

NiemanReports

October, 1958

The Paper Curtain of Washington

John B. Oakes

Colorado's "Little Nieman" Plan

Houstoun Waring

Covering Science in Age of Sputnik

Arthur J. Snider

Editors Need Science Education

Carl W. Larsen

Economic Pressures on the Press

Leo Burnett

Censorship in Modern Spain

Peter Sand

Let There Be Parody

Adolph O. Goldsmith

Home Was Hutchinson, Kansas

Oscar S. Villadolid

**Reviews — Nieman Notes — Scrapbook: British and U. S. Press Compared — Goldfine
Case Brewed in Boston Press Feud — Report on a Science Seminar**

Nieman Reports

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

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

VOL. XII., NO. 4

OCT. 1958

Colorado's "Little Nieman" Plan

By **Houstoun Waring**

This is a report on what is probably the first conscious imitation of the Nieman Foundation in America. For thirteen years we in Colorado have referred to our dream as the "Little Nieman" plan. Now that we have found a sponsor, the name has been established as the King Fellowships in Journalism at the University of Colorado.

Lloyd J. King, operator of a chain of supermarkets in Colorado, wanted to do something monthly in the way of newspaper awards. When his public relations man consulted Mort Stern, a Nieman with the *Denver Post*, the outline of the Little Nieman proposal was offered. The rest came easy, as groundwork had been laid with the university regents who had agreed to waive tuition.

Mr. King promised to donate \$3,000 for the tax-exempt stipends and another \$750 for administrative and other expenses. This may seem small in comparison with the Nieman Foundation, but our plans went no further than a five-week course of study in June and July, during the first summer term at Boulder.

Prof. A. Gayle Waldrop, director of the College of Journalism, obtained valuable advice from Louis Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation, and thus the King Fellowships were launched with a minimum of error.

Our plan differs, however, in several respects from that at Cambridge.

Houstoun Waring, editor of the *Littleton Independent*, was a Nieman Fellow in 1944 and has worked in season and out to see this "Little Nieman" program established in Colorado.

1. There is no upper age limit of 40, and so we had fellows from 33 to 56 years of age.

2. Under terms of our grant, we were limited to journalists living in Colorado. This had the effect of pointing some of our discussions to state and regional problems.

3. Fellows are permitted to take courses for credit, and two decided to do this.

4. An effort was made to appoint policy-making men and women to the fellowships. Five of the seven fellows, it turned out, have a substantial voice in their papers because of total or partial ownership.

5. Instead of 9 o'clock classes, our fellows all turned out for 7:30 sessions. Most took four to five 60-minute periods daily.

Otherwise, our program was much like Harvard's but possibly more intensive because we were limited to five weeks. The Sunday evenings were devoted to a social hour, dinner, and a two-hour discussion of newspaper matters. From 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. each Tuesday and Thursday we had seminars on everything from science to education. These were always led by two or three qualified men in the field.

As at Harvard, the King Fellows generally chose courses in political science, history, economics, international affairs, and anthropology.

Yet this was not an ordinary summer school with the routine classes in a humdrum academic atmosphere. It so happens that the University of Colorado has one of the nation's largest summer schools with 5,400 men and women on the campus during the first term. These students are drawn not only by the climate, the beautiful buildings, mountain scenery, and exciting recreational program. They also come to hear educators from all over America, to attend the readings and lectures, see the foreign films and live drama, and participate in square dancing, steak fries, and snowball fights. In addition to the 5,400 students, thousands of others come for one of the thirty-four institutes and conferences—ranging from Driver Education Workshops to the Summer Music Camp.

Highlights of the summer were distinguished lecturers, such as Dr. Edward U. Condon, Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn, Dr. Philip Morrison, and the Harvard economist, Alvin Hansen. So we enjoyed a considerable movement of the mountains to Mohammed. Our out-of-state seminar leader one Sunday was Nieman E. H. Linford of the *Salt Lake Tribune*.

The King Fellows were permitted to live in adjoining rooms at a campus dormitory, and we also arranged to eat together. This has naturally led to the formation of a Society of King Fellows which expects to meet at Boulder each summer for some weekend when the new crop of Kings is on the campus.

(Continued on page 21)

The Paper Curtain of Washington

By John B. Oakes

James Madison said: "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but the prologue to a farce or a tragedy or both."

The constitutional guarantee of a free press in a democracy is simply a guarantee of the people's right to know. It is not a special privilege to newspaper publishers, but rather a special protection for the citizens of a democracy. It is a means of ensuring that people have access to information of public events and of making it possible to provide them with that information.

The First Amendment, the tradition of our democracy, and the needs of our people all combine to require freedom of information, availability of information, access to information, within only the limitations imposed by demands of national security.

For the converse of this picture, all we have to do is look at governments where such freedom of information is denied. If it can be truly said, as I think it can, that ignorance and superstition go hand in hand, it can also be said that suppression and dictatorship do likewise. A rising anti-democracy will almost inevitably as one of its first actions take steps to suppress the free press, both by shutting off availability of information and by throttling opposition newspapers.

We all of course have seen vivid examples of this sequence in Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany, Communist China, Franco Spain, and Peronist Argentina—to name the most outstanding.

Now I am not going to suggest that freedom of information is in imminent danger in the United States, but there are certainly a few areas where there has been a weakening or erosion of that freedom; and the administrative branch of the United States Government is one of them. Our government does limit real freedom of information in three ways: by censorship, by manipulation, and by control.

Mr. Oakes, of the New York *Times* editorial board, contributed this discussion to a conference on freedom of information at Mt. Holyoke College. His associates on the panel were Representative John Moss, chairman of the House government information subcommittee; Murray Snyder, assistant secretary of defense; Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the *Cowles papers*; and Martin Agronsky, radio and television commentator.

Censorship

Peacetime censorship within the government is a by-product of the cold war. It is to be sharply distinguished from wartime censorship, which most newspapermen more or less graciously accept. But the control of information sources by government in peacetime, for fear of letting the Russians or any other potential enemy learn anything that might be of possible value, has gone too far for comfort.

It was first formalized in postwar years by President Truman in an executive order in 1951 establishing a uniform procedure in a number of executive agencies for classification of information "to keep military and related secrets from falling into the hands of the enemies of the United States." With this objective no one could reasonably quarrel; but there was widespread concern that the system established by Mr. Truman would provide a screen behind which government officials could cover up errors of judgment or worse. The natural bureaucratic tendency to hide mistakes or stupidity behind the sheltering cover of "national security" is almost irresistible, and the hearings of the Moss Committee have demonstrated a number of such instances.

Actually the Truman system never did prove as much of an obstacle to newspapermen as had been feared; but two years later—in 1953—President Eisenhower established the present system as one that would both safeguard defense secrets, which we all want to do, and increase public access to information, which many of us want to do.

Those closest to the scene in Washington don't think it has worked out that way. I believe most newspapermen would agree that during the past few years news has been censored at the source in various departments of government in Washington with increasing effectiveness. A kind of paper curtain has been set up by a multitude of government press agents whose purpose is not only to inform the public of the good things their department is doing but also to keep the public from knowing the bad things.

The increasing protests from newsmen against this policy of hide and run culminated in the establishment in June, 1955, of the Congressional investigation under Representative Moss, the principal purpose of which was to uncover the concealment of information within the executive departments, to blast that information out, and to change the system. Some legislation has been very recently approved

by the Committee to accomplish these ends. Some administrative actions have also been taken, including establishment last year in the Defense Department of an Office of Declassification, which is in itself a hopeful step and one a long way removed in spirit from Secretary Wilson's famous 1955 memorandum establishing as a criterion for departmental releases "constructive contribution to the primary mission of the Department of Defense."

I think there is still a great deal to be said for former Senator Benton's idea of establishing a kind of "public defender" in government whose primary purpose would be to promote rather than retard the flow of news. However, I do not agree with Representative Moss that Congress or the public has an inherent right of access to all exchanges of ideas or opinions or correspondence within the executive branch. President Eisenhower and all his predecessors back to and including George Washington who have been faced with this problem have rightly resisted Congressional attempts to lay hold of intra-executive communications. The Presidents have based this action on a perfectly proper determination to keep separate the legislative and executive branches of government. This is quite a different matter from censorship within government of news and information rightly belonging to the public. It is inconceivable to me that Representative Moss would seriously maintain, for instance, that Senator McCarthy was justified in demanding an inside account of conversations and the way decisions were arrived at in the executive departments.

Manipulation

However, serious as is this tendency to censorship, even more serious is the manipulation of news by a governmental structure that during the past decade has become increasingly more powerful and more complex. By manipulation of news I mean the techniques of releasing information as and when it suits the political purpose of an administrator and giving it a special twist that may even distort the facts. I mean the use of highly organized "leaks" or specially rigged television shows, of all the devices known under the generic name of "Madison Avenue." I mean the tremendous burst of pre-publicity about the Vanguard that didn't go off, a public-relations fiasco managed in the first instance not by the newspapers, which have taken the blame, but by the government itself. I mean the efforts springing from interservice rivalries to play up one of the military departments over the others, thereby leading to "good stories" that only vitiate the national defense. I mean the effort at news manipulation of which the Atomic Energy Commission is now being accused in respect to detection of atomic explosions and other matters, although at this point one cannot yet be certain whether these instances were accidental or calculated.

These are things very difficult to cope with, very difficult to pin down; but the net result of this tendency to manipulation is to release information to the American people in a manner chosen by the government on its own terms. Only alert and sensitive reporting can cope with this obstacle to a truly free flow of news.

Some Congressional committees and committeemen have also worked up their own technique of manipulating the news. By issuing statements of a content and at a time of their own choosing, they can and do give a special color to the flow of information. By releasing from behind the doors of an executive session just the news they want to release, *ex parte* and highly biased, they can if they choose direct the formation of public opinion in a way that some of the press has been too lazy, too hidebound by tradition, too concerned with sensation rather than truth, adequately to guard against. The very growth of the practice of holding executive sessions—a noticeable feature of the Congressional scene in recent years—heightens the danger even when the intention on the part of the committees (and they include some of the most respectable ones in Congress) is simply to expedite their own work and not to manipulate public opinion at all.

Control

I have spoken of censorship and manipulation as governmental devices that affect the outflow of information and therefore the democratic process. The third category is what for want of a better name I would call pre-control; and the perfect example was the effort to use the press as an instrument of national policy by denying American reporters the right to report in Communist China—a rule that has been modified by the government but not yet completely rejected in principle.

Secretary Dulles gave a dozen reasons for imposing this astonishing form of prior censorship, excusing it on the grounds that freedom of the press was not involved because the First Amendment applied only to publishing the news and not to having access to it. Furthermore he placed the gathering of news on the same plane as the selling of chewing gum, and the right of American newspapermen to travel as of no more significance than the right of any tourist. Naturally the press rejected these arguments with unaccustomed unanimity—the basic grounds for the rejection being a belief that government has no right to prevent gathering of the news except, as in the case of military secrets in wartime, for reasons of utmost urgency and in the most narrowly restricted sphere.

News is not a commodity to be turned on and off to suit the uses of diplomacy, but rather it is an essential component in the formation of public opinion in a democracy. This does not mean that every diplomatic conversation has

to be conducted in the full glare of publicity. Quite the contrary. I believe, for example, that if a successful summit meeting is to take place, it is obvious that long and private diplomatic discussions will have to take place first. Serious diplomacy cannot be conducted by the Khrushchev-Bulganin school of propaganda letter writing. But Woodrow Wilson's dictum of open covenants openly arrived at is still essentially sound; if the public opinion that in the last analysis creates foreign policy in a democracy is to have a chance properly to function, the public must have available as much information about foreign problems—including the problems of potentially enemy countries—as it can get. That is one of the functions of the newspaper.

I am as opposed to government censorship as any of my colleagues, always recognizing that some *modus operandi* has to be found to reconcile the genuine requirements of national security with the rightful demands of a free press for full information about what's going on in government.

Responsibility of the Press

It always has been and probably always will be the task of the good reporter in Washington to pry out of government officials information (apart from security matters) that the officials are not too anxious for the public to know. It is almost inherent in any government bureaucracy to take the position that what the public doesn't know won't hurt it. It's usually the safer, and the easier, way. Conversely, it's the job of the reporter to break down that barrier and it is the responsibility of the newspaper to print the information he pries loose. That's the way good reporters and good newspapers are made; it is an unending battle between press and officialdom; and there are enough good reporters around Washington to dig up most of

the information of the kind we're talking about. The question is, are there enough good newspapers to publish it?

I don't want to be misunderstood on this matter. I'm for the fullest possible disclosure of governmental information, but I merely wish to point out that, even if there were no barriers at all, the problem wouldn't end there. There still would have to be alert reporters to recognize the news when they see it, to be willing to dig for it when they don't and to be employed by newspapers that will print it when they get it.

We newspapermen, in our organizations and in our public pronouncements, are in fact entirely too prone to talk about our privileges and not enough about our responsibilities. The only valid reason for the First Amendment is, as I have said, to ensure the public's right to know; and if the press as a whole fails in carrying out that mission, then it loses the very basis for special consideration. I don't believe the American press is irresponsible, but I do say that an irresponsible press would be a greater threat to press freedom today than all the censorship, manipulation, and controls that our government could possibly cook up. For an irresponsible press would destroy by its irresponsibility the very foundation on which American journalism must rest.

But the press, no matter how responsible, cannot do the job alone. It needs responsible readers too. Our responsibility as newspapermen is "to inform—not to entertain, goad or incite" but to inform. That is half the battle in a democracy. But the other half of the battle lies in the willingness of the reader to be informed. I am not quite sure whether that battle is being won.

It Is The Editors Who Need Educating in Science

By Carl W. Larsen

A considerable amount of news print at \$135 per ton has been used recently to tell the American public something is wrong with their kindergartens, elementary and high schools and universities. Unfortunately, though, very little has been said about the need to educate our opinion leaders for the heavy responsibilities so suddenly thrust upon them in this fast-moving age of the atom and space exploration. And, among these opinion leaders, newspaper editors certainly occupy a most prominent position.

Whether they like it or not, American newspapermen are front-line educators on everyday contemporary affairs in our society—the men who are asked to provide the vital data the citizens of the world's leading nation need for the important decisions facing them.

The American "Parliament of Science," convened recently in Washington observed: "The American public is disturbed, worried and confused. We thought we were well in the lead, scientifically and technologically. Now, all of a sudden, this comfortable assumption is challenged. We are 'behind.' It isn't clear just what this statement means, or whether the serious versions of its possible meanings are in fact true. But there is no denying the general concern, and the almost frantic determination to 'do something about it.'"

There still is not a coast-to-coast commentator in this country on science and public affairs. But that day will come soon, I hope.

In this quick-tempered period, we must demand that the quality of reporting and editorial opinion—especially on science—be of the highest order. This quality is needed because intelligent citizens need it to meet their new responsibilities.

And what are some of these responsibilities?

1) In the years ahead, Americans will be asked to spend greater and greater percentages of their gross national product, directly and indirectly, for research and development. How can they make wise choices of the available

options if they do not get accurate, objective information on what is being offered?

2) In the halls of Congress, only a very few men have an understanding of the complex problems of basic research—its financial needs and future. They are being asked to appropriate millions to scientific efforts and must accept the judgment of experts on their value. How shall these judgments be evaluated?

Incidentally, it was quite heartening to note recently that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy sponsored extended hearings on the promises of basic research. Strangely, these hearings received little space in the newspapers.

It is relatively easy for a Congressman to vote on whether a new bridge should be built across River X at Point Y, but how is he to know whether \$150,000,000 requested by some obscure physicists for a new particle accelerator is in the national interest? Here, it is that intelligent reporting of science is needed to make certain that public decisions in this area are wisely made. Everyone talks about taxes these days. Today, we debate how much to spend on foreign aid programs. Tomorrow, the Great Debate in Congress might well center about spending for science. To me, the debate over foreign aid seems to be much simpler to define than any possible discussion over whether we are spending too much or too little for solid state physics or new element chemistry. Intelligent science reporting and editing can prepare us for these debates.

3) Which space projects shall get public support? Should the Army's be favored, or the Navy's or the Air Force's? Are emotions and traditions to be the main factors in our decisions on this question or will hard facts?

These are just three of the problems that face our country. The public needs information—solid and hard information—on which to base its research and development decisions.

Even when it has acquired this information, it may be unable to make decisions in some vital areas because of the complexity of the problem. Therefore, the public also will need hard and solid information about the men to whom it is entrusting its future in space and the atom. Are these men broad-gauged enough to carry the burden or will they seek to represent special interest groups?

So, these indeed are difficult days—and they could become even more difficult—for scientists and science reporters. A Russian satellite soars into the sky and suddenly

Long a top reporter on the Chicago *Sun-Times*, Carl Larsen was speaking as public information officer of the Argonne National Laboratory (atomic energy), when he talked to the annual forum of the University of Missouri School of Journalism on the urgent need of educating editors on science reporting. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1948.

Americans turn their eyes onto the nation's scientists. Simultaneously, tough city editors—who only a few years ago had police reporters for their “favorite sons”—demand “all you can give me on that rocket story” from their science reporters.

The newspaper reader becomes dizzy, not at watching Sputniks or Explorers, but in trying to evaluate all the claims and counter-claims served up to him as “news” by equally-confused news editors. The offerings of the staff science writer suddenly move from page sixteen to page one. To steal a word from the sociologists, he finds himself “accepted.”

Yet, has the American public been offered the information it needs and deserves in this new space race? One word seems to stick in the international lexicon. It is “Sputnik.” Offered to Americans, in the name of objective reporting, are phonetic but non-informative names such as “Regulus,” “Snark,” “Nike,” “Explorer,” “Atlas,” “Vanguard,” and many others. For copyreaders, these are good headline words. The reader? He is baffled more and more about the rocketeers’ claims over which missile has power-steering, power-breaks, power windows, lucite paint? Who knows! If Americans are to decide intelligently on which of these missiles to invest hard-earned tax dollars, they must get better space-age reporting. Reporters must dig—and dig, travel and travel, read and read—not only from American sources but also from foreign experts.

There has been considerable talk by newspaper editors about the need for “freedom of information.” Many government agencies have been criticized—some justly, some very unjustly—for allegedly not providing adequate amounts of information to the press. I certainly am in favor of the doctrine of “freedom of information,” as should be any American.

However, many editors urge greater “freedom of information” by federal departments and agencies one day; the next day, they order their editorial writers to demand sharp reductions in the number of people working on public information activities within these same departments and agencies.

Yet, the truth of the matter seems to be that major newspapers—and most magazines—in the United States could not be published today without the assistance of some public relations people—those in private industry, on university staffs or in government. Economy-conscious publishers simply would not or could not spend the money needed to cover all the areas in which these public relations people assist them.

Public information specialists can play important roles in our society. Big government, just like big business, must

be interpreted to its people. I do not mean here to imply in any way that public information men and women working for publicly-financed agencies should serve as lobbyists for their particular agency. Their basic mission should be to tell the truth, not to dilute it. In some rare cases, government public information people have been prostituted, but I dare say that, comparatively, these cases are the exception rather than the rule.

Even as vital as public information people might be in public affairs, they cannot and must not be asked to carry the entire burden of informing the people. Newsmen must never abandon this mission to public information people in a democratic society.

As a public information man, I would like to submit that I am getting a little bit tired of “spoon-feeding” newspaper people, doing all their work for them. More editors should insist that their men get out on the street and “dig.” In this age of electronics, editors permit their newsmen to depend too much on the mailman, teletype machines, telephone, radio and even television to cover news for them. Instead, reporters should use their legs and their heads. In this connection, I would like to note that only two or three men are assigned full-time by U. S. newspapers or wire services to cover atomic energy. Atomic energy offers plenty of possible story subjects. To name a few: Fall-out, power reactors, cancer therapy, irradiated food, bomb tests, etc., and even the possibility of using the atom to thrust us into space.

Yet, as far as I can learn, American editors have assigned only one daily newspaper reporter and possibly one wire service reporter to cover atomic energy on a full-time basis in this country. In addition, there is a handful of such reporters representing a few highly specialized atomic energy trade magazines and business papers. But they do not write for the man in the street on whom this democracy depends so much for its support. The fact is that the people do not have more than two “auditors” from the American daily press representing them 24 hours a day on the vital subject of atomic energy.

In its April 5 issue, the critical *Saturday Review* said: “Without journalists a Republic would be as helpless as a hospital without surgeons. And the good journalist takes the accuracy and honor of his work as seriously as the good surgeon does his. Yet since the end of World War II the journalist has practiced his craft with increasing difficulty. Bureaucracy, operating behind thick, self-protective hedges, has grown to stupefying dimensions; perhaps the most important functions of the government operate behind a second, even thicker hedge of ‘security classification.’”

Then came an attack on the public information effort of the atomic energy program in the United States. I have

done some checking on the facts in this area and learned that since July 1, 1953—in less than 5 years—the Atomic Energy Commission has declassified 69,512 items of information. I do not mean to imply that each item of information would provide a newsworthy story, but certainly there must have been some background information of value included in this pile of data.

I am told that this is probably the most thorough peacetime declassification project ever undertaken in any country in the world. To accomplish this elimination of "secret" stamps on nearly 70,000 items, the Atomic Energy Commission has sponsored two "crash" declassification programs. Each "crash" programs lasted three to four months. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued 23 semi-annual reports to Congress and thousands of press releases. These public reports to Congress generally run more than 400 pages and cover progress in such areas as radioisotopes, power reactors, international co-operation, physical research, etc. Weapons tests, weapons facilities, biology and medicine activities also are detailed in these reports.

The AEC also sponsors a technical book publishing program which pulls together in coherent form much of this declassified information. These books comprise much of the available atomic energy technical knowledge available in the world today.

I will admit that the weapons data is rather limited, but this is for reasons of national security. But though it is limited, this weapons information in its totality is more than has ever been released by any other country in the world. These reports are available to the public and any newspaperman can get them by writing the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

In all the world today, the United States has provided the most knowledge—on an unclassified basis—about atomic energy. It is the only country which has opened even its weapons tests to newsmen from both the United States and foreign countries. Thousands of newsmen, both foreign and domestic, have been permitted to visit atomic energy installations in this country.

But back to my basic point today—the education of the newspaper editor toward more and better science reporting. It is not enough to train and hire better science reporters. News editors, editorial writers and managing editors must understand the importance of the complex stories the science reporter brings in. They must learn that, in the long run, some science stories are of greater import to the man on the street than the page one tale about the clandestine shooting of a blond in a West Side love nest. They must learn, too, that science reporters often

cannot make predictions. They cannot promise "cancer cures." The science reporter must deal in objective, accurate reporting of what is new in medicine, space, atomic energy, chemistry, physics, metallurgy, mathematics and other important areas of science.

Probably the most urgent requirement is for science reporters to be able to communicate—to explain through simple analogies, and in simple terms to the layman, just what scientists are doing in their laboratories and why taxpayers should or shouldn't support them. Science news cannot be regarded only as news promising a "fight" or a "forecast." Actually some of the best mystery stories that I know are those detective yarns about work accomplished in quiet laboratories. Certainly, the discovery of Salk vaccine to conquer polio is a first-rate detective story in which man defeated a killer. It isn't as simple to tell, though, as the story of the capture of two masked bank robbers. It takes sophistication and knowledge and hard work to get the facts on the science story.

And, I would suggest, too, that science news will sell newspapers just as it has sold books and magazines. It is good business—as well as good citizenry—for editors to give good play to science stories.

The fastest way to educate the American people on the challenges of the atomic and space ages is through their 3,000-odd newspapers—their dailies and weeklies.

In the last few post-Sputnik months, two national foundations have made grants to Columbia University to speed the training of science reporters. Certainly, this is a step in the right direction on the uncharted map of the space age. But we also must make certain that the editors—the men who will handle the copy turned out by these science writers after they have left Columbia—will know science fiction from science fact. I would urge that some foundation set up a seminar for the education of editors in science. Science reporting must be served as a steady newspaper diet.

In this age of specialization, editors should ask themselves what makes a good reporter—a curious person who wants to know why and how. You will find that most scientists are cooperative, although they frequently are not versed in communications. So, the science reporter becomes the link between the scientists and the public.

I believe America's science reporters are an intelligent, industrious group. Our next step must be to make their jobs easier by getting them as much acceptance in the city room as the city hall reporter or the man assigned to police headquarters.

So, in a sentence, what this country needs more than a good five-cent cigar today is a regiment of aggressive, accurate and articulate science reporters who are well-paid and well-regarded by their editors.

Covering Science in the Age of Sputnik

By Arthur J. Snider

It is almost commonplace to say that we are living in an age of science. One doesn't pick up his newspaper or magazine without being reminded of it.

In the past people must have been equally thrilled by what was happening in science. When Christian Huygens in 1650 junked the hour glass and made himself a clock, people must have marvelled that science was able to put time in such practical perspective. The great difference between the past and modern times is the responsiveness of the press to scientific developments.

When Robert Fulton took that steamboat from New York City to Albany and back, for example, only one newspaper reported the event and in a single paragraph. Some additional publicity ensued when Fulton's own letters to New York newspapers told about the event.

When the first steam locomotive ran on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad in 1830, the event was chronicled in a Washington paper in a single long paragraph. The story of man's first flight at Kitty Hawk was ignored by most papers.

When the newspapers in the earlier part of this century finally did catch up to the idea that the reader was interested in the impact of science on his life, they began to devote increasing attention to it. But many papers overdid it in a way that gave rise to so-called yellow journalism.

The disfavor and enmity that were created among scientists by the newspapers of that day hang over to this day and in some respects make difficult the cooperation of the press and scientists because of scientists' mistrust of the press.

The more responsible press attitude toward science probably started during World War I and after. Science made big news as the government turned to the laboratories for depth bombs to conquer the U-boat menace, for chemical warfare weapons and for radio and airplanes, and with the country involved in war, the press took these things seriously.

The first big meeting which science writers, as such, covered was the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1922. Alva Johnston covered for the *New York Times* and in four days filed 13 columns of copy, an expository feat that won for him the Pulitzer Prize.

Twelve years later, in 1934, the National Association of Science Writers was formed with 12 members. Eight of these persons are still living and active. They have been

since joined by some 130 more science writers who are working for newspapers, magazines and syndicates and another 150 who are in the field of scientific public relations. This is as indicative as anything I can cite of the interest that has grown up around science in the press.

About six years ago, the National Association of Science Writers polled 50 managing editors with respect to the space given to science writing now and 10 years prior.

Thirty-one believed the amount of space had doubled, or more. Eleven believed it had increased about 50 per cent, four believed it had increased slightly, two believed it was the same.

Forty-one per cent of the editors ranked medicine and public health as first among all the sciences in reader interest, followed by atomic energy, then new inventions for the home, then agricultural science, aviation, military science, research generally, industrial application of science, then astronomy, then social sciences, next engineering and finally physics and chemistry.

I give the whole list because it is interesting to note that the tail-end items were engineering and physics-chemistry. It's quite likely that another poll today, in the age of Sputnik, would put those subjects much higher in the list, although it is still probable that medicine would be first. In fact, medicine was found by George Gallup in a recent poll reported to ASNE to top all fields of news interest.

Yet, the surge of science is so new to American journalism, there is considerable suspicion that many editors have not yet caught up with its impact on the reading public. The journalism educator, Dr. Charles E. Swanson, covered 130 papers for subject matter in the period of 1939 to 1950. Out of the 40,158 news, editorial and feature items selected for study, Mr. Swanson found only 0.6 per cent devoted to science and invention and 1.1 per cent to health and safety. Science was sixth from the bottom. Largest space was given to sports—11.6 per cent of the total.

It was a two-part study. The first part of the study had to do with the amount of space given to the various subjects. The other compared the percentage of space with the percentage of reader interest in the various fields. In reader interest, comics were first; war and defense, second; then came fire and disaster, human interest, weather, major crime, social significance, consumer information, etc. Sports ranked 33rd! Science ranked 10th.

Perhaps editors who pride themselves on knowing what the public wants may be erring with respect to sports and with respect to science.

Arthur J. Snider is science editor of the *Chicago Daily News*. This is from a talk at Missouri Journalism Week at Columbia, Mo.

In addition to editorial foot-dragging, another reason more science does not appear in the press is the inherent difficulties that militate against popular presentation of science.

One is the difficulty of the content of many areas of science. Some subjects, by the abstract nature of their material, cannot be presented to the reader in terminology that he can understand or in illustrations that are analogous to life situations with which he is familiar.

The average reader is not interested in science for science's sake. In order to be interesting to the reader, the story must have some element of applied science. He is not interested, for example, in the fact that another particle has been discovered in the nucleus of the atom, but he is interested in whether it might mean a new source of energy. In order for science to be interesting to the layman, it must relate to his life, his health, his comfort, his leisure, or stimulate his curiosity or arouse his emotions.

Another factor that may be preventing more science from appearing in the popular press is the point of view concerning publicity held by many scientists. The scientist is much more concerned with his reputation among his peers than his reputation among the general public. It is easier to destroy a good reputation than to build one. One quick way for a scientist to lose his reputation is to appear as a publicity seeker. There are codes of ethics in the scientific professions, particularly in medicine, that forbid self-advertising, and many scientists give this a very narrow interpretation to include even the mention of the name in the paper. To the newspaper, on the other hand, use of a name in a story is an integral part of the story. A name lends authenticity and reliability.

Another problem is the difficulty in translating the works of science into lay terminology. There is no exact translation. The scientist by his very nature tends to be conservative in that he develops a specific set of facts and he wants to describe these very accurately. He wants to avoid generalizations. The newspaperman, on the other hand, will have a better story if his generalization can be made broad to cover as many people as possible. Where science is accurate to 10 decimal points, newspapers like to settle for round figures.

I think scientists sometimes demand of the press a degree of accuracy not asked of their own practitioners. A physician, for example, may make a grave or even fatal diagnostic or therapeutic error and explain it away as his "best clinical judgment." There is a frightful amount of inaccuracy in even routine laboratory tests, not only inaccuracies inherent in the limitations of the methods, but in the interpretation of the results. We don't hear about them. A reporter's errors, as everyone knows, are run off at the rate of 50,000 newspapers an hour, exposed for all to see.

By and large, any newspaper success in science reporting has come through achieving a compromise between reader intelligibility and scientific faithfulness. As Edward E. Slosson, first editor of *Science Service*, put it: "The would-be popularizer is always confronted by the dilemma of comprehensible inaccuracy or incomprehensible accuracy and the fun of his work lies mainly in the solution of that problem."

A scientist should distinguish between literary accuracy and scientific accuracy, realizing that the popular account is not intended to be presented as an exact translation and that a fellow scientist would not depend on a newspaper report for his information but would go to the original source.

In order to grasp reader attention, information must be given to him painlessly and with all the entertainment value possible. Unlike college students who are under a certain compulsion to read their textbook, or scientists who must keep up with their professional journals, the newspaper reader is a free agent. He may read or not as he pleases. The story must cater to his attention, for the human animal is lazy. Everything he buys except food, clothing and shelter has to be sold to him, even though he needs it and knows he ought to have it. If you don't believe that, just remind yourself of the various books you have stacked around the house that you've intended to read. No one likes to swallow rock-hard facts without a little sugar-coating.

The mechanics of newspaper writing and editing also make a problem for scientists' relations with the press. And perhaps the newspaper form is not the most effective way of presenting scientific information. Qualifying material often must be relegated to paragraphs well within the story. The headline even further strips the information of qualifications and reservations and careful argument. The scientist's theme is punched into a half-dozen words of black type.

What is a science writer and where does he come from? A science writer usually comes from the ranks of the staff. He must first of all be a general newspaperman. He must have done general assignments out of the city room for the way he will cover science is exactly the way he covers any other story. The elements of good newspapering still apply.

The dean of science writers today is probably William Laurence of the *New York Times*. He majored in philosophy at Harvard. Later he was graduated from Boston University Law School. He joined a New York paper as a reporter. On one assignment he did an excellent job on an interview with a Dartmouth professor who had attacked the Einstein theory, and the *New York Times* hired him as a science writer.

The dean before him was Howard Blakeslee, who died a few years ago. Mr. Blakeslee had been a newspaperman

since his college days. He was as a reporter first for a Detroit paper, writing straight news copy, features and sports. When he joined the Associated Press, he wrote all types of news, including science. He found he liked science and he wrote more and more in that field, until in 1928, he was appointed science editor.

Most of the 150 science writers on newspapers and magazines have come into the field in that way, starting in general reporting, asking for and taking on the science assignments as they turned up, then finding themselves devoting most of their time to that field.

Recently journalism schools have given increasing attention to training science writers. Most recently Columbia University graduate school of journalism announced an advanced science writing program for reporters and editors who have had at least three years experience.

In addition to learning the techniques of news presentation, a science writer must be exposed to some basic science. He must gain an appreciation of the scientific method, the spirit, aims and objectives of research, in order to serve as a faithful interpreter.

A science writer cannot be expected to understand all the various fields of science in order to write about them. He couldn't possibly do so. Science is so specialized today that even two researchers in related fields have difficulty understanding one another. A science writer is not so much an expert in science as he is an expert on scientists. He makes it his business to find out who are important men in the field, who have made the contributions in the past and are likely to make them in the future. A science writer is only as good as his news sources.

Now, of course, scientists will not spend time with a science writer if he shows no appreciation for the subject matter. While they couldn't expect him to know the technique of metallic shadow casting in electron microscopy, they do expect him to know what an electron microscope is. If you were going to interview a bridge expert, it would be incumbent upon you to be familiar with a deck of cards.

An important source of information for science writers is the scientific journals. A large number of scientists make the first announcement of their discoveries by this means. Some 30 or 40 or 50 journals may come to the desk of a science writer each month, and he must, if not able to read them thoroughly, thumb through them. This is where his knowledge of terminology, as well as what is going on in the field, will stand him in good stead. If in doubt as to whether the particular article represents a major advance, he can comb through his mental file of trained seals and call one to talk it over.

In addition to visiting scientists in their laboratories and reading journals, the science writer attends a good many meetings, both on his home front and in other cities. This

gives him a further opportunity to mingle with scientists, refresh and enlarge his background, as well as to report on new developments in the field.

To the scientist, he has the responsibility of conveying the meaning and spirit of his work without indulgence in false emphasis or sensationalism, to report it with respect, dignity, and fair implications and a reasonable standard of accuracy.

At the same time, he must be cautious about the frailty of humans who may become overenthusiastic about their research, overemphasize the positive and eliminate the negative aspects. It is from this type of news sources that unsound scientific news can emanate as well as from the reporter who seeks to flog up a sensation.

In addition to the responsibilities to the scientist, the press in reporting science has a responsibility to the reading public. This is particularly true in the field of medicine and health. Stories that make sweeping claims, any so-called "secret" progress, drugs that claim to cure baldness or cancer or leukemia may raise hopes and bring cruel let-downs in a desperate public.

Among the offending types of story is what might be called the "sanctified quack" type. This is written when a clever and smooth-talking faker finds a sufficiently gullible reporter. These are usually the cultists and the exponents of fads like yogurt and black strap molasses.

Another offending story might be called the "Don't Worry Any More Story." This is characterized by a florid style of reporting and a hearty slap on the back for all those who have suffered and now are to be relieved of all suffering from disease X.

Then there is the story that, after a promising truthful start, deteriorates into falsehood by garbled or butchered editing.

Another undesirable is that which tailors facts to fit the theory.

Finally, there is the statistical myth story wherein a weak promise is supported by even weaker statistics.

One of the newest responsibilities the press has in this age of science is to see that the people are fully informed about technological advances that overzealous government agencies are prone to classify unnecessarily as secret information. This is one of the newer obligations of the press.

We need have no fear that information of value to an enemy will be presented, for in the continuing cross pull between secrecy and information, there will always be plenty of pressure on the side of secrecy. The great danger is not that the press will reveal secrets of potential value to the enemy, but rather, that it will default in its obligation to maintain a balance of forces by constant pressure in the opposite direction. There is a growing tendency to regard

secrecy as a sacred cow to be accepted without question by the American people. At times in our present climate one is almost made to feel a sense of guilt in questioning security policies. The press must always take the view that the issue is not how much can be legitimately withheld, but rather, how little must necessarily be withheld.

This philosophy has been crystallized by the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the phrase, "the right of the people to know." Newspapers have always looked behind closed doors, even though official guardians keep them out and assure them that all is well. It is the business of the press to see for itself. True, poking and prying sometimes offers the opportunity for abuse, but perhaps this is a small price we must pay for the type of vigilance that is provided by the American press.

How good a job is the press doing in the reporting of science? One way to find out is to ask scientists. The National Association of Science writers did that in a survey of 36 scientists listed in "American Men of Science." About half gave unqualified approval to the contemporary reporting of scientific developments. Eleven others had some reservations and six expressed outspoken disapproval.

Twenty-one scientists voiced the plea to get rid of sensational reporting as their chief recommendation. Sensationalism has come to have a stigmatized meaning when applied to the press, but when you look at the Webster definition of a sensation, namely, something producing excited interest or emotion, then certainly many things happening in science are sensational, and you are derelict if you write in low key. It is sometimes amusing that the same scientist who makes the outcry against sugar-coating abstract facts for reader palatability will, in telling a parlor story, embellish it with every entertainment device he can muster to get his point across.

We don't bat 1000. We occasionally publish an article about a new treatment which after a year or two of clinical use turns out to be a dud. It may take a year or more for the negatives to crop up. But that is inherent in medicine. The press should not be expected to anticipate re-evaluations which the medical profession sometimes must make. We are reporters, not prophets, and we can simply record the state of the art as of the date of our report. The newspaper presents daily the longest, most detailed story of our civilization. Science deserves its chapters.

Rather than have less science in the paper, as many would have it, we need more. The more knowledge people have about their health, the better they can protect it. The more information on technological progress they have, the better able they are to participate in making decisions.

Along with more science in the popular media, we need more people trained to gather and edit it.

Let There Be Parody

By Adolph O. Goldsmith

Are television writers becoming afraid to use parody because of the federal court injunction against Jack Benny's parody of *Gas Light*? This fear was expressed by Attorney W. B. Carman before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Benny v. Loew's, Inc.* Carman, in asking that the decision of the United States Court of Appeals be reversed, said that the broadcasting industry had steered clear of parodies ever since the *Gas Light* suit had been brought by Loew's in 1952.

Carman told the Supreme Court justices that parody would become a lost art if the lower court's ruling were upheld. He pointed out that parody must be based upon an original work, and should enjoy the same exemption from copyright infringement penalties as critical reviews.

On March 17 the Supreme Court split 4 to 4 on Benny's appeal. This had the effect of confirming the lower court's ruling that Jack Benny violated the copyright laws by presenting *Auto Light*, a 30-minute television parody of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer film based on the play *Gas Light* by Patrick Hamilton. That is, by virtue of the tie vote, Benny's appeal did not succeed. Benny made a later plea for the Supreme Court to reconsider its ruling, but that plea was also denied. This means that the injunction against further showing of *Auto Light* imposed by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California (Central Division), and affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, was continued in force.

"The ruling was regarded as a blow to the ancient art of parody," wrote Anthony Lewis in the *New York Times*. "It apparently means that you can't take substantial quotes from a copyrighted work when you spoof it unless you have the copyright holder's permission."

The tie vote, with its consequent maintenance of the status quo in regard to the lower court's ruling, was made possible because Justice William O. Douglas did not participate in the decision. Justice Douglas declined to comment on his reasons for non-participation. Ordinarily a justice's reasons for abstaining are apparent or can be learned. For example, a justice may be a friend of one of the parties, he may own stock in a litigant company, or at some time in the past he may have served as counsel for one of the parties. The reasons for Justice Douglas' disqualification are not apparent at this time.

In the event of a tie in the Supreme Court, no opinions are written and no announcement is made as to which way

Law of the press is one of the subjects Prof. Goldsmith teaches at Louisiana State University.

the justices voted. If Justice Douglas had voted to affirm the previous ruling, an opinion would have been written by the five justices affirming, setting out their reasons for so doing and explaining in what parts of the lower court's ruling they agreed, as well as mentioning certain points wherein they disagreed with the lower court. Also, the four justices voting for reversing the decision (and in favor of Benny's contention) would have written a dissenting opinion setting forth their reasons for believing that he had a right to parody *Gas Light* as he did. Of course, if Justice Douglas had voted on Benny's side, the decision would have been reversed and reasons given in the majority opinion. If either of these alternatives had occurred, the situation probably would be somewhat clearer.

The facts in the Benny case are:

In 1945 Jack Benny obtained consent of Loew's to present a radio parody of *Gas Light*, and broadcast it over the radio network of the Columbia Broadcasting System. In 1952, CBS produced a half-hour television show burlesquing *Gas Light*, with Benny playing the Charles Boyer role. It was telecast over the CBS network. No consent was obtained from Loew's or Hamilton to present the television parody. Immediately after the telecast, Loew's sent a telegram to CBS stating that Loew's was the owner of *Gas Light*, that CBS had used a substantial portion of the play in the television program, and that Loew's intended to enforce its rights against infringement. Counsel for CBS replied that its presentation was a "fair use" of the work and that CBS had the right to parody *Gas Light* as it did. When CBS prepared to distribute a film of the production over several television channels, Loew's filed action and secured a temporary restraining order, which was made permanent by the later court actions.

In the decision of the Court of Appeals, Judge McAllister wrote: "... there is only a single decisive point in the case: One cannot copy the substance of another's work without infringing his copyright." Other points were raised and discussed, but the basic one apparently was that Benny used too much of the script of *Gas Light* verbatim. This was made easier for his script writers through use of a copy of the shooting script of the motion picture furnished to CBS by MGM at the time the radio parody was written.

The district court found as facts:

"(1) that the locale and period of the works are the same; (2) the main setting is the same; (3) the characters are generally the same; (4) the story points are practically identical; (5) the development of the story, the treatment (except that defendants' treatment is burlesque), the incidents, sequences of events, the points of suspense, the climax are almost identical; and finally (6) there has been a detailed borrowing of much of the dialogue with some variation in wording. There has been a substantial taking by defendants from the plaintiffs' copyrighted property."

The key words in this decision are "substantial taking" of copyrighted property. "The test as to whether a taking of protectible property is a substantial taking is not primarily a quantitative one," Philip Wittenberg writes in his book, *The Law of Literary Property*. "The question is one of quality rather than quantity, and is to be determined by the character of the work and the relative value of the material taken." He adds that "the court must look to . . . the degree in which the use may prejudice the sale, diminish the profits, or supersede the objects of the original work."

If, as the court held, Jack Benny did "lift" too much of the copyrighted material—the "substantial taking" referred to by the court—this does not mean that henceforward all federal judges will put the infringement label on all parodies which use some parts verbatim from a serious copyrighted work. In fact, there has been a later case involving parody in which the right to parody was upheld. This was the case of *Columbia Pictures Corp. v. NBC, Inc.*, and it was tried in the same Federal District Court and by the same judge, James M. Carter, who tried the Benny case seven months earlier.

The NBC television network presented a parody of *From Here to Eternity* under the title *From Here to Obscurity*, without the knowledge or consent of Columbia Pictures, who brought a copyright infringement suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

In his decision in favor of the defendant, NBC, Judge Carter wrote:

"Burlesque is a recognized form of literary art. . . . Since a burlesquer must make a sufficient use of the original to recall or conjure up the subject matter being burlesqued, the law permits more extensive use of the protectible portion of a copyrighted work in the creation of a burlesque of that work than in the creation of other fictional or dramatic works not intended as a burlesque of the original. Such right extends to the use by the burlesquer for such purposes, of, among other things, an incident or some incidents of the copyrighted story, a developed character, some small and unsubstantial part of the story, and some small and unsubstantial amount of the dialogue, but not to the use of the general or entire story line and development of the original with its expression, points of suspense, and build up to climax."

Judge Carter also listed the ingredients of a dramatic work which are not protectible by copyright: Title, theme, locale and settings, the "situations," ordinarily the characters, the ideas, and the bare basic plots.

The United States copyright law, if followed to the letter, would preclude quoting any part of a copyrighted work. The laws reads, in part: "Any person entitled thereto upon complying with the provisions of this title shall have the exclusive right to print, reprint, publish, copy, and vend the copyrighted work." The courts, however, in numerous

decisions, have qualified this absolute protection by saying that there can be taking of "a reasonable portion" of the copyrighted material. The courts have thus made possible the limited use of material which, under the copyright law, is completely forbidden to be quoted. If the courts had held strictly to the terms of statutory copyright, a book reviewer would not be permitted to quote excerpts from a book.

Courts have generally applied a simple test to determine whether a user of copyrighted material has overstepped the line of fair use: Is the appropriated material of such quality or quantity as to constitute competition to the original work? Would its sale or distribution tend to replace the copyrighted work or reduce the income derived from it by the owner of the copyright? Obviously, no court can dogmatically specify how many words or even the percentage of words which may be "lifted" from a copyrighted work, since the quality of the taking must be evaluated as well as the quantity.

As for the apprehension concerning use of parodies among those in the television industry (if, indeed, such apprehension exists), it would seem that it is groundless. The decision in the Benny case has not radically changed the tenor of court decisions in regard to use of copyrighted material in burlesque presentations. The duty of the courts is, and always has been, to see that a citizen's rights are protected, and this includes his right to his literary work when duly registered in the copyright office. The courts have the responsibility of weighing the evidence (in the case of television parodies of motion pictures, viewing the original work and the parody), and deciding whether the parody made use of such much of the original work that the parody approached duplication of the copyrighted work in too many particulars.

Judge James M. Carter ruled (May 6, 1955) that Jack Benny's *Auto Light* "had copied a substantial part of appellee's photoplay" and had therefore infringed the copyright of the play and motion picture *Gas Light*. Seven months later (December 9, 1955) Judge Carter ruled that

the NBC production *From Here to Obscurity* was a legitimate burlesque of the book and motion picture *From Here to Eternity* and did not infringe the copyright of James Jones and Columbia Pictures.

As though anticipating the screams of anguish from the parodists, Judge Carter included this statement in his opinion in the Jack Benny case:

"Fertile minds will experience no difficulty in providing Mr. Benny and others in his fraternity with ample material for the exercise of their special art. We have not sounded the death knell on burlesque; in fact we hope we have cleared the air sufficiently to give it more room for its erratic flight."

This frank statement, coupled with his subsequent action in approving the use of burlesque in *From Here to Obscurity*, certainly does not forbode evil times for the future of burlesque in American entertainment. In the case just mentioned, Judge Carter even set out some ground rules within which writers of burlesque may safely work. (Quoted supra.)

And the ruling of the lower court in the Jack Benny case was not concurred in by all the members of the United States Supreme Court. Four justices voted to affirm the ruling and four voted to reverse it. As mentioned above, Justice Douglas did not vote. We can therefore be sure that *at least* four justices of the Supreme Court felt that Benny's *Auto Light* did not make use of a substantial portion of *Gas Light*. This straight-down-the-middle split may serve as a brake on any judge in the lower federal courts who might have ideas about further limiting the use of copyrighted matter in burlesque presentations.

During the Supreme Court hearing of the Benny case, Attorney Carman was asked to document his contention that the suit had caused the broadcasting industry to steer clear of parodies. He replied that he knew this because he watches television and knows the industry. Justice Felix Frankfurter was heard to murmur: "A brave industry."

Whether this remark is factual or ironic remains to be proven by that industry.

(From *Encounter*)

British and U. S. Press Compared

By Charles Curran

For a British newspaperman, to go from Fleet Street to New York is like going from Dartmoor to Mayfair. He passes from a society where he is trammelled into one where he feels privileged. Of all the differences between British and American journalism, this difference in the status of its practitioners is the most important, as well as the most impressive. There are two reasons for it. The main one is that the United States, by contrast with Britain, has a classless social structure with an egalitarian climate. The secondary reason is that the legal restraints imposed on the British Press do not exist in the United States. The two are largely cause and effect.

Britain is still a plural society. Despite her big redistributions of political and economic power, she remains a country dominated by an upper class, set apart from the rest of the population, marked by differences in upbringing, education, outlook, and traditions. Mass journalism and upper-class values are always at variance. Since those values are estimated, in deferential Britain, by other classes as well, news-getting is a trade that must be practised in a social climate that is basically hostile to it. There is a continuous clash between intrusiveness and reticence, between the quest for facts and the dislike of publicity.

This clash is made sharper by the fact that the British newspaperman usually comes from the lower slopes of the social pyramid. If he is under 45, the chances are that his education ended in a State secondary school at 16; if he is over 45, he probably left a State elementary school at 14. He is exceptional if he comes from the upper-class matrix of preparatory school, public school, and Oxbridge University. (Only one of the eight men who now edit Britain's national morning papers has passed through the matrix. The proportion is certainly no higher at other levels of journalism.) The exceptions are more numerous than they were; but it is still true that the typical British newspaperman originates outside the complex network of relationships, conventions, shared tra-

ditions, and social attitudes that compose the upper class. He enters it as a visitor, or as an immigrant, not as a native.

Take any type-figure in that class—the permanent official at the head of a Government department, a High Court judge, a Church of England bishop, a banker, a landowner, an ambassador, a Guards officer, the master of an Oxford college, a member of one of the families in the social orbit of the Throne. Common to all of them is the tacit presumption that a mass-circulation journalist is their social and cultural inferior. This presumption is not by any means irrebuttable: it can be negated by individuals. But it is always there. The consequences are extensive, though not easy to define. Only a social astronomer as percipient as Trollope or Henry James could chart all the nuances of a cordial conversation between, say, a journalist who left an elementary school at 14 and a Permanent Under-Secretary who has scaled the peaks of Whitehall by way of Eton, Christ Church, an All Souls fellowship and the Athenaeum.

The class frontiers, of course, are not so rigid as they were, and the traffic across them—for journalists and other people—is growing all the time. But the newspaperman finds the journey easier if he travels on a journal that does not seek a mass circulation. In spite of increased social mobility, a mass circulation journalist remains a person from a different world to the controlling personalities of upper-class Britain (and still more to their women-folk). He may be Daisy Miller; or he may be Mr. Salteena. In any event—as that great outsider Edmund Burke told the Duke of Bedford—he must show his passport at every turnpike.

Ex 3-6400

Now the newspaperman's position in the United States is a complete contrast. For the American social structure is broadly homogenous. It contains no upper class marked off from the mass by education, or speech, or conventions, or any other differentials. It has no tradition of hierarchy, or deference, or inherited superiority. Its climate is fiercely hostile to

any such pretensions. The people who exercise authority bear little resemblance to their British equivalents. So far from claiming prestige, they are eager to disclaim it, to conceal anything that may distinguish their tastes, habits, recreations, or vocabularies from those of a truck driver. The United States is a country where imitation is the tribute that the eminent pay to the masses; and they pay it all the time. The Supreme Court Justice and the barman, the ambassador and the mechanic, the Presidential candidate and Willy Loman, all went to the same kind of schools, grew up in the same social soil—or, if they did not, are at pains to behave as if they did. President Eisenhower, like Mr. Truman, is apparently not suspected of being a cultivated gentleman with scholarly tastes; but if he were, he would go to all lengths to rebut the suspicion. A British Prime Minister can avow a liking for Horace, or Jane Austen, or Cezanne without electoral risk; but for an American politician to do so would be like proclaiming a taste for wife-beating.

Whatever may be the drawbacks of such a society, the advantages it gives to the journalist are undeniable and enormous. There are no impediments to news-getting. Privacy is unpopular. It is taken for granted that readers have a right to know anything that journalists think may interest them, from the state of the Presidential ileum to the chest measurements of a woman marrying her tenth husband. It is taken for granted that anybody who occupies a public position of any sort, or who, for whatever reason, attracts any public attention or curiosity, shall be accessible to the Press at all times; that he, or she, shall answer questions, supply information, pose for photographs. The universal accessibility of the United States is summed up by the Washington telephone directory. When you open that volume you find, set out in large type, a list of useful numbers that range from the police and the fire brigade to the United States Secret Service—EX 3-6400. The telephone number of all America is EX 3-6400.

The Challenge of Economic Pressures on Freedom of the Press

By Leo Burnett

Back in the early 1900's, Upton Sinclair, author of *The Jungle*, took out after the press in a book called *The Brass Check*, in which magazines and newspapers of the day were clearly branded as prostitutes. His general thesis was "he who pays the piper calls the tune."

He made such categorical statements as these:

"American newspapers as a whole represent private interests and not public interest."

"American journalism is a class institution, serving the rich and spurning the poor."

"It is a business fact that a newspaper or popular magazine is a device for submitting competitive advertising to the public, the reading matter being bait to bring the public to the hook."

Now, some 50 years later, this panel is faced with the same question: "Does he who pays the piper call the tune?"

My own particular part in this discussion, as I understand it, is to comment on the degree to which the present day advertiser influences or attempts to influence the editorial attitude and content of media through the power of the purse.

I find it difficult to speak to this point because never in my entire experience with advertisers have I ever once been requested to place schedules or withhold schedules in order to influence the editorial stance or content of an advertising medium or to imply that "if you will scratch my back, I'll scratch yours."

Neither have I been asked to influence news and editorial policies of media in any other way.

Yet, during the past 22 years, our agency has placed more than \$522,000,000 worth of advertising.

There have been a few occasions when I have used whatever influence I might have to call the attention of publishers to what I consider legitimately newsworthy events, but I have always done this on my own volition.

Therefore, I can only make a few observations of trends as I have seen them develop over the last quarter century.

What is the advertiser after anyway? Sales of course, but also a favorable public attitude. He is no different in this respect from a political candidate, an organized charity, a university, a labor union, or for that matter the United States Government, which is constantly trying to enlist public support back of its policies in terms of pending legislation.

In seeking public support the advertiser today is dealing with an increasingly sophisticated public with an increasing degree of perception, discrimination and cynicism.

He is also dealing with a shock-proof public—even a public that likes to be shocked.

At the turn of the century magazines, for example, went only to about 18 million people, largely the elite. Now they go to nearly 250 million. Virtually everybody reads them.

Never before has American business lived so conspicuously in the gold fish bowl. If an advertiser, in his efforts to influence public opinion, is not guided entirely by ethical motives, or even if he is motivated by pure greed, he at least has learned that he cannot accomplish his ends through stupidity.

This discussion deals with the so-called "pressures" that advertisers, industrialists and others may bring on news media and the consequent influences on news and editorial values.

"Pressure" in this respect is an ugly word, but it seems to me that our whole modern society, economic, political and cultural, is one of pressures and counter-pressures—or checks and balances.

It is inescapable and I, for one, regard it as completely natural and wholesome in a democratic system.

The competition for public attention and support is an important characteristic of a society in which we enjoy the privilege of free choice, whether the choice is a sack of flour, a source of news and entertainment or a political candidate.

This free choice invites competing pressures. Advertisers seek to extend the influence of their advertising with news values. Industrialists seek to have their economic views and their acts of social responsibility accorded a news value. Welfare agencies plead for more recognition of their deeds, as well as the needs of the unfortunate or the deserving. Educational institutions plead the cause of cultural values, specialized knowledge, traditions, heritages and human dignity. The church, through its various denominations, seeks to give people greater spiritual strength. And so it goes. All of these and other pressure groups, or, more politely, self-interest groups, must have public understanding and support—and usually financial participation in one form or another.

All of these plead for press attention to good, normal things. But these good, normal things are plentiful and commonplace. Therefore, the editor is not prone to put them on the front page with headlines.

Obviously the media—press, radio and TV—are the wardens, sentries and gatekeepers of public interest.

They have the over-riding responsibility of projecting the truth, whether it is beautiful such as a new hospital or brutal, such as a gang murder or a kidnapping.

Their yardstick in measuring all the information competing for public attention must be "How much does it interest the greatest number of people right here and now?", "Would you read it yourself if you did not have a special interest in it?"

A second question this gatekeeper must ask himself is, "Does this contribute harmfully to an imbalance in the values of our society?"

To reverse the order of these two measurements would be to risk the loss of readership and thus reduce the ability of the medium to hold the confidence or deserve the following of the public.

For a news medium to bend its news values in the direction of the supplicant with the biggest advertising budget or loudest complaint or implied boycott obviously would be more foolhardy than completely to ignore a responsibility for influencing the tastes and self-interests of people to higher levels of intelligence and conduct.

Guided by these considerations, no news medium has the right to close its presses, cameras or air waves to a newsworthy story simply because the story bears the name of Pillsbury, Red Cross or Carleton College.

On the other hand informed and successful advertisers have learned that to use advertising as a weapon to influence a medium or to barter with an honest journalist is gross stupidity. Such conduct obviously seeks to undermine the very integrity of the media which make them worthwhile as advertising carriers in the first place.

Over the past 25 years we have seen certain magazines rise and fall. Some of the failures were simply out of step with the times. A few, in my observation, lost out simply because they cautiously but still mendaciously catered to the advertiser with special stories or articles or the implied promise of same and thereby lost their editorial independence and vitality.

I see signs today where editorial mentions of an advertiser and ads by the same advertiser, even in the same issues, appear to be more than coincidental. All I have to say is that, in my opinion, such publications are ultimately headed for the rocks.

The point of view of the smart advertiser of today, I believe, is well expressed in the following statement by the Advertising Director of one of America's oldest and biggest and most successful national advertisers. He said:

"We have always been convinced that any attempt on the part of either the advertiser or the publication to link advertising revenue with editorial material in the long run works to the detriment of both parties. Certainly we want to and do supply information about

our products and their uses which we feel will be of real interest to editors and readers. We are convinced that in our own area it is natural for editors and writers to look to us as an important source of such information. However, we have never asked or implied that the use of such material was related to our placement of advertising.

"We are convinced that there is no surer way to blunt the value of a publication's character and vitality than to have editorial content influenced by advertising investment."

Just as we have seen certain publications deteriorate as the result of mendacity we have seen others grow constantly stronger because of complete editorial independence. These are the great magazines and newspapers of today.

While none of these magazines actually caters to advertisers, none of them hesitates to mention companies and products by name when the stories are of sufficient news value.

I am sure that if there happened to be a Coca-Cola sign accidentally caught in a wonderful news photo, *Life* would not paint it out, regardless of what Pepsi-Cola might say.

In recent years the *Saturday Evening Post* has appeared less and less reluctant to call companies and products by their right names. I recall, for example, a recent *Post* article on the Tomato in which both the Campbell Soup Company and the Burpee Seed Company were given full credit.

Life has given editorial attention to the Pillsbury Grand National Recipe and Baking Contest and Bake-off at the Waldorf, as it has to numberless events related to people and companies which happened to be advertisers.

I am sure that if all the spices and spice cakes in the world were advertised in the *National Geographic*, that publication would never be influenced to run an article on the Spice Islands, unless the editors considered it of special interest to readers.

As I see it, *Fortune* has one of the most difficult problems of all in determining what it will or will not print and in spite of the hostilities it has engendered in many quarters, it must be given credit, I think, for courageously pioneering a new type of business journalism.

The *Wall Street Journal* gives us plenty of evidence that business news can be lively as well as accurate.

Some business publications are little more than venal flatterers of their industry or trade, and this kind often fall by the wayside, but there are a few strong ones and in our own advertising industry I pay special tribute to *Advertising Age*, although on various occasions it has infuriated me.

Newspapers, by and large, are devoting more and more space to business news in their business sections, but generally, according to my observation, they lag behind the magazines in their willingness to call companies by their right

names in their news sections, except in the case of a disaster such as a plane crash or a train wreck, or in the obituaries of deceased advertisers.

Generally in this matter of calling companies by name we have certainly come a long way since the days when it was considered almost a disgrace to mention the name of an advertiser.

I am reminded of the story of an advertising man who went to George Horace Lorimer, famous editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*, with some stories about A. G. Spalding, head of A. G. Spalding & Bros., who was practically the father of major sports in the United States. Mr. Lorimer looked over the material and said, "That would make a very interesting article, but we can't use it because Mr. Spalding is an advertiser." What a long way the *Post* has come!

Part and parcel of this overall problem is the muscle-flexing which sometimes occurs in the case of various companies and industries, and particularly in the use of the boycott.

Here are examples that occur to me:

Life ran two editorials opposing fair trade legislation. As I understand it, they were loudly damned by many manufacturers and the National Retail Drug Association. One manufacturer placed copies of *Life* on sale at cut rate prices at the National Retail Drug Association Convention.

At least three advertisers canceled their advertising. One situation, involving a major company with several divisions, was particularly amusing. Division No. 1, let us call it, canceled advertising in *Life* because of its fair trade editorials. Division No. 2 heartily concurred with *Life's* position on fair trade. In view of the fact that these two divisions sell through many of the same retail outlets, this seemed somewhat paradoxical. The pay-off came recently when Division No. 1, which had canceled its advertising, abandoned fair trade.

This spring *Life* ran a series of articles on the educational system in Russia. It was a timely and thorough piece of reporting.

The American Association of School Board Administrators rose up in arms because it thought the article reflected badly on our American system. Teachers across the country were asked to boycott *Life* and I am sure that if the Association had been a *Life* advertiser it would have immediately canceled its schedule.

This seemed particularly unfair to me, because Roy E. Larsen, president of *Life*, unselfishly and at great personal sacrifice, has probably done more than any individual in America in behalf of better schools and was personally responsible for organizing the National Council of Better Schools.

I am told that this boycott to date has resulted in 135 letters, 28 cancellations and four new subscriptions.

One of the most recent boycotts attempting to influence advertising revenue was that of the Citizens Council of Little Rock against the *Arkansas Gazette*, involving anonymous threatening letters to some 1,500 advertisers.

We all know what happened. Editor Harry Ashmore and the *Arkansas Gazette* won an unprecedented double Pulitzer Prize. The boycott did not cost the paper a cent of advertising revenue and the subscription, after a loss of 10.6% daily and 9.7% Sunday, is gradually rising again.

I dare say that this paper would stand on principle against its biggest advertisers should the occasion warrant.

In this connection I want to read you a memo I wrote recently to the media department of our agency:

"I feel sure that this memo is unnecessary (as most memos are), but I am writing it as a special note of precaution.

"It is probably particularly unnecessary in the case of our media department, which I know is well-informed, alert and public-spirited and looks beyond the statistics and the slide rule in its media recommendations.

"I refer, of course, to the recent experience of the *Arkansas Gazette* and its editor, Harry Ashmore, who between them won two Pulitzer Prizes in their stand against Governor Faubus in his actions in denying the right of the Supreme Court to order desegregation of the public schools.

"Although it survived the boycott attempt directed to both advertisers and subscribers, and apparently did not lose a dollar of advertising revenue, it still has the problem of regaining the approximately 10% loss in circulation which it suffered.

"The point of this memo is that this temporary loss of circulation should under no circumstances become a factor in our evaluation of the medium and in our recommendations to our clients. In fact, I feel, it should influence us to place maximum lineage in this newspaper, which is not only a shining example of editorial integrity and courage, but which, in the experience of local department stores, is a highly efficient advertising buy, in spite of its currently reduced subscription, rate per thousand, or what have you.

"Incidentally, I was interested to learn that the *Arkansas Gazette* is the oldest newspaper west of the Mississippi (age—139 years).

"If this memo is construed by anybody as an example of using the economic power of advertising to influence the freedom of the press, make the most of it."

I have tried to highspot here a few examples of good and poor "gatekeeping" on the part of media.

Getting back strictly to advertisers and paying the piper, I want to underline my conviction that the proper relationship between news media and self-interest groups is neither silence nor distance.

Rather, the proper relationship is a communion of activity in which each appreciates the objectives, principles and services of the other.

In this communion media should recognize their own woeful inadequacy of staff to root out all the potential news in a complex society for evaluation, selection and dissemination. They should be understanding of self-interest groups that feel neglected. At the same time self-interest groups should submit what they believe to be newsworthy to the editorial channels, rather than to the advertising channels of media, and accept gracefully the appraisal of the trained journalist, regardless of any advertising club they may hold.

The supplicant must have the initiative and creativity to dramatize his information and thus give it more news

appeal. This is where the trained public relations man comes in.

In the final analysis, let's keep in mind that while each of us holds membership in one self-interest employment group part of each day, *all 24 hours of every day* each of us owns stock in other self-interest groups such as tenants or landlords, Rotarians or Kiwanians, taxpayers or relievers, Republicans or Democrats, shoppers or parents. As we move endlessly from one group to the other our self-interests undergo subtle changes. Our ultimate self-interest as pertaining to news in all groups is for truth—the beautiful truth or the brutal truth. Let's not quarrel with it too strenuously. To make it work there must be a communion of interests and the gatekeepers must not only be understanding and courageous but must be clean all the way through.

Leo Burnett is chairman of the Chicago advertising agency that bears his name. This is from a talk to the University of Minnesota annual forum.

Home Was Hutchinson, Kansas

By Oscar S. Villadolid

AMERICA may be dragging her feet in the cold war, but she is definitely making long, deliberate strides in trying to win the hearts of Asians through her \$20.8 million cultural and exchange educational programs.

Though little known, sometimes even unheard of, in the awesome East-West power struggle, this "battle" for the minds of people has contributed immensely to a better understanding of America—and what she stands for. Yet, a great many politically-minded Americans have, ironically, failed to place more emphasis on the very "weapon" that can someday make them win the cold war without firing a shot.

Not long ago, we winged our way into the American south, deep into the land that has become so well known to Asians as "Little Rock." When we left Washington, D.C. for the "notorious land," we were apprehensive, felt that, perhaps, it was not wise after all to have asked that we see the soft under-belly of the great United States. What was there to see than what had already been printed in *Life* and *Look* magazines, pictures of southern "Whites" spitting at the faces of helpless "Blacks" and inflicting on them physical harm merely because a few innocent colored schoolchildren wanted to take full advantage of an educa-

tion which they are entitled to under the laws we mused. Being an Asian, and thus "colored," there was really nothing much to think about, except of "Little Rock" all the way.

Looking back, the situation was not as bad, as hopeless and as reprehensible as it appeared two months ago. On the contrary, we left the south with the inevitable verdict that the conditions were much better than we had expected them to be. For the first time, we really began to appreciate what a complicated and ticklish problem school integration was in a southern community—too provincial in its prejudices and too raw in its emotions. Indeed, there was much to be desired in trying to uplift the standing of the Negroes; but, on the whole, we were impressed by the progress being made in this direction. We left the U. S. deeply convinced that a hard-working Asian could find his place under the sun in America, too.

This understanding of the true facts in the American south could not have come about without the Fulbrights and the Smith-Mundts, as they are popularly known here. So with an understanding of American life and government one goes home from a trip to the U. S. highly elated by the experiences of American civilization. One also gathers these impressions: America has a culture distinctly her own, her women are hard working despite all the kitchen "aids" and mechanical gadgets not available in the distant East, her family ties, with obvious exceptions, are

This is from an article by **Mr. Villadolid** in the *Philippines Herald*, May 24, on his U. S. visit.

still firm and her religious life strong. The so-called westerners are even hospitable people, and nowhere in the vastness of America did we sample a brand of hospitality as the kind dished out to us by the Texans.

"Feeling" the "pulse" of America this way does not only leave a lasting imprint in the minds of those who have been there but they may also help "mature" their thinking on matters affecting the U. S. By no means will they be expected to act like "puppets" upon their return, subverting their convictions to new found ones, or laying aside their nationalistic aspirations for alien considerations. But with the proper background of American life and government seen firsthand, they will act with acute deliberation and sobriety on delicate matters affecting the U. S. and the ideals which she stands for. Undoubtedly, these are tangible "acquisitions" which could greatly enhance closer and better understanding between Asians and Americans in this era when the peace is being delicately balanced through "terror."

Unlike the disinterested group which has cast its lot with the pre-Sputnik type of diplomacy of "might makes right," there are, in the U. S. State Department in Washington, D. C., silent workers who firmly believe that the world's differences could be aptly bridged through cultural and educational exchanges.

With 10 years experience with international exchange programs, these officials have incessantly tried to hammer home the point that military and economic strength are not the only two weapons that could shape a world of friends. And there can be no disagreement on this. For intellectual and social attainments, the knowledge of which can be spread only through the exchange of opinion-forming individuals, are very important too, if not as vital as economic and military power.

Since the program was launched by the American Congress 10 years ago, 60,000 exchanges had taken place, 40,000 of whom are foreigners and the rest Americans who have gone abroad to various countries of cultural interest to them. These numbers include the two categories of the department's current exchange activity—the Fulbright program for teachers, lecturers, research scholars and graduate students, and the Smith-Mundt leader specialist program for influential individuals and experts in particular fields.

State Department officials concede that the leader-specialist program, concentrating on the exchange of influential adults, is generally agreed to be a marked success. This is not surprising. For the opinion-formers who have gone on 60-day visits to the U. S., numbering more than 800, exert a lot of influence in their respective countries. These influential tourists, upon their return home, pour forth their impressions in speeches, books, articles and personal discussions.

But one thing has been of utmost importance to this program: the recipients had gone to America and returned to their homeland content in the thought that they had been granted complete freedom to make their choice of places to see, to visit and persons to talk with.

What, perhaps, has contributed greatly to the success of this leader-specialist program is the "private sponsor" system which could be found in more than 1,000 American communities, from the big cities of New York and Chicago to the rural districts of Tennessee and Kansas. This is one of the surprises of the great U. S. where, to the eyes of an outsider, every American is too busily engaged in raising his standard of living to bother with people from the outside. But not every American is engaged in the "rat-race," a good number of them—businessmen, social workers, farmers, editors, publishers, etc.—have been giving their precious time to the "visitor" who has come to the U. S. for the first time "to discover America."

We discovered the real America this way. In Dallas, Texas, after a tiring day touring newspaper offices and TV stations, we were farmed out, by people who took care of our program of activities, into the homes of average Americans. Mr. and Mrs. Ray Johnson, a middle-aged couple with a son in the armed forces, took us in that evening. Time flew so fast that before we knew it it was already past midnight. There was still a lot of things to discuss about each other's country, but time was running out, and so were the 60 days for the trip that carried us through Washington, D. C.; New York; Knoxville, (Tennessee); New Orleans; Dallas, (Texas); Kansas City; Hutchinson, (Kansas); Chicago; Detroit; Buffalo; Niagara Falls; Quincy and Cambridge (Mass.), Easton (Pennsylvania), Seattle (Washington), Minneapolis, Milwaukee and San Francisco (California).

But the most pleasant experience we had in the big, vast U. S. was not in New York, Washington, D. C., or Chicago, but in a small town in Kansas with the funny name of Hutchinson. We had wanted to visit a small town and sample life in such a community when we made out our itinerary with the help of Mr. Melvin Bergheim, a programming expert of the Governmental Affairs Institute, in Washington, D. C., but little did we realize that it would afford us our most pleasant and memorable experience in America. What made our stay there most pleasant and worthwhile was the kind of hospitality John McCormally, his wife, and their four children afforded us. They are simple people, though John is the managing editor of the town's newspaper, the *Hutchinson News* (cir. 48,000), and a former Nieman Fellow; but there was warmth and sincerity in the way they received us—like old friends separated by miles of ocean. And we got a kick out of eating hamburgers, salad and French fried potatoes for lunch beside an old fireplace that barely kept the 36 degrees

F. cold out of the living room. His publisher, Jack Harris, was swell, too. He was the kind of American, soft-spoken and understanding, that, we thought, could win Asians easily on the side of the U. S.

Our concept of the typical American, as a sophisticated tourist with too much money to throw away while strutting around the Philippines—an impression shared by many—was effectively disproved by John and Jack and a number of other hardworking Americans we met in the U. S. They impressed upon us the fact that a good many Americans are, after all, people, too, who share a genuine feeling with Asians and understand that they, also, have a role to play in shaping the course of the future. Their understanding of us and the problems we face made the world seem like a golf ball.

It was like, in Hutchinson, home in America.

Perhaps, the critics will argue that this is an isolated case; after all, no two individuals, as in nationalities, can be alike. But the widespread popularity in the Philippines of the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright grants seem to belie the critics. With the exception of a numbered few, visits to the U.S. on these grants have brought about a general feeling of enlightenment among the recipients on delicate subjects which, at one time, had seemed incomprehensible to them. As intellectual enlightenment is understanding, it would, therefore, not be difficult to expect that better and closer understanding between nations would follow.

Doubting Thomases who seem disposed toward the old-type diplomacy that characterized Britannia when she ruled the waves may well profit the experiences of Filipinos in cultural and educational exchange programs. The results are certainly more tangible, although they may not be proclaimed before the whole world with the same brazenness and intensity of a cannon's roar.

To the "have not" Asians, whose world has just started to emerge from the nightmare of poverty and isolationism, the fight is not by the number of guns, tanks or planes, but by the amount of bread heaped into the empty "breadbaskets" of waiting millions. Knowledge, to them, will be the propelling force to achieve this end, not sporadic economic "dole-outs" that oftentimes lead to a false sense of economic security and national stagnation. Of course, this approach to the ailing millions of Asians will entail a long process that will surely hurt the pocketbook, but it will represent more than a gesture of friendship; it is friendship for friendship's sake.

"Little Nieman"

(Continued from page 2)

Certainly, this sort of program can be established in several parts of America to the benefit of our profession. We had thought to draw upon eight or ten states for our fellows, but thus far our regulations limit us to Colorado. Time may change this.

Meanwhile, Colorado's King Fellows will watch with interest the development of other Little Niemans in four or five places. All you need is a good university—and money.

The first King Fellows were: George Brown, Denver *Post*, a state senator and leader in Colorado's Negro community; Mrs. Helen Cudworth, Radio Station KFTM; Carl Dorr, editor and publisher of the Brighton *Blade*; Richard G. Lytle, Meeker *Herald*; Mrs. Idella Noel, co-publisher Platteville *Herald* and LaSalle *Leader*; Ross Thompson, publisher Rocky Ford *Daily Gazette*; and Houstoun Waring, editor Littleton *Independent* and the Arapahoe *Herald*. Curator: Prof. A. Gayle Waldrop, University of Colorado.

Censorship In Modern Spain

By Peter Sand

On the 7th of March of this year, the Spanish "General Direction of the Press" in Madrid sent from its offices a dispatch for publication in all Spanish newspapers. The notice stated that occasionally foreign political observers and diplomats erroneously attributed to the Spanish government a control over the news and commentaries about international affairs that appear in the Spanish newspapers and periodicals.

The report continued that it was necessary to reiterate that the Spanish press's news and opinion was spontaneous on all questions of international politics. The only control, it was stated, that the government exercised on the reporting of international issues was when Spanish foreign policy was directly involved or when Spain's relations with a foreign country might be affected.

Such a protest might have had more value were it not for two facts directly involved in the news item as it was printed. First, the report referred only to international news and the omission of any reference whatsoever to domestic news was an inadvertent emphasis of the existing censorship. Second, the release itself was a *cosigna*, a release by a government office that had to be printed in its entirety and that could not be commented upon.

It is difficult to understand the purpose of such a press release. The intelligent Spanish reader can judge easily the spontaneity and freedom of the Spanish press by its very treatment of foreign news. From observation of news stories, only one fact emerges: The Spanish press is always unanimous in its attitude towards any international news of significance. The first Russian "Sputnik" was hailed by General Franco, only a few days after its launching, as an event that "could not have occurred in the old Russia, but had to occur, inevitably, in the new Russia." Not one Spanish newspaper raised its voice against this implicit praise of dictatorship, nor did one suggest that achievements just as great have come from democratic countries. Going further back, one would have found a unanimous support of Egypt during the Suez incident that was in line with the press's equally unified pro-Arab attitude. A year after Suez, when it was finally revealed to the Spanish people that they, too, were having difficulties with Arab rebels, the press became unanimously anti-Arab. Such unanimity creates some doubts concerning its spontaneity.

The fact is this. Spain, ever since the beginning of the

civil war and the formation of the Franco government, has been under a rigid censorship, and despite periodical government disclaimers, the censorship remains. Even though the Spanish government, every April on "National Press Day," lauds the objectivity and integrity of the Spanish press, that same government does not appear to have sufficient faith in that press to repeal any of the laws that control it.

The first laws restricting the free flow of information in Franco Spain were passed by the *Junta*, the provisional Nationalist government. Two months after the outbreak of the civil war, the *Junta* established a censorship over the mails. This was a military necessity as the territory occupied by the Nationalists still contained many Republicans who would have gladly used the mails in attempts to transmit vital military information. However, regardless of its necessity at the time, this law, like every other law cited below, is still in force. At present, it is used only sporadically, and primarily against individuals suspected of conspiring against the present government. Nonetheless, there is a recent instance when it was employed to open a registered letter sent by an English bank to a Canadian resident in Spain, and the contents of the letter were invoked as evidence of a violation of the currency regulations, purely inadvertent, on the Canadian's part.

However, the beginning of the extremely restrictive censorship of the printed word was in December 1938 when the Minister of the Interior issued the following edict:

"The production, sale, and circulation of pornographic books, periodicals, pamphlets, and all types of pornographic printed matter and pictures; and of socialistic, communistic, anarchistic, and in general, demoralizing literature, are declared illegal."

The juxtaposition of pornographic and socio-economic publications may have been an attempt at legal humor, but the prohibition of "demoralizing literature" is an excellent example of the legal vagueness that invariably characterizes such authoritarian laws wherever and whenever they are promulgated. This law, the foundation of all censorship exercised in Spain today, is, with the use of "demoralizing," so all-encompassing that anything the government, or any individual censor, finds objectionable can be prohibited. The law is applicable to publishers, distributors, booksellers, and libraries. The law provided, further, for an immediate and continuous surveyance of the shelves of all circulating libraries, both public and private.

Peter Sand is the pseudonym of an American writer who has lived in Spain for five years and has a wide acquaintance among Spanish writers, lawyers and scholars.

In April 1938, the censoring body (this term must be employed since censorship has been the responsibility of several different departments of the Spanish government in the past twenty years) was given even more power. A new law provided for the prohibition of printed material, not only on the grounds of doctrine, but also on the basis that the publication of certain "unnecessary or replaceable" books could contribute to the suppression, in the event of a paper shortage, of works more worthy of attention. The effect of this law was that the censor then had the power to force publication of certain works by a subtle form of blackmail, approving part of a publisher's list with the condition that the remaining "unnecessary or replaceable" books were supplanted by what the censor considered to be more "necessary" works.

June of the same year saw the censorship extended to imported foreign publications as well, and an interpretation of the law, shortly thereafter, applied it not only to books imported by wholesalers and booksellers, but also to books imported by private individuals, whether received through the mails or carried through customs personally. Exceptions were made of Catholic liturgical books, scientific and technical works that did not deal with doctrinal matters, and sheet music unaccompanied by words.

Also excepted were books coming from Germany, Italy, and Portugal, published in those countries in their own national language after 1932, 1922, and 1926 respectively. The fact that those years correspond with the establishment of the dictatorships in those countries cannot be dismissed as coincidental.

The censoring of additions to private libraries through interference with the mails is still practiced by the Spanish government. Last year, an American translator of Spanish books, residing in Spain, asked one of his publishers to send him two copies of Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution*. Several months passed without receipt of the books. Assuming that they had been lost in the mails, a not uncommon occurrence in Spain, he wrote again requesting them anew. The publisher sent two more copies of the book, but these also failed to arrive. Finally, both the publisher and the translator wrote to the Spanish embassy in Washington in protest. In addition, the translator wrote to the American Embassy in Madrid, and then, on their advice, wrote to the American Consulate in Barcelona. The translator received a reply from the Consulate saying that they had conveyed his protest to the postal authorities in Barcelona, and very few days after receipt of the Consulate's letter, all four copies of the book were received by the translator.

The rapidity and ease with which this situation was resolved furnishes a clear picture of the capriciousness with which the censorship is invoked. Clearly, the Spanish gov-

ernment was within its rights, under its own laws, of refusing to deliver a work of "communistic literature." Whether the book should then have been confiscated, destroyed, or returned to the sender is a question for legalists, but its action in holding the book and delivering it at the first complaint received from a foreign office of authority casts a strange light over the whole situation.

In April 1940, the little remaining freedom of expression was removed. All speeches, meetings, dissertations, and other "oral forms of the expression of thought" were to be submitted to the censor if they did not occur at universities, churches, or meetings of recognized political parties, or did not concern themselves with the business appropriate to those organizations. With the passage of this law it would have seemed that no further legislation was necessary.

However, by September 1940, apparently one group in Spain felt that the censorship was in some ways inadequate. As a result, works dealing with the civil war in Spain and referring to its preparation and execution were not only to be submitted to the regular censoring body, but to a military censor as well. Thus, the indoctrination of the average Spaniard was insured, and consequently his present-day military knowledge of the war, like his political knowledge, is both limited and erroneous.

Even this law, it must be assumed, was regarded as being too lenient. A few days after its appearance, it was followed by another giving the military censor the right to delete, from books and articles, any reference to sources that it considered undesirable on the basis of their accounting or interpretation of the facts. In effect, this permitted the censorship of bibliographies.

Then, for five years the censorship laws remained unchanged. However, an edict issued in June 1945, while not adding to the oppressiveness of the censorship, clearly demonstrated the ludicrous lengths to which the authoritarian state can go. All books printed in Spain were from that date to be classified in one of three categories: recommended, authorized, or tolerated. The promotion of a book was to be restricted in accordance with its category.

"Tolerated" books could only be listed in catalogues; their display or advertisement was forbidden. "Authorized" books, in addition to catalogue listing, were permitted advertisement, and display of one copy in a window or showcase. "Recommended" books were granted the further privilege of quantity display.

The *Book of a Thousand and One Nights*, and Camus's *The Plague* are both "tolerated." *The Little World of Don Camillo*, for many years completely prohibited, later achieved the "authorized" class. "Recommended" books were principally those that extolled the present regime or its leaders and heroes, and books that dealt with religious and moral issues.

The same law further provided for the future declaration

of certain books as "Books of National Interest." This title was to be bestowed on foreign books, in Spanish translation, that were an "exaltation of the spiritual values of Spain in its historical or present representation." Such books had to be listed in catalogues, could be advertised, and were the only books that were entitled to complete display by themselves in a window or showcase. Not one of several booksellers interviewed could remember the title of a single "Book of National Interest" nor could any of them be positive that any book had ever achieved this lofty status.

Seemingly, by March 1946, the government felt that its position was secure enough to allow relaxation of the censorship. At least, on that date a law alleviating the restrictions on the press was issued. "The Director-General of the Press is permitted to attenuate the existing regulations for the press." However, merely so that it might exercise some restraint, the press was denied the right to criticize the unity of the country, or its internal or external security; the fundamental institutions of the Spanish State, or the persons that represented those institutions; the principles of Catholic dogma or morality, or ecclesiastic persons or institutions; or the *Fuero de los Españoles*. This last is the Spanish *Bill of Rights* and since among other shortcomings it fails to guarantee freedom of the press, it is understandable why the government would prefer that it not be criticized.

However, despite the seeming thoroughness of the legislation, Spanish censorship, like Spanish government today, is not an operation of law, but of men. These men, the censors, are employees of a division of the Ministry of the Interior, the *Fomento de Turismo y Información*. This can be translated roughly as the "Office of Tourism and Information." The *Fomento's* function is the publicizing of Spanish tourist attractions both in Spain and abroad, and the control of hotel and restaurant prices and facilities in Spain; but tourist information is not all that it concerns itself with. For "information" read "censorship," and its principal function becomes obvious: It controls all printing and public entertainment in Spain.

The present Minister of Information is Arlas Salgado. Salgado is a member of *Opus Dei*, a secret lay Catholic organization. There have been both conjecture and rumors about the nature and aims of *Opus Dei*, but actually little if anything is known about it, not even the total number of its members. It is firmly believed that its members are sincerely devoted and dedicated to the principles of its church, this devotion and dedication being one of the admission requirements. This being the case, while it might be unfair to accuse Salgado of fanaticism, it would not be unreasonable to doubt his openmindedness.

The present Director-General of the Press is Adolfo Muñoz Alonso. A former theological student, he has a Bachelor of Arts degree in theology from Rome. His de-

votion to the Catholic Church is no doubt equal to Salgado's.

There is a strong possibility of the censorship becoming even more rigid as a result of the appointment of these two men. Some journalists maintain it is already being felt. As a result of Franco's Concordat with the Vatican in 1953, the Spanish Church was given censoring powers in matters concerning faith and morals. The presence of two such men as Salgado and Muñoz as the heads of censorship in Spain can easily result in an extremely wide interpretation of the subject-matter of faith and morals.

However, these two men are merely the governors of the censorship organization, and their decisions are mainly those of policy. The instrumentation of such policy is left to lesser lights.

While the seat of censorship is in Madrid, there is a delegation of *Fomento* in each province. The size of the delegation depends on the quantity of publishing done in the province. Catalonia has about 18 censors, while the Balearics have only one. The provincial delegations are responsible for all publications numbering less than eighty pages. Anything larger, unless special privilege is granted, must be sent to Madrid. On occasions, shorter publications have been sent to Madrid when the provincial delegate, for one reason or another, did not want to accept responsibility. This is understandable when it is realized that the censors have neither special training nor special qualifications for the posts they occupy. The job pays well for Spain, and is usually given today to a young man with little to recommend him except the fact that his father has been owed a favor by someone in a position to appoint, or intercede in favor of the appointment of a censor.

All printed material, with the exception of business cards and letterheads, must be submitted to the censor. This includes not only such obvious material as books, newspapers and magazines, but also encompasses advertising layouts, posters, throwaways, and theatre programs. Also the provincial censor passes on any public entertainment presented in his area, and enforces compliance with Madrid's censoring of motion pictures. (A public entertainment occurring on Church-owned property must undergo an additional ecclesiastical censorship.)

All material, excluding novels and foreign publications intended for translation, is submitted to the censor in galley proofs. Novels may be presented in manuscript and foreign publications in their original form. The material is read by the censor, and changes, deletions, and even additions are advised. Proofs submitted to the provincial censor are then stamped "passed" and returned to the publisher. Madrid, however, returns the material without any stamp indicating its having been through censorship. This, according to one source, is because several years ago, when

Madrid also stamped matter "passed," a few pages made their way to England and there were printed in a periodical to the great mirth of the English and the great embarrassment of the Spanish government.

Some of the censors' recommendations are extremely petty. For instance, no writer may refer to the Spanish "civil war," but must employ the phrases, "crusade of liberation" or "popular uprising." Another trivial aspect of the censorship is its insistence on referring to the losing side in the civil war as "reds," and not permitting any reference to the "Republicans" (Spanish, that is) unless preceded by some such opprobrious adjective as "detestable" or "oppressive."

The extremes to which this can be carried are well illustrated by the instructions to the press after the death of Ortega y Gasset, Spain's greatest modern philosopher and, many think, greatest modern prose stylist. His political opinions, however, did not coincide with those of the present regime; therefore, all newspapers and magazines were instructed that their obituaries and eulogies could not designate him *maestro*. This, while it means "master" or "teacher," has an extremely laudatory connotation in Spain. Applied to an intellectual, or anyone for that matter, it means that he is *the* master of his craft and as such can serve as a model to anyone. The government apparently did not consider Ortega to be the very model of a major political philosopher.

In addition to exercising controls over words and phraseology, the censor further controls the very news itself. The press services in Spain are directly under government control; so that international news and national news are censored at the very source. Local news, of even the most trivial nature, is often censored simply because it is offensive to one of the local government officials. And often, "news" that is of local interest and known to the bulk of the populace is never printed. For six months the rebellion of the Arabs in Spanish Africa was concealed from the Spanish people. When the difficulties were finally revealed, complete casualty lists were still withheld, and in one area where it was known generally that two local boys were killed, no notice of their death appeared in the local papers.

At times the local censorship becomes almost pathetic. There are constantly recurring shortages of various products on the local markets throughout Spain. Scarcely a month goes by that any city in Spain is not faced with a scarcity of olive oil, kerosene, rice, or sugar. Severe penalties are levied on any shop exceeding the fixed price of these products, and these penalties are carried out. In such situations, there cannot be a single family that is not aware of the shortage. Yet in the great majority of the cases, not a word is mentioned in the local press. Explanations are needed, but are rarely forthcoming; the government seems

to feel that the problem is solved if there is no public admission of its existence.

Obviously the Spanish government cannot have the complete control over the foreign press that it has over its own. This problem is solved in the simplest manner; when the government is offended by an item in a foreign paper, the paper is not permitted to be sold, or if it is possible to do so simply, the offending item is removed. The latter occurred several years ago when an article on Marilyn Monroe appeared in *Collier's*. One illustration in that article was scissored out of all copies placed on sale. It would be difficult to understand how even the famed calendar photograph of Miss Monroe could offend any but the most sensitive, but seemingly *something* was too salacious for the Spanish public.

However, as one Spanish lawyer expressed it, "The worst part is not the news we are denied, but the lies that we are expected to believe." During Spain's honeymoon with the Arabs, the Suez crisis occurred. The Spanish press was second only to the Egyptian in describing the severe casualties suffered by the British, French, and Israeli forces. Eisenhower's election in 1956 was hailed as demonstrating that even the American people felt that political salvation was possible only when the government was in the hands of a general. While electricity was still being rationed in Barcelona this spring, there was a long article in the papers throughout Spain boasting in the 14-fold increase of electric power since the beginning of the civil war. And last fall headlines proclaimed the fact that for the first time in decades Spain was exporting steel. The truth, perhaps, but the truth only because even Spain's scant production of steel was more than sufficient for its small heavy industry.

Even responsible editors have no choice in printing the lies and distortions that are foisted upon them by the press services and government agencies. Most of the feature articles printed in the Spanish press are *cosignas*. As mentioned above, *cosignas* must be printed and cannot be criticized. As well as feature articles, they will include news items, political speeches, and photographs. In addition to its mandatory publication, a *cosigna* will usually carry explicit instructions for its placement in the paper and the size of the banner to be placed over it.

And as often as not there is an inadvertent irony in an occasional *cosigna*. Recently, Franco made a speech to the Spanish Parliament. It was announced well beforehand and the foreign press was speculating as to the possibility of its being the public announcement of Franco's retirement from active politics. Actually, it was nothing more than another speech. Several *weeks* after its presentation, a *cosigna* appeared headlined "Foreign press comments on Franco's speech to Parliament." The news story carried datelines of New York and important European cities.

The reader was informed that the New York *Times* reported the speech and commented upon it editorially. The news about the speech reported from London, Paris, and other cities was similar. The Spanish reader learned that Franco's speech was considered of sufficient importance to receive comment in the press centers of the world, but he never did learn what the nature of that comment was.

From this it is obvious that the Spanish reader is among the worst informed in the non-communist world. The more intelligent of the Spaniards realize the deficiencies of their press and many of them who read a foreign language subscribe to foreign newspapers or magazines. The subscription is a necessity due to suppression of news-stand copies whenever critical news of Spain appears. Even though the censor has the right to seize periodicals in the mail, he rarely exercises it. Most issues whose sale on the stands is prohibited will arrive through the mail, even though mail copies are occasionally seized. Fortunately, the subscriber is not deemed culpable in such cases.

Time and *Newsweek* have both, on many occasions in the past three years, been banned from the news-stands, but in the same period of time several subscribers interviewed have received all of their copies of *Time*, and only one issue of *Newsweek* has been seized. *Newsweek's* error in that issue had been to review favorably Herbert Matthew's *The Yoke and the Arrows*, a book severely critical of the Franco regime. (Matthew's book, incidentally, earned itself a *cosigna*. It was attacked heavily for casting doubt on the legend of the siege of the Alcazar in Toledo. His claim that the legend was a fabrication resulted in the book being exposed as a compilation of lies. The only allusions in the press's attack were to his account of the siege; his criticisms of Spain's government and economic situation were ignored completely.)

The literary censorship is just as extensive as that of the press. All of the works of Gide, Sartre, and Anouilh are banned, both in original and in Spanish. A partial list of the authors that have had one or more books banned includes O'Neill, Arthur Miller, Stendhal, Herman Hesse, Thomas Mann, Shaw, Dos Passos, William Faulkner, Balzac, Flaubert, Malraux, Camus, and even Spain's leading novelist, a recently elected member of the Spanish Royal Academy, Camilo José Cela. In addition, the *Complete Works* of three of the most important Spanish writers of this century, Ortega y Gasset, Unamuno, and Pio Baroja, are printed in Spain in incomplete form, lacking some of the most important writings of these men.

With the combination of strictness and capriciousness in Spanish censorship, it is surprising that any literary publication at all is carried on in Spain. More than once, a manuscript has been approved by the censor and after proofs have been run the publisher requested to submit it for censorship again. Then, for some reason, a passage that was

inoffensive in manuscript has become offensive when set in type. Even worse, there have been occasions when, after an edition had been completely printed and bound, the censor had decided that the book might not be sold. The vagaries of these actions do not have to be explained, need not be justified, and cannot be appealed.

Soon after Camus received the Nobel prize, a publisher in Spain submitted two Camus novels to the censor. Even though they had previously been rejected, the publisher apparently felt that the recent honors bestowed upon Camus would serve as effective pressure upon the censor. The two submitted were *The Plague* and *The Fall*. The censor remained adamant on *The Fall*, but approved *The Plague*, this approval, however, being extended only to an edition of 3000 copies. On the face of it, it would seem that the censor was granting the publisher the privilege of corrupting 3000 readers, but no more than that. It is possible that the censor did not want to go on record as refusing publication to a Nobel prize-winner, and in approving a limited edition, turned the problem back to the publisher. Despite low production costs in Spain, it is still difficult to realize a profit on the sale of 3000 copies of a book; so, its subsequent publication must be regarded as a public service or an attempt to thwart the censor.

It is this ambiguity of the censorship that creates its vilest aspects. Neither publisher, editor, nor writer can work without consideration of the need for conformity. Clearly, of the three it is the writer who is most seriously affected by this need for "auto-censorship." No writer in Spain today feels free to write as he pleases. He cannot be concerned only with reportorial or artistic integrity, but also must consider conformity to the censor's desires. Consequently, he has to train himself to write for the censor rather than for himself or for the public, and almost must force himself to think in the censor's terms. But if a writer is asked what it is that he fears, he will tell you that the horror is—he doesn't know. He is simply afraid and he doesn't know of what—whether it is loss of economic security, prestige, or even freedom.

Since one of the tenets of the present Spanish government is its complete acceptance by all elements of the public, most news concerning dissidence is censored; therefore punishment of critics of the regime is rarely reported in the press. As a result, the writer cannot know what to expect for having written censorable material. One young writer was sentenced to a year in prison for having written a sincere and well-intentioned exposure of graft and corruption in the government. His article was not published; he was convicted on the basis of its being sent to a high government official in the form of a signed personal letter.

The average writer in Spain would never consider anything so drastic as direct criticism of any phase of the

present regime; he is fairly sure that imprisonment would come as a direct consequence. But he doesn't know what the result of an inadvertent indirect criticism would be, nor can he ever be sure whether any chance phrase will be regarded as such indirect criticism. He must constantly be on his guard, and write as expected. And in this lies the worst form of corruption, for the writer is forced to corrupt himself.

Yet there are writers in Spain today who, despite the strictness of the laws, despite the arbitrariness of the censors, and despite the vagueness of the punishment, try to retain their self-respect by thwarting the censorship whenever they can. There is the anecdote of the writer who was summoned before the censor to explain an article he had written. The censor told him, "Garcia, I've read this article and it seems to me that you wrote it so that it could be read two different ways."

"No, sir," replied Garcia, "the way I wrote that article, it could be read six different ways."

Ambiguity is the best weapon that the writer has at his disposal. This is well demonstrated by the following excerpt from an article in one of Spain's best weekly news magazines:

"If today the military, stepping over all the laws and precepts, destroys the basic morality of a country, the only hope is that another military group, when the moment arrives, will put things back in their places."

The writer was not speaking of Spain nor of military *coups* in the abstract, but rather describing Peron's rise and fall, and for this reason, seemingly, the statement was passed by the censor. Since in present-day Spain, however, factions have formed within the army itself, there *is* a hope that "when the moment arrives" (on Franco's death), the liberal elements in the army will be able to take over the government. This situation has not been reported in the Spanish press and it is possible that the censor was not aware of it. Or if he were aware, assumed that the journalist was not, and therefore making no comparison between Argentina and Spain.

Nonetheless, despite the few successful subterfuges on the part of some writers, it would be rash to assume that the government's control over information is being undermined. The Spaniards able to read the foreign press, and those able to read between the lines of an occasional article are in a very small minority. Most of the people accept the Spanish press as a valid source of information or else dismiss it as an unimportant political tool. If the control over the press has not achieved the ideal and converted the populace, it has at least created in a new generation a feeling of political apathy and an acceptance of the inevitability of censorship. These and the voicelessness of the opposition are sufficient to insure the perpetuation of the regime, and that is the prime purpose of censorship.

Years of Change

By John M. Harrison

THE PERILS OF PROSPERITY, 1914-1932, by William E. Leuchtenburg. University of Chicago Press. 297 pp. \$3.50

The period 1914-1932, which is covered by Prof. William E. Leuchtenburg in this most recent of the first-rate Chicago History of American Civilization series, has special interest these days. Somebody is always making comparisons between Now and Then. And there are many convenient parallels.

But Professor Leuchtenburg is not much interested in this kind of exercise. For one thing, he doesn't accept the conventional stereotypes which have come to represent many of the men of the "Roaring Twenties" in the public mind and which make the comparisons so much easier. Without forgiving them their mistakes and shortcomings, he holds them not so much accountable for what happened as they are representative of attitudes which were prevalent at the time.

His assessments are not soft or uncritical. There probably is no more damning summary of Warren Harding's weakness of character, for example, than the story Professor Leuchtenburg tells concerning a statement to young Harding by his father:

"It's a good thing you wasn't born a girl. Because you'd be in a family way all the time. You can't say No."

Yet this young historian, now at Columbia University, manages to make it eminently clear that Warren Gamaliel Harding was precisely what the American people wanted and got in the way of a President when they went to the polls in 1920. He was the embodiment of that new word with which he afflicted the American language—normalcy.

The Coolidge and Hoover portraits are equally clear, and equally free of the kind of distortion that has been characteristic of much of what has been written about them. Especially in dealing with Herbert Hoover, the author has avoided this tendency toward the "devil theory" of history.

But the real strength of Bill Leuchtenburg's study of this amazing period in

American history, when so many sharply contrasting forces were at work, is in the clarity and incisiveness with which he summarizes what was going on in the minds and hearts of the people, and the way he interrelates these with the political and social and economic developments of the 18 short years encompassed in this study. These are some of the chapter headings:

"Innocents Abroad"

"Red Scare"

"Tired Radicals"

"A Botched Civilization"

"The Revolution in Morals"

"The Second Industrial Revolution"

"The Sidewalks of New York"

In these chapters, Professor Leuchtenburg draws remarkably complete pictures of the great changes which were taking place. They had started before 1914. But World War I brought some of them to a head. Others were pushed to crisis stage almost simultaneously by a variety of forces. The author sums it up admirably in his epilogue:

"The 1920's have been dismissed as a 'time of immaturity, the years when America was hell-bent on the 'gaudiest spree in history.' But there was a great deal more to the era than raccoon coats and bathtub gin. 'The world broke in two in 1922 or thereabouts,' wrote Willa Cather. The year may not be accurate, but the observation is. The United States had to come to terms with a strong state, the dominance of the metropolis, secularization and the breakdown of religious sanctions, international power politics, and mass culture. The country dodged some of these problems, resorted to violence to eliminate others, and, for still others, found partial answers. The United States in the period from 1914 to 1932 fell far short of working out viable solutions to the problems created by the painful transition from the nineteenth-century to modern America. But it is, at the very least, charitable to remember that the country has not solved some of these problems yet."

This kind of setting recent events in historic perspective is Professor Leuchtenburg's forte—in the classroom or on the printed page. He is also one of the liveliest writers among modern historians and there is as much pleasure as information in this book.

The book includes, incidentally, a list of suggested reading in the period which is by far the most complete this reviewer has seen anywhere—a useful list for any practicing newspaperman who wants to dig for himself in this critical period in American history.

Book Notes

(A quick once-over of a few books that should not be missed.—L.M.L.)

COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM, The Story of the Christian Science Monitor, by Erwin D. Canham. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston. 454 pp. \$4.85.

The editor of the *Monitor* has described its first fifty years. A remarkable history of a great newspaper, born of an ideal and dedicated to it, which has set the highest professional standard and developed also the soundest proficiency in journalism. As the paper is a must for those who need to be informed, its history is similarly now an indispensable item for every journalism library or editor's book shelf. Erwin Canham has been on the *Monitor* for two-thirds of its history and its chief editorial executive for one-third. This is both asset and limitation as its historian. Brought up in its history and legend, he makes a fascinating story of its early years and recounts the attainments of the assorted journalists who peopled its early pages, both the distinguished and the bizarre. But the *Monitor* now is the best paper it has ever been and has the best staff, and this I think does not show enough, probably because its editor is too close to it for perspective. The thorough description of its organization and processes and the chain of command is informing. Canham is more candid than one would suppose a man could be, who works for a church, in discussing the inevitable limitations a theology places upon journalism.

That the result has not proved more restrictive says much for the caliber of all concerned in the product. For it is an achievement entirely unique to produce a newspaper of professional quality under the aegis of a church. As an endowed

newspaper the *Monitor* stands alone. In its half century, no other such venture has been launched. This is a curious fact, particularly in the light of the *Monitor's* success and of the number of other institutions with the resources to make such a strategic contribution to our society.

THE SPLENDID LITTLE WAR, by Frank Freidel. Little Brown, Boston. 314 pp. \$8.50.

That is what John Hay called it, congratulating Theodore Roosevelt, who had established proprietary rights in it which he was soon to cash in politically. It was Richard Harding Davis's war too. He added to its splendor as did Howard Chandler Christy, Frederic Remington, William J. Glackens and John T. McCutcheon. Their sketches illuminated the Spanish-American war for the magazines of the time, and make a vivid part of Professor Freidel's book, which is gorgeously and copiously illustrated, as much picture as text. It makes a splendid book.

But it is not the splendor but the grim reality of the war for the men who fought in Cuba that Freidel reports in vivid detail: the awful mess of the staging in Florida, the lack of transportation, the absence of a medical corps or ambulances, the scandal of the bad beef, the disease, and the heavy casualties from the carnage at El Caney and the bitter fighting at San Juan hill. Stephen Crane had his apprenticeship in courage there. Hobson gave us "Hobson's choice."

The Navy had the glory of Manila Bay and Santiago without the dirt or the casualties, because the Spanish ships were so ill prepared to fight. So Dewey's name burst in instantaneous fame upon the nation, after Manila Bay. Schley and Sampson left a lingering controversy after Santiago. But fortunately it didn't matter how badly that battle was planned; the Spanish ships offered no real opposition.

The exploration of a half forgotten incident in our history is a side excursion for an historian already known for his biography of Franklin Roosevelt. But it fills a gap, and it is quite suggestive now that we hear so much about the possibility of "small brushfire wars." This Cuba affair was a jaunty adventure for

the America of '98. But before it ended America was a Pacific power, with commitments that made part of the preface to Quemoy and Matsu.

ALGERIA: THE REALITIES, by Germaine Tillon. Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y. 115 pp. \$3.

This book is just what it says. Those who know Algeria best are most enthusiastic about it. Albert Camus says it is the only book he has read on Algeria that didn't give him a feeling of unreality and discomfort.

The realities Germaine Tillon describes are not primarily political. They go deeper, into the economic and cultural problems. She describes a people who have had their own tribal life destroyed by their contact with European civilization, but have as yet had nothing put in place of it. Their economy grows more meager, their starved land less able to support their increased population. The problem for France, as she describes it, is of a tremendous educational program, and a huge economic development to provide jobs. She writes of urgency to avoid total disaster. Her concise book is a distillation of such complete knowledge and deep understanding as is rarely combined with lucid writing.

EISENHOWER: CAPTIVE HERO, by Marquis Childs. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 310 pp. \$4.75.

It is only on the last page of Mark Childs' book that the name of President Buchanan appears. But all the book has been moving to that end. "It was not that President Buchanan did anything bad. He simply did nothing."

This, I think, is the first substantial and informed critique of Eisenhower as president since Robert Donovan, two years ago, produced *Inside the Eisenhower Administration*. Donovan, able and sympathetic, sought to find leadership in the administration. He could not, and being honest, his book showed it. Childs confirms this but goes further. It never was in the cards to get leadership there. It was all an illusion. His book develops the illusion. It starts with General Marshall's selection of the self-confident extrovert,

Eisenhower, as just the right symbol to lead our forces abroad. The transition to politics is a familiar story, and the carry-over of the military habit of waiting to decide until after all the facts were in. Childs traces the history of those who had done Eisenhower's staff work for him before Sherman Adams, and of those who have written his speeches down the years. It was not Eisenhower's fault that the American people were infatuated with the amiable qualities that General Marshall had needed for his purpose. They needed a hero, Childs says, insisted on one, and made him out of their own illusions. Their image has proved extraordinarily resistant. It did not tarnish when Eisenhower embraced both McCarthy and Jenner after they had called General Marshall a traitor. It was not weakened by the failure to fight McCarthyism, or by the yielding of defense needs to the budgeteers, nor by surrender of the keys of diplomacy to the China lobby, nor by inaction in the recession, nor even by failure to lead in the great constitutional crisis which made a hero of Faubus.

"Captive of his own indecisiveness," concludes Childs, as well as of "the hero-worshipping public." The 32 selected cartoons help the mood.

THE PUERTO RICANS, by Christopher Rand. Oxford Press. 178 pp. \$3.75.

This book is based on the series Christopher Rand did for *The New Yorker* last year. It is a brilliant piece of reporting that describes the immense and complex changes wrought by the movement of some 600,000 Puerto Ricans to New York City. Rand has studied the culture that they left and the conditions that they found in their new life, their adjustment to it, their exploitation, their impact on the metropolis, and its on them. Rand has found here a subject with range and depth to give full rein to his journalistic quality. A great story greatly told, and one that signalizes again the extraordinary journalistic opportunity *The New Yorker* provides to a few gifted spirits who know how to use it. Chris Rand's journeys through their fluid columns have given us some of the most distinguished reporting of our times.

THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA,
by John K. Fairbank. Harvard Press.
365 pp. \$5.50.

This is a revision of Prof. Fairbank's earlier authoritative history of our relations with China. He carries the account through the stormy tangled last decade and this provides the background to the wierd international maze that brought up at a dead end on the island of Quemoy. A ready reference for the editorial writer; an indispensable book for the student of China; a head-clearing draught for those who have tried to make sense of the Dulles diplomacy on China.

THE UGLY AMERICAN, by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick. Norton Co. 285 pp. \$3.75.

Capt. Lederer has teamed up here with a political scientist and the result is a Book-of-the-Month. This is a sharp departure from Bill Lederer's light and fanciful naval stories. Lederer and Burdick started their productive acquaintance a decade ago at the Bread Loaf Writers Conference.

This novel is too realistic to be comfortable to Americans. For it is based on our management of our official relationships in Southeast Asia. It is a hard hitting, even bitter arraignment of our Asian diplomacy, which may help illuminate this Fall's crisis in the Formosa Strait. It's a lively story with its heroes and villains.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT. The Key to International Development. Edited by James Daniel. McGraw-Hill. 282 pp. \$5.

This is a record of an unusual conference on the problems of the undeveloped parts of the world. It brings into one volume the contributions of the leading economists, statesmen, scholars and business men who joined in the discussions sponsored by *Time-Life International*.

The section titles indicate the scope of the book: The great potential of mankind; capital is crucial; men and markets; a world in our hands; government as a partner; the men and the means; the challenge of the future.

Mary Handy completed a Nieman Fellowship in June and expected a baby in July, before returning to her work as education writer on the Christian Science Monitor. Her sudden death just before the baby was due came as a shock to the large community who valued her, both for the quality of her professional work and for the high spirit, gaiety and enthusiasm of her approach to life. This appreciation is by her colleague, Robert R. Brun, a Nieman Fellow in 1949, now American news editor of the Monitor.

"Do you know Mary Handy?" How many times I've asked that question and had people brighten up and say, "Sure, I know Mary." Almost always they talked of Mary as something special, and she is. In the *Christian Science Monitor's* City Room sometimes her laugh would fill the place for a moment, and heads would come up with a grin. There was never a question about Mary's being somewhere, all there, and full of the love of life.

Mary didn't do things halfway. She let the *Monitor* know she was ready and willing to write for us by going around the world and giving the Youth Section a sparkling series on what she saw and what young people said to her. She was hired shortly after that, in 1951.

Mary passed on in July just after completing a Nieman year, a year that was full. She got along well with the men of her group, always ready with an idea and never content to be just along for the ride. She felt especially at home at Harvard for many years she had been the *Monitor's* education reporter. The other day I got out her clips, envelope after envelope of them, much of it from Harvard. More, she was deep in education all through Massachusetts and New England.

Mary Handy

An Appreciation

The result was that three times, in 1952, 1953, and 1955 Mary was given the New England Woman's Press Association's award "bestowed in recognition of the most outstanding service to journalism given during the current year by a New England newspaper woman." She became a public figure in New England, often serving as moderator in public discussions. She had a particular interest in educational TV and discussed its future with Al Capp in one of the Ford Hall Forums a few years ago.

Before coming to the *Monitor*, Mary graduated with an A.B. from The Principia in Elmhurst, Illinois. She did graduate work in Paris and at Oxford University, and studied at the Juilliard School of Music. Later, just before her flight around the world, Mary taught secondary school English at Putney School in Vermont.

Mary lived in Lexington with her husband Gene Langley, the *Monitor's* talented artist and cartoonist. She was very aware of her place in the profession as a woman and in her home as a wife. Her contribution, though, was well beyond her home and her profession. She included the world in her thought and with the vivacity and joy there was also concern for all mankind.

ROBERT R. BRUNN

Nieman Visitors

Visitors in Cambridge during the Summer: Mr. and Mrs. Hays Gorey and family; Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Kieckhefer and family; John Doherty; Mr. and Mrs. Ed Hale and family; Hazel Holly; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Molony; Prof. and Mrs. Fred Maguire and 1958 Dartmouth-graduate son, Tom; Burnell Heinecke, Donald Zylstra.

E. Wesley Fuller

1912-1958

News of the sudden death of Wesley Fuller from a heart attack came as a shock to his Nieman and other Harvard associates. He was only 46. He had just delivered an address to the Maryland Utilities Association at Virginia Beach and had started for a swim with Mrs. Fuller when he suffered the attack, September 13. Funeral services were at his home 124 Sagamore Road, Maplewood, N. J., and burial in Arlington National Cemetery. He was an officer in the U. S. Marines in World War II.

Native of Boston, Wes Fuller was a top scholar at Boston Latin School, a graduate of Harvard College in 1933 and then a reporter on the Boston Herald. In 1938 he became one of the first group of Nieman Fellows, studying science to qualify as a science writer. Like many another science writer of that period, he was disappointed in the opportunity for his specialty on his newspaper. After war service, first managing the Red Cross blood bank in Boston, then with the Marines as air combat intelligence officer, he joined the Bell Telephone Laboratories in New

York as information officer in 1946. Since 1956 he had been assistant director of publications for the Laboratories. He was a highly talented specialist in technology, an able interpreter of technical information, a skilled editor and one of the promising executives in his organization. One of the liveliest minds in the original group of Nieman Fellows, he was one of the most active in all Nieman affairs, a man of enthusiasm and devotion and warm friendships. His untimely death is a loss to a large group of former colleagues and associates.

His wife, former Marjory Hale, is a native of Arlington. Their one son, John W. is a graduate of Brown University who has served in the Navy since completing college.

Mrs. Fuller requested that his friends, instead of sending flowers, might contribute in his name to the Memorial Fund of the Program for Harvard College, 124 Milk Street, Boston. A memorial donation for the 1938-39 group of Nieman Fellows has been made.

NIEMAN NOTES

1941

George Chaplin, editor, and Thomas Sancton (1942), star reporter of the New Orleans *Item*, have been going through the experience of having a paper shot out from under them. The *Item* was sold to its larger competitor, the *Times-Picayune*, this summer.

Chaplin had been there 10 years and Sancton nine.

1943

McGraw-Hill published *Private Investment*, edited by James Daniel, in August. It is a report of a San Francisco Conference on international industrial development, sponsored by *Time-Life International* and Stanford Research Institute. Some thirty articles by members of the conference.

1943

The California University Press has a new book on Yugoslavia by Fred Warner Neal, now on the faculty of the Claremont Graduate School, in international relations. He spent the summer in Eastern Europe on assignment from the Twentieth Century Fund to study "national communism."

He expected to attend the International Political Science Association meeting in Rome at the end of September. Besides his teaching, he has been contributing columns on foreign policy to the Los Angeles *Times*.

1945

After completing a summer session as one of the first Fellows of the University of Colorado's "Little Nieman" program,

Houstoun Waring took off for Missoula, Montana, to give the Dean Stone Memorial Lectures at the University of Montana. He is taking leave of absence from the editorship of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, for the September-December term. "Irene goes with me to Montana." Alan Barth (1949) of the Washington *Post* held this lectureship last year.

1947

The 25th anniversary of TVA saw a handsome 25th Anniversary Report to the Nation, in which Paul E. Evans, director of information, had an important part.

Francis P. Locke, associate editor of the *Dayton News*, was back in Cambridge with his family for his 25th Harvard class reunion.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for October has an article by Fletcher Martin on his own experience as a Negro with segregation in southern Illinois. He is on the news staff of the Chicago *Sun-Times*.

1949

The Oxford Press published *The Puerto Ricans* by Christopher Rand, in September—a book developed from his *New Yorker* series of last year.

Grady E. Clay, Jr., real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, was one of eight Americans to attend the first international seminar on urban renewal at the Hague, the last week in August. He then went to Liege, Belgium, for the annual congress of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, and visited European cities to report on urban renewal for the *Courier-Journal*.

Lawrence G. Weiss has joined the editorial page of the Denver *Post* after several years of teaching journalism at the University of Colorado.

1950

After a year and a half in London for the Washington *Post*, Murrey Marder thinks the legend of the foreign correspondent needs some correction:

So many people, I'm sure, still think of a foreign correspondent poised with elbow on bar and foreign intrigue in his mind. Would that 'twere so. More likely the correspondent, having just struggled through trying to translate a nuclear experiment into layman's

language, has grimly turned to the dilemma of trying to explain the difference—in language which someone might read—between a common market and a free trade area. And he has no problems about the 40-hour week; more likely he's trying to figure out if he can squeeze by with a six-day week of 10 or 12-hour days. But there are many compensations. One, here in Britain, is the daily exposure to newspaper writing which is usually so much better than ours, although the reporting on the average is much poorer. A combination of American reporting style and British writing style surely would be a delightful goal.

Fran and I have been fortunate to find living quarters right in the center of town, in a rare setting: Albany, a private, historic court, between Piccadilly and Savile Row. And after nearly a year and a half of life abroad, London now has begun to feel like home. I travel on the Continent on the average of about once every two months, and when possible Fran comes along with me.

In addition to writing for the *Post*, I do about three minute-and-a-half broadcasts a week for the *Post* radio and television station in Washington, WTOP, and the same broadcasts are used for the *Post*-owned stations in Jacksonville, Fla. This has been a considerable added burden, which I wouldn't recommend for anyone starting a one-man overseas operation, although I've had to learn to live with it. Most of these broadcasts are done by telephone from my office, over the trans-Atlantic cable, recorded in Washington, then used as desired. On some occasions I do longer pieces, with regular overseas broadcasting facilities.

1951

The Youngstown *Vindicator* for July 13 had a feature story on Simeon Booker, Jr., Washington bureau chief of the Johnson Publishing Company (*Jet* and *Ebony*.) He grew up in Youngstown.

Hoke Norris is the new literary critic of the Chicago *Sun-Times*. He has served on their news staff several years after earlier work with the Winston-Salem *Journal-Sentinel*. He is the author of a novel: *All the Kingdoms of Earth*, 1956.

1952

Robert W. Brown, back from a foreign assignment with the USIA in India, is associate editor of the St. Petersburg *Times*.

John M. Harrison has recovered from an operation for detached retinas this summer, and is back at work publishing the *Daily Iowan* and handling numerous other chores on the faculty of the Iowa school of journalism at Iowa City. Shirley is teaching English at the University High School.

John L. Steele was named chief of the *Time-Life* bureau in Washington in July. He had served *Time* in Washington for five years, at the White House, on Capitol Hill, at political conventions and on Presidential campaigns. He is also a frequent member of "Meet the Press" panels.

1953

Melvin Mencher has left the Fresno *Bee* to be assistant professor of journalism in the William Allen White School of Journalism at the University of Kansas.

A daughter, Peggy Joan, was born Aug. 16 to Ginny and William Steif in San Francisco where her father is assistant news editor on the *News*.

1954

Richard Dudman of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* covering the French crisis in

Algeria this Summer, found Henry Tanner (1955) of the New York *Times* and Stanley Karnow (1958) of *Time*, Inc., on the same assignment and reports on "a little Nieman reunion in Algeria."

Charles L. Eberhardt has undertaken a new assignment for the United States Information Agency—to broadcast on the Voice of America news and comment from the White House and State Department. He has been with USIA since 1954, after working on New Mexico newspapers.

Donald L. Zylstra moved this summer from the Denver *Post* to the Baltimore *News-Post*, where William A. Townes (1943) is managing editor.

1956

Ed Seney, editor and publisher of the weekly *Town and Country Reporter*, South Miami, Florida, last month added a new weekly, the *Perrine Press*, which will cover the Perrine area and South Dade. Ed says it is a new concept in publishing a suburban paper, with a magazine style format, printed on newsprint.

1957

Harold Liston reports happily that he has promoted himself a new job on the Bloomington *Pantagraph*, to take him out of his city editor's desk and give him a chance to write—"special assignment work on stuff the management or managing editor think ought to get more careful or intensive treatment than the beat men can give it. The specifics are few. Covering the legislature, area politics and education are about the only sure activities."

1958

Bill McIlwain, day news editor of *Newsday*, reports a son, William Franklin McIlwain, III born July 29.

Harvard and M. I. T. Science Seminar

By Herbert Shaw

A small science seminar, jointly sponsored by Harvard and M.I.T., took place in March. The seminar was for working newspapermen in the New England area.

Louis Lyons, the amiable director of the Nieman Foundation, was really the instigator of the seminar, passing along a request from the New England newspaper editors for a meeting on science topics to which they could send a group of reporters, editorial writers and deskmen.

Louis carried the request to Bill Pinkerton, News Officer for Harvard, and Volta Torrey in the M.I.T. public relations office. After tossing the idea around for a few weeks the group came up with a suggestion for a two-day meeting (one day at M. I. T., a second day at Harvard) at which a selected panel of scientists from both institutions would point to what the future might hold in each of their several fields.

The program, as it finally evolved, was built around these general topics: Mathematics, Physics, Chemical Synthesis, Bacteriology and Immunology, Hormones, and the relation of Basic Research to Medical Practice. In addition Al Blakeslee spoke at the first luncheon meeting (The Science Reporter's Job) and Earl Ubell held forth at the final dinner meeting on "Reporting Science."

Two post-dinner sessions were also held, the first on "Space" and "Inertial Guidance," the second on "Science Education."

Twenty-two men were sent by 18 papers (the Associated Press office in Boston sent two). Most were general assignment reporters who occasionally cover science or medical stories; three cover science on more or less a regular basis. The remainder were editorial writers or deskmen.

The sessions were give and take. The scientists gave with explanation of the fields in which they were working and what might be expected tomorrow or in the not too distant future. They also gave out with some of their individual opinions about science reporting in general. The newsmen took! In two days they took a medley of scientific subjects that would have had many an experienced sci-

ence writer groggy and reeling. But they also conveyed to the scientists some of their ideas as to how the latter might be more effective in dealing with the press. At the close of the two-day meeting I'd say the give and take were about a standoff.

Certainly, to cite one example, the experience was a profitable one for John Knox of the Boston Associated Press Bureau. Three days after the meeting ended John came to the Medical School to interview Dr. Joseph Mitchell of the University of Cambridge who was giving the annual Dunham Lectures at the School (Studies in Radiotherapeutics). In the course of the interview Dr. Mitchell referred to the possible effects of radiation on DNA . . . a cell constituent . . . which had been very well outlined during the science seminar. John asked some very intelligent questions on this point and built his story around it.

I think it was profitable, of course, for all those who participated, scientists and newsmen alike.

From a professional standpoint I think it might be well to report on a few points that came from the Harvard-M.I.T. enterprise.

One concerned the question: "When does a promising research development really become news?" Curiously, a scientist asked the question, and in this way.

"Scientific developments in the laboratory are usually arrived at only after long months or years of research. Once a promising development is achieved the scientist is never completely sure of his success until he has submitted the results to a group of his peers. If they agree he usually presents a paper on this work and publishes his findings in a journal. Now at what point does this become news to the layman?"

The scientist argued that it becomes news only after it has been passed on by his peers and presented at a meeting or published in a journal.

The newsmen, in general, disagreed, their comments being to the point that such a discovery becomes news when a member of the press uncovers it.

After a spirited discussion the group

agreed that perhaps newsmen could be apprised of promising research projects through a series of progress reports which would be held in confidence, but used as background material once the research proved to have merit. None, however, was willing to suggest just how these progress reports could be made.

Another suggestion was presented by the scientific group, particularly to the smaller dailies. "Why," they asked, "if your paper cannot support a full time science writer, why not a weekly science column?" As set out such a column could embrace not only national and international scientific developments and achievements, but some elements of high school science. One of the Boston papers has followed this suggestion and is planning (in April) to start a weekly science column which will include, among other items, simple science experiments and mathematical problems.

On the opposite side of the coin, each of the scientists was impressed with the attentiveness of the press representatives attending the sessions and with the calibre and comprehension of their questions.

Admittedly this was a sort of "grass roots" experiment in the field of science reporting. Yet until more of the middle-sized and smaller newspapers can find a place for full-time science writers on their staffs, this field of reporting will fall to the general assignment man who, it is hoped, has an interest in science. The desk men attending were certainly made aware of some of the difficulties that stem from inept headlines, even though this often abused practice was mentioned but once during the meeting—at least by the scientists.

Whether or not Harvard and M. I. T. under the guidance of the Nieman Foundation will repeat the seminar in 1959 remains to be seen. Certainly it seems that other groups over the nation might borrow the idea for such seminars in their own geographical areas.

Herbert Shaw is assistant to the dean of the Harvard Medical School. This report of a science seminar was for the June *News Letter* of the National Association of Science Writers. What it omits to report is that Mr. Shaw gave a major assist to organize the seminar. This is the same seminar whose program was reported in *Nieman Reports* for April.

Landscape Needs Critics

During recent years I have been studying with special and professional interest the Sunday sections of many prominent newspapers. These are devoted to "Home and Business," to "Homes and Gardens," to "Modern Living," or more commonly to "Real Estate and Building." While these supplements deal with the design, use, occupation and enjoyment of the American landscape, they are strongly oriented toward successful merchandising of real property. Their tone toward agents, contractors, and their merchandise is generally admiring and seldom expertly and openly critical.

On most daily newspapers, one may criticize a movie because it's "entertainment." But one may not criticize a new housing tract of 300 acres because this might hurt sales. One may ride roughshod over an inept artist. But one may not openly criticize a housing project which is offensive to the eyes of its 2,400 tenants and 10,000 neighbors. This is "editorial comment" and belongs on the editorial page. (But try to find a practic-

ing architectural critic on a typical newspaper!)

Glaring Omission

Why should a new civic center escape the kind of detailed criticism which newspapers lavish on new plays, movies, TV shows, books, and musical performances? Why should a new redevelopment project be discussed solely on the basis of how many families it will displace, how much it costs, or who got what commission on the land sale? Why such daily concern with legal trivia and such indifference to progressive visual ruin?

The impact of mass-produced housing and new expressways, of redevelopment and untrammelled sprawl, is continuous and often depressing. There is no subject in contemporary life more deserving of the expert, searching gaze of the daily journalist.

As the Australian architect and critic, Austin Boyd, phrased it in the *Journal of Architectural Education*, Summer issue, 1957:

Satisfying popular comment will come spontaneously and pleasantly when ordinary, normally educated people understand the essentials of architecture as they understand drama, literature, cooking, knitting and football. It is not essential to be an exponent or even an expert on these activities to be an entertaining, valuable critic of them.

Widespread uglification needs the widest variety of criticism—not only in *Landscape Architecture* and in *Fortune* but in the daily newspapers which are read by millions of people. We challenge the newspapers of America to rise to this occasion.

GRADY CLAY

Landscape Architecture
April

Grady Clay is real estate editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and associate editor of *Landscape Architecture*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1949.

Figures Security over Freedom Equals Nothing

Editor, El Paso Times:

On May 23 an article was reprinted on your editorial page from the *Texas Legion News* commenting on the Constitution of the United States and the Supreme Court. The article was grossly inaccurate historically and should not go unchallenged.

The *Legion News* said the writing of the Constitution was done . . . "largely by everyday plain people." Nothing is further from the truth. Many of the most brilliant minds of the age took part in drafting the Constitution. They were profound scholars of history and government. The notion that just "everyday plain people" got together and drafted what is probably the most remarkable single document of its kind ever written is pure fantasy.

The *Legion News* asserted further: "They (the authors of the Constitution)

wrote it so that there would be no need for argument as to what they meant." Here again is a statement that has no relation to historical fact. The Constitution was born of argument and the argument has continued since its inception right down to the present day. And the Supreme Court, from the moment of its first decision, has been in the center of the argument.

The argument over the Supreme Court rises and falls with the temper of the times and the changing political scene. During the New Deal days, many of the same elements which today are attacking the Supreme Court were then defending it vigorously under the leadership, among others, of Herbert Hoover, whose motto in the 1930s was: "Hands off the Supreme Court." As one who disagreed with

FDR's plan to pack the Court, I have been disappointed in Mr. Hoover's silence in recent years when the Court has again been under attack.

The *Legion News* calls on Congress to "demand that the Constitution shall stand." The quickest way to undermine the Constitution is to sabotage the Supreme Court. The *Legion News* expresses concern over the security of the nation. A government which protects the individual political freedom of its citizens and is responsive to their needs will remain secure. If the American people are misled into insisting on security above freedom, there will come a day when they will have neither.

—Philip Kerby,

2461 E. Horseshoe Canyon Rd.,
Los Angeles 46, Calif.

May 28, 1958

(This was the "Beacon Hill Weekly" column in the *Berkshire Eagle*, July 12.

A Feud Between the Boston Herald and Globe Is What Put Mr. Goldfine on the Road To Fame

By A. A. Michelson

BOSTON—It's ironic that the Boston *Globe*, which precipitated the investigation and the ultimate disclosure to the nation that there's Goldfine in "them thar" New England hills, can't claim a Pulitzer Prize for its efforts.

It was indirectly pressure from the *Globe* which brought a team of congressional investigators into Boston, but the object was not a look-see into Bernard Goldfine's give-and-take tactics but the circumstances under which the competing Boston *Herald-Traveler* was awarded Television Channel 5 last year. The *Herald-Traveler* was awarded the channel by the Federal Communications Commission even though a career hearings examiner of many years' experience had recommended that it should not be given the franchise.

* * *

FOR ALL the attention that has been focused on the testimony before the congressional subcommittee on legislative oversight, however, the Boston *Globe* is understandably unhappy, because the tax troubles of Bernard Goldfine and the wild rantings of John Fox, the publisher who presided over the death of the Boston *Post*, are merely detracting from the general intent of the investigation in Boston. In an editorial yesterday the *Globe* takes a dim view of the "current sideshows" in Washington and calls for a "prompt return" to the "real purpose" of the inquiry—the investigation of agencies.

Said the *Globe* in an unusually timely editorial (more often the *Globe* is commenting on Cicero's orations against Catiline): "Comedy has a pleasant and useful

place in American life. But there is serious work to be done." In a following editorial the *Globe* returns to normalcy with a discourse on "Why Bathers Shiver."

* * *

IT COULD BE that this whole Bernard Goldfine-Sherman Adams fiasco, which is having a profound political effect all over the country in the current congressional elections—would never have come about were it not for an alleged attempt four years ago by the *Herald* to block the financing of a proposed new *Globe* plant in South Boston. Eventually, the *Globe* did get its money from the John Hancock Life Insurance Co.—about 10 million dollars—and the spanking new plant is today a reality.

The Taylor family which operates the *Globe* is not easily moved to drastic action, as a day-to-day look at the newspaper and its editorial page will indicate. Editorially, it rarely gets involved much in the local or state issues of the day. It is a staid, conservative newspaper, and its editorial and news departments ooze with competent writers and reporters. It is said that when the *Globe* refers to the President, it doesn't mean Eisenhower, or Truman or whoever else might be the national chief executive at the time but rather Nathan M. Pusey, James B. Conant or whoever might be the administrator of the famous campus on the Charles.

But about four years ago word reached the Taylors that a Boston *Herald* executive had quietly approached the John Hancock people and advised them that the *Globe* might be a poor risk on a loan of

10 million dollars. This, of course, was not quite cricket, and the friendly competition (mostly for the advertising dollar, not for political ideas) which had existed for decades between the two dailies became strained. Up to that time, the *Globe* had little or no interest in Channel 5. But from then on, the passiveness of the *Globe* changed to violent opposition to the *Herald's* TV petition. The *Globe* itself was not interested in such a franchise, but it became violently interested in fighting such a license award to the *Herald*.

Thomas Macken Joyce, formerly of Pittsfield, who was the Boston *Herald's* "consultant" in the fight to win the TV channel, has tried to run down the report that the *Herald* publisher, Robert B. Choate, or any other *Herald* executive, had tried to tout the Hancock people off of the *Globe* loan, but he says he has been unsuccessful. However, it is obvious that *Globe* management is unconvinced, and the feelings have reached almost Hatfield-McCoy proportions. Social relations, involving many a proper Bostonian, have become strained to the point where many old friends meeting at the eighth tee at the Myopia Hunt and Country Club give each other the frigid treatment.

It's too bad that relations have been strained, but many a State House observer wishes that the same violent differences which exist over this personal issue could be extended to all issues of local, state and national import. If it were, Boston would be treated once more to a journalism which would be interesting, educational and altogether refreshing.

The biggest magazine bargain in America!

NIEMAN REPORTS AT \$3 A YEAR.

The best present for a newspaperman.

THE MAGAZINE ABOUT NEWSPAPERING.

Everything in it is For and By and About Newspapermen!

Four Times a Year — Four Issues for \$3.00

250,000 words for \$3.00 and all of it good reading. No ads except this one.

No policy line except whatever interests newspapermen to write
and to read about newspapers.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, representing the 250 newspapermen who have held Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of matters common to their work.

Start a subscription for a newspaper friend with this issue.

Send subscription to:

NIEMAN REPORTS, 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

1 Yr. \$3.00

2 Yr. \$5.50

3 Yr. \$7.50