

NiemanReports

December 1962

Managing the News

Clark R. Mollenhoff

The Thalidomide Story

Arthur E. Rowse

The Sunday Papers:

The Bigger the Better

Wm. I. Nichols

Two Sunday Experiments

Wm. A. Hachten

Television Takes a Look at the Press

John M. Harrison

Take a Forthright Stand

Thomas M. Storke

In the Public Interest

Saul Friedman

President and Press

Louis M. Lyons

The Great Price Conspiracy

John Herling

**Broadcast Conscience . . . Haggerty, Nixon and Hiss . . .
GOP Flivver in Arkansas — Reviews . . . Nieman Notes**

NiemanReports

VOL. XVI., NO. 4

DECEMBER 1962

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council. Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

Press and President

In his extended colloquy with the reporters at his November 20th press conference, the President came out ahead in the public view, as Presidents generally do at their press conferences. He adroitly kept the emphasis on security and intelligence reports, areas in which, of course, he was wholly right in saying he had no apology for news restraints during the Cuban crisis. But this was not what the correspondents were protesting. Nobody mentioned Arthur Sylvester's contention that news is a weapon. But the President knew this was implicit. His handling of the problem was professionally sophisticated. He knew as well as anyone that the ground for complaint was not an emergency clampdown, but the attitude of the Defense and State Department spokesmen that playing tricks with the news was defensible policy.

Partly because of the President's obvious respect for the questioning correspondents (Edward Folliard, Clark Mollenhoff and Raymond Brandt), partly from their restrained tenacity, this televised discussion before a vast public proved exceptionally illuminating on the constant issue of reporting the most important assignment in the world—the government of the United States.

Unquestionably this was one of the most avidly watched of any Presidential press conference. Even with the wrap-up report on Cuba as its central focus, more than a fourth of the time was spent on the problem of the reporters. Before it was over the President was asking questions as well as answering them. He kept Raymond Brandt on his feet through a series of half a dozen responses.

This was useful public education. The issue of fullest access to news, compatible with security, was well served by its three press advocates. Taken together, their three separate sorties developed pretty nearly the full dimensions of the problem. The President had three prepared positions and he had to use them all. With deft fencing, he met the first question as though it were limited to the first crucial week of the Cuban crisis. When the second question made that defense no longer tenable, he still tried to contain the complaint within the areas of security and intelligence. It took a third challenge to bring the matter wholly into the open. Then the President chose

to join the correspondents his fast footwork hadn't put off. He came out for the full flow of the news. If the rules got in the way, they'd change the rules. This was a notable public incident. Few, if any, previous Presidents would have had the complete awareness of the problem to manage it as shrewdly, yet, finally, as satisfactorily. He defended the practices of his Administration in the clutch of the Cuban affair without denying the principle that the persistent correspondents kept defining until it stuck. They wisely refrained from further rebuttal in the President's own arena. Yet they were, of course, aware of relevant points that could be made.

The President said correspondents could not be allowed on Guantanamo because it was a danger spot. Yet some of them had been carried on a naval plane to that assignment of rendezvous with the Caribbean maneuvers which were mysteriously cancelled the day before the President's announcement of the quarantine of Cuba. To make safety the decisive factor in accrediting correspondents to military assignments was so novel as to suggest some other reason for the government to avoid concentrating attention on our Cuban naval base just then. Anyway it would hardly explain refusal to let correspondents accompany the quarantine fleet. That would hardly have been more dangerous than India under invasion. Yet on the shortest notice, the Pentagon ferried a cargo of correspondents to India to publicize our first shipment of military aid to Nehru. Their dispatches quite generally reflected the Pentagon view that Nehru's plight proved how wrong his non-alignment policy had been. While the hand of Washington public relations lay so heavily on the Caribbean and reached to India, it claimed impotence in Vietnam. There American correspondents were expelled for penetrating reports, and those remaining have been denied access to news of operations in which American forces played a key role and suffered casualties. Even to the naive, it is evident that American policy has been determining accessibility of news to the American public in strategic areas.

Some of this is inevitable in strained times, which will continue. Short of Utopia, reporters will never be wholly reconciled to the protective devices any government will contrive to its needs. But official news channels will be opened up some—indeed the President has guaranteed it—because of the capacity of American reporters to fight for the right of access to vital news of public affairs. This November 20th demonstration must have increased awareness in the public of their stake in the issue. Happily the controversy found a President fully aware of its importance, and ready to go into it publicly with responsible correspondents. This was basically a good show all around and a good precedent.

LOUIS M. LYONS

Managing the News

By Clark R. Mollenhoff

The Cuban crisis has resulted in one of our most dramatic examples of the high-level handout. For a period of several days in late October, our knowledge and our coverage were largely limited to the facts that were fed to us through the Pentagon, the State Department and the White House. There was no power to go behind the self-serving declarations of the Kennedy Administration, and for the time being most of us were willing to put up with it.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester frankly admitted that the Kennedy Administration engaged in an almost total management of the news during those days of crisis. Since the peak of the tension, there has been much serious re-examination of the Cuban crisis period for purposes of determining if it was all handled in the best way possible. There are many questions that have been asked by reporters and editorial writers. There are many questions that should be asked if we are to do our job as a free press.

Was the government information control lodged in proper civilian hands, or was it too much in the hands of the Pentagon?

Was the crisis over Cuba used as a justification for unnecessary tighter controls over press contacts in the State Department and at the Defense Department?

Have the attitudes on news control as demonstrated by high Administration officials been such that we can have faith those officials will use proper restraint in the imposition of news controls in the future?

It has been encouraging to see the nation's newspapers voicing a general concern over the "news management" during the Cuban crisis. It has been stimulating to hear the Pentagon reporters speak with almost a single voice in opposing the Sylvester directive to control the interviews and telephone conversations between reporters and Pentagon personnel.

The military affairs reporters contend that there is no question but that the Sylvester directive has the potential for reducing the Pentagon coverage to canned handouts and monitored interviews. Examine the simple one-paragraph directive to Department of Defense personnel:

"The substance of each interview and telephone conversation with a media representative will be reported to the

appropriate public information office before the close of business that day. A report need not be made if a representative of the public information office is present at the interview."

Only the naive would take seriously the assurances of Sylvester and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that the directive is for the purpose of making more information available in "an expeditious and equitable manner." Veteran Pentagon reporters, such as Mark Watson, of the *Baltimore Sun*, and Jim Lucas, of the *Scripps-Howard* newspapers, comment that the Sylvester directive is a "Gestapo" tactic. Their sharp criticism is echoed by almost every other military affairs reporter.

This is not a case in which the Pentagon writers have some long-standing bitterness against Defense Secretary McNamara. To the contrary, most of them express considerable admiration for McNamara as an administrator of the Department. They simply feel that the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

The men who are now leading our nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower Administration on our defense posture. Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, less than two years in the job, can produce the right answers without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

It is safe to say that there is not much support for this thesis among the Pentagon reporters. Also, there are many high ranking military officers who resent the Sylvester directive as a sharp curtailment of the right to dissent. While there is almost unanimity of opinion that the Sylvester directive will curb dissent, there is considerable doubt if it will be effective in stopping the occasional irresponsible news leaks.

The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it is encouraging to see the nation's press irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is not unreasonable to express some doubt as to whether the fury will last. If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylves-

Clark R. Mollenhoff, 1961 Pulitzer Prize winner for his Washington reporting, serves the Cowles papers. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1950. This is from the Harold L. Cross Memorial Lecture to the National Editorial Association in St. Louis, Nov. 16.

ter order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the nation's newspapers follow what is a more characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the news gathering picture.

Don't say that such negligence can't take place, because you know that the press is more noted for its forgettery than its memory. If you are honest with yourself, you will admit that the press drops more things than it completes.

In the sphere of your own experience you can remember examples of newspapers that contented themselves with a one-shot or two-shot story job on governmental corruption or mismanagement, and concluded it with a one-shot editorial. That press lethargy can be the pattern on the Sylvester directive, unless the newspapers of the country continue to raise a fuss about it and use every reason for ripping it apart. **IF YOU LOSE THIS ONE, YOU CAN BE PREPARED TO LOSE MORE GROUND LATER.**

It would be appropriate here to bring a reminder of some recent history that set the stage for the Sylvester directive. It was less than ten months ago that the newspapers of this nation gave an overwhelming endorsement to McNamara's use of arbitrary secrecy.

The press said it was willing to accept McNamara's self-serving views on Pentagon censorship, even when there was no "national security" claim that could be made to justify the secrecy. The press told McNamara it was quite proper for him to defy a properly authorized committee of Congress and refuse to produce witnesses for direct questioning by that committee.

I refer to the so-called "muzzling" hearings by the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee. The chairman was Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi. There was no controversy on many major points. It was a properly authorized committee. It was operating within its jurisdiction. It was headed by a responsible chairman. Members of the subcommittee were orderly in their conduct, and there was no abuse of witnesses.

After establishing the basic pattern of speech censorship, the subcommittee asked for the testimony of the persons who did the actual censoring to determine the reasoning in a program found filled with "inconsistency, caprice, personal judgment, and even irresponsibility."

Defense Secretary McNamara refused to allow the censors to testify, and obtained the support of President Kennedy to claim an "executive privilege" for doing so. McNamara said he was responsible for the operations of the Defense Department, and he would do all the explaining that was needed.

It was as if Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman had appeared before the McClellan subcommittee investigation of the Billie Sol Estes case to bar that group from questioning subordinate officials in the Agriculture Department. Such a position by Freeman would have caused a roar of outrage, but McNamara was praised.

McNamara declared that the subcommittee would have to content itself with his self-serving declarations—his high level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. His claim was essentially the same as the Defense Department asserted in its "news managing" program during the Cuban crisis. There were some differences. When McNamara was before the Stennis committee he could not and did not contend national security was involved in the "muzzling" investigation. Also, he was defying a Senate subcommittee that had a legal right to have its questions answered.

The editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. But the reasoning behind the editorials had nothing to do with principles that supposedly guide us in our editorial judgments. McNamara was cheered because he was defying Senator Strom Thurmond, an unpopular Senator from South Carolina. Thurmond claimed that Pentagon censorship was being used to incorporate a "no win" policy in the speeches of high-level military officers.

The question of whether Senator Thurmond was right or wrong in his conclusion was not important. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

However, principles were forgotten for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own long-time self interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their recent news managing ventures? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

If the press of this nation is interested in remaining free, it will be necessary to pay more attention to principle and less attention to expediency or personalities. You do not suggest abandoning normal rules of jurisprudence to jail someone you consider to be a bad influence on society, for you recognize the damage such action could cause.

Neither should you let your judgments on the conduct of a governmental proceeding in Washington be governed solely on the impact of your heroes or on those with whom you disagree.

Editorial writers are supposed to take the long view of our problems, overlooking the seeming allure of expediency, and seeking to arrive at balanced judgments. Don't let it be said that you did not do the study necessary to understand

the danger inherent in the Sylvester directive. Don't let it be said that you did not understand the role of the congressional investigation in checking the tremendous power of the Executive Branch. Don't let it be said that your political hatred or your blind hero worship obscured the principles you intended to support.

If you have lost your capacity for balanced independent thinking, then you are a likely candidate for the title of "high-level handout collector."

The real test is this: Have you become the tool of some political figure or pressure group? Do you challenge facts and conclusions of your sources? Are you an independent thinker, or are you a rubber stamp?

The test can and should be applied to your city hall reporters, county courthouse reporters, statehouse reporters, labor reporters or science writers. It is well to remember that handout collecting is not a disease that is limited to Washington, D. C.

Because of the pressure of work and the difficulty to be informed on all subjects we must cover, there are few who have not slipped periodically into some of the pitfalls of high-level handout collecting. This is not intended as a scolding criticism of all who have ever strayed into these patterns. I hope it will be regarded as a plea for tough self analysis, and a determination to do more independent thinking.

It should be helpful to review some of the press failures of the past to provide some insight into what results of high-level handout collecting.

Look at the failure of the press—reporters and editorial writers—with regard to the widespread corruption and misuse of power by some of our largest labor unions. It happened because too many labor reporters had lost their independence or their perspective. They had become nothing but handout collectors at the office of the AFL and CIO. Many labor reporters considered themselves as labor's ambassador in the news room. They regarded themselves as statesmen who explained their philosophy of labor to their readers, and to the editorial writers.

Such labor reporters were not objective commentators on the labor-management scene. They were closer to the labor leaders than to their own city editor. I believe that it is significant that most of the work of digging into labor union corruption was done by general investigative reporters, and not by the labor specialists.

Many labor reporters denied that any significant corruption existed. They explained the documented cases as isolated instances. They opposed establishment of the McClellan committee, and were cool to its operations for several months.

Recall the Army-McCarthy hearings when the press applauded the Eisenhower Administration for instituting a broad pattern of arbitrary secrecy under a claim of "execu-

tive privilege." Because the doctrine was aimed at Senator McCarthy in those hearings it was applauded, and it wasn't until many months later that many newspapers awakened to the fact that they had endorsed a doctrine of unlimited secrecy. They accepted a self-serving statement by President Eisenhower without challenge.

That blunder should have been enough to alert the press to emotional reactions based on the personalities involved, but it didn't.

Examine the reporting and much of the editorial comment at the time the House Legislature Oversight Subcommittee was starting its investigations of the Federal Communications Commission and other regulatory agencies. Many reporters, columnists and editorial writers were dramatically wrong on one of the crucial issues. It was because they accepted a private interpretation of the law and ethics of secret one-party contacts with members of regulatory commissions.

Bernard Schwartz, chief counsel for the Legislative Oversight Committee, wrote a memorandum of law stating that any of these one-party contacts on the merits of a case were illegal, and constituted grounds for disqualifying those who engaged in such tactics.

Schwartz, an expert on administrative law, was panned as being "naive" and unknowing in the ways of Washington. Our slightly corrupt and exceedingly sloppy regulatory agency members came forth with the view that there was nothing wrong with a little secret talking as long as there was no proof of a wrong decision or a pay-off. This was a high-level handout of the most insidious type. It was picked up and adopted by a large number of reporters, columnists and editorial writers.

The scholarly legal studies by Schwartz were ignored, and he was chastised. It was not until nine or ten months later that the Justice Department was forced to take a public position in connection with the Miami Channel Ten case. In its legal brief, the Justice Department accepted the Schwartz thesis and argued that the contacts between FCC Commissioner Richard Mack and Lawyer Thurman Whiteside were improper and illegal and grounds for cancellation of the award of Channel Ten. The Schwartz thesis was vindicated, but it is unlikely that many editorial pages took note of it.

It is certainly handout collecting of the worst kind when reporters or editorial writers accept erroneous conclusions that are whispered by an administration. This is particularly true when legal decisions dealing with the issue are available for examination.

But, isn't it also handout collecting if you support programs you do not understand? Isn't it handout collecting if you endorse the grand concepts and the clever political slogans of a political party or an administration, and never go to the trouble of digging out the facts?

A balanced judgment requires that you know which foreign aid programs have been successful and which have been failures. It requires that you know enough of the details to do your own analysis of projected programs, so you are not merely a rubber stamp for an administration's view—a high-level handout collector.

In these days when the federal budget is soaring over the \$90 billion mark, we cannot afford the luxury of merely endorsing broad concepts. We cannot afford the blind partisanship that supports political personalities and parties.

The public will not expect us to conduct a full audit of the \$50 billion Defense budget or the \$6 billion Agriculture Department budget. However, the public should be able to

count on our newspapers pointing out the symptoms of waste and mismanagement in government.

The reading public should be able to rely on editorials that are the product of clear and independent thinking, rather than a weak imitation of a popular trend.

The public should be able to rely on our newspapers to fight vigorously against the directives under which any administration seeks to stifle dissent. Above all, our newspaper reporters and editors have a responsibility to themselves and the profession to do the study necessary to know when press freedom is at stake. We cannot erase past mistakes but we should be determined that these mistakes will serve as effective warnings for the future.

President Vs. Press

Text of questions and answers on government information policy at President's Press Conference, Nov. 20.

Q—Edward Folliard, *Washington Post*—

Mr. President, your Administration, like others, has been criticized for its handling of information. The point is being made that reporters are being hampered in carrying out their role as the link between government and the American people, that we're not keeping the American people well informed, as the result of government policies.

LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida and now head of the National Association of Broadcasters, has accused both the Defense Department and the State Department of news suppression in the Cuban crisis. Would you care to comment on your general feeling about that situation?

A—The President—

Well, it is true that when we learned the matter on Tuesday morning until we made the announcement on the quarantine on Monday afternoon that this matter was kept in the highest levels of government.

We didn't make any public statement about it, and I returned to Washington that Saturday morning because I had a campaign trip that was going to take me until Sunday evening, and I had to come back and we did not want to indicate to the Soviet Union or to Cuba or anyone else who might be our adversary the extent of our information until we had determined what our policy would be and until we had consulted with our allies, members of O. A. S. (Organization of American States) and NATO.

So for those very good reasons, I believe, this matter was kept by the government until Monday night.

There is—at least one newspaper learned about the — some details on Sunday evening and did not print it for reasons of public interest.

I have no apologies for that. I don't think that there's any doubt that it would have been a great mistake, and possibly a disaster, if this news had dribbled out when we were unsure of the extent of the Soviet build-up in Cuba and when we were unsure of our response and when we had not consulted with any of our allies who might themselves have been involved in great difficulties as a result of our action.

During the week then, from Monday till Sunday—when we received Mr. Khrushchev's first message about the withdrawal—when we attempted to have the government speak with one voice, there were obvious restraints on newspapermen. They were not permitted, for example, to go to Guantanamo because, obviously, that might be an area which might be under attack.

Since that Sunday, we have tried to—at least intend to attempt to lift the—any restraints on the news and as a reader of a good many papers—it seems to me that the papers have more or less reflected quite accurately the state of our negotiations with the Soviet Union.

They have, in a sense, been suspended because we've been arguing about this question of IL-28's. So there hasn't been any real progress that we could point to or any hard information we could put out until today, which we're now doing.

Now, if the procedures which have been set up, which are really to protect the interests or security of the United States, are being used in a way inimical to the free flow of news, then we'll change those procedures.

Q—Clark Mollenhoff, *Cowles Publications*—

Mr. President, with regard to the information policy, much of the controversy has centered on two specific orders:

there's the [Arthur] Sylvester directive at the Pentagon which is for policing the contacts with the press with individuals in the Pentagon.

And there's another order by [Robert J.] Manning of the State Department which deals with the same general area. There's been quite a lot of criticism where some of the veteran correspondents have contended that this could cut down on the contacts, the normal flow of news and . . . I wonder if you have thought in terms of revising this, modifying it or . . .

A—The President—

—Yes. As I said, we would modify it or change it if it turned out that it has the result that you suggest. As it is we are tonight suggesting that—there be lifted the 12 points that we made to the press in regard to voluntary restraints on the movement of troops and so on. That will be lifted tonight.

There will be a change, I think, in the State Department policy directive, because the need there is somewhat different than it is in the Defense Department.

In the Defense Department, we're dealing not only with the problem of movement of troops, but also with the question of the very sensitive intelligence and the method by which that intelligence is received.

And I don't think that as yet it's been demonstrated that this has restricted the flow of essential news out of the Pentagon. Now if it does, we'll change it. But I haven't been convinced of that as yet.

Q—Raymond P. Brandt, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

Mr. President, you said that you'll change this procedure to the Defense Department when it's been demonstrated the present policy is too restrictive—

A—The President

A.—That the public interest isn't being met, that's correct.

Q.—How are you going to find out? The present situation is that the officers and others down there are reluctant to have any contact with newspapermen because they . . . not only have the time they spend with the newspapermen but the time in writing the reports.

A—Well, I'll bring that to Mr. Sylvester's attention, but I'm not sure that we're suggesting that—you—in the first place, this rule's been in effect in the C.I.A. [Central Intelligence Agency] for many years.

Are we suggesting that any member of the Defense Department should speak on any subject to any newspaperman; the newspaperman should print it or not print it, as he sees fit, without any effort to attempt to limit the printing of news which may deal with the collection, or the methods of collection of intelligence information?

Q—No, sir. It was just a question of—there are many areas other than the movement of troops, and so forth.

A—And intelligence.

Q—But —

A—And in those areas which are not involved we are delighted to meet, talk to Mr. Sylvester, and with representatives of the press, and see if we can get this straightened out so that there is a free flow of news, to which the press is entitled and which I think ought to be in the press, and on which any Administration really must depend as a check to its own actions.

So I can assure you that our only interest has been, first, during this period of crisis, and over a longer period, to try not to have coming out of the Pentagon information which is highly sensitive, particularly in the intelligence areas, which I can assure you in my own not too distant experience, has been extremely inimical to the interest of the United States.

Now that is our only interest. Beyond that, I think it ought to pour out. And as far as I'm concerned, I'll be glad to discuss [it] with Mr. Sylvester and Mr. Manning.

Now, as I've said, Mr. Manning . . . now that we've passed at least a phase of this crisis—will, I think, attempt to improve his order and improve the flow of information.

I will say as an example that information has not necessarily been cut off, is the fact that Governor Stevenson sent a message on his conversation with U Thant—reporting U Thant's two-day visit to Cuba—it was finally distributed in the Department of State at 8 A.M. By 10, before the Secretary of State had seen it, it was on a wire and one of the wire services had it completely, including some of the quotes from it, and it caused Governor Stevenson some pain.

So that I think information has been flowing out. But if it isn't, we'll get it out. So I can assure you, Mr. Brandt, that we'll work on it.

Q—Other than national security.

A—Correct, correct.

In The Public Interest

By Saul Friedman

As leaves drop from the trees in the fall so the spate of incidents fluttered through the busy air this autumn in unprecedented number and importance and settled at the base of the foundation of a free and critical press.

First, with the burgeoning of the Cuban crisis came President Kennedy's request for voluntary censorship and restraint in reporting the crisis and its attendant stories. For the most part the press agreed. Then, in West Germany the *Der Spiegel* affair landed and stirred visions of the past years, when the press was a captive tool. For the most part the press was alarmed. Then Richard Nixon singled out the press that he couldn't use in a discordant swan song (alas, the swan was an ugly duckling after all). The press clucked its disappointment. At the same time, in Birmingham, Ala., an editor was charged with violating election laws prohibiting the solicitation of votes on election day. His crime was writing an editorial taking sides in a local controversy. The press hardly took notice. Then Arthur Sylvester suggested that the news media is considered, by the Defense Department apparently, part of the cold war "weaponry" of the United States. The press cried "foul!"

Much has already been written, separately, about these incidents. The scholars of journalism will no doubt have much more to say when all the elements needed to make scholarly essays are in. Instead of travelling the more dangerous and exhaustive route of analyzing each of these incidents or combining them into an essay on the status of freedom of the press, it will be simpler and perhaps more revealing to do two things: First, to suggest that all these incidents have much in common; and second, to crystallize them into some theme by comparing them with another, unpublicized incident of some months ago in Houston, Texas, where three newspapers, three television stations and many radio stations compete for the news as hotly as anywhere.

The Houston *Post*, the independent morning paper, carried the usual year-end story of the ten best local stories of the year. High on the list compiled by the *Post* was the story of integration coming to the restaurants in downtown department stores. The wrap-up story recounted the sit-ins and the struggles that led up to integration. Since integration of downtown eating places was unthinkable ten years ago, and since it was accomplished with not one incident, it was a top story. That is, it would have been a top story—if it had been carried. What was carried was a one or two paragraph short buried in the paper about a week or so after integration had begun. Neither the *Post*,

the independent *Chronicle*, nor the Scripps-Howard *Press*, nor any of the radio or television stations carried the news until it was a *fait accompli*. And it was barely mentioned at that. Since then much integration news has either not been carried or has been played down.

This is not unique to Houston. It happened in Dallas, Ft. Worth, and Austin. In Nashville, the usually fearless *Tennessean* held back on some of its integration coverage. In all these cities this was done on a voluntary basis. The freedom not to print was being used.

How it came about in Houston is perhaps indicative of why usually responsible and competitive papers do what they criticized the President for asking—submit to voluntary censorship. When, after sit-ins and boycotts, the Houston department store owners were ready to integrate the eating places, they held a meeting with the owners or top editors of the news media. It was agreed that in order to prevent any unhappy incidents it would be best to announce integration quietly to Negro leaders. Reluctantly the news media agreed to make the public announcement about a week later via calm and unobtrusive news stories.

Similarly, when downtown hotels were integrated some months later no announcement was made, except obliquely. One newspaper ran a story of a Negro masonic convention and happened to mention that several of the conventioners were staying at formerly segregated hotels. This situation, incidentally, embarrassed the wire services since they were not included in the conferences that led to the agreements.

Let us leave aside some of the obvious criticisms of the newspaper policies: the city rooms grumbled; there were discussions about advertisers and their reluctance for publicity for fear they would lose customers. There may be something in this argument, but it is difficult to believe that if the news media were unanimous in NOT going along with the censorship request, they would have suffered at the hands of the advertisers.

But these arguments make it evident that it is all too easy to pass judgment on the editors and publishers who agreed to this censorship. The fact is (and it is a fact too many Northern papers do not consider) that newspapers have a great deal of responsibility to keep the flame of racial conflict from spreading out of control. The newspaper serves the community which supports it and not vice versa. In Houston as elsewhere the community leaders feared the possibility of violence, they said. They looked to the newspapers to minimize the possibility of incidents which would further separate the races. Although it was painful to them, the news media executives agreed to exercise judgment, restraint and responsibility and not print a helluva good story. What was more important? To print the story because it's a story? Or to make sure that integration will come off smoothly?

Saul Friedman is a Nieman Fellow from the Houston *Chronicle*.

These arguments were somewhat weakened by two factors. Long before integration of eating places and hotels, school integration came off smoothly. School integration was given magnificent, saturation coverage by Houston's papers. Bus integration was slightly publicized, but by its very nature, *de facto* integration became known by many immediately, yet there was no incident of any importance. Secondly, while Negro business leaders did not criticize the newspaper policy of keeping silent, the sit-in leaders who won the battle were understandably critical.

Apart from the rather superficial arguments, the question of overriding importance emerges: How far should the newspaper go in allowing itself to be used "for the good of the community?" And there are others: Who is to decide what is "good" for the community? How is it to be decided? What is the criteria of "good?" Is freedom of the press the freedom not to print? And finally, is the immediate objective, the avoidance of violence or the possibility of violence, more important than all the intangible concomitants and reasons for press freedom?

Each day of his working life, the publisher, the editor and the reporter play the role of public censor. Each of them plays God as he weighs the news story on the two sides of the scale that balances freedom of the press: the needs of the newspaper and the needs of his fellow citizens. If we are to criticize the publisher for putting just a bit more weight on the community side because he feels he is an inextricable part of that community and is there to be used by it, then we may become critics of our whole reason for being. And yet "for the good of the community" newspapers failed to speak up and have helped cause riots in New Orleans, Montgomery, and Mississippi.

There are no simple answers to the kind of role the newspaper should play in the life of its community or how it should play it. There is little difference between a group of town fathers who press an agreement on the newspapers, and Arthur Sylvester saying what has been true for quite a while—that the newspaper is being used by the community of the United States. The question still to be settled of course is not whether the newspaper is a weapon—but what kind of weapon will it be?

Cellist and Piano Pusher

When we heard for the first time that a man named Lincoln Gordon had learned to play the cello at the age of forty, and when we learned that he might become the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil we ventured the hunch that, for the first time in its history, and in the history of Brazilian-American relations the American Embassy might become a musical Embassy. "Dito e feito," as the Brazilians say, meaning no sooner said than done. Sure enough in less time than it takes to say Pindamonhagaba, Ambassador Gordon discovered in the cultural section of the Embassy, appropriately enough, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Borup, he a violinist and she a pianist, and Ray E. Millet, of the TV and radio section, an expert viola player. They formed a quartet and every week, the political weather permitting, they play together. They hid their lights under a bushel until the very kind of opportunity which would capture their imaginations brought them out into the open. This was A Grande Parada, a big show put on in the Municipal Theatre to raise money for retarded children.

By Paul Vanorden Shaw

And according to the public prints the Beethoven number played by "our" string quartet scored not only a musical but an overseasmanship triumph. They played not only to a crowded house but against the competition of some of the outstanding Brazilian stars of screen, stage, TV and radio. Very distinguished Brazilian amateurs, too, also braved the floodlights to help in the good cause. Ambassador Lincoln Gordon shone in another field on that night. He also established a reputation as a piano pusher. It seems that the Municipal Theatre piano on stage for the quartet number was not in the right place. Mr. Gordon instead of calling on the Marines or on the stage hands to move the grand piano helped to do the job himself. Fortunately for history and posterity a photographer caught the Ambassador in the act and the picture of an American Ambassador to Brazil pushing a piano

has appeared in Brazilian papers, depriving the communo-nationalist press of a new excuse to show how Americans in Brazil exploit labor.

This episode was in character. Among recent U.S. Ambassadors to Brazil Mr. Gordon is the one who has put on the least dog, suffers not at all from diplomatitis nor from a sense of his own importance. Just as a cigarette ever dangling from his lips became part of the personality of Oswaldo Aranha, once Brazil's Ambassador to Washington and one-time Foreign Minister, Ambassador Gordon and his pipe are inseparable companions and adjuncts of his personality which contribute to his popularity and success as a diplomat. The informality of his attire, the simplicity of his manner and the sincerity of his approach to people and problems, ever since his arrival last year, have more than compensated for his inexperience as a career diplomat and explain, in part, his acceptance by the VIPs of Brazil. He treats them like Harvard students and they eat it up.

Brazil Herald, Oct. 23.

The Thalidomide Story

By Arthur E. Rowse

"Who can exaggerate the importance of a single person speaking?"

These words, spoken recently on television by Archibald MacLeish, no doubt were intended to embrace things written as well as spoken. Their truth, as applied to the press, has never been more amply illustrated than during recent months.

History is spotted with examples of the tremendous power of the press. One can point to just one article in a tiny Texas weekly and its effect in blowing down Billie Sol Estes' multi-million-dollar house of cards. Or, on a broader scale, one might consider a more recent newspaper article about a certain little-known doctor and drug that caused a national furor.

Since the middle of July, the nation's communications media have been basking in the knowledge that they alerted the American public to the frightening menace of a seemingly harmless sleeping pill that has been blamed for horrible deformities in thousands of babies the world over. Widespread public attention to the thalidomide story undoubtedly has saved many mothers-to-be in this country from taking the suspected drug.

The impact on government has been equally great. Before July 15, the outlook for Congressional passage of an effective drug control law was extremely dim. A Senate committee had pulled almost all the teeth out of a bill submitted by Senator Estes Kefauver after a series of hearings dating back to 1957. Even the toothless bill was given little chance of survival. The cumulative effect of pharmaceutical industry pressure on the press and Congress was considered too great to change the status quo despite the considerable evidence of drug profiteering in the Kefauver hearings.

Then came the explosion. On July 15, the Washington *Post* printed a story by reporter Morton Mintz describing how Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, a medical officer in the Food and Drug Administration, had resisted persistent industry forces for more than a year in blocking the public sale of thalidomide in this country.

The dramatic account was flashed around the nation. The revelations were made even more stunning by the subsequent disclosure that while Dr. Kelsey was blocking public sale, more than 2.5 million tablets were being distributed to unsuspecting human guinea pigs by 1,267 doc-

tors. Through a loophole in the law, drug firms were allowed to offer new drugs to doctors for what is called "clinical investigation."

Reactions to the story were rapid. A frantic search of medicine cabinets gripped the nation. Further drama was added by Sherri Finkbine's trans-oceanic quest for an abortion to prevent the birth of what she feared might be a deformed child as a result of her use of thalidomide pills during early pregnancy.

President Kennedy, recognizing the sudden change in atmosphere, sent an urgent appeal to Congress requesting that such loopholes in the pending drug bill be plugged and the bill passed.

Senators were quick to comply. The diluted bill that had already been reported at the time of the President's request was restored almost exactly as he wished, and it sailed through the Senate by a vote of 78 to 0. A similar bill passed the House, 347 to 0. The measure signed by the President (Oct. 10) grants the FDA greatly expanded powers to regulate drugs.

Few stories in recent years have so decisively demonstrated the power of the press, once aroused, to change the course of events—in this case, thankfully, to the public benefit.

But the extensive coverage, coming after so much human damage had been done, also left some provocative questions. For one thing, could a more alert press have recognized the news any earlier and thus prevented some of the infant deformities still being attributed to the drug in this country?

Thalidomide first aroused suspicions of the medical world back in February, 1961. That was when Dr. Kelsey chanced to read a letter in a British medical journal suspecting the drug of causing nervous tingling sensations in some people. Thalidomide, under the trade name of Contergan, had been marketed in West Germany since 1957. It became known for an ability to relieve morning sickness in pregnancy and for being suicide-proof even in very large doses. Distribution soon spread to other countries.

One of the first articles about the drug in the general press appeared in the August 16, 1961, issue of the widely circulated German newsweekly, *Der Spiegel*. The full-page article described the drug's suspected nervous effects. By this time, Contergan had become the most popular sleeping pill in West Germany.

At the same time, an Australian gynecologist, Dr. W. G. McBride was beginning to raise the first suspicions that thalidomide had been the cause of an outbreak of baby deformities in Australia. He communicated his findings to the drug manufacturer, Chemie Grunenthal, in Germany, and to medical journals during 1961. But his letters to Grunenthal were rebuffed and his articles failed to cause a stir.

Arthur E. Rowse is on the Washington *Post*, and author of *Slanted News*, an analysis of the handling of the Nixon Fund story in the 1952 campaign by the 35 largest newspapers.

It was not until November that a more extensive survey of a much larger outbreak of phocomelia was linked to the drug in West Germany. Dr. Widukind Lenz, a Hamburg pediatrician, made a survey of mothers of deformed babies and reported that at least half of the women had used thalidomide in early pregnancy. Phocomelia, the Greek word for seal flippers, is the term used to describe the very rare phenomenon in which infants are born with stunted and distorted limbs on abnormally large bodies.

In the face of Lenz's evidence, the pill was immediately withdrawn from the market by the manufacturer, and the German Ministry of Health issued a warning about use of the drug by pregnant women. (Australia had become the first country to withdraw the drug earlier in November on the basis of McBride's findings.)

Immediately the issue became top news in European newspapers, magazines, radio and television. But for some reason, American mass media did not pick it up. At the time, few people knew that the drug was already being circulated in this country by the Wm. S. Merrell Company of Cincinnati and by persons who carried the drug back after buying it abroad. A routine check by a competent reporter could have turned up this information and provided the basis for a news story. About the only American reaction, however, came in the offices of the Merrell Company. The firm did not withdraw the drug, but it sent out letters to some of the doctors who had received the pill warning them against prescribing it for women known to be pregnant.

Last February, the controversy landed closer to home. On February 22, the day after a second warning letter from Merrell citing new research confirming earlier findings, the Canadian Department of Health and Welfare reported the situation publicly. This set off widespread reactions in the Canadian press. But still no news of the international sensation reached the readers, viewers and listeners of American mass media except in *Time* magazine. The issue of February 23 carried an article entitled "Sleeping Pill Nightmare." On March 30, the magazine made another reference to thalidomide and mentioned "a sharp-eyed woman doctor on the FDA staff" whom it did not name. Even *Time*, however, did not follow up its own lead on Dr. Kelsey's epic struggle. (Incidentally, it was not until March that Merrell withdrew the drug from sale in Canada and its application at the FDA.)

In reporting new drugs, American news media generally have been ecstatic in praise and exact in parroting publicity handouts. In controversial cases, the media traditionally have sided with the manufacturers. Senator Kefauver, whose persistent efforts toward stricter drug controls culminated in unanimous passage of the drug bill, has been a frequent target of the press.

Last December, for example, *Reader's Digest* reprinted

two articles from *Newsweek* strongly attacking his activities. To Raymond Moley, Kefauver's hearings on drugs, automobiles, bread, insurance and other consumer items were "a deplorable show" resulting in "sensational headlines." In a companion piece also reprinted, Henry Hazlitt criticized what he called the "political hostility to the drug business." These articles were garnished with a boxed editorial reprinted from the *Saturday Evening Post* opposing the proposed cut in the life of drug patents.

Testimony at Congressional hearings has described how puff pieces for new "miracle drugs" and other products are "planted" in the various media. Once planted, the weeds spread fast, with the help of all the lazy media that feed on clippings. When the weight of this propaganda is added to the genuine achievements of the drug industry and then echoed in the halls of Congress, the pressures on someone like Dr. Kelsey can become considerable. The forces of advertising and public relations often seem to have drugged the news distributors into unconsciousness in areas of the public domain where reportorial probes are needed the most. Incompetence and inertia also have been ingested in large doses by the press.

It makes one wonder how many other news stories of this kind are lying around right now waiting to be recognized.

It was left to another alert woman doctor to present the first full medical report on thalidomide in this country. This came on April 11 when Dr. Helen Taussig, a pediatrician at Johns Hopkins University, revealed results of a European research tour at the annual meeting of the American College of Physicians in Philadelphia. In describing the tragic developments in West Germany, where an estimated 7,000 babies have been or will be born with grotesque deformities, she warned that a similar outbreak could happen in this country under existing drug laws.

In her talk were elements of a good story of potentially great interest to Americans. Her speech was covered at length by the *New York Times* and a few of the papers taking the *Times* news service. The Associated Press also sent out a story, its first on the subject. But a random check of large papers across the country showed that few printed anything.

A high point was reached six weeks later, on May 24, when Dr. Taussig testified at an open meeting of the House Antitrust Subcommittee headed by Rep. Emanuel Celler. She showed color slides of deformed infants she had seen and revealed the existence of several cases in this country. She also reported that thalidomide pills were being distributed by doctors here.

Certainly by this time, thalidomide had become of major news significance, not only for what Dr. Taussig actually said but also for what a diligent reporter might have turned up with a little effort. Yet, according to one

committee staff member, there was no specific reference to this hearing by any general newspaper, magazine, radio or television outlet in this country for eleven weeks, long after the *Washington Post* broke the story about Dr. Kelsey.

The issue of *Science* magazine dated the next day carried an editorial by Dr. Taussig mentioning the role of Dr. Kelsey. And the June 30 issue of the *Journal* of the American Medical Association carried a long article by Dr. Taussig with photographs and a reference to Dr. Kelsey. Although both of these publications are closely watched by the mass media for story ideas, they apparently caused no stir with these articles. Nor had a brief reference to thalidomide in the May 5 issue of *American* magazine.

By early July, several large papers were known to be tracking down tips from high offices about a possible news story lying around the FDA. Mintz found that he was not the first reporter to have interviewed Dr. Kelsey on the subject. But no details of her long struggle reached print until his story in the *Post*. Mintz himself was acting on a tip received by another *Post* reporter who had covered some of the Kefauver drug hearings.

His story broke the dam. Saturation coverage soon made Dr. Kelsey and thalidomide household words. The thoroughness of coverage testified to the news value of the story. But it also posed further questions. For example, are the American news media so somnolent that they must be prodded before they recognize news? Are they too producer-oriented to be aware of the kind of information that American consumers want and need?

A subsidiary question is whether there is any way to improve the flow of scientific data among professional health authorities. According to Senator Hubert Humphrey, it was "by accident" that Dr. Kelsey saw the vital British article in time to block the otherwise automatic sale of thalidomide within the 60 days the FDA had in which to find reason to withhold its approval. Humphrey said she ought to have had such information "immediately available by IBM machine." The months of costly delays of some nations in banning the suspected drug after receipt of such damaging evidence—Japan did not ban it until May—shows not only a huge disparity in standards of public protection but also a simple lack of adequate information.

The thalidomide story showed both the failure and the power of proper communication of vital public information. For months, the most highly developed mass media in the world failed to recognize a sensational news story. Yet all it took to tell it, and completely reverse the course of plodding government and public health, was one good reporter.

Take A Forthright Stand

By Thomas M. Storke

I believe with deep sincerity that the responsibility for maintaining all of the freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assemblage and freedom of the press—rests on the shoulders of the men and women who ARE the press. I believe that the greatest threat to those freedoms lies in our failure to be true to our convictions—our failure to speak out when we see freedom jeopardized, even in what may seem to be a small way.

I have frequently read that newspapers have had to resist pressures, or have been threatened by some governmental action to curb their stand for freedoms. To me this is all sheer nonsense.

Let me make one point perfectly clear: During my 62 years as an editor, no one has ever questioned my right to stand up for justice or freedom whenever they were under attack, either directly or indirectly. No one has ever attempted to bring pressure against me, commercial or otherwise, in an effort to silence me on any issue. No governmental or legislative action has ever been a threat to the press so far as I could discern.

I believe that the greatest sin of the American press is the sin of omission rather than the sin of commission—the sin of refusing to take a stand on issues that might become too "hot" to handle.

There would be little reason for apprehension if all of our newspapers were as forthright and conscious of their responsibilities as the *New York Times*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Washington Post*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Louisville Courier-Journal*, *Milwaukee Journal*, *Los Angeles Times*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *San Francisco Examiner*, *McClatchy's Bees*, and some others. But too many newspapers, large and small, do not meet the standards of those newspapers, I regret to say. Too many newspapers do not speak out on the vital issues with clarity and conviction. . . .

There is nothing that should have seemed remarkable about my own clash with the leader of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch. I did only what any other newspaperman would or should do in the same circumstance. I took a close look at what the Birch Society was doing to

This is from the Elijah Lovejoy Convocation address at Colby College, November 8, given by **Thomas M. Storke**, editor and publisher of the *Santa Barbara News-Press*. Mr. Storke received the Pulitzer Prize for the most distinguished editorial of 1961.

my own community and I told my readers what I thought about it.

I saw a steady pattern of undercover attack against school officials, against churchmen, against governmental leaders, against university professors and administrators. With rising anger I read Robert Welch's charges of Communist conspiracy, directed against a former President and one whom I consider to be a great Chief Justice of the United States. I read such undiluted Welch poison as this, and I quote: "While I too think that Milton Eisenhower is a Communist, and has been for 30 years, this opinion is based largely on general circumstances of his conduct. But my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt. . . . There is only one word to describe his purposes and actions. That word is 'treason'."

After my newspaper—a relatively small newspaper of 35,000 circulation—disclosed in a dispassionate series of articles what was going on in our community, I spoke my editorial mind. My opening statement may have been more forceful and less eloquent than was called for, but it did give me a platform from which to direct my fire in the weeks to come. This is what I said:

"The editor and publisher of the *News-Press* is in his 85th year. His entire life has been spent in this community. His memory takes him back many years and his reading even further. He lived when conditions were rugged. When West was West and men were men. He lived during periods when if a man or a group of men openly by word of mouth, or the printed word, called our president, our vice president, our secretary of state, the president's brother, members of the Supreme Court, and others at the head of our government, traitors, they were made to answer. Such slanders often called for a visit from a courageous and irate group which brought with them a barrel of tar and a few feathers. . . . It is in the light of this background that the *News-Press* tells where it stands on the John Birch Society."

The results were amazing. An outpouring of support for my position came from the moderates in the community, both liberal and conservative—the people in the middle who are heard from too rarely. Community leaders who had been attacked stood up and fought back, realizing that the newspaper was behind them.

But most amazing—and in many instances distressing

—was the reaction around the country as word of my editorials spread. It was amazing to me that within a few weeks requests came for almost 20,000 reprints of my editorials.

It was distressing that among the hundreds of letters I received were many that read like this:

"The Birchers are moving into our community. Already they are making life miserable for our teachers and preachers. They are dividing our town. What can we do to combat their activities? We have appealed to our local newspaper, but it won't take a stand. It is helping the Birchers for its silence."

It is distressing that even now I can count on the fingers of both hands the number of major newspapers that have come to my attention that have taken a position on the Birch issue. I am not saying what position other newspapers should have taken. I am only saying that they should not have ducked the issue, sensitive though it may have been or may be today.

Whatever position newspapers choose to take on an issue, they MUST speak out if they are to continue to deserve the protection of the First Amendment to the Constitution. The greatest threat to freedom of the press lies within ourselves—the press. We are truly the custodians. Freedom can survive only if we newspapermen fulfill well the responsibilities the Founding Fathers had in mind when they singled us out for the protection of the First Amendment. Freedom can survive only if newspapers, first, inform their readers fully and fairly about the issues that affect their lives, and, second, take vigorous, honest stands on those issues. Both information and comment contribute to informed, lively discussion of issues—discussion which is an essential ingredient of the democratic decision-making process.

It matters, of course, which side of an issue a newspaper takes. But what matters more is that it take a stand—a firm editorial position which it proclaims clearly. From the clash of ideas and opinions on an issue, we can expect that human decency and democratic principles will prevail in the end. From silence and evasion we can expect only public confusion and apathy.

I do not mean, in all this, to exalt the editor's position unduly. I do not mean to suggest that even the best of editors cannot go wrong or do not go wrong on occasion.

But I do say this: The editor worth his salt will have conviction and a regard for human decency and he will be articulate about it.

Television Takes A Look at the Press

By John M. Harrison

Whatever conclusions one may draw from the state of things, the fact is that television today provides a major share of the assessment of press performance in the United States that is available to the public. For the last 18 months, WCBS-TV has been taking a weekly look at the New York City newspapers. St. Louis' KMOX-TV and Chicago's WBBM-TV have begun similar programs.

"WCBS-TV Views The Press" began with Charles Collingwood as critic-commentator. Ned Calmer took over in April, 1962. They have talked about almost every aspect of press performance. Predictably, they have largely been either ignored or excoriated by the newspapers.

Last February 16, the *Daily Mirror* observed of Collingwood, who was then still running the show, that he "... strives to impugn the integrity and objectivity of the American newspaper." These sentiments haven't yet been put in the form of a resolution by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, but in all probability they will be.

In fact, both Charles Collingwood and Ned Calmer appear to have worked hard at making this 15-minutes-once-a-week program (it is on the air Sunday afternoons from 4:45 to 5) as scrupulously impartial as possible. They have handed the New York newspapers large and sweet-smelling bouquets on many occasions—most recently on their coverage of the U.S. undertaking with respect to Cuba. They have defended newspapers and magazines against many of the stock charges of their critics—sometimes, it may be, with as much of an eye to defending the electronic media as the print media.

But even when they have been critical, both Calmer and Collingwood have been good-natured. Their barbs never are angry, or ponderous, or pontifical. One almost wishes they sometimes were more indignant, that they would demonstrate a measure of commitment instead of maintaining an habitually detached attitude.

WCBS-TV has chosen to confine its viewing to New York newspapers, with a rare venture into other areas. This is possible in New York—one of the few cities in which there remains a press spectrum broad enough to offer room to roam.

The program has managed to avoid the temptation to concentrate on deploring the antics of the New York tabloids. Both Collingwood and Calmer have seemed concerned not to single out particular newspapers as whip-

ping boys. And although they frequently and effectively have used the foibles of individual newspapers for illustrative purposes, they usually have sought to arrive at conclusions based on the performances of all New York newspapers rather than just one or two.

The *Herald Tribune's* lifted face, its interrogatory headlines, and its lets-break-it-down-to-the-bare-bones techniques quite properly have come in for a lot of attention. Whatever their merits, these changes have represented a major development on the New York press skyline in the last two years. They require analysis, and have received it from "WCBS-TV Views The Press."

Variety in subject matter has been a primary objective of the program. It has ranged over just about every kind of problem in press coverage. It has dealt with news developments—big stories and inconsequential ones. It has examined long-range problems—press treatment of the Kennedy Administration, for example. It has featured visiting dignitaries and members of CBS' overseas news staff to discourse on national press systems—not just the press in the United States, but in Brazil, Cuba, Indonesia, and many other places. One Sunday last September, Calmer even got around to reporting what journalism teachers were thinking about and talking about at their professional gathering. And he did a good job of analyzing that one, too.

These are intelligent and perceptive men who have been viewing the press for WCBS these past 18 months. They have an eye for the ludicrous and the venal in press performance. But they have, too, that warm and affectionate feeling for newspapers that is typical of the men who always have been the most effective critics of the press. They look on the failures and abuses they report from time to time with much more of sorrow than of anger.

Once in a while, in fact, they seem willing to swallow some of the old bromides that apologists for the press have been serving up for such a long time. One felt so when Mr. Collingwood, discussing the amazing press buildup of George Romney's candidacy in Michigan (Feb. 18, 1962), concluded that it "just happened." When he seems to give credence to the argument that "there's nobody here but us chickens, and we got here all by ourselves and without collusion," one wonders if he isn't being gulled by the American Association of Chicken Thieves. One wonders, too, if he—or Mr. Calmer—would apply the same bromidic conclusion to the seven-days-wonder buildup in the press

John M. Harrison teaches journalism at Penn State University. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1952.

of Bill Scranton in Pennsylvania—including the strategically timed cover story in the news magazine of which his brother-in-law just happens to be publisher.

Yet the occasions are few when either Collingwood or Calmer has seemed anything less than perceptively and honestly critical. Nor have they ducked the big ones. As major news stories have come along in the last year and a half, "WCBS-TV Views the Press" has had something to say about the way the New York press handled each of them. Their observations have been worthy of the attention of the men who edit the nation's newspapers.

On Feb. 25, 1962, of John Glenn's flight: "What the newspapers did extremely well was the kind of thing that they're uniquely equipped to do—to concentrate on all the facets of the story, to document it, background it, reflect upon it and put the whole thing into perspective."

On March 4, 1962, of the return to the United States of Francis Gary Powers: "While the *Herald Tribune* was leaving no innuendo unturned, other papers treated the Powers story in more objective fashion and were willing to wait for the official verdict."

On Oct. 28, 1962, of the Cuban action: "By and large, with some notable exceptions here and there, New York's papers did a superb job on the story right from the beginning. . . . Mostly there's been a praiseworthy lack of political partnership on the editorial pages."

Probably, however, both Charles Collingwood and Ned Calmer have been at their best when dealing with what might be described as lesser issues. Calmer, particularly, sometimes attains a low-key eloquence of understatement in his comment on the human condition that is genuinely moving.

Trenchant comment on developments within the press itself has been a regular feature. When Westbrook Pegler and the Hearst organization parted company, when John Denson took leave of the *Herald Tribune*, when there were important personnel changes at the *Post* and the *World Telegram and Sun*, "WCBS-TV Views The Press" had things to say about the why and how of it.

Here, then, is a weekly forum in which the performance of a representative group of American newspapers is being assessed by other newsmen—albeit newsmen associated with another medium. One may regret that it has been limited to the New York press. One may regret even more that it is not made available to television audiences in other parts of the country.

The story is that CBS believed such criticism should be locally based, and that it hoped other stations would rush in to follow the WCBS example. The response has been something less than a stampede. There are two, of which "KMOX-TV Views The Press" serves as an example. This program has been available to viewers in the St. Louis area for about the same time as the one in New York. It's a 15-minute program, offered every two weeks, with Steve Fentress as commentator. It has been described as ". . . our bi-weekly examination of the newspapers and periodicals most read by St. Louisians," with the concession that "since St. Louis journalism is not an island, we sometimes venture afield to talk about other papers, in other cities, and of trends which affect all newspaper journalism."

This was how Mr. Fentress paved the way, July 28, 1962, for discussing absorption of the Milwaukee *Sentinel* by the Milwaukee *Journal* and its implications with reference to Rep. Emanuel Celler's plans to investigate monopoly trends in U. S. newspapers. Actually, this discussion was brought back home to St. Louis and an analysis of the *Globe-Democrat's* personal campaign against a local political figure—all this by way of the possible involvement in the congressional investigation of Samuel Newhouse, owner of the *Globe-Democrat*.

But although "KMOX-TV Views The Press" tends heavily toward the local papers, and especially their treatment of local issues, Fentress has done a good job of investing his program with general interest. He is fortunate in having newspapers of the calibre of the *Post-Dispatch* and *Globe-Democrat* to discuss, and especially in the fact that these newspapers are articulate spokesmen for diverse political philosophies. In most American cities, there would be precious little to contrast much of the time.

It is this fact which makes one question CBS' original judgment that programs of this kind must originate locally, and that "WCBS-TV Views The Press" should be confined to a New York audience. What three stations are doing locally is better than nothing at all. But this doesn't preclude the possibility of a national program, or a group of regional ones, which would assay the performance of the press in various areas.

Yet television is to be commended for making this tentative start, which is more than anybody else associated with the business of informing the American people has done toward measuring the day-to-day performance of the press.

The Bigger The Better

Defense of the Expanding Sunday Paper

By William I. Nichols

Some viewers-with-alarm worry that the Sunday newspapers are now too big. They say that they are unwieldy, hard-to-handle, and filled with too much which does not fit the old concept of "hard news." Such thinking underlies much of the original promotion behind the *National Observer* and all the other talk about the need for stripped-down, capsulated national newspapers.

Frankly, I do not share this apprehension at all. The increased bulk of the Sunday newspaper is, I believe, natural and healthy. It is a unique social phenomenon and a glory of our times. For, in a sense, it holds a mirror up to the technical and cultural explosion now going on in every phase of national life. It shows us how the expanding forces of increased income, leisure and education have widened the range of people's interests and activities. And it is to meet this change that newspapers are adding—often through syndicated features or sections—many areas of subject matter once available only to limited and selected groups.

The fact is that this revolution which has expanded the newspapers has had its effect on the whole field of communications. If we understand this correctly, it helps to explain some of the turbulence which has been going on among magazines, newspapers, books and television.

The basic cause, of course, is to be found in the expanded interests and lifted horizons of millions of Americans. And here is a point which needs to be examined well. In one sense, it is true that we are moving toward a classless society. It is true that this is an age of mass production and mass consumption and mass communication. But I believe it is false to conclude from this that we are moving toward a world of standardization and uniformity. On the contrary, I believe that shorter work hours, bigger wages, higher education are *for the first time in all history*, making it possible for vast masses of mankind to emerge as individuals. Almost everyone now has the money and the time to enjoy pursuits that would have been beyond his means a short quarter century ago.

William I. Nichols is editor of *This Week*. This is part of a talk to the New York Chapter, Public Relations Society of America, Nov. 21. He says it was "provoked" by the article, "The Trouble with Sunday Papers," by William Hachten in *Nieman Reports* for April.

These changes in living habits have spread their effect over reading habits and listening habits and the entire field of mass communications. As individual interests multiply, we are seeing a trend toward the specialization, or "*splinterization*," of audiences for all media except the newspaper itself.

In periodicals, for example, the well-recognized trend is away from general magazines and toward "specialty magazines," which provide intensive coverage in individual fields of interest—hobbies and the like. Once there were dozens of general magazines, but now you can count them on the fingers of one hand. The inevitable result of this trend is that the total magazine audience has become "fragmented" among many periodicals.

And in television, a similar process of splinterization is also at work. It is bound to increase as stations multiply. Already in the big-city the average television viewer has 4.4 channels to choose from. And the fragmentation of audiences is bound to increase with the advent of pay TV and the further multiplication of stations. Congress has just ordered manufacturers to make sets which will tune in on everything, so there will soon be 82 channels available instead of the present twelve. From now on, many of the new high-frequency stations are certain to be geared to specialized and educational programs for selective audiences. Thus, a standard situation comedy will now have a hard time catching a trout fisherman when he knows that another more selective station further down the dial is running a series on fly casting.

* * * * *

The more this process of splinterization continues in other media, the greater are the chances for strategically-located and correctly-edited newspapers to emerge as the one dominant, universal, centralizing force which unites all the people and all their interests. The implications, both in terms of readership and advertising, are tremendous.

How can the newspaper meet this opportunity? It is my conviction that, from the very beginning of things, the ingredients of communication have been the same; and they are basic; and they are fourfold. In short, any medium of communication is supposed to communicate one or more of the following elements. They are: (1) *news*; (2) *entertainment*, (3) *service or instruction*; and (4) *inspiration*.

One of the current troubles of general magazines, I believe, is that they are losing their franchise in many of those areas, because this material is being supplied better, cheaper, more attractively by other media. This includes paperback books; it includes television; it includes specialty magazines; and, most important of all, it includes the Sunday newspaper.

At the same time that the general magazines are having diminishing influence in those four interest areas—the newspapers are having an *expanding* role. And the people who serve the newspapers least well, it seems to me, are the ones who concentrate on news to the exclusion of the other three values, and who imply that the newspaper is somehow straying from its path or failing in its duty, if it concerns itself with these other areas—the areas of fun and entertainment; of instruction and how-to-do-it; and the area of inspiration.

Recently I received a questionnaire from a professor of journalism in the Middle West who implied that somehow there was something wrong with the Sunday newspaper being so big, and having so many sections and all those ads. He seemed to be holding his nose at all those pages having to do with entertainment and service and escape or anything else besides “hard” news.

I also think much of the initial propaganda behind the *National Observer* made the same error—and it is significant that this approach has now been abandoned. It implied that bulk is bad; that ads are bad; and that special sections are bad. In the process I think they failed currently to understand the true function of the Sunday newspaper—which is to meet *all* the needs of all the people in the community, to pull all the splinterized groups back into one coherent whole, and to supply them with a complete, efficient, practical tool—in effect an encyclopedia for daily living.

And as part of the service function, let's never forget the ads. It is the greatest missing of all points to think of newspaper advertising as something which competes with, or intrudes on, or dilutes, the news. On the contrary, newspaper advertising *IS* news because it gives you the exact what and when and where and—most important of all—how much of everything that concerns your daily life.

Then, finally, there is the whole great field of *inspiration*. There was a time when the great national magazines were, above all else, a strong inspirational force throughout the land.

But now, inspiration is in danger of becoming a lost art. National magazines, in their headlong pursuit of readership, seem to have become self-conscious, or cynical, or sophisticated. And in the process I believe they have lost that strong, outflowing force of faith and leadership which

once united them so intimately with the American people.

Meanwhile, think of the newspapers. Nobody is closer to the people than they are. They cover the news of every church in town. They have never ceased to carry on their function of inspiration, through community leadership and editorial crusades.

* * * * *

Stated simply, my proposition is this: that the Sunday newspaper is not only not wrong, but right, to cover the whole waterfront, to try to be the guide to, the key to, the encyclopedia for modern living—in effect, to be an enormous bulletin board that gathers together the entire community once each week.

Not long ago I had a survey made of the newspapers that distribute *This Week*. The average paper consisted of 202 pages, divided among 11 separate sections. Big? Of course such a paper is big. But as to bigness, let me say it just once more—correctly edited, the bigger the better, the more useful, the more serviceable to everybody in town.

Critics of newspapers—chiefly our friends from over on the television side of the street—like to point to the present wave of newspaper consolidations as a sign of weakness. Actually I see it just the other way round. In cases where there has been a costly and uneconomic duplication of facilities, consolidation generally represents a straightening and a strengthening of lines, so that the newspaper can give more complete and comprehensive service in a modern sense, and on a more economical basis. The old competitive gambit of scoops and circulation bellicosities was fun while it lasted, but these have nothing to do with the realities of present-day communications. Thus, while other media have been growing more splinterized and more diffuse as to audience, the trend for newspapers, and especially Sunday newspapers, is to become more coherent, more predictable, more compact. All such developments only emphasize the newspapers' central role as an agency of public convenience and necessity.

* * * * *

As to future trends for the Sunday newspaper, I think they can best be summed up in two phrases: *more bigness* and *more order*. And as a footnote or supplement to that prediction, let me state that in years to come the layout man will be almost as important as the editor. For when the physical arrangement is correct, then readership is concentrated and intensified. Sunday newspapers are most apt to seem big and unwieldy if they are sloppily put together. Everything falls into place once the newspaper is so organized that its several functions are instantly apparent.

Two New Sunday Papers

A British and an American Experiment

By William A. Hachten

During a time of marked consolidation of newspapers in both countries, two new Sunday newspapers have recently appeared: in Britain, the *Sunday Telegraph* in 1961, and in America, the *National Observer* in 1962.

Shortly after three national British Sunday papers died, Viscount Camrose (William Michael Berry), whose family has published the *Daily Telegraph* since 1928, launched the first successful new Sunday paper in Britain in 42 years.

The Dow Jones Co., publishers of the highly successful *Wall Street Journal*, started America's first truly national Sunday paper a year later.

Differences between Sunday journalism in Britain and the United States are quite distinct, but a comparison of these two somewhat similar publications is interesting because the American paper is patterned after the better British Sunday papers, while the British paper has copied features of the typical American Sunday papers.

Berry's *Sunday Telegraph* has already established itself as both a critical and a commercial success. With its circulation after one year at about 700,000 weekly, the *Sunday Telegraph* has generally been conceded to be a worthwhile addition to Britain's eight national Sunday papers. Brian Inglis, editor of the British *Spectator*, has said, "The *Sunday Telegraph*, beyond doubt, was the paper of the year in 1961."

Dow Jones' *National Observer* cannot as yet, however, be considered a success. So far, the critics have been cool, the advertisers somewhat reluctant, and circulation seems to be stabilized now at about 200,000. There are 60 U.S. Sunday newspapers with over 200,000 circulation.

Each paper was designed to "fill a gap." The *Sunday Telegraph* was intended to appeal to readers not quite up to the intellectually demanding standards of the *Sunday Times* or the *Observer*, but who wished for more solid fare than was offered in the popular *Sunday Express* or its four more low-brow competitors.

The *National Observer* also was designed to fill a gap: to offer a well-written compact Sunday paper of general interest and with high editorial quality to the American reader who is not content with plowing through several

pounds of advertising and trivial editorial content every Sunday morning.

The paper has sought to offer an alternative to the bulky U.S. metropolitan Sunday papers, which can weigh up to five pounds. In its first issue of Feb. 4, 1962, the *National Observer* commented editorially: "The problem of most readers is to find their way through the sheer bulk. And we believe that a weekly national newspaper can help those who are interested in the world around them to see it whole and understand it better. The *National Observer* hopes to do this by virtue of the fact that it is a newspaper and not a magazine, a weekly and not a daily, that it is national and not local."

The models for the *National Observer* were without doubt the intellectual British national Sunday papers—the *Sunday Times* and the *Observer*. (Even its name, which was purchased from a Minneapolis, Minn., journal on Masonry, is indicative of this.) A frequent criticism of the early issues of the *National Observer* has been that it has fallen short of the intellectually demanding standards set by the two British papers.

Launched in February, 1962, with a good deal of publicity and promotion (including certificates for charter subscribers), the *National Observer's* circulation after six months totalled some 198,000 mail subscribers and 60,000 sold through newsstands and home delivery, but has since leveled off.

If the *National Observer* has tried to emulate the quality of British Sundays, then the *Sunday Telegraph* has sought to include a U.S. press characteristic: an ample amount of fresh news from Saturday in the Sunday paper. The basic idea was that Saturday was not a poor news day at all, but only made so by Fleet Street's stunt-minded Sunday press.

Before publication began, the *Sunday Telegraph's* editor, Donald McLachlan, visited American Sunday newspapers and said later, "We will concentrate on the news approach in everything." Berry himself had said, "Sunday papers have become all views and no news." His paper has gone about changing that situation.

So, the interesting contrast between the papers became this: The *National Observer* tried to make of a Sunday newspaper a true weekly with a serious in-depth presentation of the week's significant news events and thus to move away from the tendency of most U.S. Sunday papers to present a news section featuring Saturday's news wrapped

William A. Hachten is assistant professor of journalism at the University of Wisconsin. *Nieman Reports* for April 1962 published his "The Trouble with Sunday Papers." (See rejoinder by William I. Nichols in this issue.)

around a bundle of magazines and feature sections. The *Sunday Telegraph*, on the other hand, has tried to infuse hard and fast-breaking news into British Sunday journalism which has long been noted for its lack of solid news.

Differences in Formula

The *Sunday Telegraph* has been the more successful, but then it is the less unusual of the two papers in approach. Its slogan has been, "The *Sunday Telegraph* fills the gap," and its promotional material envisioned the paper as "Neither weightier than you wanted nor more frivolous than you fancied."

After its first year, the *Sunday Telegraph*, with 700,000 circulation, still trailed Roy Thomson's *Sunday Times* (circ. 994,459), and Lord Beaverbrook's *Sunday Express* (circ. 3,566,400), but was on the heels of the *Observer* (circ. almost 750,000) and well past the trial stage.

As *Newsweek* wrote, "Picking his way between the *Sunday Times*' stress on interpretation and the *Express*'s stress on sensation, Berry concentrated on a bright blend of hard news delivered in crisp informative stories and solid features, especially in the women's and sports departments." In format and content, though, the *Sunday Telegraph* does not represent a basically new approach to Sunday journalism in Britain.

But this is not to underestimate Berry's accomplishment. For a new, high quality national Sunday paper has been established during the same 12-month period in which three national Sunday papers (*Empire News*, circ.: 2,084,397; *Sunday Dispatch*, circ.: 1,485,236; and *Sunday Graphic*, circ.: 877,788) all ceased publication.

The *National Observer* has made a significantly smaller impact on U.S. Sunday journalism, but then it was assigned a much more difficult task. Unlike its British cousin, the *National Observer* demands of its readers a change of reading habits. It lacks the immediacy and local news impact of a typical U.S. Sunday paper, and, moreover, its specialized news content lacks the variety, range and departmentalization of the "back of the book" sections of the U.S. news magazines, *Time* and *Newsweek*, with which it is probably in more direct competition than with metropolitan Sunday papers.

By scattering a variety of miscellaneous, special interest stories through the paper, it makes unusual demands of its readers. The *National Observer* does an excellent job of summarizing and re-telling in a penetrating and interpretive way the six or eight major stories of the previous week. But after that, what is included or excluded seems almost a matter of chance. Too many feature news stories lack the usual news pegs or tie-ins that news magazine readers have come to expect. Many stories seem to be obvious and rather pedestrian "rewrites" of stories that appeared earlier in the week in daily papers.

Despite the obvious differences between U.S. and British Sunday journalism, these two new Sunday journals have some things in common.

Appearance—The *National Observer* has been running in 1962 about 16 pages an issue and the *Sunday Telegraph* about 24 pages. However, since the *Telegraph* carries considerably more advertising, both carry about the same amount of editorial content.

Although the *National Observer* uses six wide columns and the *Telegraph* the usual eight, both favor conservative and traditional makeup and typography.

Staff's Relations to Daily—Each paper is produced by a staff which is essentially separate from its allied daily newspaper staff.

Berry himself is the principal link between the two *Telegraphs*. On Saturdays, he concentrates on the Sunday paper and reads all the major copy and makes suggestions. The *Sunday Telegraph* is built around a nucleus of 80 writers, reporters, editors, and correspondents, supplemented on Saturdays by some 60 extras, some from the *Daily Telegraph*. Unlike its competitors, the *Observer* and the *Sunday Times*, which have no daily affiliations, the *Sunday Telegraph* can call upon the resources of its daily counterpart.

The *National Observer* is unique among U.S. Sunday papers in having a completely self-contained staff. (The *New York Times* has a large number of persons who work only on the Sunday edition, but it still relies heavily on the daily *Times*' staff.) However, some ties to the *Wall Street Journal* are implied, if not obvious. Editor William Giles worked 11 years for the *WSJ*, as did the managing editor, Don Carter. Beginning with an editorial staff of 29, mostly rewrite men, it has its headquarters in Washington, D. C., away from the main *WSJ* offices. Until it can muster its own reportorial staff, the *National Observer* has relied on some 40 part-time correspondents and free lancers. Occasionally, however, a by-line or contribution from a *Wall Street Journal* staff member has appeared in the paper.

Here, then, is another interesting contrast: the *Telegraph* consciously trying to incorporate resources of daily journalism into its Sunday product and the *National Observer* just as consciously trying to avoid using the extensive daily facilities of its parent publication.

Production and Distribution—Both Sundays enjoy important production advantages. The *Sunday Telegraph*, despite its separate editorial staff, uses the *Daily Telegraph*'s presses and production facilities and makes use of such non-journalistic personnel as accounting, maintenance and telephone operation. Since the *Sunday Telegraph* is one of eight national Sundays, the methods of distribution throughout the British Isles are well established.

The *National Observer* entered the new field of national Sunday papers with the best production facilities available

for such an effort. The seven plants which print the *Wall Street Journal's* four regional editions are scattered around the United States and, being idle on Saturdays, are made to order to produce nine national Sunday papers. So far, the *National Observer* has only been printed at three plants: in Chicago, Chicopee Falls, Mass., and Washington, D. C.

Distribution, however, has so far apparently been the *National Observer's* toughest problem. The *Wall Street Journal* uses the mail to deliver its paper the same day it is produced. But with no Sunday mail delivery, it has been impossible to put many *National Observers* into the hands of readers on Sunday morning, considered the best time to read a Sunday paper. So, in July, 1962, the *National Observer* switched from a "Sunday" to a "Monday" dateline. For most readers, it's not seen until Monday—a factor that certainly inhibits its image as a national Sunday paper.

Differences in Content

Here are some comparisons of the editorial content of the two papers:

Reviews—The *Sunday Telegraph* gives more thorough and intellectual coverage to reviewing the arts. A dozen or more able reviews of current books are provided as contrasted with the *National Observer's* article or two which comments on four or five books.

The same can be said about the performing arts, although the *Telegraph* has the advantage of covering a more centralized and homogeneous cultural area.

Sports—The *Sunday Telegraph* thoroughly covers sports—devoting at least four full pages to complete results while the *National Observer* devotes an article or two to some

unusual or interesting sports feature. Further, the U.S. paper also has the disconcerting habit of scattering small sports items through the whole paper.

Financial News—Both papers give one page to excellent coverage of financial and economic news. This seems to be one of the most solid pages in the *National Observer*, not surprising considering its relationship to the *Wall Street Journal*.

Features in Series—The one obvious concession to popular tastes in the *Sunday Telegraph* is the continued series on the famous and infamous which are a staple of the British reading public on Sundays. The *National Observer* runs no continued stories and, in its features, avoids the sensational and the trashy. It maintains an essentially respectable middle-class appeal which probably the intellectuals find inadequate, as do the semi-literates who see a Sunday paper as primarily entertainment.

Conclusion

It is dangerous, of course, to carry comparisons of this kind too far. It is not fair or reasonable to say that the *Sunday Telegraph* has been the more successful paper so far because it has done thus and so and the *National Observer* has not. Each new paper operates under vastly different conditions of journalistic and economic competition.

Both are important and serious new efforts to provide diversity in the progressively restricting and standardized field of Sunday journalism. For that reason alone, these new Sunday journals are greatly welcomed in both nations and journalists on both sides of the Atlantic will watch their progress.

On Writing *THE GREAT PRICE CONSPIRACY*

By John Herling

When I first began to think about writing this book on corporate corruption, I thought of it largely as a record of shock reactions. It astonished me, as it did so many others who read the newspapers and magazines, that men of corporate distinction could suddenly turn out to be self-confessed criminals.

Actually, this is an old theme—this notion that men of great repute have feet of clay, and that the husbands of Rosie O'Grady and the Colonel's lady are brothers under the skin. We have a whole crop of illustrative business novels—a genre which perhaps began in the United States with William Dean Howells, Theodore Dreiser and Frank Norris, and has been represented recently by Cameron Hawley's *Executive Suite* and a whole group of novels which depict the in-fighting for power and prestige among the business Olympians.

But it was not too long before I discovered, in my researches, that the story of skulduggery involved in the price-fixing, bid-rigging activities of the electrical industry, with all of its clandestine activities, also was accompanied by the harsher story of a struggle for survival among men who wield power inside some of America's greatest corporations.

So we have developed here a narrative in which I found I could be as frank and uninhibited as a writer of fiction and as meticulous as an honest journalist must try to be. In fact, the more nearly we could stick to the facts of these electrical conspiracies, the more incredible became this story of men and corporations who manipulate sections of our economy for their profit and at the expense of the consumers—hundreds of communities and their millions of taxpayers. At any rate, it was quite clear that the truth was good enough—or bad enough—and required no exaggeration in order to make an effective story.

What caught me—and what I hope catches the reader—was that the specific events brought together in this chronicle of a conspiracy possess components of a universal quality. There is factual truth and symbolic truth, and *The Great Price Conspiracy*—that is, the book—is, I think, powered by both.

I don't know whether factual or symbolic truth is a hot literary property, but so far as this writer is concerned they set him in motion in February, 1962, and gave him little rest until the book was finished.

The story is made up of several elements. First, it is a

chronicle of men in high places who pleaded guilty and were sent to jail. Only seven men actually went to jail, but what has been generally lost sight of was that though thirty top officials of the leading electrical manufacturing companies were sentenced to prison terms, the sentences of twenty-three top officials were suspended—and they were just as guilty as those who spent time behind bars. They, in effect, represented a sampling of many others—of higher and lesser degree—who were also heavily involved. Here we have the grim irony of life in a highly organized society. One is tempted to say simply, "the higher they are, the harder they fall." But that is only partially true, because the biggest of them did not fall at all. Many top executives managed to make their way across of bridge of bodies—bodies of organization men—to a position of comparative safety.

As I traveled about the country and read and researched and interviewed, the drama—the melodrama—of these conspiracies came to represent only a part of the picture. How had this great price conspiracy—the greatest in the history of the Department of Justice—come to be unearthed? The conspiring corporations and their investors were the key point. But the Department of Justice furnished the counterpoint. And when we talk about the Justice Department, we must talk about the men—young and of middle years—who, over a considerable stretch of time, had dedicated themselves to carrying out their responsibilities in the service of the people.

Therefore, we not only behold here a duel between the conspiring corporations and a government, but find ourselves spectators at a tremendous psychological struggle—a clash of wills and minds between the lawyers for the government and the lawyers representing the huge corporate power—the latter firms a sort of profane priesthood of corporate ideology. More often than not, the lawyers for the conspiring corporations sought to overawe the government lawyers by the sheer impact of corporate presence. The corporate fallout over Washington was sometimes terrific. Strong nerves and implacable diligence were required to withstand the shifts from threats to promises to lofty disdain. But despite the show of corporate affluence, the men in the Department of Justice held on.

This was quite a heroic role the lawyers in the Department of Justice had to play. After all, they were bucking a trend. You must remember they were functioning under an Administration whose overall public policy was not, of course, to condone skulduggery, but was certainly geared to

John Herling, Washington columnist, published *The Great Price Conspiracy* early in 1962.

genial conformity. In this book, therefore, we have not only the revelation of economic criminality, but we have a cluster of heroes, who pulled the curtains aside to reveal the backstage reality. They were led by Robert A. Bicks, acting Assistant Attorney General in 1959 and 1960. The story of how Bicks refused to back down on an intensive enforcement of the antitrust laws; how, as a result, his appointment as Assistant Attorney General was held up by the largest corporate influences in the country operating through senatorial mouthpieces—and how, finally, Bicks failed to win senatorial confirmation—is both a sad and a heartwarming story. Bicks' disappointment has become an honorable wound which I am confident will not affect his career. Besides, the bleeding was all internal. Bicks had antagonized certain sectors of the business community because of his articulate and aggressive antitrust activity. His refusal to let up, even in the Presidential campaign of 1960, actually embarrassed the Republican Party, since some of its heaviest contributors were under the antitrust guns. Though Bicks never was confirmed by the Senate, he managed to go on "acting" as Assistant Attorney General, until the end of the Eisenhower Administration. He is now engaged in the private practice of law.

The momentum of the electrical conspiracy cases carried over into the Kennedy Administration. The activity of the antitrust division was well and vigorously launched and the determination has been sustained under Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger and Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

When Bob Bicks first began his push against the electrical manufacturing companies, some of his fellow Republicans gazed at him with a look of wild surprise—as if to say, "You're out of your mind, boy." And then, when gentle chiding failed, they began to say "Bicks can't get along with people."

But as Justice Department's search for evidence went on, and as the slow build-up of documents and evidence continued, there finally came into Bicks' hand a little slip of paper on which one of the conspirators had written down his instructions for clandestine behavior. "Use first names only; use plain envelopes; use coin box telephones; empty wastepaper baskets in your hotel rooms" and so on—all the matter-of-fact devices which reduced the conspiracies to a series of sordid, furtive, business-like details. When Bicks brought this item of evidence triumphantly to Attorney General William P. Rogers, the latter knew he had a conversation piece. When the slip was passed around among

the Cabinet members and then shown to President Eisenhower, the latter finally spoke. "Why," he said, as the truth dawned on him, "the only thing those fellows didn't say was 'Don't take notes.'"

In my book I have tried to bring alive the characters of the executives who were caught in the bind of this conspiracy. They were, in effect, made to take the rap for a whole network of conspirators. And yet, in taking the rap, the conspirators sought to make it appear that they were not wearing hair shirts. For an interlude, to be sure, these corporate executives suddenly became uncharacteristically introverted and even contrite. For the first time in their adult lives they had no organization to nurse at. They were rejected. The humiliation of exposure—the shame of getting caught—seemed to dominate their attitudes, rather than shame for the commission of the deed they were caught perpetrating. Some of the conspirators—men I talked to—were furious at themselves for getting trapped. Despite their corporate sophistication, they appeared naked and naive and failures. After an interval, they began to fight their way back to corporate respectability. They carefully curbed their anger at the corporations they left behind them. This was especially true in the case of General Electric, which threw general managers and vice presidents onto the street like bodies pushed out of houses in the great London plague. Most of these men knew that they would have to live in the same business world with the corporations and the executives who had judged them expendable. They knew if they talked too much they might find their chances for new careers withering in the pervasive revenge of nervous chief executives who had managed to remain disengaged from criminal penalties. I talked to some of the men while their tears were still fairly hot, and they were still suffering in their moment of truth.

Throughout the story of the conspiracies, there runs the theme of devalued ethics in a corporate society. We see the effort on the part of corporate public relations to perpetrate the big lie that it was the individual men who were immoral and not the corporations; that corporate ethics remained intact. Aside from the tangible damages—the losses in dollars and cents suffered by the companies and communities which were cheated through the electrical conspiracies (and nearly two thousand damage suits have been filed throughout the country)—the fact is that these pervasive conspiracies present us with the clear evidence that the "corporate image" has been maintained by the greatest cosmetic and preservative job since the mummification processes of ancient Egypt.

Hagerty, Nixon and Hiss

A riddle of November was to find James Hagerty standing staunchly against the top brass of the GOP and the big advertisers, in defense of the farthest reach of freedom of utterance, while the press officers of the New Frontier were stuttering their justifications of the Administration's awkward attempts to control the news. One can forgive, I think, nearly all the lapses of the Administration in the Cuban crisis on the ground of dire urgency. What shouldn't be accepted is the attempt of government news men to justify this with a new-found rationale, which offers no assurance that the lapses may not become the precedent for permanent policy. They have discovered a philosophy to fit the crime.

The concurrent controversies over the Nixon-Hiss broadcast and the Cuban crisis news quarantine took on a special piquancy from the figures involved. The conclusion is almost inescapable that Jim Hagerty's reversion to the fullest journalistic freedom is a reaction to working under wraps so long, when he encountered, and often had to resist, the natural instincts of his former press colleagues. It is more of a puzzle to find the very recent free journalists in the Administration now applying themselves to develop a logic for management of the news.

Of course nobody in government ever admits to management of the news; equally every Administration inevitably attempts it. It is harder to understand the extreme sensitivity, that approaches timidity, of this most modern and sophisticated Administration. It has had intimate experience and extraordinarily personal relations with journalism. The press on the whole has been more understanding, less captious in reporting and appraising it than in the days of Roosevelt or Hoover or Truman.

All these had their inevitable press difficulties and estrangement. Hoover ended no happier with a topheavily Republican press than Roosevelt, and even Harry Truman could never understand why criticism should not stop short of any Presidential relationship.

The rugged efficiency of Jim Hagerty in the cause of Eisenhower and his whole regime (Nixon included) put to shame the motivational experts of professional persuasion. But now, a free man again, he, even more than those who remained free, recognizes that such a hubbub as the Nixon-Hiss broadcast set off is the very manifestation and strength of an open society.

Surely no one in authority over news ever was under greater internal pressure to use it. All his old associates were pressing, culminating in a telephone call from his old Presidential boss. The contract-breaking telegrams from big advertisers, the howls of veteran organizations, the complaints to the FCC, could have been anticipated. It would be fascinating to know what conversations, if any,

occurred between Hagerty and Howard Smith. One recalls the appeal of Helen Reid of the *Herald Tribune* to Dorothy Thompson, when the *Trib's* prized columnist committed her first criticism of Hoover in the 1932 campaign: "But Dorothy, you'll lose all your friends."

Howard Smith has been fortunate in his associates and backers. He had a unique contract, and one of the first, after the broadcast, to support him was his sponsor, Murray Lincoln, president of Nationwide Insurance Company. Lincoln endorsed again, as he had before, the complete freedom the contract gave the broadcaster. He accepted its expressed ban on any interference with program content by the sponsor. He had not seen eye to eye with Howard Smith on the Nixon-Hiss program, but he wouldn't reduce an iota the broadcaster's full freedom. Lincoln instead turned his criticism on those who protested the program without seeing it, and especially those stations that banned it in the face of protest without knowing what was in it. I did not find anywhere in those newspapers that I see daily any mention of Murray Lincoln's strong statement, though the Associated Press made it available for the morning papers of November 14. But they all carried the contract-breaking efforts of two big advertisers who had no sponsorship relation to that program, one of them a former treasurer of the Republican National Committee, the other a sponsor only of the kind of entertainment programs that could not possibly ever cost him the criticism of a single customer.

Not only did ABC stand firmly with Smith, but Richard Salant, news director of CBS, the network that Smith left because it would not give him enough freedom, supported him.

Mr. Salant said he was "distressed at the pre-broadcast efforts to suppress any part of the Howard K. Smith broadcast and at the post-broadcast efforts by advertisers and others to punish ABC."

LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, supported the broadcast as "within the range of sound journalism." And Newton Minow, FCC chairman, sharply asked Walter Annenberg to "comment" on the action of his Philadelphia and New Haven stations in deleting from a news report the fact that they had suppressed the Smith program. Public response too must have balanced in Smith's favor. For the Taft station in Columbus, after suppressing the program Sunday night, ran it Wednesday night, having received hundreds of protests of the suppression, and reported that, after showing the program, their protests fell off sharply and were about evenly balanced between those denouncing and those applauding its showing.

To present Hiss as a critic of Nixon was Howard Smith's first full test of the absolute freedom his unique contract had given him. He obviously strained it to the limit and must

have strained with it his relations to ABC, and the chance that the freedom of broadcasting of such a contract will become prevalent.

Without abating one's admiration of Mr. Smith's forthrightness, and even while applauding his blunt candor in appraising the career of Richard Nixon, one may question his judgment or taste in presenting Alger Hiss in this context. It was irrelevant. Jerry Voorhis soundly enough protested that he was the victim of the broadcast. Bracketing him with Alger Hiss as critics of Nixon left Jerry Voorhis in the same association that Richard Nixon had tried to show him in that bygone smear campaign. Howard Smith properly included Nixon's role in the Hiss case as the springboard to Nixon's political rise. But history was visually served by the scene of Hiss, Chambers and Nixon before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1948. It needed no current comment by Hiss. Smith narrated it himself.

An occasion might arise when it would be sound journalism to present Alger Hiss, and the capacity of a Howard Smith to meet such an issue would become vital. But this was not the occasion. Indeed nothing since the death of Whittaker Chambers has suggested the possibility that the Alger Hiss case might become an American Dreyfus case, although as much time has now elapsed since the first Hiss trial as the whole era of the Dreyfus case, from conviction to exoneration. Nor did anything on the program suggest that Howard Smith had remotely in mind the resurrection of the Hiss case. When Hiss insisted on a chance to declare his innocence on the program, he was told they were not interested in that. The Hiss case had been no factor in the election that saw Mr. Nixon defeated in California, nor had anyone brought it up in any other current context.

Alger Hiss' performance on that post-election program was unnecessary, and to the cynical could be accounted for only by that instinct for the sensational which is so inherent in the reporter's trade. Only the rare reporter who has always resisted it can point a finger at Howard Smith. But it will be a lamentable result if it prevents other such contracts as that which has given Howard Smith the independence that responsible and competent broadcasters should have.

(The contract entered into by the sponsor of Howard Smith's program explicitly stated "it is the independence of mind of Howard K. Smith" that they desired to have portrayed, and "the client will not, for itself or by the network, countenance any interference in the program that could be deemed an attempt to compromise that independence of mind and spirit.")

For the other half of the riddle, quite evidently none of the press officers who divide communications on the New

Frontier, nor all of them together, approach the authority Jim Hagerty was able to assume in a communications vacuum in his administration. Their role is more that of the professional football quarterbacks. You can almost see the plays sent in from the bench. What is left to them is to be responsible for the fumble.

Arthur Sylvester's fumble in covering for the Defense Department was not so costly from the loss on the play as from the philosophy he tried to erect on it: "The generation of news by actions of the government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. . . . The results justify the methods we use."

Many had been able to forgive the Administration for withholding, evading, even equivocating, on information, under the urgency of the crisis. But Sylvester voiced a policy that violates the whole concept of a free press in an open society. Robert Manning did not repeat this offense when he was confronted with a protest of the State Department reporters over a new rule that officials must either have a public affairs officer present in any talk with a reporter or turn in a detailed report of everything said and to whom. Manning said rather that the order was misunderstood, that it would "enhance the availability of information," and enable him to "learn where the gaps are" in information. This could hardly have convinced reporters, but it showed he had not lost all sense of the relation between a free press and a democratic government. [On Nov. 27 Manning rescinded his order. See under "Nieman Notes."]

LOUIS M. LYONS

Hagerty: Quotes

Any individual, any group, any company has the right to agree or disagree with anything that is presented on the air or printed in the press.

But pressure in advance to force cancellation of a program and pressure after it by economic means to punish or intimidate is another matter. It threatens not only the very existence of freedom of the press, but enterprise itself. It must be resisted.

To yield to prior censorship and the pressures of personal attack and economic boycott is to surrender the basic right of freedom of the press. This right we will never surrender—or compromise. To do so would be to betray our responsibility as a news medium.

If we are weakened, you are weakened, for if through fear or intimidation we fail to provide all the news—good or bad, favorable or unfavorable—then you, the citizens of the nation, cannot be properly informed.

—ABC Broadcast, Nov. 18.

Broadcast Conscience

(speech by Gov. LeRoy Collins, president, National Association of Broadcasters, Nov. 19.)

"It is my personal view that our codes should be much more than sets of legalistic standards and delineations of good taste and estimated public tolerance. I think the codes should serve as a broadcast conscience as well. Under them and to them, the individual broadcaster and all related enterprises should be able to look for, and find, ethical and moral leadership.

"For example, if we are honest with ourselves, we cannot ignore the mounting evidence that tobacco provides a serious hazard to health. Can we either in good conscience ignore the fact that progressively more and more of our high-school-age (and lower) children are now becom-

ing habitual cigarette smokers? The most recent statistics I have seen point out that 20 per cent of boys have started smoking in the ninth grade and also 30 per cent of all girls smoke before they are graduated from high school. We also know that this condition is being made continually worse under the promotional impact of advertising designed primarily to influence young people.

"Certainly the moral responsibility rests first on the tobacco manufacturer. Certainly it also rests on the advertising agencies. Certainly it also rests on the outstanding sports figures who permit their hero status to be prostituted.

"It is also true that broadcasting and other advertising media cannot be expected to sit in judgment and vouch for the propriety of all advertising presented to the public over their facilities.

"But when others persistently fail to subordinate the profit motive to the higher purpose of the general good health of our young people, then I think the broadcaster should make corrective moves on his own. This we could do under code amendments, and I feel that we should proceed to do so, not because we are required to, but because a sense of moral responsibility demands it."

Reaction

Collins in Center of Rising Controversy

By Jack Gould

The future of LeRoy Collins as president of the National Association of Broadcasters is the subject of rising controversy following his outspoken disapproval of tobacco advertising designed to encourage young people to smoke cigarettes.

Mr. Collins, whose contract as head of the trade organization is scheduled to be renegotiated late next month, has told friends that he cannot foresee the outcome of the intra-industry split over his recommendation that cigarette commercials be brought within the purview of the N.A.B. code of good practices.

The fuse that has ignited one of the most widespread and sensitive disputes ever experienced by the broadcasting family was a speech delivered by Mr. Collins on Nov. 19 in Portland, Ore.

The remarks of Mr. Collins have hit the broadcasting industry with unusual force because of the importance of tobacco advertising to the television medium.

According to *Television Magazine*, the gross revenue derived by TV in 1961 from

cigarette concerns amounted to \$104,254,325.

The radio medium earned in the same year approximately \$30,000,000 from the tobacco industry, putting the total for radio and TV at more than \$134,000,000.

The Tobacco Institute charged that Mr. Collins had taken a position on the cigarette controversy without sufficient supporting scientific evidence. And it denied that cigarette advertising was primarily directed to the young.

The networks and many independent stations were incensed over the precipitation of further controversy over smoking and lung cancer by a major figure within the broadcasting industry.

Mr. Collins confirmed in Washington yesterday that his office had been deluged with letters and telegrams of protests but noted that he also had received many expressions of support. He made clear that he had no intention of retreating from his position and specifically addressed himself to the core of the industry debate over the dimension of his authority.

Many broadcasters were disturbed because Mr. Collins had made his speech without formally consulting the board of directors of the N.A.B., which traditionally has fixed association policy.

Mr. Collins, the former Governor of

Florida who first won national public attention as the permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention in 1960, said that he felt that the president of the broadcasting organization should be accorded wide latitude in expressing personal views.

Without such an opportunity to furnish leadership, Mr. Collins noted, he "wouldn't be interested in the job."

It is believed possible that Mr. Collins will champion the idea of dissociating cigarette commercials from such themes as sports heroics and youthful romances.

One reason for the uneasiness in the ranks of broadcasters and advertisers is the precedent already established in British commercial TV. Cigarette commercials are barred from the air until 9 P.M. In this country nearly 60 per cent of the tobacco advertising on the air comes before that time.

Mr. Collins's independence of mind has not sat well with some broadcasters ever since he assumed office in January, 1961, but several privately conceded yesterday that the tobacco controversy might be a major factor in keeping him in office. One broadcaster observed: "The Governor has us over a public relations barrel. How can you seem to be against schoolchildren?" —New York Times, Nov. 28.

The Way It Was

MEMOIRS OF A MAVERICK PUBLISHER. By J. David Stern. Simon and Schuster. N. Y. 320 pp. \$5.

J. David Stern was one of the last of the oldstyle political publishers—one of that breed which went into competitive situations with the intent of providing a political point of view.

Mr. Stern did not buy a newspaper in Philadelphia, for example, just because he wanted to publish a newspaper there. He wanted to publish a *Democratic* newspaper in a town that would not otherwise have had one. One concludes from his autobiography that he was not simply an idealist or an ideologue. It was rather that the political point of view was part of the product he put on the market.

He published papers in New Brunswick, New Jersey, and Springfield, Illinois, before settling down, in 1919, in Camden, New Jersey, there to become a somewhat regretful monopolist. From Camden, he expanded to take over the *Record* in Philadelphia and the *New York Post*.

The *Post* was bought in 1933 and sold in 1939. Mr. Stern had had his doubts about its prospects but he was sold on the purchase by an associate who, as Mr. Stern puts it, "painted the picture of a knight in shining armor, fighting for the New Deal, planting his standard on the pinnacle, New York."

Before they sold it, Mr. Stern tells us, he and his associates had shelled out \$4,500,000 to keep the *Post* going.

The *Record*, acquired in 1928, was sold to the opposition *Bulletin* in 1947, during a strike by the Guild. The Camden papers, which also were struck, went, too; they were part of the deal. Mr. Stern took the strike hard. He reports that he had been the first publisher to recognize the Guild.

The publisher is a brisk and straightforward, if not necessarily iridescent, autobiographer. He evokes a world in which finance, politics and newspapering intermingled inextricably.

"I went to see Jim Farley, the Postmaster General. He called in his legal department. After a lengthy conference, Jim ordered the rules changed so that the *Post* could not only collect coupons from contestants but also cash payments. Thus, the puzzle

department, like the book department, paid its own way."

At New Brunswick he did battle against big business.

His ally was one Barney Gannon, a Democratic county boss who is remembered by Mr. Stern because: "Many political leaders have promised me support. Barney not only promised but he delivered."

Mr. Stern and Barney whipped big business in a city charter election.

Thereupon, Johnson & Johnson came around with an offer which, as Mr. Stern recalls, was framed thusly: "Congratulations, Stern. You certainly put it over. Great work. Barney never could have done it without your editorials. Stern, how much do you want for your stock in the paper?"

Thereupon, Mr. Stern hesitated, before saying \$25,000. Barney was no doubt sorry to see him go.

He was soon in Springfield, where he acquired control of the *News* by investing \$20,000 and persuading Frank O. Lowden of Chicago, general counsel of the Pullman Company, to fork over \$140,000 of demand notes which he held on the newspaper. Mr. Stern wanted to swap preferred stock. Mr. Lowden went him one better, and cancelled the debt.

Soon, Mr. Stern was supporting Mr. Lowden for governor. By 1920, he was supporting Governor Lowden for the Republican nomination for President. By then, Mr. Stern had moved to Camden.

Publishing seems to have been one turn of fortune after another, with Mr. Stern's papers rising or declining as he was able to seize upon the turn of events, or as the turn of events beset him. He seems satisfied that he missed few tricks.

"After 1917 on (he writes) I had another run of luck like my first week as a cub reporter. The six hours' difference between European and Central Time was a most fortunate break for the *News-Record*. Our 6 p.m. War Extra cleaned up cable news from France and Germany up to midnight European Time. In those days, there was no competition from radio."

One is left with the impression that this is the way it must have been. And that maybe this was the way it had to be.

—Patrick Owens

Good Stories

By Saul Friedman

THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE READER. Edited by William Hogan and William German. McGraw-Hill, N. Y. 322 pp. \$5.95.

Any reporter reviewing this reporter-exalting book is likely to be prejudiced, but this admirable job of compiling a fast-reading anthology of the best of the *Chronicle* since 1865 must prove at least three things.

First, the peaceful coexistence of the reporter and his natural enemy, the editor, can produce a book like this (Hogan is the *Chronicle's* literary reporter, and German, a 1950 *Nieman*, is news editor).

Second, the continuing marriage of the arch enemies can make for the stories which, in the first place, made it possible for Hogan and German to put their "reader" together.

Third, the book shows that the *San Francisco Chronicle* is perhaps not just a good feature factory, but a paper that is just now selling American newspapers on a new and vital way of covering the news.

On this last point, it is interesting and perhaps symbolic to note that of the 75 stories included in the anthology, about ten could be called straight news stories by self-righteous editors who want to play things "down the middle."

Even in those ten stories there is evidence they are "straight" in that they are aimed at a point; and that point is not simply the telling of a story for the sake of telling a story.

Many great names in modern journalism are represented here—Herb Caen, Lucius Beebe, Tom Mathews, Stan Delaplane, Pierre Salinger (who, if not great, is at least famous)—but even the lesser names catch on to the *Chronicle's* way of doing things.

When the wire services in the spring of 1953 were turning out "straight" news stories of returning prisoners of the Korean War, we read stories of pale, emaciated boys subjected to the brutality of the enemy. The enemy is always brutal, isn't he? And returning prisoners are always pale and emaciated, aren't they? *Chronicle* reporter Ruth Newhall also wrote a

"straight" story of the returning prisoners. But she turned her attention to newsmen haranguing the young returnees for I'm-glad-to-be-home quotes, which were insipid, and stories of Red brutality, which in this case were not true.

It is to the *Chronicle's* credit that her story was printed. And it is to the paper's credit that other stories containing the reporter's display of originality, innovation, creativity, and unorthodox writing were also printed.

Reporter Vance Bourjaily's delightful yarn of his visit to a nudist convention contained few, if any, grammatically correct or complete sentences. It was run nevertheless.

If the selections in the *Reader* are typical, the *Chronicle* has shown the results of the too-rare policy of letting the reporter tell the news like a short story from O. Henry, Runyon, Conrad or London.

Once this kind of story is written, the editor is confronted with creativity and literature—and this he cannot destroy even though he sees phantom glimmers of editorializing in it.

For those who have criticized the *Chronicle* for its feature emphasis, let us be charitable and see in this perhaps another way of communicating the news.

This is the day of newspaper punditry, of specialist-experts, of analysts, of concern for editorial courage, of depth reporting, of the slow death of Hildy Johnson.

But this does not mean it is to be the death of the sensitive, honest reporter who must be trusted to see and write what his eyes saw.

The prejudice of the reporter may be bubbling to the surface again, but perhaps the most important thing said in this book is given in the introduction by these two fine writers and editors who know when to let their source tell the story.

They quote the present *Chronicle* city editor, Abe Mellinkoff: "In the many uncertainties of journalism, there is one certainty: The reporter is the single indispensable ingredient of a good newspaper. Many a paper—God knows—is duller and less perceptive than its staff. But no paper can rise very far beyond the competence of its reporters.

"Writing a story for a daily newspaper is creation, and all creation is formed of

fragile ideas and feelings. . . . Rigid memos on how things will be done can be posted on the bulletin board in the city room, and constant flagellation of the reportorial mind and psyche can create a corporate style of writing. But the results will not be creative. The stories will be acceptable—safe at first base. None will ever clear the fence for a beautiful, easy home run."

Lunatic Fringe

MEN OF THE FAR RIGHT. By Richard Dudman. Pyramid Books. N. Y. 190 pp. 50 cents.

This is a newspaperman's set of sharp profiles of those characters of the extreme right who have made so much noise on the national scene that, until the 1962 election, they were widely rated a rising threat. Most of them qualify for the lunatic fringe, and one chapter heading: "Fanaticism on the Far Right," covers the lot. But the collection is comprehensive enough to include Senators Barry Goldwater and Tower, and it includes a chapter on the efforts of such conservatives to disengage from the irrational antics of the Welch-Walker-Hargis-Schwartz-Benson types. A chapter on "The Intellectuals of the Far Right," such as William Buckley and his *National Review* associates, makes the point that the chief force in the right extremism is anti-intellectualism. This is a brisk account and handy reference on the crusading rightists.

THE PRESS AND AMERICA (Second Edition). By Edwin Emery. Prentice-Hall. 801 pp. \$8.95.

Mr. Emery, professor of journalism at the University of Minnesota, has revised his ambitious history of journalism which won the Sigma Delta Chi national research award when it was first published in 1954. Henry Ladd Smith was the co-author of the first edition, but he has not participated in the revision.

Professor Emery updated the book, expanded the bibliography following each chapter and added a chapter entitled "Economic Pressures on the Mass Media."

About Writing

By John Kole

BREAKING INTO PRINT. By Edward Weeks. The Writer, Inc. 145 pp. \$3.95.

MORE LANGUAGE THAT NEEDS WATCHING. By Theodore M. Bernstein. Channel Press. 107 pp. \$2.50.

Surely Gutenberg or even Mergenthaler never envisioned today's flood of printed communication. Therefore, perceptive efforts to dissect the outpouring are always welcome.

The two short books are by editors who joined their publications almost 40 years ago when they were just out of college. In Mr. Weeks' case, of course, it was the *Atlantic Monthly*, where he has served as editor and "The Peripatetic Reviewer" for more than 20 years. Mr. Bernstein is assistant managing editor of the *New York Times*.

Under Mr. Weeks' guidance, the 105 year old *Atlantic* has accelerated its search for the best in writing—essays, short stories, articles, personal experiences and poems. He recalls fondly an incident of his early career when as the first reader for the magazine he was delighted by the quality of a short story, "Fifty Grand." Until then, the unknown author had a pile of rejection slips on the story from other publications. His name was Ernest Hemingway.

But this is not a book of memoirs. It is a packet of sympathetic understanding and advice for those who seriously yearn to write. The odds of publication are poor, Mr. Weeks warns, pointing out that the *Atlantic* accepts only 500 of 45,000 manuscripts each year and that only 1 in 50 book manuscripts ever sees the plates of a printing press.

All the more frustrating is his further warning that "since writing is unquestionably the worst paid of all professions, those who do it have to be persistent if they are to survive."

But Mr. Weeks clearly admires this persistence. Furthermore, he urges a great deal of humility and a proper respect and love for words. Pedantry is definitely not wanted.

In our nuclear age of super problems which are seemingly insoluble, good hu-

morous writing is the hardest to come by, perhaps because we are too preoccupied with the dilemmas of our time.

Despite the struggle which writers must face to "break into print," Mr. Weeks leaves no doubt that he believes it is worth the candle.

As Mr. Bernstein's title indicates, he has compiled more of the journalistic common sense which has brought so much attention to his *Watch Your Language*, a larger book published in 1958. Every two or three weeks, he issues a publication called "Winners & Sinners" for *Times* reporters and editors. It is, as he calls it, "a bulletin of second-guessing," and has provided most of the material for both books.

At the very least, frequent examination by a great newspaper of its own use of language should help prevent repetition of the sins. One gets the impression that Mr. Bernstein has as much fun collecting these examples of good and bad writing as he did marking up student newspapers at Columbia when he was managing editor four decades ago.

Many professional newsmen will be astonished by some of the awkward writing and errors that manage to creep into the *Times*. They may even speculate that the staff needs a bit of prudent trimming. However, the author defends a typical mistake as "perhaps not excusable, but . . . at least understandable" in the never ending pressure at a large daily newspaper.

Bits from Bernstein

(The author gleaned these items from his own paper to point up "More Language That Needs Watching.")

It's how he finishes that counts. "Cleric to Start Fast."

A landslide. "He has been frequently called on to assist in the board's integration efforts and was the unanimous choice of Dr. John J. Theobald, Superintendent of Schools, for the new position."

Quick, Henry the spot remover! "There, from 10:30 A.M. until 9 P.M. Miss Preis poured over the fabrics and sketches." Or should it be "pawed"?

Eh? "More photographers and reporters than the room could accommodate were crowded into it."

One-dimensional reporting. "The campaign for the Oct. 3 elections is being fought the width and breadth of the city."

Spoon feeding. "Now throw in two tablespoons full of chopped parsley and cook ten more minutes. The quail ought to be tender by then." Never mind the quail; how are we ever going to get those spoons tender? (Make it "tablespoonfuls.")

Nice trick. "Faubus Hints He'd Shut School Before It Opens."

Those starved railroads. "Yesterday morning all trains were met by The Green-

brier's limousines and taken directly to the hotel for breakfast." Nothing but diners, obviously.

Man, that's news! "Engineers to Hear Diesel Talk."

Eh? "Cleric Studies Stars. U.S. Missionary in Rhodesia Uses Self-Made Telescope." How far is this automation business going, anyway?

Eh? "13th Floor Losing Its Absence Here."

ADVERSE. He is not adverse to reading about himself. "Adverse" means opposed, antagonistic, hostile. "Averse," which is the word desired here, means disinclined, reluctant, loath.

AMID, AMONG. "Among" means in the midst of countable things. When the things are not separable the word is "amid" or "amidst."

SIBILANT. "Just before the program began, a sibilant whisper came from the last row: 'Mildred got here.'" Try that on your sibilator.

TROVE. "A Pre-Inca Trove Is Found in Peru." Know what a trove is? It's something that's found.

The South Will Change

By Patrick J. Owens

WE DISSENT. Edited by Hoke Norris, with essays by Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely, Ralph McGill, Kathleen Keen Sinnett, Thomas D. Clark, Lenoir Chambers, Jonathan Daniels, Hodding Carter III, LeRoy Collins, Francis Pickens Miller, James McBride Dabbs, Borden Deal, Paul Green, and Mr. Norris. St. Martin's Press, N. Y. 211 pp. \$4.95.

The fourteen Southern natives represented in this compilation march, in James McBride Dabbs' metaphor, to a drummer ostensibly unheard by most other Southerners.

They are not all integrationists—at least not explicitly so—but all of them favor change in Southern patterns of racial accommodation. All of them espouse the brotherhood of man. All of them are much aggrieved by the South's reluctance to come to terms with its future.

Yet the book is put together on an odd presumption: That people who disagree with the Citizens Councils, J. Strom Thurmond and James O. Eastland (as P. D. East is wont to style him) are hard to find south of Mason-Dixon.

Mr. Norris informs us in his foreword that *We Dissent* seeks to "give voice to the opposition in the South"—"If our book can inform the rest of the nation, and of the world, of this opposition—this large and growing and most loyal opposi-

tion—then it will have served its purpose."

The fact is that Southern dissent, while insufficient to the need, is pretty widespread. The declarations of conscience of literate Southerners have been with us in quantity for some years now. Those who contribute to *We Dissent* have almost all dissented previously, sometimes more eloquently.

In these circumstances, there is a fundamental irrelevance to a book got up as an exhibition of Southern racial liberalism. (Not, in first intention, of the quality or variety or extent of that kind of liberalism, but simply of its existence.)

The point would not need to be labored, or even made, if *We Dissent* were not in this way representative of much writing about the South these days. The Southern

dissenter is becoming a stereotype. He deserves more discriminating appreciation.

* * *

If *We Dissent* has value, that value lies beyond its intention.

The book could not possibly have been written by Yankees. The South is the last stronghold of the troubled conscience, and it is the quality of some of these consciences which makes this a worthwhile and useful book. The contributors to *We Dissent* address themselves to a subject which has been a central concern for a lifetime. They tend to speak with a luminous tolerance which eschews easy answers and fingerpointing.

We Dissent is also a contribution to the Southern quest for affirmative values.

Most Americans—North and South—seem to see the end product of Southern change as a sort of Yankeeified Dixie—a North with a Southern accent.

C. Vann Woodward, the most eminent of Southern historians (or expatriate Southern historians; he is now at Yale), has suggested that the South may have a brighter future than this. Some of the authors of *We Dissent* have contributions to make to the discussion Mr. Woodward has started. They are among the prophets of a South which has escaped Northern dehumanization, which cares about social justice, which can bear honest self-criticism—which can offer the nation, as Mr. Woodward put it, "participation in a heritage and a dimension of historical experience that America very much needs, a heritage that is far more closely in line with the common lot of mankind than the national legends of opulence and success and innocence." *

Says Mr. Dabbs:

"If we could see the South for what it is, a region where men have striven greatly, endured greatly, and yet have managed through it all to keep a sense of human values, a sense of personal relationships so lacking in the modern world, a sense even of manners in a world gone mad for material gain, a sense of humor, sometimes playful, sometimes wry—if we could

see our tragic history, whites and Negroes involved together in more than two centuries of defeat, partly self-inflicted, partly inflicted by the world, then we should come to realize that we have resources here valuable to both the nation and the world, and that segregation is not one of them."

Say the Stokelys:

"Released from the confinement of an over-riding concern with race and the costly toll of segregation, the best meaning of the Southern tradition could bring a new balance to American life: balance between the urban and rural, between man and the machine, between making a living and making a life. . . . The choice lies between being overwhelmed in the inevitable tide of equality and freedom which is moving humanity everywhere, or seizing that tide and using it to capture the imagination and allegiance of the world."

Seizure and use of the tide may prove as difficult inside the metaphor as outside it. But the ambition surely is preferable to the cash register rationale for Southern re-ordering which appears to prevail in the South today.

The South will change; there no longer is room for question on the point. What remains undecided is whether accountancy or morality will pipe the tune of change. The question before Southerners, in other words, is change to what?

The Philippines

THE PHILIPPINES: A Young Republic on the Move. By Albert Ravenholt. D. van Nostrand. N.Y. 204 pp. \$4.25.

This fine book tells virtually all that one should know about the Philippines, readably and in short compass. Its author has long specialized on the Philippines, first as a World War II correspondent, then as a fellow of the Institute of World Affairs, and latterly on the American Universities field staff.

In this compact book, he deals with the history and background of the Philippines, the current politics and economics of the islands, and with the arts, industries and pastimes of the Filipino people.

Horse to Back

(From a speech unexpectedly made at the press dinner for the annual Laurel International Race, by R. A. Farquarson, minister for information at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, Nov. 11.)

I have spent much more of my life as a newspaper man than I have as a diplomat so you will understand that in my career I have known more horses' asses than I have horses. This is perhaps a poor qualification for recommending to you tonight that you place your money on the Canadian horse, but there are other reasons. The Canadian horse comes from France, so understands French-Canadian. The jockey grew up in Canada and has won more races than any other jockey. But the really important reason why you should support this horse is that the owner is also a newspaper publisher and he is my son's boss. Therefore, you will understand, gentlemen, why I give you with such enthusiasm, Lebon M.L., the Canadian horse.

(The race was won by Match II, the French entry. Mr. Farquarson's favorite came in 12th in a field of 13.—Editor.)

Broadcasting

To the Editor:

I enjoyed Robert B. Rhode's article describing the "conscience, dignity, and sense of independence" of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

Just after putting the article down, I heard a news broadcast on WHDH in Boston reporting Premier Khrushchev's offer to withdraw his nuclear missiles from Cuba if we Americans would withdraw ours from Turkey. In effect, he accepted Walter Lippmann's suggestion.

Here is WHDH's classic radio headline for this news:

Khrushchev Tries High-Powered Thermonuclear Blackmail in Cuban Crisis.

GEORGE KOSKI
Lanesville,
Gloucester, Massachusetts

* C. Vann Woodward, *The Burden of Southern History*, Louisiana State University Press, 1960.

How G.O.P. "Upsurge" Flivvered in Arkansas

By Tom Dearmore

The main significance of the general election in Arkansas was the unmistakable revelation that Winthrop Rockefeller's effort to build the state Republican Party is running out of gas.

Also, the balloting showed that the right-wing extremists—the Communist-callers and prophets of internal collapse—have been wasting their money trying to impress the Arkansas voters, and that Senator J. W. Fulbright has impressive strength in his home state.

Fulbright has been pictured by some observers as a pale intellectual liberal who might be next to helpless this year in the barracuda waters of Arkansas politics. He had not been in a tough senatorial race for 18 years, he had become a controversial figure, the provoker of a national debate in which he and Senator Barry Goldwater were protagonists, and it was time for him to prove himself again on his home grounds.

Some people predicted the worst for him, and many predicted trouble. For instance, *Time* magazine in its October 26 issue listed him first under a heading "Democratic Seats In Doubt." *Time* stated that in the past Fulbright "merely went through the motions of campaigning" to defend his Senate post, and added: "But under the leadership of GOP National Committeeman Winthrop Rockefeller (brother of Nelson), the Republican Party has made a remarkable upsurge in Arkansas, and Fulbright faces a strenuous challenge in Republican Kenneth G. Jones, prosperous orthopedic surgeon . . ."

The "remarkable upsurge" proved to be no more than empty talk. The Republicans did stir Fulbright into action (he expended much more effort in the general election campaign than he did against his Democratic primary opponent), but the way he rolled over Dr. Jones on election day should have ended the state GOP's expansionist illusions.

Fulbright garnered almost 70 per cent of the votes. Dr. Jones did not even receive as many as the Republican who ran a perfunctory race for governor two years ago.

And this blow came despite the fact that his election was the primary objective of the "new" Republican Party in Arkansas. The party's machinery was thrown behind him and all the stops were pulled. Goldwater came to the state (in Rockefeller's private plane) to speak for Jones, and Senator John Tower of Texas stumped part of the state in his behalf. The doctor made dozens of speeches and many telecasts. Rightist groups from other parts of the country flooded the state with literature attacking Fulbright's record. It was a good show, but that's all it was.

It was the old business of calling the Senator a liberal, then talking loosely about liberalism, socialism, collectivism, communism, in one breath. Goldwater came to lambast the "retreaters" in the battle with communism, and Jones said Fulbright's record included "failure by appeasement." The Cuban question, and Fulbright's advice last year against the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion, were made the main issues. Fulbright accused both Jones and Goldwater of trying by innuendo to bring his loyalty into question, in the manner of McCarthyism, and a release from his headquarters late in the campaign stated:

"It is deplorable and revolting that once again such tactics are being used by the hatchet men supporting Senator Fulbright's opponent, Doctor Jones. Doctor Jones himself, by a vague and far-fetched use of such words as socialism, statism, communism and one-worldism, insinuates, without directly saying it, that Senator Fulbright is not loyal to his people in Arkansas or to his nation.

"With this encouragement, his henchmen and most passionate supporters, some of them poison pen artists from other states, go much further in their efforts to arouse suspicion of the Senator's motives and purposes."

Some Republican leaders no doubt thought they had in Dr. Jones another John Tower, an energetic young man who could scale the wall of another Solid South Democratic stronghold. This is not an unworthy aspiration; two-party politics is de-

sirable. But the tone of Jones' campaign was not commendable and certainly was not good politics. We believe his dissertations about the main danger to the United States being in Washington, not in Moscow, plus his disparaging remarks about the UN and some of the domestic functions of government, lost him the votes of many conservatives who might have supported him. But some basic issues got debated in a lively manner, and perhaps his candidacy served a purpose in providing the debate.

Fulbright came closer to the people of Arkansas than he has since 1944, when he was first elected to the Senate and his discussions of most of the great national issues were searching and superb. He is more of a lecturer than an orator and this has been considered a political liability, but the people listened as he outlined the facts about nuclear war as it might affect this state, as he told of the high order of diplomacy needed to prevent such a war, as he discussed Cuba and the prospects for the economic betterment of the United States, and of Arkansas. His powerful position in the Senate, and with the Kennedy Administration, no doubt gained him many votes. He has been instrumental in securing a good many recent projects for the state. But a majority were also convinced that he is no proponent of appeasement of communism.

In fact, it was ridiculous to picture him as a liberal. He is liberal in two or three major areas, but in general he might be termed a moderate conservative.

He was the beneficiary, of course, of a smoothly-functioning state Democratic organization. The party closed ranks in the general election, with remarkably few deviations.

The saddening thing about the election was that Winthrop Rockefeller helped tie the state GOP to the most irresponsible wing of the national Republican Party. Rockefeller could have given the Arkansas Republican Party an affirmative direction, could have helped it elect estimable candidates at the local levels. The blatant campaign against Fulbright weakened his party. All its candidates for the state legislature were beaten. It does not have even the barest grassroots strength.

He could have brought more moderate and progressive Republicans than Gold-

water and Tower to aid the party in Arkansas (assuming that it was necessary to bring in any out-of-staters). He teamed with the extreme conservative element that is most interested in destroying his brother Nelson's chance for the 1964 Presidential nomination. It has occurred to us that it might be Winthrop's luck to watch the Arkansas delegates jump the traces and vote for Goldwater in a convention show-down.

The only thing that might regenerate the Rockefeller movement in Arkansas would be his own candidacy for a major state office. Arkansas Republicans were in a high state of expectancy, waiting for him to announce for office this year. Some folks have the impression that he lacked the nerve to jump into the fray himself, and was content to egg others onward while remaining safe on Petit Jean. Perhaps he will come down and run someday, and possibly the time will be right. But possibly his best opportunity has slipped away and his chances have been blighted by the sad showing of 1962.

The Republican Party lacks leadership and party pride. Even Dr. Jones assiduously tried to avoid the party label, describing himself merely as the "conservative candidate." Republican candidates should be more enthusiastic about admitting they are Republicans; everyone knows it anyway.

It must be added that the leadership of the state Democratic Party does not offer much incentive for loyalty from those who identify with the national Democratic Party. In this time of a strong Democratic Administration, the leader of the state party—the governor—is estranged from that Administration and is its constant critic. Arkansas's main tie to the rest of the world is its influential delegation in Congress and the Senate.

A lesson of the general election is that Arkansas is as far as ever—if not farther—from becoming a two-party state. The factionalism within the Democratic Party, which is more pronounced than ever before in modern times, will have to suffice for two-partyism, and perhaps it is not too bad a substitute.—*Baxter Bulletin*, Mountain Home, Ark., Nov. 15.

Tom Dearmore is editor of the *Baxter Bulletin*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1960.

NIEMAN NOTES

1941

William J. Miller of *Life* has taken on a course on Reporting in Perspective at Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism.

1943

William A. Townes was appointed assistant managing editor of the *Baltimore Sun* in October.

John F. Day reported from Karachi the production of the first television project in Pakistan, an operation in which *Time-Life* Broadcast and Philips of Holland joined.

1946

Robert Manning, assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, along with Arthur Sylvester, his opposite number in the Defense Department, was the center of a protest by Washington correspondents over the handling of news during the Cuban crisis. A directive of Manning's Oct. 31 ordered department officials to report the names of any correspondents to whom they had given information.

Manning rescinded the directive Nov. 27, and stated:

"There need be no apology for a procedure designed to provide such information, or otherwise to serve the national interest as it is related to information.

"I am concerned, however, about the manner in which this matter has been discussed in the press and in other communications channels and the serious misimpression that is being conveyed about the department's attitude toward public information.

"That attitude, simply put, is that there must be a steady and forthcoming flow of information and assessment to the public, through the press as well as other channels, within the acceptable bounds of responsible judgment and national security."

1947

Jack Foisie had a hitch in Vietnam for the *San Francisco Chronicle*. He reported

on the difficulties American correspondents have there in a piece for the *Nation*.

1948

LaVerne and **Justin McCarthy** announced the birth of a son, Justin Gregory, in Washington Oct. 29.

1951

The *Knickerbocker News* in Albany announced appointment of **Wellington Wales** as chief editorial writer in October. After working on New York and Boston newspapers, he had spent several years in the Virgin Islands, where he was associate editor of the *Daily News* in St. Thomas.

Angus McL. Thuermer, political affairs officer in the U. S. Embassy in Ghana, reports on a safari to Tanganyika with the family in October, which is Spring in Tanganyika. Not that seasons make much difference there.

1953

John Strohmeier, editor of the Bethlehem (Pa.) *Globe-Times*, is a new member of the advisory committee of the *Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

1954

Richard Dudman of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* Washington bureau is author of a new book, *Men of the Far Right*, published in paperback in November by Pyramid Books. By the time the book was out Dudman was on a two-month tour of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

1955

Selig Harrison is leaving the *New Republic*, where he has been managing editor, to go to India the first of the year as South Asia correspondent of the Wash-

ington *Post*, which is opening a new bureau in New Delhi.

He has served in India before, with the Associated Press, and is author of *India: The Most Dangerous Decades*.

1956

The Boston *Globe* appointed **Robert L. Healy** political editor in October. He had been Washington correspondent, a post the *Globe* filled with **Wilfrid C. Rodgers** (1959).

1958

Dean Brelis took on a new educational television project for WGBH in Boston this fall. He handles two backgrounds interviews a week for "The World At Ten," a joint program of WGBH-Channel 2 Boston, and New York's Channel 13, for the Eastern Educational Television Network.

1961

At the height of the Mississippi rioting, **A. M. Secrest** used his whole editorial page in the *Cheraw Chronicle* (S. C.) to warn South Carolina against following the lead of Gov. Barnett. He castigated the *Charleston News and Courier* for advocating resistance to the Federal government.

1962

Murray Seeger of the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* and **John Emmerich**, managing editor of the *McComb Enterprise-Journal* (Miss.), presented a critique of labor papers at the International Labor Press Association annual meeting in Cleveland, Dec. 1. With other Nieman Fellows of last year they judged the labor press awards that were presented in Cleveland.

Newspaper Reaction to the Prayer Decision

To the Editor:

I wonder if you would be interested in the results of this little study on editorial reactions to school prayer.

It's one way to keep busy when one is retired!

RICHARD B. EIDE

Florida State Univ., Tallahassee

True, the daily press is an influential American institution guided by high principles. But it is not without those who are willing to sacrifice editorial principles for expediency. In such instances the press becomes a reflector of regional prejudice rather than a creator of sound public opinion.

The editorial reactions of some 70 representative dailies on the school prayer decision is a case in point.

The editorial stand taken by these dailies was evenly divided for and against the decision. In force of expression, however, the stand taken by the newspapers that opposed the decision was much more vehement, at times intemperate.

A number of newspapers that opposed the decision simply used it as a point of departure for blasts against the Supreme Court and its past decisions. Some stressed past decisions on religion. Some reflected anger generated by the Court's integration decision. Some simply reiterated Justice Stewart's dissent and mentioned a number of similar violations among the numerous ceremonial practices which Justice Black, in his closing remarks, said had no resemblance to a religious exercise. Some asked for an immediate amendment to the Constitution. A few, lest their criticism be misunderstood, made clear their support of the doctrine of separation of church and state.

By avoiding the temper and emotionalism that obscured much of what was ac-

tually said in the ruling, the group of dailies that supported the decision expressed more broad-minded and tolerant views. In general they felt that government had no right to set up a religious norm from which persons had to be excused. They agreed with Justice Black when he said that prayer was a personal and sacred matter not to be decided by public officials. They felt that the danger of this case was not the prayer itself but the commingling of church and state. They believed that both religion and government would be stronger if they stood on their own feet. They also agreed that the Court neither passed judgment on prayer nor forbade the mention of God in the classroom.

Such well-known newspapers as the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *Washington Post*, the *Milwaukee Journal*, the *Baltimore Sun*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Des Moines Register* and the *Atlanta Constitution* were among those in general accord with the decision.

Only a few newspapers omitted editorial comment.

Nieman Dinners

Among Nieman dinner speakers this fall the following former Nieman Fellows: **Clark Mollenhoff** (1950), Washington correspondent of the *Cowles* papers; **Howard Sochurek** (1960), *Life* photographer, on his return from Outer Mongolia; and **John Seigenthaler** (1959), editor of the *Nashville Tennessean*, with Publisher Amon Evans; **John L. Steele** (1952), Washington bureau chief, *Time-Life*; **Harry Ashmore** (1956), editor-in-chief, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. **Edwin O. Guthman** (1951) joined his chief, Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy, in a Nieman seminar, Nov. 26.