exploit the farm program. Its other weaknesses and failures. A recipe for a more rational farm policy.

BLACK MAN'S AMERICA. By Simeon Booker. Prentice Hall. 230 pp. $4.95.

A Negro reporter's graphic story of some things he has seen happen to Negroes in Alabama and Mississippi; an inside commentary on the way the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations acted on civil rights. A Who's Who of Negro leaders and their maneuvers to keep the lead.

Nieman Books in Process

Anthony Lewis on the Supreme Court, from his *New Yorker* series.

Christopher Rand on the Cambridge science-industry complex, from his *New Yorker* series.

JOURNEY AMONG BRAVE MEN. By Dana Adams Schmidt. Little Brown & Co. (June 16).

On the Kurds: "the fightingest people in the Middle East."

Scrapbook

A Lost Prize

Most commentary on this year's Pulitzer Prize awards has focused on the jury's failure to grant any honors in the fields of drama, fiction and music. The merits of these indecisions are arguable; but another exercise in non-recognition is worthy of sharply dissenting notice.

The truly conspicuous omission was the absence of any award or citation for the most unconventional and distinguished journalistic endeavor of recent (or ancient) years—A. H. Raskin's remarkable 15,000-word behind-the-scenes *Times* report on the long, bitter newspaper strike that stopped the local presses for nearly four months.

An inquiry into the circumstances surrounding this lamentable lapse of the newspaper dignitaries who bestow journalism's most celebrated accolades provides no satisfactory answer. It is, in a sense, a story in itself, providing another melancholy footnote to the muddled annals of the Pulitzer Prizes.

* * *

Raskin's product was both an unprecedented and memorable episode in the history of U. S. journalism. It was a candid, informed study of the forces and personalities involved in the prolonged newspaper blackout; no sacred cows were spared in his account of that disastrous saga of mutual miscalculation, misunderstanding and misfortune. Management and union negotiators were treated with fine—often devastating—objectivity in his account, and even those who were scared recognized the extraordinary honesty and perceptiveness of the report.

This was one of journalism's finest hours—and one from which all newspapers and newspapermen had reason to derive a certain pride. It seemed to establish, among other things, the proposition that a newspaper could tell the rough truth about a conflict in which its own executives had been deeply involved. Indeed, it would have seemed appropriate for the Pulitzer jurors to honor both the man who wrote the report and the publisher—the late Orvil Dryfoos—who sanctioned its publication despite adverse passages on the conduct of the Publishers Assn. in the conflict.

Without harshly deprecating other winners, one is obliged to argue that the Raskin story surely warranted larger immortality than the diligent coverage of a "multi-million-dollar vegetable oil swindle in New Jersey," one of this year's triumphant entries.

* * *

Non-recognition of the Raskin report cannot be ascribed to negligence or absentmindedness. It was a considered judgment of the Advisory Board to which the document was referred for final consideration.

For some inexplicable reason, the *Times* itself did not include the Raskin story among its submissions; but this did

not preclude a prize since other journalists took pains to sponsor him. It was also true that his report did not neatly fit into any category such as "spot news" coverage or "national reporting." But if there was any authentic ambiguity on that point, the Pulitzer board has resolved the problem in the past—and did so again this year—by awarding special citations. This year's "special" was awarded to the Gannett newspaper chain for something described as "special coverage of success stories on 'The Road to Integration.' "

One member of the board said privately yesterday that a Raskin citation was rejected because "there was a feeling that too many special citations were reducing the value of the prizes." But the explanation is wholly unconvincing in view of the dispensation for the Gannett exhibit. The choice should hardly have been difficult, if indeed there could be only one selection in the "special" category.

* * *

Conceivably the *Times'* initial failure to advance Raskin's name contributed to the drowsiness that overcame the jurors when the subject came up. But that is poor justification for so large a goof. Every other committee that has presided over the distribution of newspaper awards this year. (Polk, Guild, etc.) has saluted the Raskin story. It was the talk of newspaperdom when it appeared. It will be remembered whenever newspapers self-consciously hesitate to write freely about matters in which they have direct involvement.

Yet none of these considerations apparently swayed most of the pillars of newspaper society who comprise the Pulitzer board. Certainly some men cared; otherwise the case would never have reached the board. But plainly they were lost voices.

One can only conclude that "The Establishment" regarded the Raskin revolution in labor reporting (about the affairs of newspapers) as precocious and presumptuous. It is a sad tale; it revives anew the question of whether the stuffed shirt should be the arbiter of journalistic excellence, and whether, with due reverence for Mr. Pulitzer, working newspapermen should regard the board as a jury of their peers or a tribunal of their overseers.

—New York *Post,* May 7.

New Nieman Award Cites Vietnam Correspondents

The following is a slightly cut version of a Harvard University news release of May 4.

American correspondents in Vietnam in 1963 received the first Louis M. Lyons Award for Conscience and Integrity in Journalism.

The announcement of the establishment of the award as well as the initial recipients came from the 1963-64 class of Nieman Fellows at Harvard University.

The award, they said, is to be presented annually by Nieman classes at Harvard. It is named for the retiring Curator of the Nieman Fellowships for Journalism at Harvard.

The Vietnam correspondents were cited for reporting "the truth as they saw it. . . without yielding to unrelenting pressures . . . from numerous sources including the United States government."

Singled out for specific mention were Cornelius Sheehan, of United Press International; Malcolm Browne, of the Associated Press, David Halberstam, of the New York *Times.*

A special citation added, however: "We also cited their dedicated colleagues whose courage, determination and skill helped to let the people know."

The award will consist of a plaque to be hung in the Nieman Fellowships office at Harvard recording each year's winner or winners. In addition, any individuals cited specifically are to receive smaller plaques of their own.

The first award was selected by the 1963-64 Nieman class.

Nieman alumni, now numbering in the vicinity of 300, are to be asked to make suggestions for award recipients in future years. The Nieman class in residence will then make the choice.

A spokesman for the current Nieman class said the intention of the group was to create an award to honor displays of conscience and integrity by individuals, groups or institutions in communications.

The award in the future presumably could be given to a newspaper or radio or TV station or to an individual or a group of individuals.

Louis M. Lyons has been Curator of the Nieman Foundation since 1939. He was a member of the first Nieman class, of 1938--39, and became Curator after the first Curator, Archibald McLeish, was appointed Librarian of Congress by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He has been a leader in discussion of the role of the press in modern America and an editor and distinguished reporter in his own right.

As a newscaster of radio and television for the Boston educational station, WGBH, he has won wide recognition, including a Peabody award for news reporting in 1958 and a duPont award this year.

He has been editor of the professional journal *Nieman Reports* since 1947, which has dealt with the difficult problems faced in the daily reporting of increasingly complex events of our time.

He was a reporter for the Boston *Globe* when he first became associated with the program. After his retirement as Curator of the Nieman Foundation this year he plans to join the staff of WGBH as news director.

In making the first Louis M. Lyons Award the 1963-64 Nieman class prepared a special citation to the winners, the text of which follows:

A Citation

We name the American correspondents in Vietnam, in 1963, recipients of the first Louis M. Lyons Award for Conscience and Integrity in Journalism.

Under trying conditions they reported the truth as they saw it from Vietnam without yielding to unrelenting pressures, direct and indirect, to distort the news. These pressures were exerted by numerous sources, including the United States government.

Foremost among those we honor are Cornelius Sheehan, of United Press International; Malcolm Browne, of the Associated Press, and David Halberstam, of the New York *Times.*

We also cite their dedicated colleagues whose courage, determination and skill helped to let the people know.

THE 1963-64 NIEMAN FELLOWS

A Code on Pre-Trial Publicity

After two and a half years of study and conferences, a Committee of Massachusetts newspapermen and lawyers published a "Guide for the Bar and News Media"—an effort to confine pre-trial publicity to limits that will not endanger the chance of a fair trial.

They announce its adoption by 26 daily and 31 weekly papers in the State and by the Massachusetts Broadcasters Association.

This is the "Guide."

PREAMBLE

1. To promote closer understanding between the bar and the press, especially in their efforts to reconcile the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press and the right to a fair, impartial trial, the following mutual and voluntary statement of principles is recommended to all members of both professions.
2. Both professions, recognizing that freedom of the press is one of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, agree that this fundamental freedom must be zealously preserved and responsibly exercised subject only to those restrictions designed to safeguard equally fundamental rights of the individual.
3. It is likewise agreed that both the press and the bar are obliged to preserve the principle of the presumption of innocence for those accused of wrongdoing pending a finding of guilty.
4. The press and the bar concur on the importance of the natural right of the members of an organized society to acquire and impart information about their common interests.
5. It is further agreed, however, that the inherent right of society's members to impart and acquire information should be exercised with discretion at those times when public disclosures would jeopardize the ends of justice, public security and other rights of individuals.
6. The press and the bar recognize that there may arise circumstances in which disclosures of names of individuals involved in matters coming to the attention of the general public would result in personal danger, harm to the reputation of a person or persons or notoriety to an innocent third party.
7. Consistent with the principles of this preamble, it is the responsibility of the bar, no less than that of the press to support the free flow of information.

FOR THE PRESS

Newspapers in publishing accounts of crime should keep in mind that the accused may be tried in a court of law.

To preserve the individual's rights to a fair trial, news stories of crime should contain only a factual statement of the arrest and attending circumstances.

The following should be avoided:

1. Publication of interviews with supoenaed witnesses after an indictment is returned.
2. Publication of the criminal record or discreditable acts of the accused after an indictment is returned or during the trial unless made part of the evidence in the court record. The defendant is being tried on the charge for which he is accused and not on his record. (Publication of a criminal record could be grounds for a libel suit.
3. Publication of confessions after an indictment is returned unless made a part of the evidence in the court record.
4. Publication of testimony stricken by the court unless reported as having been stricken.
5. Editorial comment preceding or during trial, tending to influence judge or jury.
6. Publication of names of juveniles involved in juvenile proceedings unless the names are released by the judge.
7. The publication of any "leaks," statements or conclusions as to the innocence or guilt, implied or expressed, by the police or prosecuting authorities or defense counsel.

FOR THE BAR

To preserve the individual's rights to a fair trial in a court of law the following guide lines are prescribed for the Bar.

1. A factual statement of the arrest and circumstances and incidents thereof of a person charged with a crime is permissible, but the following should be avoided:
   (A) Statements or conclusions as to the innocence or guilt, implied or expressed, by the prosecuting authorities or defense counsel.
   (B) Out-of-court statements by prosecutors or defense attorneys to news media in advance of or during trial, stating what they expect to prove, whom they propose to call as witnesses or public criticism of either judge or jury.
   (C) Issuance by the prosecuting authorities, counsel for the defense or any person having official connection with the case of any statements relative to the conduct of the accused, statements, "confessions" or admissions made by the accused or other matters bearing on the issue to be tried.
   (D Any other statement or press release to the news media in which the source of the statement remains undisclosed.
2. At the same time, in the interest of fair and accurate reporting, news media have a right to expect the co-operation of the authorities in facilitating adequate coverage of the law enforcement process.

Scrapbook

How Public Must The Public Schools Be?

Dr. S. P. Marland, *superintendent of schools in Pittsburgh, put this head on his February* Newsletter, *over the following letter to his staff:*

Dear Colleagues:

One of the practices of school administration in a big city that I am beginning to appreciate might be called *instant information*. By this I mean that a brief reply to a press inquiry at mid-morning in the administration building may be a headline in your lap as you take the streetcar home that afternoon. Or what might be seen as a routine Board of Education action, initiating faculty deliberation on a late Tuesday evening, becomes a bold-faced declaration on your breakfast table Wednesday morning.

Let me add very quickly that the Pittsburgh Schools are favored with honest, cooperative and accurate coverage by the news media. My problem is that I would much prefer a more deliberate means of communicating with the 4500 members of our organization than through the journalistic interpretations of a third party, no matter how accurate he may be.

Shortly after World War II, I was returned from overseas service to a brief stint in the Pentagon. I noted that nearly all middle- to top-level staff personnel read the New York *Times* diligently every morning. Their purpose was to find out what was being said by their departmental chiefs in order to be current with the public. At first I was appalled by this phenomenon of "organizational bigness." Later, I came to accept it as necessary in the labyrinth of Washington. But I never thought that I would find myself wearing the same ill-fitting cloak.

A number of occurrences prompt this concern, the most recent being the announcement of plans for end-of-year examinations in the secondary schools. The newspaper reports were honest accounts of what the reporters saw and heard. But the casual reader could have concluded the following, all of which would have been erroneous:

- That examinations in general are unfamiliar to the Pittsburgh Schools.
- That the Board of Education had accomplished some kind of a triumph.
- That the examinations were to be imposed without further participation and deliberation by the teachers as to their scope, purpose and content.

Without wanting to labor the illustrations, the facts behind the *instant information,* which press representatives could not have known, were as follows:

The Board of Education action was a matter of adopting the 1964-65 calendar, with days set aside to allow for examinations, but more particularly to allow a slightly shortened school year and some time for teachers to correct and record the results of the examinations. The action had to do with adopting a calendar, not with making a revolutionary new policy by fiat.

The action was based on lengthy deliberation among administrative and staff officers, with the benefit of informal counsel from individual teachers.

There being a year and a half before June, 1965, it is intended to make a careful study of the nature and worth of the examinations, with the active and necessary participation of teachers in formulating further policy.

This illustration could be transposed into other examples of *instant information*—salary planning, vocational technical education, need for new and modernized school facilities, and others.

Three basic principles converge to create this problem:

(1) The alertness and skill of the press in seeking out and reporting information in a colorful and appetizing fashion. As teachers, we uphold this right and obligation, and would deplore "managed" news. (2) The fundamental legal obligation of the Board of Education to enact, monthly or more often, local legislation of greater or lesser public interest. The administration necessarily puts before the Board of Education items for study and action, sometimes bound by inescapable time table, and rarely knowing how the "color" of the Board meeting will appear to a journalist. (3) The obligation on the part of the administration to provide opportunities for faculty participation in the affairs of education, toward the ultimate success of the policies enacted by the Board. I hold this proposition as most important.

The inquiring conscientious spirit of our newspapers, combined with the bigness of our organization, sometimes places these forces in chronological disarrangement. This is my problem.

It takes about twenty minutes to get a headline on the air; about two hours to get it on the news stand, but it takes about four days for the normal processes of internal communication to get from me to you. By the time the "normal administrative processes" work, the issue is cold, and I find myself having to protect or defend or patch together a position, rather than to present it administratively for constructive faculty responses and counsel.

Education is the most public and visible of all the professions. In the formal affairs of the Board of Education this is right and good, as we carry on our work of public enterprise brightly illuminated for public view.

But, separately, as a professional body, we have many responsibilities short of the formal affairs of the Board of Education which are privy to internal professional discussions only.

Ethics demand privacy in many teaching tasks. Good order in professional planning calls for internal deliberation of a non-public action. It is the balancing and reconciling of the non-public and the public aspects of teaching that I must try to resole. It is my hope that as we proceed with our plans for the Faculty Advisory Committee we may be able to correct the periodic surprises of *instant information.*

In any case, please know that your Superintendent of Schools does not choose to inform you by means of headlines, and that the headlines, though accurate, leave much more to be shared through the slower but more conventional channels of school organization.

Sincerely,

S. P. Marland, Jr.

Dwight Sargent Heads Nieman Program

'Trib Editor Named as Lyons Retires

The following was the Harvard University news release, May 11:

Dwight E. Sargent, the editor of the editorial page of the New York *Herald Tribune,* will become Curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard University on July 1.

In directing the program of university study for experienced newsmen, he will succeed Louis M. Lyons, who has been Curator since 1939.

Mr. Sargent, who studied at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow in 1950-51, was editor of newspapers in Portland, Maine, before he joined the New York *Herald Tribune* in 1959. He served on the Selecting Committee on Nieman Fellows in 1956.

He was one of the organizers of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, and its Chairman in 1953. He also helped in organizing the New England Society of Newspaper Editors, and was instrumental in establishing the Elijah Parish Lovejoy Fellowship at Colby College, which brings a distinguished journalist each year to lecture on the Maine college campus.

The Nieman Fellowships give experienced newsmen a year of study within Harvard University, in any fields useful as background to their journalistic work. The Fellowships were established in 1938 by a gift of the late Mrs. Lucius W. Nieman for the promotion and elevation of the standards of journalism. The Fellowships honor the memory of her husband, the founder of the Milwaukee *Journal.* Some 300 newsmen have studied at Harvard under the Fellowships since they were established in 1938.

Mr. Sargent, who is 47, was born in Pembroke, Mass., and received the A.B. degree from Colby College in 1939. Colby conferred on him its honorary M.A. degree in 1956, and later elected him a trustee.

He was telegraph editor of the Biddeford, Me., *Journal* and make-up editor of the New Bedford, Mass., *Standard-Times* before joining the U.S. Army in 1942. He served at the Army Information School in Lexington, Va., and in the European Theatre of Operations, and was discharged with the rank of captain. He then became news director and news commentator of radio station WGAN in Portland, Me. He was editor of the editorial page of the Portland *Press-Herald* and *Sunday Telegram* when he held a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard in 1950-51.

On the basis of his studies of state government at Harvard and in Maine, he editorially urged a series of reforms which were adopted by the Maine legislature. In 1955, he was made editorial page director of the three Portland newspapers. He joined the New York *Herald Tribune* in 1959.

He is a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma Delta Chi, the Overseas Press Club of America, the National Press Club in Washington, and the International Press Institute.

He is married to the former Elaine Marion Cass, and they have three children.

Mr. Lyons, who retires this summer, has been associated with the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard since their establishment in 1938. As a reporter of the Boston *Globe,* he studied at Harvard in 1938-39 with the first group of Nieman Fellows. He then became Curator of the Nieman Fellowships, continuing on the staff of the Boston *Globe* until 1946.

He has edited the quarterly, *Nieman Reports,* a journal of press opinion, for the Nieman Alumni Council.

His nightly news and comments over Boston's educational radio and television station, WGBH, are now heard through most of New England and in New York. For his news broadcasting, he has received the Peabody Award and the duPont Award.. He also holds the honorary L.H.D. degree from the University of Massachusetts, the LL.D. from Colby College and Marlborough College, and the honorary D.Ed. from Rhode Island College.

Reprinted from
Nieman Reports, *Oct. 1959*

State of Maine Man

This morning I had a good visit with the just appointed editorial chief of the N. Y. *Herald Tribune,* Dwight Sargent of Portland, Maine.

He dropped in. This was not unusual. Dwight has been dropping in every so often ever since he was a Nieman Fellow, eight years ago. He always has a few things on his mind to remind me to do, to keep the world right side up.

Dwight has been tending to the job of keeping things right side up in Maine, directing the editorials of the three Portland newspapers.

When he finished his Nieman year at Harvard studying State government, Dwight told me he was going home with a few quite definite ideas for the government of Maine. He soon published a series of editorials entitled, "If I Were Governor."

But he didn't stop with one series. He kept at his points. One of them was to get rid of the outmoded September election. They have. Another was a four year term for governor. That has been voted. Another was a shorter ballot, and that has been accepted. There were other things, too, that got done as Dwight Sargent kept sawing wood on his editorials.

Under his direction, with the confidence and support of a modern management, the paper moved from stand-pat Republicanism to independence.

Sargent is a country boy and some people have smiled that that other country boy, Robert White, the *Trib's* new president, from Mexico, Mo., should have reached into Maine for his editor. But John Hay Whitney came back from England to have a hand in the choice too, and made the final decision after exploring the mind of Dwight Sargent in a searching interview which came after Whitney's agents had explored Sargent's background.

It is an interesting background. He is 42. He grew up in a small New Hampshire town and went to Colby College. Later he was one of the prime movers in establishing the Lovejoy Lectureship at Colby, and has helped select the dis-

tinguished editors who have annually filled that lectureship.

He was a prime mover in organizing the National Conference of Editorial Writers and the New England Society of Newspaper Editors.

A year ago he took a trip around the world because he thought a down-Maine editor ought to get out more and see for himself.

He's a tight-lipped Yankee, but behind that poker face a keen mind is ticking. It ticks in laconic phrase, often in humorous expression, and with an unendingly surprising stock of information on everything.

"Why do we say 'Down Maine' when it's up North?" someone was asking one day.

"Because it's down wind," said Sargent, with a glance up from his newspaper.

Dwight Sargent says there are three things a great newspaper must have:

1. A conscience.
2. Something to say.
3. Good writing.

I am sure he had occasion to say it recently to John Hay Whitney, new owner of the *Herald Tribune,* who himself was born in Ellsworth, Maine.

As to the good writing, Sargent has a little personal list of tired cliches that he will not tolerate in an editorial.

I asked him to list them for me.

"These" he says, "I consider some of the most horrifying:

It remains to be seen.
It would appear that.
This is as it should be.
A step in the right direction.
Trite but true.
Started the ball rolling.
Got off to an auspicious start.
Struck a blow for democracy.
The political pot is boiling."

And he added: "If another misguided soul tells me that New York's gain is Maine's loss, my list will be one cliche longer."

So the *Herald Tribune,* setting out on a new chapter under the ownership of John Hay Whitney, has as editor and editorial chief two country editors, in their early forties, Robert White of Missouri and Dwight Sargent of Maine.

As I read the announcement that the down-Maine man is going to be the editorial page editor of the paper Horace Greeley founded, I remember a sign on the road in the village of East Poultney, Vermont, that nearby that spot Horace Greeley had his first newspaper job.

Down the road a short piece in Poultney is the birthplace of George Jones, who was the main strength of the New York *Times* when it undertook the struggle that ended in freeing New York from the clutches of the Tweed Ring.

Those were country boys, who built the character of the greatest newspapers of their day.

Louis M. Lyons—WGBH Newscast
September 10, 1959

Stephen E. Fitzgerald 1909-1964

Stephen E. Fitgerald died March 23d after a long illness, in Bronxville, New York, where he lived.

Native of Baltimore and educated at Johns Hopkins University, he joined the Baltimore *Evening Sun* in 1929 and continued with it until 1942, when he joined the staff of the War Production Board, to become its deputy director. He was a member of the second group of Nieman Fellows, 1939-40.

He developed his own public relations firm in New York after the war. He was former president of the New York Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America and editor of the society's journal. He was author of a book on public relations: *Communicating Ideas to the Public.*

A first class reporter in his newspaper days, he was equally successful in business. His clients included leading American corporations. He was a leader in developing public relations as a profession.

Nieman Notes

1943

John F. Day resigned from *Time,* Inc.'s foreign news service in April to buy a partnership in the Exmouth *Jonrnal,* a large weekly on the Southwest coast of England. "I am buying the interest of the editor who at 77 agreed to sell only if I would permit him to continue to work as a reporter. I consider that a good deal, because it will take an American, even one who has been over here two and a half years, time to get adjusted to and be accepted by an English town. I have married a wonderful English girl since I have been over here. I like England so much I decided to settle down here. Maybe I am the first Nieman Fellow to try his wares in such a manner in a foreign country."

John Day was a reporter on the Cleveland *Press,* later managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal;* then news director for CBS, before going to London for *Time,* Inc.

1944

Fred Maguire, professor of journalism at Ohio State University, was a guest speaker at the 19th Conference for Readers and Writers at the University of Pittsburgh, March 13.

1948

Dr. Lester Grant is a member of the teaching staff of the New York University School of Medicine; also directing one of the research laboratories of the New York City Health Department. After graduation at Harvard Medical School in 1955, he served as interne and resident in teaching hospitals in Boston and New Haven. He received a postdoctoral fellowship at Oxford and earned a Ph.D. in physiology and medicine.

1949

Alan Barth, editorial writer for the Washington *Post,* was the principal speak-

er at the 18th annual convention of the Maryland Scholastic Press Association. More than 1,000 high school journalists from Maryland, Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia attended the convention.

1951

Dana Adams Schmidt, New York *Times* correspondent in the Middle East, received the George Polk award, for his articles on the Kurdish rebellion. "For the best reporting, requiring exceptional courage and enterprise abroad." Schmidt spent 46 days among the Kurds in their mountain hideouts and interviewed their leader.

1954

Douglas Leiterman produced and directed a one-hour television portrait of John Diefenbaker, Canadian Conservative Party leader, for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It was the ninth special presentation of the CBC Document series. He received the Wilderness Award of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for his documentary last year on race prejudice in the U. S.

1955

Henry Shapiro was in Cambridge for an April visit after a flying trip from Moscow to California for the marriage of his daughter,Irena to Barry Alan Corten April II in Berkeley.

1957

After four and a half years on the Philadelphia *Bulletin,* **Fred Pillsbury** returned to the Boston *Herald* as a feature writer in the Sunday department, in April. He had been doing weekly features for the Sunday magazine on the *Bulletin.*

On February 2d, the 5th U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the conviction of **William Worthy** of *Afro-American* for entering the U. S. from Cuba without a passport. The Court declared unconstitutional the section of the McCarran Act under which he was indicted. This ended a prosecution that had lasted almost two years.

1958

Newsday appointed **William F. McIlwain** managing editor, the first of May. He has been with *Newsday* since 1954, as copy editor, columnist, city editor and assistant managing editor.

1959

T. V. Parasuram, Washington correspondent of the *Indian Express* newspapers, reports a baby girl born April 12, "the first girl in our family for two generations. We named her Anita after a search for a name that was Indian as well as American."

1961

Robert Smith became editorial page editor of the Charlotte *News* in February, moving from the Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot,* where he had been Sunday editor and associate editor.

Chanchal Sarkar, as director of the new Press Institute of India, has brought consultants from the International Press Institute to help small Indian papers with their problems of accounting and equipment. He found that business and technical problems had to come before editorial needs.

The South Carolina Press Association awarded a silver loving cup to **A. M. Secrest** this Spring for publishing the weekly newspaper (the Cheraw *Chronicle*) performing the most valuable community service of any paper in the State.

The *Columbia Journalism Review* cited the Cheraw *Chronicle* "which has shown continuing awareness of South Carolina's racial problems and has taken editorial positions calculated to ease them peacefully and justly."

Lewis Nkosi made an American tour this Spring for the London *Observer* to report on the developments on the Negro rights issue, particularly in the South.

1962

People keep writing about the series of beats **Gene Roberts** has had in the Detroit *Free Press* in the short time since he went North from the Raleigh *News & Observer.* The one that caused the most excitement was from Dallas. Assigned there to cover the Ruby murder trial, he got hold of all the Lee Oswald pictures that *Life* later published, and had them first in the *Free Press.*

1963

Pat Owens left the Pine Bluff (Ark.) *Commercial,* where he was editor, to join the *Arkansas Gazette,* this Spring, as editorial writer.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica's* memorial volume, "A Tribute to John F. Kennedy," will include a column by **Gene Graham** in the Nashville *Tennessean,* Nov. 24, on Kennedy's sense of humor. The book is being published for the Kennedy Memorial Library.

Paul Kidd of the Hamilton *Spectator* received first prize for editorial writing in the Western Ontario Newspaper Awards. The judges said of his prize editorial that "it made a good case for reform of the legal aid system in Ontario. He states his arguments clearly and forcefully." Kidd also won honorable mention in reporting for his report of the funeral of President Kennedy.

The South African government refused to admit **Saul Friedman** of the Houston *Chronicle,* who was to have worked six months for the South African Associated Newspapers, as part of an exchange. This action was in March. Two months later, a government press commission in an official report accused all foreign news services of distorting or falsifying news from South Africa and proposed a tight system of control of foreign correspondents.

Victor McElheney this Spring became European correspondent of *Science,* the magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was science writer on the Charlotte *Observer* before he was awarded the Arthur D. Little Fellowship for science writing.