

NiemanReports

December 1963

The Newsmen's War in Vietnam

Stanley Karnow

Advertising in Russia

Faith I. Popkin

Vested Interests of Reporters

James McCartney

Censors and their Tactics

Jack Nelson

For Polemical Passion in the Press

Karl E. Meyer

What Keeps Them From Newspapering?

John L. Hulteng

Reviews: *Professor Schlesinger's Reflections*, by Louis M. Lyons—
All Honorable Men, by Dan Wakefield

—Nieman Notes—

NiemanReports

VOL. XVI, NO. 4

DECEMBER, 1963

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

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

Censors and Their Tactics

By Jack Nelson

My subject is the activities of the censorship forces and the damage they do to our education system by pressuring for the banning and alteration of books.

In this age of exploding knowledge, when man is reaching for the moon and we talk about brinkmanship and a nuclear war that could devastate civilization, we still publish high school history books that refer only to the War Between the States, a euphemism to please Southern ears. For that matter, many Southern newspapers eschew the name "Civil War."

Shortly after the Civil War, a New York publisher advertised: "Books prepared for Southern schools by Southern authors, and therefore free from matter offensive to Southern people."

But times have changed and regional texts have given way to books competing for a national market. So now the trick is to offend as few people as possible. The result is that many books lack vitality and are too dull to interest the students. Controversial subjects are treated superficially or not at all.

Jack Nelson of the *Atlantic Constitution* won a Pulitzer Prize for his investigative reporting in 1960. With Gene Roberts, a Nieman colleague of 1961-2, he wrote *The Censors and the Schools*. This paper was delivered at the Freedom of Information Conference, University of Missouri School of Journalism, Nov. 7

An American history text, complete through the 1960 election, deals with the Southern resistance to the Supreme Court in a single sentence. It is little wonder that the Negroes' rebellion against second-class citizenship catches many Americans by surprise.

To read many textbooks you would think Americans are all white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, white-collared and middle class. Two university professors, after perusing a number of social studies books, concluded that students would get the impression that "all Americans live on wide, shady streets in clean suburban areas, occupy white Cape Cod style houses, drive new automobiles, have two children (a boy and a girl of course) and own a dog."

Problems of non-English speaking migrant workers, smog, water shortages, crowded housing, slums, poverty, crime and disease are glossed over in many texts.

Now textbook publishers do not avoid publishing information about controversial subjects because they believe this is the best way to promote education. They do it because in some cases it is not only the best, but the only way they can sell their products.

The publishers face a dilemma. Every time they show the courage to explore controversial subjects in depth they risk economic setbacks caused by censorship forces. Even relatively minor matters can cost them sales. For example, in Bastrop, La., recently the school board, learning that Macmillan planned a new line of readers in 1965 which would ignore an old taboo and show white and Negro children playing together, banned the books and urged the rest of the state to do likewise.

In our research for *The Censors and the Schools*, Gene Roberts and I found that the pressures for the elimination or censorship of "unpleasant" ideas or facts often come from diametrically opposed forces. This has been a big factor in the treatment of the Negroes' plight.

On the one hand segregationists clamor to keep out of books pictures of Negroes and whites together or any mention of an integrated society. Some extremists go so far as to find "subtle integrationist propaganda" in the pictures of white and black rabbits. In Alabama a textbook was attacked for including a picture of former Secretary of State Christian Herter shaking hands with the President of Nigeria.

On the other hand, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has demanded that facts it considers objectionable be excluded from books.

The high rates of crime and disease among Negroes should be discussed in textbooks as well as in the press. Not to justify opposition to integration, but to help explain it, to help show what suppression in a segregated society has done to the Negro.

As the NAACP has said, the outstanding accomplishment
(Continued on page 22)

The Newsmen's War in Vietnam

By Stanley Karnow

Until a *coup d'état* overthrew the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, there were two wars going on in South Vietnam. One was against a Communist guerrilla enemy. The other was against foreign correspondents. The anti-Communist struggle continues; but the revolt that toppled Diem has, at least for the present, given the newsmen peace with honor.

For years, correspondents trying to cover the Diem government's two-way fight against the Communists and its own domestic opposition were plagued by physical violence as well as persistent, invidious efforts to manage their news and discredit their reporting.

They were maligned by the late President Diem for "poisoning American public opinion," and accused by his ter-magant sister-in-law, Madame Ngo Dinh Nhu, of being Communist infiltrated.

Observing "guidance" directives from Washington or inventing their own lines of conduct, American officials in Saigon fed them propaganda and limited their movements to such an extent that a Congressional subcommittee recently charged that "the restrictive U. S. press policy . . . unquestionably contributed to a lack of information about conditions in Vietnam which created an international crisis."

As if these obstructions were not enough, the Saigon-based newsmen were also subjected to internecine abuse from fellow journalists. Predictably, the bitterness of their criticism was directly proportional to their unfamiliarity with the situation in Vietnam.

Thus columnist Joseph Alsop, though acknowledging that Diem's press relations were "idiotic," still accused Saigon's resident reporters of carrying on "egregious crusades" against the regime. Less knowledgeable visitors to Vietnam, like Hearst editor Frank Conniff and Miss Marguerite Higgins, then of the New York *Herald Tribune*, were more hostile. "Reporters here would like to see us lose the war to prove they're right," said Miss Higgins.

The most vitriolic tirade, however, was launched by *Time*, which last September charged the Saigon press corps with "helping to compound the very confusion that it should be untangling for its readers at home." According

to *Time*, the journalists presented a distorted picture of events in Vietnam because "they pool their convictions, information, misinformation and grievances" and, in short, were in conspiracy against the Diem government. It was a fascinating thesis. Hardly had it appeared in print than *Time's* Southeast Asia bureau chief Charles Mohr and Saigon reporter Mert Perry quit their jobs. "That piece," explained Mohr, "was concocted entirely in New York and based on no dispatch sent by a correspondent here."

The target of the offensive was a band of young, hard-working, passionate reporters. The youngest of them, 26-year-old Cornelius Sheehan of the United Press International, sleeps in a windowless room adjoining his office and, as a U. S. army officer once described, "he is bent on beating his typewriter into scrap metal." The oldest of them is 32-year-old Malcolm Browne of the Associated Press, a lean, determined ex-chemist to whom working in Saigon is a "never-ending wrestling match" to extract facts from mysterious sources and laconic officials.

The most proficient among them is tall, dark David Halberstam, 29, of the New York *Times*. A Harvard graduate who served his newspaper apprenticeship in Tennessee, he won the American Newspaper Guild's Page One award for his reporting from the Congo, and has been operating in Saigon since May 1962. In Washington, where wags sometimes call the Vietnam conflict "Halberstam's War," State Department insiders often get more information from the *Times* than they find in government cables. "David is an excellent reporter," a U. S. diplomat says with a mixture of admiration and irritation. "But how he lays his hands on so much confidential material is astounding."

In a paradoxical way, the official freeze on fraternization with correspondents increased rather than diminished the reporters' sources of first-rate information. Many lower echelon functionaries, in disagreement with high-level policy, did not hesitate to provide reporters with news. This was particularly true within the Vietnamese establishment, where the disaffection against Diem's rule before the *coup d'état* had expanded to such proportions that some astute correspondents were able to build up a network of official native informants throughout the provinces. Sheehan, Halberstam and Perry had advance notice of the military revolt against Diem—a message reading: "Please buy me one bottle of whiskey at the PX."

U. S. reporters also depended heavily for news on American military and civilian advisers in the field, many of whom were frustrated by the refusal of their superiors in

Stanley Karnow served *Time*, Inc., in Paris and then Algeria for more than a decade, then served for three years as their correspondent in Southeast Asia and wrote the book *Southeast Asia* published by the Life World Library, 1963. This summer he transferred to the *Saturday Evening Post*. He was a Nieman Fellow, 1958.

Saigon to listen to reports that deviated from the rosy "party line." One such officer was Lieut. Col. John Paul Vann, formerly the senior U. S. military adviser in a key area of the Delta. His criticism of the way the war was being waged was so systematically ignored that he recently quit the service to be able to speak freely. In an interview with *U. S. News & World Report* last September, he said: "There has been a lack of firsthand information [about Vietnam]. High-ranking people are sent there from Washington and told to get results. It becomes a kind of consuming desire on their part to show some palpable results. I believe this causes a tendency to play down the real picture."

Correspondents who listened to Vann and other officers like him did not purposely seek out military men with criticism to voice. On the contrary, these responsible officers were the best available news sources. To suggest that they performed for the benefit of reporters would be to undervalue the stature of these soldiers.

To suggest, as some critics have, that the Saigon correspondents behaved irresponsibly, is to miss the mark. They have been reproached for their "emotional involvement" in the Vietnam situation, and they do not deny the charge. "I defy anyone to spend six months in Saigon without becoming emotionally engaged," one of them explains. "After all, we're human beings, not jellyfish."

But to a larger, deeper and more complex degree, their subjective reaction to the situation was a natural reflection of the American conscience confronted with Vietnam's "dirty, untidy, disagreeable" war, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk once called it. In aiding South Vietnam to fight its Communist threat, the U. S. took the politically uncomfortable step of allying itself with the ineffective, unpopular, and tyrannical government of Ngo Dinh Diem and his family. A leading American diplomat termed it "a medieval, oriental despotism"; as a high Vatican representative put it recently: "It was a regime that could have become Communist overnight—they'd have had only to change the flags."

When the U. S. commitment to South Vietnam began to take shape a couple of years ago, it became part of American policy to camouflage the shortcomings of the Diem oligarchy. The U. S. could not, of course, knock a government it was boosting. Also displayed, as George Kennan described it, was "that curious trait of the American political personality which causes it to appear reprehensible to voice anything less than unlimited optimism about the fortunes of another government one had adopted as a friend and protégé."

Thus American policymakers and practitioners, fearful of ruffling Diem's sensitivities, urged American reporters to avoid pessimism and criticism. U. S. generals told correspondents that "bad news hurts morale." Frederick E. Nolting Jr., then the U. S. Ambassador to Vietnam, once

said: "Why don't you newsmen give Diem the benefit of the doubt?"

Early in 1961, a special effort was made to create an attractive public image for the Diem regime. One day, a pleasant, Uruguayan-born American named Jorge Ortiz turned up in Saigon as representative of the New York advertising firm of Kastor, Hilton, Chesley, Clifford and Atherton, and he rapidly transformed the atmosphere. He arranged interviews for reporters with government officials and organized airplane tours of the "fighting front." He hired pretty Vietnamese girls to guide visiting correspondents, loaned them Olivetti typewriters, and facilitated the movement of their cables at Saigon's archaic post office. For these services, Diem paid Ortiz and his employers \$100,000 per year and expenses.

Some aspects of this public relations operation were strange and somewhat sinister. For one thing, Kastor, Hilton *et al.* had acquired the contract in a curious fashion. The deal had originally been negotiated separately by a vice-president of the company, Lloyd Whitebrook. But Whitebrook had helped himself to \$15,000 of the firm's money, presumably to use as expenses in acquiring the Vietnam account. When the company discovered this felony, they made a bargain with Whitebrook: they agreed not to press charges, in exchange for which he transferred to them the Vietnamese public relations contract. Quite suddenly, Whitebrook died in Washington in July 1962.

There was another peculiar angle to this press agency. It was alleged, by one of Ortiz's assistants, to have been connected with the CIA. If true, it was not precise what role Ortiz played as a CIA operative, though he very clearly served to inform the Vietnamese government about correspondents' conversations with their sources. For example, a reporter was dining one evening in a Saigon restaurant with an important and disgruntled Vietnamese civil servant—who has since left the country—when Ortiz casually joined them for coffee. Next day the reporter was invited to lunch by a high Vietnamese official who angrily played back the talk of the evening before. When taxed with this obvious case of espionage, Ortiz replied lamely: "I just wanted you to hear the government's side of the story."

But whatever his ethics or his acumen, no public relations man could do much to beautify Diem's image. For Diem did not desire only the "benefit of the doubt," as Ambassador Nolting suggested he be given; he wanted total subservience. *Newsweek's* Francois Sully was expelled from the country for supposedly slighting the Women's Solidarity Movement, and NBC correspondent James Robinson was declared *persona non grata* for referring to the Ngo Dinh's as a "family clique." On occasion, displeasure with the U. S. press reached shrieks of hysteria. Last September, after the New York *Times* unintentionally omitted ten words from one of her letters, Madame Ngo

Dinh Nhu cried that the paper belonged "to an international Communist-inspired conspiracy aimed at slandering Vietnam."

To Diem, his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu, Madame Nhu and the rest of the family, the press was an instrument of the state. Their country's twenty-odd newspapers operated entirely under government control. They were told what to print in regular "guidance" memoranda, and some actually had their editorials written for them by officials. All submitted their page proofs every morning to a team of twelve censors, and the penalty for deviation from official doctrine was severe. Last August, for example, a Saigon daily called *Tu Do*—which, ironically, means "freedom"—was closed down for "compromising the security of the state," and five of its staff members were jailed.

As a result, Saigon's newspapers completely lost their credibility. Educated Vietnamese read them largely for their serialized fiction. For news, a great many listened to the Vietnamese-language broadcasts of the Voice of America (which, Brother Nhu declared, "is not the voice of the American government but the voice of a group of capitalists who control it"). Arriving in Saigon last summer, I recall being asked by a customs officer if I had any foreign newspapers. "I'd like to read one," he explained, "so I can find out what's going on in this country."

With their monolithic mentality, President Diem and his ruling relatives sincerely believed that American journalists should also accept some kind of control. Indeed, during a revealing interview in 1961, Madame Nhu candidly submitted that the Western press might well emulate the Communist press by deciding on a common line to follow. Her idea was a sort of press "policy planning committee" headed by Joseph Alsop, who then had nothing but praise for Diem. When the interviewer politely replied that neither he nor his colleagues always concurred with Alsop, Madame Nhu snapped: "Well, if you won't be convinced by people who know the truth, then I can't help you."

In the eyes of the Ngo Dinh family, the ideal journalists were Gene and Ann Gregory, an American couple who ran the English-language daily, *Times of Vietnam*.

A former U. S. Information Agency employee who first went to Vietnam in 1950, Gene Gregory started his newspaper in 1956, about the same time he founded a company to import radios and other electrical equipment. Gregory became the recipient of lucrative, government-issued import licenses, and by some coincidence, the *Times of Vietnam* took to parroting government themes. Madame Nhu herself sometimes checked the paper's proof-sheets, and the paper echoed her hysterical tone with remarkable precision. NEW YORK TIMES LIES AGAIN was a fairly typical headline, over an article disputing a contention in the New York Times. "The President called the conspiracy 'a gigantic plot' but did not say it was masterminded by the U.S. Cen-

tral Intelligence Agency," ran a lead describing Diem's denunciation of an alleged attempt to overthrow his regime.

After months of berating the U. S., Mrs. Gregory ironically rushed to the U. S. Embassy for asylum when the recent *coup d'état* erupted. Her office, unfortunately, was smashed by one of those "spontaneous" mobs that appear so frequently in Asian upheavals.

Gradually and perceptibly, as the U. S. became more identified with the Diem regime, American officials in Saigon began to behave towards their own press like the regime itself. As Halberstam put it, "The U. S. Embassy turned into the adjunct of a dictatorship. In trying to protect Diem from criticism, the Ambassador became Diem's agent. But we reporters didn't have to become the adjuncts of a tyranny. We are representatives of a free society, and we weren't going to surrender our principles to the narrow notions of a closed society."

And therein lay the rub. Former Ambassador Nolting, a charming Virginian, never quite understood that American reporters could not be made to tailor their articles to conform to a government policy. He may have had no illusions himself about the nature of the Diem government, but he was under instructions to appease its whimsies. For reasons that even his closest associates still cannot clearly delineate, he expected U. S. correspondents to go along with this strategy. "Fritz Nolting is one of the finest human beings I've ever met," says one of his former aides. "But he didn't have the foggiest idea of how to deal with the press."

To an incredible extent, Nolting underestimated reporters' abilities to unearth stories, and he was constantly being surprised by their knowledge of facts he thought to be confidential. He failed to realize that, while he sedulously withheld information, correspondents were getting their details, sometimes distorted, from Vietnamese officials or out of Washington. During a delicate period of negotiation with Diem in late 1961, for example, Nolting refused to see the press for three weeks, even to give them "off the record" background guidance. Yet Washington was leaking like a sieve with accounts of the same negotiations, and reporters in Saigon found themselves in the peculiar position of being scooped on events occurring in Vietnam by their colleagues back home.

At the same time, Nolting tried valiantly to persuade the press that Diem and his family were much better than they appeared to be. He would tell visiting editors, for example, that Diem was really a popular man "because his picture is displayed everywhere." With reporters who had some experience in Vietnam, however, this line fell flat. "The first time I saw Nolting," recalls the veteran CBS correspondent Peter Kalischer, "he told me that Diem's real strength lay in the countryside. After hearing that, I figured there was no point in questioning him again."

In the opinion of many who worked with him, Nolting's

clumsiness was partly the result of his lack of experience with the mysterious complexities of an oriental crisis. He had served most of his diplomatic time in Europe, where political leaders are appreciably less devious than those in the Far East. There was also in Nolting's character, his associates say, an inherent fear of "rocking the boat," that sometimes went to ludicrous extremes. Once preparing for a TV interview, he noticed a portrait of Jefferson on the wall behind him. With utter solemnity, he asked an aide to replace it by a portrait of Washington who, he said, was "less controversial."

Efforts by U. S. military brass to control the news were even more flagrant. Until early in 1962, they tried to deny that a war was going on in Vietnam. This position may have been motivated by the consideration that, by shipping weapons to the Vietnamese army, the U. S. was violating the 1954 Geneva Accords, which it had hitherto respected but never signed. Observance of this technicality led to comic exchanges. When a huge aircraft carrier steamed up the Saigon River laden with helicopters, a U. S. military information officer was forced to say: "I don't see any aircraft carrier."

Similarly, U. S. troops in Vietnam held only advisory capacities, and attempts of all sorts were made to give the impression that they never engaged in combat. For a long time, reporters were barred from helicopter missions lest they observe Americans pulling triggers. On occasion, U. S. military spokesmen also endeavored to deny that American soldiers ever encountered Communist guerrillas. One evening, for example, a reporter learned from excellent sources that a GI had been kidnapped by the Communists. Checking with the U. S. military information officer, he received a flat denial. "Well, I'm filing the story anyway," challenged the reporter. "In that case," replied the officer, "I suppose we'll have to release the news."

In several cases, however, correspondents were inexcusably wrong. A few months ago, for instance, some of them reported a battle between Buddhist and Catholic troops that really never took place. Last August the Associated Press reported that a jeep carrying Ambassador Nolting had killed a little Vietnamese boy when, in fact, it was an army vehicle that slightly injured a girl. Some top U. S. military men contend that such stories derived from reporters' emotional desire to paint as black a picture as possible. More experienced journalists, while deploring such reporting, attribute it to the fierce competition between news agencies that frequently results in half-cocked accounts.

A more serious difference between the U. S. military command and American journalists lay in their divergent interpretation of how the war should be reported. American generals in Saigon have frankly stated that pessimistic newspaper articles lower morale and adversely affect public

opinion at home. Besides, they themselves take an optimistic view of the situation in Vietnam, and they support their opinion with charts and statistics showing the numbers of enemy weapons captured or the number of Communist guerrillas killed. To this, correspondents reply that their job is not to propagandize but to record the truth, whether it's good or bad. Moreover, they refuse to believe that graphs and figures tell the whole story. "This is an era that has to be qualified, not quantified," claims *Newsweek's* Robert McCabe. "Statistics are interesting, but they don't tell us anything about people's sympathies. Remember, the French killed thousands of Viet Minh in the Indochina War, and in the end they had more fighting against them than at the start."

The bitterness between the U. S. military and the press brewed to a boiling point last January, after a battle at the village of Ap Bac, in the important southern delta. According to American military advisers in the region, the fight had been a blistering government defeat. The Vietnamese army had surrounded the Communist guerrillas on three sides, but declined to carry through their attack. The guerrillas escaped after knocking down five U. S. helicopters and killing 65 Vietnamese troops and two American officers. The UPI's Neil Sheehan, Nick Turner of Reuter's and others took night taxi rides into the area to get the story, and in the midst of the confusion they were caught in the accidental fire of the Vietnamese artillery shelling its own men. As a leading American officer in the field said, "It was a miserable performance, just as it always is."

At U. S. military headquarters in Saigon, however, the battle was considered a victory because, the brass pointed out, the Vietnamese army had gained its objective: they captured the village. Admiral Harry D. Felt, U. S. Commander in the Pacific, repeated this thesis when he arrived in Saigon a few days later. And to Neil Sheehan he said, "You ought to get out into the countryside and speak to the people who have the facts."

Early this year, the displeasure of the U. S. mission chiefs in Saigon against American reporters knew no bounds. At one stage, when an important VIP was scheduled to arrive from Washington, Ambassador Nolting and General Paul Harkins, the U. S. military commander, commissioned a high U. S. Embassy official to write a memorandum describing the American correspondents. When they saw the memo, Nolting and Harkins ordered the official to rewrite it and make it tougher. And they weren't satisfied until he had characterized American newsmen as inexperienced, unsophisticated and malicious individuals whose "irresponsible, sensationalized, astigmatic reporting" had damaged the U. S. interest in Vietnam. Inevitably the secret document leaked back to the reporters themselves, and the official pleaded guilty to having submitted to pressure from above. "That memo was the stupidest thing I ever did," he now

confesses. "Once I was forced to rewrite it, I should have never signed my name to it."

But that memorandum was no sloppier than the kind of directives being sent from Washington to Saigon regarding news management. The author of one of them, then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Carl Rowan, was a former newspaperman who had contended that "this so-called concern about the public's right to know is really concern about the fourth estate's right to make a buck." Advocates of the principle of public access to information, he once stated, "often engage in eager self-deception." Accordingly, he drafted an order to the U. S. mission in Saigon advising that (1) news stories which criticize Diem "increase the difficulties of the U. S. job"; (2) newsmen be told that "trifling or thoughtless criticism of the Diem government" would hinder cooperation between the U. S. and Diem; and (3) newsmen should not be exposed to military activities "that are likely to result in undesirable stories." In short, as a Congressional subcommittee later analyzed the directive, facts were being hidden from the American public.

Actually, Rowan's directive was designed to improve American press relations in Saigon, but it had little effect. Finally, last May, the U. S. Information Agency chief in Vietnam, John Mecklin, went back to Washington and pleaded that official dealings with the correspondents had become so bad that the need to repair them was more important than "security and everything else." A former correspondent himself, Mecklin made no progress until he saw President Kennedy, who instructed his Press Secretary Pierre Salinger to tell officials in Saigon to "take reporters more into your confidence." For some odd reason, the message was sent on White House stationery but was not signed by the President.

But personal relations between the U. S. mission chiefs and the press in Saigon had become so bitter that not even a Presidential order could patch them up. Caught in the crossfire of official clumsiness, recriminations and distrust, Mecklin was ready to hoist his own white flag and surrender. "You can't begin to comprehend this mess until you've seen it from the inside," he sighed. "When I resign I'm going to write a book called *My Two Years in a Squirrel Cage*."

It wasn't until after Nolting had departed and his successor, Henry Cabot Lodge, arrived that a noticeable change took place. As he descended from his airplane at the Saigon airport, one of Lodge's first questions was: "Where are the gentlemen of the press?" It was, of course, a politician's question, but it cut with a double edge. It served to assure reporters that, having been a newsmen himself, he was on their side. It was also calculated to remind the Diem regime that he had no intention of playing its press agent.

Lodge's arrival in Saigon did little to ease the friction between U. S. military chiefs and the American reporters, however. While Lodge moved to get closer to correspondents, the U. S. military establishment imposed tighter restrictions on them by prohibiting their travel on aircraft except with special authorization. This difference in attitude towards journalists between Lodge and the military was more than a matter of public relations technique. It reflected a deeper disagreement about the state of the war. Like the correspondents, Lodge did not share General Harkins' optimism. Nor did he feel, as the military did, that much progress could be made as long as Diem and his family remained in power.

This divergence revealed itself sharply last September, when the U. S. military headquarters in Saigon barred reporters from flying to the site of a crashed American aircraft. "We're not going to risk an airplane and crew so that reporters can take pictures of a crash," declared a U. S. general. "Nonsense," replied an American Embassy official. "The military doesn't want photos of a crashed plane because it contradicts their optimistic line."

When Diem's internal fight against his country's Buddhists developed during last summer, the war of words between officials and journalists entered a new phase. Reporters were now charged with being overly sympathetic towards the Buddhists, whose leaders cleverly used the press as a weapon. Again, amid the complexities and confusion of the Saigon situation, this argument was a matter of interpretation. Correspondents certainly responded to the Buddhists, partly because Americans have an undeniable affinity for the underdog, largely because a burning monk makes news. The Buddhist spokesman adroitly made their case because their press relations were excellent, and they did indeed use the press because international opinion was the only weapon at their disposal. The contention that the Buddhist crisis would not have erupted if the foreign press was not present is dubious. "Diem and Nhu would have cracked down just as hard on the Buddhists," says a Western diplomat in Saigon, "but the world would have never known anything about it."

Critics of the press also belabored correspondents for "overemphasizing" the religious aspects of the friction between Diem and the Buddhists. Reporters did indeed refer repeatedly to the fact that the ruling Ngo Dinh family were Roman Catholics. Judging from many of their articles, however, they were quite aware of the nature of the dispute. By mid-July, for example, Halberstam was writing in the *New York Times* that "the controversy between the Buddhists and the government . . . has become increasingly political." UPI correspondent Sheehan was even denounced by the Buddhist leaders for stressing the political side of their protest.

Fundamentally, however, Diem's appalling mishandling

of the Buddhist issue vindicated the reporters who had claimed for years that South Vietnam's regime was hopelessly inept. In an overwhelming change of outlook, Washington adopted this view. But as *Newsweek* pointed out: "Nowadays, the journalist . . . is still abused for spreading unhappy truths. And indeed, by some curious twist of logic, it has even become the fashion to hold him responsible for the very events he describes."

As the U. S. position in Vietnam deteriorated, a chorus of attacks swelled against the Saigon correspondents. The most bitter of them came from *Time*, and, in a peculiar manner, it was largely aimed at *Time's* own chief Southeast Asia correspondent, Charles Mohr.

An acute and experienced reporter who served as *Time's* White House correspondent for several years, Mohr began to note many months ago that his dispatches from Saigon were being altered by his editors in New York. *Time* correspondents have no objections to having their copy rewritten; that is a part of *Time's* "group journalism." Mohr found, however, that his files were being sharply twisted to conform with policies established 10,000 miles from the scene of the story. For some reason, the *Time* editors preferred to minimize Diem's failings and they followed the optimistic Pentagon dogma that the war was being won in Vietnam. When Mohr complained that his own firsthand accounts were being ignored, a *Time* editor brushed aside his gripe as the bias of a "disgruntled correspondent."

Slowly, the disagreement between Mohr and his editors grew into an acrimonious dialogue. And finally, one week in mid-September, it became a public issue—publicized, inadvertently and ironically, by *Time* itself.

Reporting from Saigon that week, Mohr tapped the consensus of official opinion and wrote flatly that "the war is being lost" in Vietnam. He substantiated this strong statement with detailed evidence of serious government setbacks. But this pessimistic approach was anathema to the top *Time* editors. Mohr's judgment had to be changed completely. It fell to Gregory Dunne, a young Contributing Editor, to do the job. He refused and, moreover, declined to handle any more stories about Vietnam. Other editors stepped in. The article that ultimately appeared in print declared that Vietnam's "government soldiers are fighting better than ever. . . ."

The total alteration of Mohr's dispatch wasn't enough, however. *Time* Managing Editor Otto Fuerbringer summoned a writer to his office and with nothing but his own preconceptions to guide him, dictated the gist of an article for his magazine's Press section. It was a devastating com-

pendium of bitter innuendoes and clever generalities, all blatantly impeaching American correspondents in Vietnam for distorting the news.

Anticipating an explosion if the piece appeared, *Time's* able chief of correspondents, Richard M. Clurman, tried to have its publication stopped. But he was unable to reach *Time* Editor-in-Chief Henry Luce, the only man with authority to overrule Fuerbringer. Luce was attending a football game in Atlanta. The only other move Clurman could make was to cable Mohr, warn him of the forthcoming article, and invite him to meet in Paris the following week. What ensued would easily provide material for still another in the lengthy series of novels about *Time* Incorporated.

Clurman tried to dissuade Mohr from quitting. Mohr agreed to stay with the job—on one condition: that he be given a column of space in *Time* to refute Fuerbringer's story. Clurman recognized this as an impossible request, but he promised to see what he could do. Leaving Mohr in Paris to wait, he flew back to New York to speak with Henry Luce.

According to all accounts, Luce was surprised and confused by the turmoil within his company. He admired Mohr's passionate sincerity. But he could not, for the sake of satisfying an honest reporter, censure the skilled managing editor of one of the most successful magazines in the country. Instead, he tried to seek a compromise. He ordered Clurman to go to Saigon, with Mohr, and write a "corrective" piece about the press corps. Off went Clurman to see if *Time* could not emerge from its self-made mess with its "dignity and principles intact." Mohr accompanied him without wavering from his decision to quit. After Clurman advised against another *Time* article on the Saigon press, Luce insisted that it be written anyway. Said one reporter: "Both pieces could have been written by Madame Nhu."

By sheer coincidence, Madame Nhu did indeed trip into the Time and Life Building for an elite lunch that very week. There she met Clare Booth Luce who followed up with the devastating declaration, in the *National Review*, that America's prestige and security lay in "the pale pink palm of [Madame Nhu's] exquisite little hand."

If correspondents took a retrospective view of recent years in Vietnam, they might find some consolation in Halberstam's philosophical summation: "It may be tough to be a reporter in Saigon, but it's been a helluva lot easier than being a diplomat here."

Advertising in Russia—Now a Necessity

By Faith I. Popkin

Despite frequent sneers at advertising as an extravagance of capitalism, the Russians are now using advertising to sell their products. Soviet officials have found that this is a valuable medium for informing the people of new products and pushing goods in which a surplus exists. Likewise by use of the media, citizens with buying power for the first time can be instructed how and what to buy.

The Soviet citizen now has money to spend and he demands quality and variety from consumer production. As the supply of consumer goods slowly increases, advertisements appear on billboards, radio and television, and in newspapers and magazines. Match-box covers and even postage stamps are used to advertise goods and to promote social and political programs.

Communist advertising is also used to promote and publicize available services. Great difficulties now exist in finding fast and efficient cleaners, launderers, and repair shops.

However, Soviet advertising lacks the finesse of its Western counterpart. An example of this is in an ad for Caspian herring placed in a Moscow newspaper by the Russian Trade Organization. It read: "The quality of this herring is in no way inferior to other brands of herring."

It seems strange that Soviet advertising of such low appeal is allowed, for any form of advertising which appears in the Soviet Union must first convince the officials that its existence will better the standard of living, improve the quality of production, and in general help to strengthen the economic condition of the country. The Russians fail to draw a connection between the economic interrelationship of a journal's editorial function and its potential selling power as a vehicle of advertising. Advertisers on the air and in the printed media are not permitted to sponsor programs or to influence the formulation of their content. Nonetheless, the value of advertising is highly exploited by the government, for Soviet officials have found that advertising can lower the cost of inspection and quality control of goods. This is accomplished by product differentiation and trademarks.

Product differentiation is intentionally used to erase anonymity of production and to improve shoddy industrial outputs. Each firm in the same industry has its own name and production mark; and whenever possible the firm is obligated to identify itself on the goods it produces. In this manner not only can inferior goods be traced, but the trade

mark can also be used to attract and hold customers. Consumers are urged to find a product they like and to continue to purchase goods with that mark.

Boris Petrikovski, a technical advisor at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., had this to say about the trade mark: "We put our trademark on the goods for the purpose of increasing responsibility of industrial concerns for the quality of the articles. Workers of the plant struggle for their trademark as it is a seal of their honor."

One finds posters in Russian factories which read: "To value the honor of the factory mark is the duty of each group of workers." These posters convince the employees of the dynamics of Russian production and make them fanatical about beating the West in the production race. With this function in mind, it is not surprising that billboards are the second most influential advertising medium in Russia.

Their importance is only overshadowed by the shop windows in large Russian cities, which remain the most important form of advertising. Before Khrushchev, store windows resembled dusty museum interiors, but now shop windows in the populated areas have much more similarity to their Western counterparts.

Printed media make the third major carrier of Russian advertisements. The Soviet press is, of course, completely independent of the economic support of advertising. In the USSR the printed media are viewed as major social forces to facilitate attainment of defined goals of the society.

The press is far too valuable an instrument of the Communists to waste any of its space on irrelevant material. Thus any ads which appear must satisfy a definite need and serve as a form of very effective propaganda to keep the people sold on the Communist system.

The only forms of advertising which would be acceptable are those which are "scientifically directed" and whose aim is to fulfill the Communist program. Before a business enterprise can advertise, its budget must be approved by special agencies of the government. Funds for advertising must be justified as dictated by special conditions in the sale of the product.

The editors of Russian newspapers recognize the importance of advertising, but do not feel that this should be the function of newspapers; *Pravda* and *Izvestia* do not carry advertisements. However, evening papers do carry some ads for restaurants, jet airplanes, jewelry, etc. Most of the notices have a cluttered look which reminds one of a decorated classified ad in an American newspaper.

One of the few Moscow newspapers which carries advertising is *Evening Moscow*. It is a lively paper of four pages,

Faith I. Popkin made a special study of advertising in the Soviet Union for a research paper at Penn State University.

the last of which is devoted to ads. Russians will line up at newsstands just to buy copies.

Advertisements can also be found in various Russian magazines. Soviet technical magazines which are published by the State scientific and technical committee in Moscow sometimes contain a page or two of advertisements by foreign companies, usually French or English. Likewise mail-order catalogue magazines which describe new products and advertising techniques have been adopted by the Russians in the past two years. One of these contained over 800 items for mail-order purchasing.

Advertising on radio and television is used for direct approach; for instance, they may announce that a specific store now has a new consignment of goods. The radio is used more for this purpose as it operates all day; however, some retail officials feel that television is more effective as it attracts more people.

One example of Russian television advertising which is especially interesting is a porridge commercial. It begins, "Mothers, have you been having trouble feeding your baby?" Then "Get baby Kashs" (porridge). On the screen a crying infant appears who only quieted down when he was fed the porridge. The scene then switches to a factory which makes the food and ends with a shot of jars of the product. The night after the porridge commercial, a blonde appeared, courtesy of the government-controlled airwaves, with one arm sheathed in a nylon stocking. A woman announcer praised the product while the model prepared to put one on. The camera switched and in the next shot the blonde was back and wearing the stockings. Before these commercials, it was said that the only ones on TV were to encourage citizens to put money in State banks or to help avoid fires.

Yet another type of advertising is the three-minute film, now shown in movie theaters and on television. A film may promote children's canned foods or factory-made preserves, and in the best capitalist tradition, pretty girls are used to help advertise the products.

Numerous pamphlets are also employed by the Russians to promote a multitude of products. These advertising pieces are printed in very bright and sometimes crude colors, and often appear as though they were printed twenty years ago.

In addition, package stuffers are sent out by individual stores to announce a special sale or event. In Leningrad, prospective mothers receive a card advertising that a certain store has layettes for sale. Likewise, direct mail is used on a small scale.

For a variety of reasons, small Russian concerns have turned to advertising to sell their products. For several years, Ros-khoz-torg, the central distributing agency for household goods in the Russian Federated Republic, has been preparing advertisements for the many products it dis-

tributes. The agency profits by the use of radio, leaflets, and advertisements in local newspapers. In fact, Ros-khoz-torg is now going in for the so-called advertising prospectus, the first of which advertised 32 new household items in full color and was reported a great success by retail stores and wholesale outlets.

In an article in *Sovietskaya Torgovlya*, an official of the baked goods sales organization of the Siberian city of Khabarovsk commented on how his company advertises their goods. He said that periodically merchandise is advertised in the regional newspapers, and that this steps up the sale of these goods.

To an American public, conditioned to advertising, such a statement is hardly earth-shattering. However, it is noteworthy when one realizes that the 27 national newspapers in Russia exist only to tell the people what the government wants them to know, and not to foster advertising.

A favorite Soviet device in advertising is to tie it to a reminder of Russian space achievements. The Sputnik motif is evidenced in ad material for a variety of products. Bookshops are very popular in Russia, and book ads, which are numerous, are known to praise Soviet space conquests even when this has nothing to do with the book. If the advertisement is in leaflet form, praise of the Russians may even appear in verse.

Advertising has also been found to be a handy device for introducing new products to the Soviet people. As an example, the Soviet fishing industry has lately been catching and canning the saira, a small smelt-like fish. This product is now consumed all over the USSR, and it is advertised as "tasty, nourishing saira blanched in oil." Brand names will doubtless be added when some canned saira turn out to taste better than other canned saira.

Soviet advertising serves yet another unique function. Various Russian industries are assigned turnover goals which must be met. As a result numerous classified ads are placed by industries which are anxious to promote their products. Many of these ads are highly decorative and seem to compete with each other for attention. This draws a direct parallel to the competition existing among the factory directors who—anxious to keep their jobs—ultimately must show a rise in the level of production even at the price of sacrificing quality.

Nevertheless, many factors do operate against the increased use of advertising in Russia. The most outstanding economic problem is that shortages still exist on many items. As new apartment houses rise and the desire for furniture grows, it is not uncommon to see people wait in line for the moment when factory vans deliver to the stores so that household items can be snatched up immediately. Likewise one can see that it is obviously foolish to advertise a car when waiting lines are so long that it will take five years to fill existing orders.

Equally obstructive to the advancement of advertising is official opinion, endorsed by Khrushchev, that only "rotten goods" need to be blown up for sale to the unwary customers by the use of advertising. In addition the view prevails that advertising is undignified. Party papers are not considered proper vehicles for such a purpose.

Yet perhaps the most outstanding factors working against the increased use of advertising in the USSR are the ads and products themselves. Soviet ad men have been put on the carpet for advertising goods that were not available and for giving misleading descriptions of products. One store director in Leningrad said that their radio announcements attract women into the store. However, they sometimes complain that the goods sounded better than they are, and they ask the clerks why they make their advertisements misleading like the Americans.

Frequently a Soviet consumer will buy an advertised product, such as a tape recorder, only to find that the instrument must frequently be taken to the repair shop. Consumers also complain about the styles of clothing and the poor workmanship. These expressions of dissatisfaction make advertising of these products a real headache.

Yet even should all the above shortcomings be corrected, one vital factor is still lacking. A very interesting observation was made by Herbert Stein, an American economist,

when he visited Russia. He said that the people seem to have little interest in expressing or enjoying themselves in the clothes they wear, the furniture they select for their homes, or the food they eat. Thus the release of the individual human spirit to express and enjoy oneself is missing. Relate this statement to Western advertising motives which appeal to the latent desires in man to satisfy his mental needs by drinking a Pepsi or wearing a Brooks Brothers' suit.

The future of advertising in the USSR will obviously depend upon its capacity to enhance the Communist ideals and to indoctrinate the public. In addition, it must serve as an economic booster and a substitute for costly inspections and quality control of goods.

Although advertising's future is speculative, it is a fact that today the Russians carefully read every ad that appears. For in the Soviet bloc, people have very little information on products and must turn to second-hand vendors or an unimaginative press report to see what the industries are producing. This suggests that if the State allows advertising to grow, the people will certainly welcome its existence.

As Boris Petrikovski said, "Advertising will increase as the quantity of production increases. It will help people to find products that they need."

What Keeps Them Away From Newspapering?

By John L. Hulteng

I have been invited to consider some of the reasons why young people are not electing newspaper work as a career, and to suggest what might be done to deal with the shortage of good personnel that has developed as a consequence.

Perhaps the first thing that needs to be done is to establish the fact that there is a shortage of personnel.

For one dimension of the shortage, we might look at the statistics about journalism school graduating classes.

In 1962 all the accredited schools and departments of journalism in the country—some 47 of them—graduated 2061 bachelor's, master's and doctor's degree candidates. If we throw in the graduates of another 50 or so unaccredited, smaller departments and schools, the total comes to around 2600. This was for all divisions of the various schools, including radio-TV, advertising, public relations, magazine journalism and communications research as well as newspapers.

I haven't exact statistics on this point, but I would guess that fewer than half of the total number of graduates were pointing in the direction of newspapers—I'd guess it would be around 1200.

That means, then, that in a given year there might be 1200 graduates of journalism programs, perhaps 1000 of them from accredited schools, to meet the demands of the nation's newspapers. There are more than 1600 dailies and between 7000 and 8000 weeklies in the country. Your guess is as good as mine as to their turnover needs in an average year, but a conservative estimate based on the experience I have had would have to put it somewhere between 2000 and 3000.

Here's another dimension: The Newspaper Fund, a foundation sponsored by the *Wall Street Journal*, conducted a survey last year of job opportunities for journalism graduates. Placement officers and journalism deans were asked to give hard figures on the number of jobs available per graduate in the spring of 1962. These averaged out to about five jobs for each graduate, considering the country as a whole.

Now, obviously, the needs of many newspapers are being met from sources other than the numbers of journalism school graduates. And this isn't necessarily a bad thing. There isn't only one road to salvation, nor is there only one

avenue into the field of journalism. However, I think there are sound reasons for suggesting that the best-oriented and the most strongly-motivated recruits to the field come through the journalism schools.

The over-all figures I have cited are borne out in detail. Charles Duncan, now dean of the School of Journalism at Colorado, last spring made a survey of journalistic employers in his state to see what number of openings there were likely to be, and what employers' preferences would be.

He received replies from 78 of the 149 newspapers in Colorado, both daily and weekly. He found that on those 78 responding papers there were 1,023 employees in the news-editorial and advertising departments now.

These 78 papers estimated that they would need 138 new employees each year for the next five years to keep up with turnover. Of the 78 editors responding, 70% indicated that they wanted these new employees to be college graduates, 6% said they had no preference and 24% didn't respond to the question. And of the 78 editors, 65% indicated that they wanted the new employees to be journalism school graduates, 10% said they had no preference and 25% did not respond.

Summing up, 70% of the editors wanted college graduates, more than two-thirds wanted journalism school graduates—and they needed a total of 138 a year. Last year Colorado's School of Journalism graduated 19 students, a substantial number of whom went into fields other than newspapering. Let me quote the final lines of Dean Duncan's report:

From the standpoint of young people considering any phase of journalism as a career field, the over-all outlook for immediate employment and future opportunity is excellent. (This does not mean that at any given time a beginner can have his pick of a number of jobs. Often shortages exist in positions and places for which there are no takers. Similarly, the more desirable jobs usually draw more applicants than can be accommodated. This report is an over-all, general picture.)

From the employers' standpoint, the outlook is not encouraging. Preferring, almost to a man, to hire college graduates, and heavily favoring the graduate who has had professional training in college, they are actually getting only about one college graduate for every two positions and only one journalism major or the equivalent for every four positions.

Last spring the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon graduated 35 baccalaureate candidates and nine master's degree candidates. Of this number about 15 were headed into newspaper work. And we had requests from editors for 38 graduates. Obviously, we were unable to stretch the available supply to meet the demand.

Perhaps this is enough to establish the fact that there is a shortage.

The next logical question becomes—*why* is there such a shortage?

For one thing, the glamor stereotype that once drew crowds of starry-eyed youngsters into the newspaper field has been displaced to a large degree by newer images. When I was in college, a quarter century ago, the image of the newspaperman, the foreign correspondent, was irresistible to those of us heading into the writing field.

Today the stereotypes that lure the youngsters are those of the Madison Avenue account executive, with the three-martini lunch and the exhilarating challenge of a fiercely competitive field, or of the television commentator, bringing the word to millions of listeners every evening and interviewing the mighty of the world across the studio desk. There's also the softer sell of the public relations image, with the impressive salary and the intriguing assignments.

The image of the newspaperman has become a bit shopworn, partly because of the competition from the newer rivals, partly because many of us in the newspaper business were guilty of poor-mouthing our own profession.

Many newspapermen like to strike a pose of cynicism, and as a part of it they talk down their own field, emphasize its shortcomings and underplay its strong points. And in the 30's, of course, a great many of us who were in the business then deliberately discouraged others from trying to enter it, since jobs were scarce and hard to hang on to.

All of this has come home to roost for the newspaper business today. Potentially eager youngsters are turned away by the advice of counselors in high school or elsewhere who repeat the negative comments that have filtered through from old time newsmen or critics of the field. And many other youngsters are drawn by the brighter images of other communications areas.

A second factor responsible for the personnel shortage is, of course, money.

It is perfectly true that salaries in the newspaper business are better than they have ever been. But are they impressive enough to be competitive with the other fields that are bidding for the sort of people newspapers want?

That same Newspaper Fund survey cited above listed starting salaries offered journalism graduates in 1962—they averaged around \$85 a week. Check that figure sometime against the salaries offered by business, industry and science employers who come around to the campus to recruit. Check it, too, against the starting salaries offered for public relations jobs, or for some of the other directly competing fields within the area of mass communications.

Two years ago, Dr. Merrill Samuelson, at that time on the faculty at Stanford and now on the faculty at the University of Washington, made a study of the reasons why newsmen

leave their jobs for other fields, and why even newsmen who stay are often dissatisfied with their situations. He found that an overwhelming majority of his respondents who had left newspaper work for other fields had been dissatisfied with their salaries. But, he also found:

The really disturbing thing is not that only 16% of the ex-newsmen had been reasonably satisfied with their newspaper salaries. It's rather the substantial fraction of today's newsmen who are dangerously dissatisfied with *their* salaries. You might estimate that one in four of these newsmen is ripe to switch to the ex-newsman category.

All of this suggests that one of the things newspaper editors and publishers need to do is examine closely the competition they face for talent and how well their salary structures are designed to meet that competition.

Something else that editors might examine is the need to give more publicity to good salaries and good salary structures where they do exist. Starting salaries often provide a misleading impression of the true salary structure on a newspaper. The pay scale after five or ten years on some paper may be impressively favorable, when compared with other fields, yet too little of this information ever gets attention.

We have embarked at our School on a series of surveys to gather data on jobs and salaries on newspapers. I hope the resulting picture may be of value in attracting the sort of people newspapers like to have. But some salary data in the journalistic field can be pretty dismaying.

A study was made recently of the pay scales on Iowa weekly newspapers. On the whole, this showed encouraging progress in salary improvement. However, I was struck by one set of figures for the weeklies in the 2000 to 3000 circulation bracket. For this one group, the lowest average wage in the backshop, that of the printer's devil, was higher than the average paid to *all* employees on the news editorial and advertising sides with the exception of the editor and the advertising manager. In other words, in this group of papers, the backshop apprentice earned more than the news editors, reporters, society editors, sports editors, advertising salesmen and bookkeepers.

Turning from salaries—there's still a third reason for the personnel shortage, one that is a little harder to pin down in specific terms.

Dr. Samuelson, in his study, found significant indications that both ex-newsmen and staff members currently employed had misgivings about their job status, about the future of the field and about the importance of the work they were doing.

I think that anyone who has been in the newspaper business any time at all would be obliged to agree that there are

some conditions, some situations that would logically give rise to the sort of misgivings and dissatisfactions that Dr. Samuel reported finding.

We all know of the existence of sore spots in the field of American journalism today, both specific sore spots in the sense of individual papers that depart from ethical standards of public service, and generalized sore spots associated with practices that are widespread in the business.

Let me just note two examples of the latter sort of thing, so there will be no question about what I mean.

Two excellent and searching articles in the *ASNE Bulletin* in the last several years have called attention to the dilution of journalistic integrity involved in the practice of sports writers, travel editors, auto editors and others accepting special services or favors from news sources they are assigned to cover. Two articles with details spelled out were by J. Russell Wiggins of the *Washington Post*, writing on "Gifts, Favors and Gratuities" in the *ASNE Bulletin* of August, 1958, and Jack Mann, sports editor of *Newsday*, writing on "Whose Bread I Eat, His Song I Sing," in the October, 1961, issue.

Another type of unfortunate practice is detailed in an article by William K. Zinsser in the September 12 issue of *Reporter* magazine. Mr. Zinsser describes a typical promotional gimmick involving a visit by a movie star to a city to call attention to his latest movie. He was trailed everywhere by reporters, photographers, and TV cameramen who set up one distorted, unreal situation after another to create "news" for their outlets. Let me quote a passage from Mr. Zinsser:

It is one of the eerie facts of modern America that so many events occur solely for the communications industry and have no organic life of their own. They are non-events. Like *Sleeping Beauty*, they need the electronic kiss of the TV camera or the inky embrace of the rotary press to give them the semblance of breath. The real men and women who attend these occasions might as well be made of cardboard. Not until they are photographed, and their photograph is seen by people who were not there, do they serve the function of real people.

Equally abrasive to the ideals of a young recruit is the introduction to handouts, and to the dependence on them that characterizes some city rooms. And even more destructive can be the disillusioning discovery that in some newspaper offices ethics are elastic and adjustable when ownership, advertisers or pressure groups throw their weight around.

We can't afford to discount the grave erosion in the ranks of dedicated recruits that has resulted from factors such as these in the newspaper field. They, too, have played their part in creating the personnel shortage.

This point is underlined in an article by Edward A. Walsh, Professor of Journalism at Fordham University, writing in *The American Editor* for Spring, 1961.

Professor Walsh, taking as his title "Why Good Men Leave Newspaper Work," presented a round-up of comments from former newspapermen who had gone into other fields and who were explaining why they had made the shifts.

In the end, the newspaperman loses respect for his newspaper and sees no other paper where he can do what he wants. If he is fortunate enough to find an alternative or be offered one, he gets out. The newspaper business, as it is today, cheats the man making a career of it. It seems, at first, to offer what it actually does not: a chance to chase reality and pass it on creatively and intelligently.

I could add to Professor Walsh's examples some from my own experience. Less than a week ago, for example, I received a wistful and bitter letter from one of our graduates who, after five years in the newspaper business, has gone into the field of public relations. His last newspaper assignment consisted largely of rewriting handouts from college public relations bureaus, and this was not palatable to him. As he put it, these releases "were good, solid well-done pieces—the sort of thing I would have liked to write given time away from rewrites."

So he has gone over to the other side of the desk, as public relations director for a California college. And I doubt that he will be back in the newspaper field.

Finally, now that we have been sobered by a face-to-face examination of the problem, what is there to do about it?

Where possible, salaries ought to be bettered to the point that they are fully competitive with other fields.

The same student from whom I heard a week ago about his shift to public relations had worked up through five years of newspaper jobs to a salary of a little less than \$9000. The college public relations job he has just taken pays him \$2300 more. And incidentally, at \$11,300 a year, his salary is just about \$2000 higher than the current average pay of the University of Oregon faculty members who sent him out into the world six years ago.

Something can and should be done, too, about refurbishing the image of the newspaperman. This has been a crusade of mine for many years. In 1957, *Nieman Reports* carried an article of mine that began with the line: "It is time to think about re-glamorizing the newspaper business."

I was talking not about tinsel glamor, or deceptive and outmoded stereotypes, but the genuine appeal of journalism. This appeal lies in being in the direct center of the flow

of events, in daily satisfying the creative urge that is strong in all of us, in experiencing the ego-satisfaction that comes of seeing one's work in print, and in performing a truly significant public service function in the American society.

Since I wrote that and similar articles I have become dean of a school that prepares graduates for a number of mass communications fields. It is not my business to evangelize for any one of them. But it is the business of newspaper editors, and no one is better situated to do the job.

As a final point, I think a great deal can also be done about dealing with the dissatisfactions and disillusionments that beset some young people when they get into the newspaper business.

This is partly a matter of setting a policy at the editor's and the publisher's level that recognizes the public service function of the newspaper and underlines the ethical responsibilities of all newspapermen.

It is also partly a matter of giving staff members a stronger sense of value in their work, a clear impression that their talents are recognized and appreciated. I think that more papers should follow the practice of some in giving their staff members more opportunity for creative, digging, background assignments. Admittedly, these are more costly than beat or spot news assignments, but they may pay off in a double sense—in the form of a newspaper better serving its function and in the form of dividends in satisfaction for the staff members who carry out these more challenging and more rewarding missions.

I'd like to cite here, if I may, a few paragraphs from a talk made at a meeting of editors about a year ago, by Fred W. Stein, editor and publisher of the *Binghamton Press*.

I believe we've got to create an intellectual climate that will appeal to a journalism student who's an entirely different type than we were accustomed to finding 30 and 40 years ago. If you recall, most of the people we hired then never saw the front door of a college. . .

To attract high-class talent today, I think a newspaper has to breathe an atmosphere of vigor and independence and intelligence. I think it has to have a sense of high purpose.

Too many newspapers instead are content to rest in a comfortable cash-register existence, never stirring up controversy, always sticking to predictably partisan views, always harboring a whole herd of sacred cows, ever careful not to offend the prejudices of the lowest common denominator of their readers.

Such newspapers insult the intelligence of college students today. Little wonder that bright and thoughtful young men and women turn to other pursuits. . .

I feel pretty strongly about what newspapers need to attract and hold top-flight personnel in their news departments. They need an atmosphere of idealism and enthusiasm and healthy skepticism.

They need individuality and they need a dedication to the kind of truth that sometimes takes courage and hard work to reveal. There lies the excitement and the lure of the newspaper business at its best.

And there, I submit, lies at least part of the answer to the employment crisis in the newspaper business.

That puts at least one aspect of the problem in most effective terms, better than I could have phrased it.

And it focuses attention on the central issue—the need to attract dedicated, idealistic, strongly-motivated youngsters

into this most important of all tasks: telling the public the news it needs to know.

All of what I have been saying comes down to a question of personalities, of individuals. This newspaper field is still characterized by the talents and energies and ideas of individuals, however many advances may be underway in the mechanical areas. It is the individual editor who sets a tone for his paper, the individual publisher who determines priorities, the individual reporter who responds to the sense of public service.

John L. Hulting is Dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon. Formerly chief editorial writer on the *Providence Journal*, he was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

For Polemical Passion in the Press

By **Karl E. Meyer**

Millions of Americans are nightly witnesses to an awesome paradox of modern communications. In many major cities, there is a solid hour of news on television every evening—first the tandem efforts of Huntley and Brinkley and then a half hour of Walter Cronkite, the lone CBS challenger of the NBC twins. A mountain of money (CBS spends upwards of \$30 million a year for its news staff) has been invested in a staggering effort to stuff us with news—and also, with cajoling commercials.

Surely never before have so many Americans been so assured of getting so much news so quickly and on the whole so accurately.

Yet at the same time, never before have so many Americans had so little choice in the *opinions* they hear about the meaning of the news. On the marketplace of Fact, trading is active and highly competitive; on the marketplace of opinion, stocks are slumping and conditions are stagnant.

A telling measure of the change is the contrast between radio and television. In the vanishing era when commentators reigned, there were no dramatic pictures of sit-in demonstrations—nor were there sexy cigarette commercials with lovely nymphs rejoicing in the mentholated miracle of a new filter tip. But there was the cut and thrust of debate. Some commentators were pompous (like Gabriel Heatter), some strident and reactionary (like Fulton Lewis, Jr.), some pithy and liberal (like Elmer Davis),

but all were part of a nightly forum for debate. Today there are only a handful of survivors—the still-strident Lewis, the urbane Edward Morgan, and the forever smooth Lowell Thomas.

Television discourages contentiousness; it favors the bland vendors of Fact—the Huntleys and the Cronkites who convey a personal opinion only through inscrutable movements of the eyebrow or a slight modulation of a mellifluous voice. The case of Howard K. Smith is only the most conspicuous example of what happens to a reporter who fails to camouflage his views. Once upon a time, when Smith was his network's chief European correspondent, he was described as "the intellectual dean of the CBS news staff" by Sig Michelson, vice-president of CBS. His Sunday broadcasts from London were a weekly event on radio and Mr. Smith won virtually every award bestowed on his craft.

Then—sad day!—Mr. Smith went to Washington and became a television reporter. On October 31, 1961—two years after his arrival and shortly after his old boss, Edward R. Murrow, became chief of USIA—this item appeared in the *Washington Post*:

Howard K. Smith quit his job yesterday as chief correspondent and general manager of the Washington bureau of CBS news. The move followed a disagreement over Smith's practice of dealing in strong editorial terms in his news analysis . . . Smith insisted that the policy of interpretation be liberal, as in the past, or that the policy be changed to permit occasional, carefully labeled comment, as in newspapers. Both suggestions were re-

Karl E. Meyer puts polemical passion into editorials on the *Washington Post*. This is part of an address at a faculty forum, University of Illinois, November 1.

jected, and Smith's Sunday radio program was abolished.

The saga of Howard K. Smith is symptomatic of the timidity about opinion on the two big networks. Only at ABC, least of the networks, is there room for someone like Smith. In the modern decalogue of NBC and CBS, the first commandment for reporters appears to be, "Thou Shalt Not Express Thyself." It might annoy the sponsors.

What is happening on the air is simply an exaggerated expression of a broader tendency in what we like to call the mass communications industry. We see prodigious technical advances in packaging the product matched by a steady standardization of what lies in the package. With each breathtaking leap extending the technological frontier, it seems, something is gained in efficiency—and lost in the subtler terms of libertarian values.

There have been admirable, and astonishing, advances in newspaper production since the end of World War II. Color photographs can now be processed into engraved plastic plates in half an hour; perforated tapes feed into linotype machines to turn out stock market tables and wire service reports; more than 600 newspapers—60 of these dailies—are printed on photo-offset presses. And now computers are on the horizon. Last December 27, after eighteen months of joint research, the Los Angeles *Times* and the Radio Corporation of America announced that computer processes could be applied to editorial and advertising copy. Reporters can type directly into a RCA301 Computer which then casts the story into lead type—dividing words and making editorial corrections in the process. This means that it is possible to fill an entire front page with stories ready for the presses in 70 seconds.

According to a report in *Editor & Publisher* (June 8, 1963), the computer "might also be programmed to produce a rough layout of the paper for analytical purposes by using editorial policy as the foundation for developing the necessary machine language." Still further ahead is the possibility that the reporter may *talk* his story into a voice writing machine, thus bypassing even the typewriter. Meanwhile, advertising agencies are using computers to make marketing decisions—what the trade calls "media selection." Small wonder that one publisher, John H. Perry, Jr., was moved to exclaim: "In the field of newspaper production there probably has never been a time that can equal in excitement that which is developing today."

But alas! that excitement cannot be fairly said to extend to the critical and polemical function of the press. Let it be immediately said that the average American newspaper reporter is better paid, better trained and better informed today than he has ever been in our history. Every trade has its hacks, and there are of course newspapermen

of uncommonly feeble ability and imagination. But on the whole, in Washington, one is impressed by the competence, honesty and *professionalism* of most of the press corps.

This gain in professionalism, however, has exacted a price—loss of passion and personality. In Washington, you are literally engulfed by Fact: ream upon ream of reportage and interpretative analysis. But there is a poverty of arresting and provocative opinion. In London, in Paris, and in Rome, you can encounter more startlingly diverse opinions in the press in a week than you could encounter in Washington in a year. There is a sting and verve in British polemics—the writings of Malcolm Muggeridge, Henry Fairlie, Bernard Levin, Peregrine Worsthorne, Michael Foot, R. H. S. Crossman—that makes most American commentary seem pallid and dull by comparison.

As a rule, expressions of opinion in Washington fall within a broad establishment view, bounded on the right by David Lawrence and on the left by Drew Pearson, with Joe Alsop oscillating wildly in between. Heretics like Murray Kempton and I. F. Stone operate on the fringe, writing for small-circulation publications—while poor old Westbrook Pegler, that dispenser of strong, and sometimes rank, meat, has been cast into limbo by a Hearst chain in desperate search of respectability.

Respectability—I can think of no better word to sum up both the virtues and vices of modern American journalism. The days of the yellow press are emphatically gone; so are the extravagant and eccentric publishers like the elder Hearst, Colonel McCormick, Captain Patterson, the first Pulitzer, the late Marshall Field, and E. W. Scripps, who called himself "a damned old crank." The trend is to monopoly ownership today, to a more sober responsibility—and often, to a marked stuffiness. When the *Daily Mirror* perished in New York in October, I did not think I would mourn its passing. It was always a worn carbon copy of the New York *Daily News*—a third-rate imitation in every sense. Still, the *Mirror* had a raffish quality, like the old Third Avenue El and the beery derelicts on the Bowery. Even cheap whiskey has its place in the nature of things, and the death of the *Mirror* drained another raw drop from a press that seems over-distilled.

It is not enough to take complacent refuge in applauding the technological innovations that bring us swift and accurate news. The elder Pulitzer exhorted his editors not to be content with merely publishing the news. It was his deepest conviction that the press had an obligation to be the critic, as well as the mirror, of the society around it. That critical function is not met simply by having Huntley or Cronkite read a wire-service report over a Tele-Prompter. Diversity of opinion requires passion far more than pleasing diction.

Economic necessity doomed the *Daily Mirror*, as it has

countless other newspapers whose names are attached with a hyphen to the names of the survivors. And economic necessity presses hard against our magazines, which now seem more important than ever as the tributaries feeding the broad stream of national opinion. No one who values magazines can look with much equanimity at the melancholy economic plight of journals on the newsstand rack.

There are two crises in magazine economics—one visible, the other concealed. The first constitutes the familiar problems of rising production costs, fierce competition for subscribers, and falling revenue from advertisers increasingly lured to television. This squeeze has accounted for the death of a score or more national magazines in the last decade, some of the then popular products like *Colliers*, *Coronet*, and *Liberty*; some great magazines gone bad, like the *American Mercury*; and some specialized journals, like *Etude*. The same squeeze is pinching the once-great Curtis empire—which used to seem like an impregnable Gibraltar, haughtily removed from tides of change.

More troubling still, however, is the concealed crisis in periodical publishing—the extent to which important magazines are dependent on the largesse of a wealthy backer, or, more disturbing, dependent on the Government through preferential postal rates. In the first class are such enlivening publications as the *New Republic*, the *National Review*, and the *Nation*—with the *Progressive* in a class by itself, a magazine whose annual deficit is met by generous reader contributions.

The second class covers a wider terrain, taking in publications that are barely in the black, and including most of the privately-subsidized periodical press. This is an iceberg problem: only the tip shows, and the hidden dimensions are only suggested at rare intervals. One such interval occurred in March, 1962, when the House of Representatives approved an increase in postal rates on second class mail—especially on newspapers and magazines. The collective wail of lament from magazine publishers was the measure of the depth of the iceberg.

The *New Republic* commented editorially, on March 26, 1962, to this effect:

The imposition of an additional cent postage on every copy of a publication mailed outside the county is literally a matter of life or death, especially for those magazines whose advertising revenue is slight—that is, nearly every serious, smaller circulation publication . . . If [the legislation] is not modified by the Senate . . . postal charges paid by all magazines will rise by 40 per cent . . . (sec-

ond-class rates have already gone up 89 per cent in the last decade) and many of them will have to go out of business.

In the end, Congress relented, and magazines got a reprieve. I confess to a slight shiver, however, at the significance of the dispute. The exercise of a right prized by our Constitution—the right to express critical views—rests, in the magazine industry, on the slim margin of a penny postage stamp on each copy mailed outside the county. If a dictator should want to silence annoying minority views published in magazines, all he would have to do is to raise the postage rates.

The book publishing industry was once defined to me as an odd blend of medieval and modern methods. It has not been “rationalized,” and scientific students of business methods look with frank horror on the primitive production and marketing techniques of so many book publishers. Bully, I say, for the lack of progress, for publishers still seem to have an incorrigible belief in competition, coupled with an equally incorrigible optimism about potential authors.

No doubt there are major defects in the publishing industry, and as an author I can supply chapter and verse on some doleful aspects of the trade. Still, the bookmen have energy and daring—and they actually *like* controversial viewpoints pungently expressed.

That polemical passion can serve an indispensable purpose in a free society is borne out by two recent examples—Rachel Carson and Jessica Mitford. Miss Carson did not set out to be a model of Olympian detachment when she wrote her magnificent jeremiad on the dangers of pesticides. But the force of her opinion, backed by fact, and expressed first in a magazine article and then in a book, *Silent Spring*, stimulated a national debate. Subsequently, a presidentially-appointed committee gave official vindication to some of her most damaging charges. As for Miss Mitford, she is constitutionally incapable of being bland; her indictment of funeral extravaganzas in *The American Way of Death* was of course one-sided. It was meant to be. But she, too, drew forceful attention to a problem usually left under a shroud. Inevitably, after these two strong-minded women started a rumpus, television tagged along—offering hour-long programs on each problem, carefully balanced, of course, and giving both sides. But neither program would have ever been produced if the polemic had not been written first.

The Vested Interests of the Reporter

By: James McCartney

Some years ago in Chicago a dispute arose between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Chicago Police department over who deserved the most credit for trapping a notorious peddler of narcotics. Each agency was convinced it had played the key role. City editors all over town were getting two distinctly different versions of what happened from their men in police headquarters and those on the federal beat.

The late Clem Lane, city editor of the *Daily News*, finally threw up his hands in exasperation. "Haven't we got anybody around here any more who hasn't got an ax to grind?" he cried.

Lane was wrestling with a phenomenon common in the newspaper business yet, for elusive reasons, often overlooked in serious discourse on problems of the press. He was dealing with reporters who had developed vested interests in their beats—interests so deep that both had difficulty in taking objective views.

To the police, FBI agents were overpaid "glory hunters." The federal men felt, as they often do, that the police were "dumb cops" who would have let the peddler escape. The reporters sided with their friends and Lane's injunctions budged neither.

The phenomenon would be of little interest if the kinds of problems it suggests were no more serious than whether the FBI or the Chicago police would get public credit for trapping a dope peddler. But the fact is that problems growing out of reporters' vested interests can be much more serious. They can be serious enough to have a bearing on great national decisions and the holding of public opinion on some of the most crucial problems of the times. Some of the most influential reporters in Washington, for example, have deep vested interests in their beats or in their specialties—so deep that they have as much difficulty in presenting objective views as the two Chicago reporters. The problem is undoubtedly universal in the news business. When national news is involved its import may be magnified.

A strong case can be made that many reporters covering such key spots as the White House, the Congress, the State Department, the Justice Department, or the Pentagon are plagued with problems of vested interests.

The symptoms of the vested interest are not always easy

to detect, but the result in the extreme form is that reporters become spokesmen for their news sources rather than dispassionate observers. They become sloppy about recognizing that alternative views may exist and about digging out and including alternative views in their stories. Over a period of time some may as well be press agents for those they are covering and, indeed, sometimes perform that role, or something very close to it.

Obviously the mere writing of a story that is favorable, in effect, to the source is no sign that a reporter has sold his soul to his sources and lost his objectivity. That is a normal function of the reporter. But when reporting becomes consistently non-critical, when months or years go by without a critical story, it may be that the virus of vested interest has struck.

The difficulty in trying to understand the problem or in doing anything about it lies in the fact that the vested interest is frequently one of the most valuable of human possessions—personal friendship. No reporter can operate successfully without friends. But being objective about friends can be as difficult as being objective about one's wife.

Friendship is not all of it, however, by any means. A reporter may hesitate to take a critical view of regularly tapped sources for the very human reason that he prefers to be greeted pleasantly when he walks into an office, rather than to be treated as though he were poison. His vested interest is in maintaining a pleasant atmosphere. Another dimension to the problem involves the reporter who has come, through deep exposure, to understand and sympathize with the problems of his sources. He may become a sincere convert and advocate of their point of view. If he is involved in a field in which there are sharp differences of view he may be on the verge of losing his usefulness as a reporter. At the same time, however, his expertise may be valuable to his paper.

The price that the press, and perhaps the country, pays for reporters' vested interests can be high. When great national questions are involved a reporter's lack of objectivity may play a critical role in the public image of important government institutions. Consider some specific problems along this line in Washington.

In the Pentagon it is commonplace for reporters to make alliances with one or another of the armed services, presenting, by and large, that particular service's views on highly controversial problems of national defense. One particularly influential reporter has had a liaison with the Navy

James McCartney of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago *Daily News* is currently a Nieman Fellow at Harvard.

that goes back for years and has played an important role in influencing defense policy. Today he is working actively with the Navy in its battle against Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's attempts to reshape the nation's defense machine. Another influential reporter is, for all practical purposes, a spokesman for the Air Force. He may be counted upon to defend the Air Force's desire to maintain the manned bomber or to present, in great detail, Air Force views on strategic necessities for national survival. Both, in effect, have become creatures of the so-called military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower discussed, with grave forboding, in his Farewell Address. Of course the Defense Department has its spokesmen in the press corps, too. It pressed many of them into service—without actually drafting them—to defend itself against the onslaught from Capitol Hill when Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.) was investigating the TFX warplane contract.

The result of these practices and habits means that stories from the Pentagon frequently represent points of view of one or another of the Pentagon's warring camps. What is disturbing is that often the stories give no indication that the reporter has attempted to balance the story by obtaining views from other camps. The aforementioned friend of the Navy, for example, rarely mentions that he is writing a Navy point of view and that the Defense Department would disagree wholeheartedly. If the result were only public confusion the problem might not be too serious, for the public in a democracy is often confused. But often the public is misled—a somewhat more serious infraction.

Such specialized liaisons are relatively simple to detect in the sprawling Pentagon. They become more subtle in reporting from the White House. The White House press corps, by and large, is inclined to take the most sympathetic point of view possible toward the problems of whatever administration may be in power. In part, perhaps, because of the intimacy with which White House reporters live with the Presidential press secretary, and depend on him, the White House press tends to be the most docile in town. Although there are exceptions, party ideology doesn't seem to be important. Some of the White House regulars who counted themselves as supporters in print of the Eisenhower administration managed to switch to Kennedy without outward sign of mental anguish.

Just plain fear may play a role in White House reporting. The awesome power of the Presidency is, indeed, something to contemplate and few reporters relish the thought of arousing Presidential anger. The tendency even in Presidential press conferences is to throw the President home run balls rather than curve balls. It takes a man of some moral courage to brave the possibility of Presidential ire or of Presidential sarcasm before a national television audience. But the fact is that controversial questions often are simply not asked at Presidential press conferences. If they are, one

may be sure that White House staff members will not fail to make a mental note of the questioner. The next time the questioner makes an inquiry for his paper at the White House on a routine matter he may find staff members unavailable—for days. At least one reporter remembers months of difficulty in getting anyone at all to answer a phone call at the White House after writing a story about freeloaders on the President's private plane.

The White House beat presents special problems to a regular who might wish to exhibit a sign of independence. The beat produces so much front page news without critical reporting that a sycophant can stay in business for years.

Some of the most intriguing problems of all arise on Capitol Hill, with perhaps the most intriguing results. The tendency of reporters who regularly cover the Senate, for example, is—naturally enough—to make friends with the Senate's ruling group, the primary source of important news. By itself this is certainly understandable. But over a period of time there seems to be a marked tendency to report the activities of the ruling group in a favorable light and to make challengers to that group appear as though they are social misfits.

The importance of this tendency to the reading public becomes apparent when one considers the political ideology of the ruling group in the Senate. For many years the power has been in the hands of Southern conservatives, often working in harmony with relatively conservative Republicans. Thus reporting from the Senate tends to have a bias in favor of these groups. Senate liberals—or in fact almost all who challenge the ruling group—are frequently pictured in terms that suggest that they are all but a lunatic fringe, when in fact those outside the ruling group in the Senate include some of the most dedicated and responsible legislators in the nation.

Possibly no story illustrates the limitations of Senate reporting as it has been done in recent years better than the Bobby Baker story in Washington. Baker, who resigned under fire as secretary to the Senate majority and became the object of a formal investigation, has been an important Senate fixture since 1955. Gossip about his power and influence as well as about the fortune he has amassed has been common in the Senate press gallery. Any reporter with eyes could see him wheeling and dealing on the Senate floor when important legislation was under consideration. The facts that he owned a restaurant franchise in North Carolina and has been the co-owner of a plush motel on the Atlantic Ocean have been common knowledge—expensive properties for a former page boy with a relatively modest Senate salary. Yet Senate press gallery regulars exhibited an astonishing lack of interest in writing about Bobby Baker. He was virtually unknown even in Washington outside the immediate Senate family when the story broke, because none of the Washington papers had

ever so much as written a story about him. Nor had the heavily-staffed New York papers. This protectiveness reflected itself in at least some coverage of the Baker affair by major papers which staff the Senate even after the story broke. They tended to pooh-pooh the story in print and to suggest that Baker had no influence.

It is easy enough for an outsider to come along after a story has broken and say to reporters: "Look, see what you missed." Reporters can quickly come up with any number of reasons why a story couldn't be told. In the Baker case they could point to a law suit as a key first element making it possible to print material about Baker. Because such points are often at issue this argument is worth mention.

It may be that it would have been difficult if not impossible for any reporter in the Senate to have cracked the Baker story as it developed without the help of the private law suit, but that is not quite the point. The point is that reporters covering the Senate had consistently, over a long period of time, failed to report that a non-Senator had risen from page boy to achieve a position of astonishing power and influence—had become more influential in Senate affairs than many elected Senators. The press had, in effect, protected a key figure in national politics from the cleansing light of publicity.

It is not that reporters covering the Senate did not understand Baker's role. Most of them with political perception—a qualification that excludes some—did, in fact, understand Baker's role. They simply failed to write about him. It seems perfectly obvious that many Senate reporters were no more anxious to probe into Baker's affairs than the Senate itself. Perhaps some of them felt, with some justification, that the threat of losing friends and news sources in the Senate power structure was too overpowering—that writing about Baker wasn't worth the gamble. If this was the case the situation provides an incisive glimpse into the ramifications of reporters' vested interests.

The protective instinct also extends to reporters on the House side of the Capitol. Some of the most glaring excesses of House mismanagement have been reported with singular lack of enthusiasm by House regulars. An example is the new \$100 million House office building, a monstrous monument to Congressional eagerness to spend money lavishly when accommodations for Congressmen are involved. The facts about the building have been reported, but largely by individual correspondents from isolated papers, not by the regulars in the House press gallery. Only a few of them bothered to attend the first formal tour of the building. A non-regular also wrote the first story about plans for an elaborate underground parking garage for Congressmen and Senators in which the cost per parking space was to be \$24,700. The story killed the project, at least temporarily.

Actually, far more outrageous examples of reporters' vested interests in Washington could be furnished. Some

reporters have been so closely allied to specific political figures that their copy, for all practical purposes, could be read as handouts. There are others whose identification with one or another political party is just as clear. They tend to represent newspapers with political views that are well known through their news columns, however, and thus can't be considered a general problem.

It would be unfair to suggest that the problems discussed here are unique to the newspaper business. It would probably be more accurate to say that perfectly natural human tendencies are at play.

State Department officials complain, for example, that United States ambassadors to foreign countries frequently fall into the same kind of trap. After serving in a country for a certain period of time and getting to know its officials and its problems they are inclined to become spokesmen for the country rather than spokesmen for the United States.

One government official has said that a "good" ambassador puts the United States first 70 per cent of the time and puts the country he is serving first 30 per cent of the time. A "bad" ambassador does just the reverse. "But, after all, the ambassador has a problem," the official said. "When he goes to visit the leader of the country to which he is assigned he doesn't want to be bad news."

The U. S. bureau of the budget has the same problem with men it assigns to specialize in the budgetary problems of government agencies. Top budget bureau officials find that after a while the men begin to take on the thinking of the agency and pretty soon they are fighting to get it more money. "They try to sell the agency's case to us rather than to sell our case to the agency," said one budget official.

In the simplest sense, on virtually any beat in Washington, or possibly elsewhere, there are likely to be two kinds of reporters—the "ins" and the "outs." The "ins" are those who play along with the news sources, handle it their way, tend to overlook minor indiscretions and in general protect their sources. The "outs" fight their sources, or at least needle them. They get their news by insisting on their right to it or by sheer perseverance. They let the source know that they intend to play it straight. They get their news the hard way, running the risk of being ostracized not only by the sources but by the reporters who are "ins." A good reporter can probably do it either way, depending on the circumstances.

It is a sad commentary in general, however, that the news business in Washington has developed an exceedingly high percentage of "ins"—and far from enough "outs." It may be in part a mere symptom of the age of the organization man, the man who wants, above all, to be loved. But it's a bad thing for the business and it's probably worse for the country.

The trick for the "out," of course, is to retain the respect of his sources. To do that in some places may be no more

complicated than simply playing it straight—which, as any experienced reporter knows, is not nearly as easy as it looks from the outside. But the problem in playing it straight can become somewhat more difficult in any situation where the number of sycophants becomes unduly large.

In Washington, where there are literally hundreds of reporters, the number of sycophants on virtually any beat is unduly large. This situation is in part because of circumstances. When a government press agent knows that he can count on a reporter to give him sympathetic treatment he is not inclined to want to take extraordinary measures to make sure that a man who plays it straight is counted in. Government press agents like to deal with their friends.

Unfortunately, the reporters who are under the most pressure in this kind of situation are frequently those representing the wire services, who supply most of the nation's news. The wire services staff more beats than anyone else and count on routine news for their bread and butter. If the wire service reporter doesn't get the routine news he is, by the standards of his bosses, not doing his job. Thus he is under tremendous pressure to play along with the government press agent—the source of most routine news. He cannot normally afford to be too critical because it is so easy for the press agent to punish him, and he knows it. This factor accounts, for example, for the curious reluctance of wire service reporters covering the Justice Department to write about Attorney General Robert Kennedy's huge Labrador dog, Brumus. The Attorney General doesn't like stories written about the dog. He has found them embarrassing. Thus months have gone by during which the dog performed hilarious antics in the Attorney General's office without a word appearing in print. A courageous United Press reporter was reprimanded on one occasion by the Attorney General's press agent for writing a piece—which played page one in too many papers for the Attorney General's taste. To punish a beat man all the government press agent has to do is fail to notify him of some relatively good story that is coming out by press release—failing, perhaps, by "accident."

In defense of wire service reporters it should be added that they normally try harder to play it straight than almost anyone else. You will rarely find their stories slanted. The primary method of slanting in the news business, however, is not in what is written—it is in what isn't written. And wire service men are frequently trapped by circumstances. In a flash of independence they may write one good critical story. Then they may have trouble getting routine stories that their offices want for weeks to come.

The problems raised in this essay are not by any means simple, particularly in the light of the increasing trend toward specialization in the newspaper business. The increasing complexity of national news, and of news everywhere, has made specialization virtually inevitable. Fre-

quently only an expert reporter is in a position to understand, let alone report, the news. Yet the problem of developing vested interests becomes more acute when reporters specialize. Thus unless reporters and editors are extremely careful in seeking to avoid the pitfalls of specialization the trend can easily lead to more non-critical reporting. Snooping general reporters in Washington continue to lead the pack in developing new stories, in delving into untouched fields, particularly in investigative stories. These reporters are often "outs" rather than "ins"—who aren't afraid to call a spade a spade in print. Nor are they afraid to ask critical questions that "ins" tend to shy away from.

Avoiding the trend to specialization cannot be the answer in the complex world of Washington news, although the business will be in a sad state if the general reporter is ever abolished. Some techniques can be employed, however, to avoid some of the pitfalls of specialization. For example, if a man is assigned to cover economics in Washington it would seem sensible to include both sides of the economics coin on his beat. He might be assigned to be responsible for the Labor Department as well as the Treasury. In that way he would be exposed to varying approaches to problems. Or if a man is assigned to the State Department, it might be wise to make him responsible, as well, for the Senate Foreign Relations committee, from whence a critical view may come. Neither of these specific examples may be practical, but the basic strategy seems sound. The idea is simply to keep beats broad enough, when possible, so that a man is exposed to conflicting views in his daily routine.

Wider understanding of the significance of the problem might lead naturally toward solutions. It is not a new problem in the business. The Chicago *Tribune* used to protect its County Building beat man, if he came up with a good critical story, by sending in an office "special" to do the dirty work. It was the beat man's responsibility to feed back tips and it was the office's responsibility to protect him. The beat man could always tell his friends on the beat that the "office" demanded a critical story and there wasn't anything he could do about it.

Probably the most practical idea would involve the aggressive use of general assignment reporters, allowing them to probe freely on beats or in specializations as a regular procedure. It is predictable that beat men wouldn't like the idea, but papers are not edited for beat men. In fact the procedure would probably more than pay for itself by keeping beat men on their toes. If this sounds brutal, perhaps it is, but it should be considered that more is at stake than the preservation of the world of the beat man or the specialist.

In the last analysis, however, the conclusion is inescapable that mere devices are not going to do the job. The basic problem must, inevitably, lie with editing and editors.

If a story from the Pentagon reports an Air Force or a Navy point of view it is certainly sound journalistic practice

to require that the story make mention of the fact that the Defense Department violently disagrees. Unfortunately this seemingly simple practice—to check with the other side—is often abandoned on the so-called “higher” levels of journalism.

If a beginning reporter fails to check both sides, or all sides, of a story he is certain to incur the wrath of the city editor. But for reasons not always easy to understand, when a veteran political or labor writer, or a Washington correspondent, clearly fails to touch all bases—on much more significant material—it is often tolerated. By the same token, if a major scandal were to develop in most city halls under the noses of veteran reporters, heads would be likely to roll. But when a situation that might well be scandalous develops in the United States Senate, a situation that had been in existence for months or maybe for years, the attitude seems to be somewhat more tolerant.

Reporters, like other human beings, tend to adopt techniques that work. If a reporter gets a page-one story that represents the Navy point of view, and nobody asks any questions, he is likely to go back to the Navy for more. The implication that he may become a partisan of the Navy is an abstract consideration and, in fact, it may take months or years for partisanship to develop. The reporter should not be discouraged from developing stories from the Navy. He should be encouraged, however, to make sure that the reader is made aware that the story represents a Navy viewpoint and that there are other views.

Many of these problems would be solved if editors began to rediscover the lost art of editing. Editing nowadays is out of fashion. In this age of organization men, editors like to say: “Well, I leave that all to my Washington bureau chief.” And Washington bureau chiefs like to say: “I have confidence in my reporters.” It is as though no one on papers any more is willing to take the responsibility for reading the whole paper with insight and acumen.

If they did, it would not be possible to pick up almost any copy of any paper and find samples of self-serving, handout stories in which nobody bothered to check with the opposition. If they did, more stories would be temporarily interrupted at about the third paragraph with mention of the fact that so-and-so says this is all wet. If they did, editors in Washington would have spotted the stories on their society pages about the lavish opening of Bobby Baker’s plush motel and sent memos to their Senate men that read: “How the hell did this guy get enough to buy a motel like that?” If they did, wire service editors would have sent memos to their Justice Department men that read: “What ever happened to Brumus?” If they did, editors around the country would have wired their Washington bureaus with memos that read: “How come we need a new House office building in the 1960’s when the size of the House hasn’t changed in 50 years?”

The business and the world that we live in need the application of every sharp and suspicious mind available. They need more reporters who are willing to suffer the indignities of being “outs.” They need more editors who read their newspapers with care and are able to pick up the telephone, place long-distance calls, and say: “What the hell!”

“What the hell’s” from editors may not solve all of the problems that reporters have with vested interests. Over a period of time, however, such calls would keep reporters aware of the fact that their bosses knew what was going on. Such pressure, in the way of humankind, works wonders.

Censors and Their Tactics

(Continued from page 2)

ments of many Negroes should be dealt with factually and truthfully in school books. But the plight of a majority of Negroes, the discrimination they still face, also should be related with all the “unpleasant” facts included.

Are we to alter or ban American classics in literature because they contain Negro stereotypes? Or are we to teach them in the context and times in which they were written?

After NAACP pressure the New York City Board of Education dropped Mark Twain’s *Huckleberry Finn* as a reading text in elementary and junior high schools. And all because of a central character in the classic, “Miss Watson’s big nigger, named Jim.”

In the words of the New York *Times*, “The truth is that *Huckleberry Finn* is one of the deadliest satires that was ever written on some of the nonsense that goes with inequality of the races.”

The Portland *Oregonian* pointed out, “It is, in fact, a disservice to the American Negro to pretend that he always had advantages and privileges accorded most other Americans, to pretend that the Missouri slave of 1840 talked and thought as does Dr. Ralph Bunche . . .”

Now while the NAACP, and, on occasion, other minority interest groups have campaigned for censorship of books, by far the greatest pressure today emanates from right-wing sources and is based on political ideology.

The ultra-conservatives are better organized and better financed than in any period in our history. In recent years their campaigns for censorship have forced the alteration of many textbooks and have resulted in the banning of hundreds of books from school libraries.

Unlike the NAACP and other crusading organizations which, for the most part, work independently of each other, the right-wing groups distribute each other’s propaganda and carry out concerted campaigns.

In San Antonio, Tex., last year, a legislative committee

investigating school books for "subversive" contents heard from a score of witnesses armed with propaganda which had originated in Washington, D. C., and at least six different states—from the Watch Washington Club of Columbus, Ohio, the Teacher Publishing Co. of Dallas, Tex., America's Future of New Rochelle, N. Y., the Independent American of New Orleans, La., the Church League of America of Wheaton, Ill., and Education Information, Inc. of Fullerton, Calif.

Not long before the Texas hearing, materials from the same sources, plus literature from the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Parents for Better Education in California, Coalition of Patriotic Societies in Florida, and other groups were used in an attack on books in Meriden, Conn., schools.

While some of these groups have different axes to grind, they all find a common cause in the Communist menace as a domestic threat. So that you find a Southern segregationist juxtaposed with a Northern industrialist in a campaign for censorship.

A segregationist equates integration with Communism and obligingly includes in the same category the income tax, social security, organized labor and other irritants of the ultra-conservatives.

An industrialist sees a Red hand in federal taxes and control of industry and business, and he obligingly ascribes the same danger to the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation.

You find a physician worried about socialized medicine, a minister troubled by "obscenities," and ordinary citizens concerned about the patriotism of other citizens. And they all blame it on Communism and together put up a solid front for their demands to censor and ban texts and library books.

One day last year a reporter investigating the activities of censorship groups in Texas called on a news service bureau at the State Capitol to ask what it had on file on J. Evetts Haley, leader of a militant, right-wing organization called Texans for America.

The blasé answer was, "Nothing. You can't take Haley seriously. He's not worth keeping a file on."

Yet Haley and his Texans for America led successful censorship campaigns against texts and school library books and helped spark a legislative investigation that turned into a witch-hunt. Professors, authors and publishers of texts were smeared as dupes and willing conspirators of the Communists.

Like the news service bureau, most of the Texas press gave Haley relatively little attention. Perhaps they thought a man who publicly advocated "hanging" Chief Justice Earl Warren, punched a professor in an argument over the movie "Operation Abolition," and smeared Southern Meth-

odist University as being "tainted with left-wingers," should not be taken seriously.

Whatever the reason for the scant attention given to the Haleyites and others who have clamored for censorship, the result has been that well-organized forces attacking books in Texas have operated with little organized opposition, free of public scrutiny. And they have forced alterations in many textbooks, the banning of others, and the banning of many school library volumes.

In many other states the same thing has happened to some degree in recent years. During the past five years school books have come under fire in nearly a third of the state legislatures.

In Mississippi, after a campaign by the DAR, the State Farm Bureau Federation, the White Citizens Council and the State American Legion, the Mississippi Legislature voted to put the selection of textbooks virtually in the hands of the governor, Ross Barnett. This Fall Gov. Barnett demanded that the state textbook selection committee, which he controls through appointments, remove from Mississippi high schools a book called *English in Action*, Course No. 2. Gov. Barnett condemned the book on the grounds it taught "world government" and he cited one quote on the book which he said was harmful to youths: "I think world government is necessary and attainable."

In California, a breeding ground for groups that attack books and the system of public education, numerous book battles have been fought. In one case an entire chapter on the United Nations was deleted from an eighth-grade civics book.

In Florida the state superintendent of schools assured protesting "patriotic" groups that publishers were deleting from several volumes "phrases that might have been considered objectionable."

In Texas scholars described as "shameful" the extent to which the State Textbook Committee and publishers of school books bowed to the demands of censorship forces.

In Levittown, New York, this year the Board of Education banned *The Subcontinent of India* by Emil Lengyel on the grounds the author once belonged to some Communist-front organizations. This is a favorite tactic of censorship groups, attacking a book not on the basis of its contents but on the author's past and present affiliations with organizations the groups dislike.

An interesting footnote about the Levittown banning of Lengyel's book is that another of his works, *1000 Years of Hungary*, was banned by the Communists and all of his writings were banned by the Nazis.

When the censors fail to document an "objectionable" affiliation for the author, they urge that the book be banned because the authors listed for collateral reading

are "objectionable." Some boards of education, under pressure from censorship forces, have voted to buy no textbooks whose authors have not been "cleared" by the FBI or the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In Alabama, the DAR currently is pressuring the Legislature to ban textbooks the Daughters believe to be "un-American" and "pro-Communist." Among "objectionable" authors the Alabama Daughters cite are John Steinbeck, Ernest Hemingway, Archibald MacLeish, Allan Nevins, Henry Steel Commager, Carl Van Doren, Eleanor Roosevelt and Arthur Schlesinger Jr., all of whom also are on the national DAR's blacklist.

Unfortunately, some newspapers have editorially acquiesced in, and even supported, some of the book censorship campaigns. When Amarillo (Tex.) College and four Amarillo high schools withdrew from libraries 10 novels, including four Pulitzer Prize winners, the Amarillo *News-Globe* lauded the move in a front-page editorial and proclaimed its own guide for censorship: "... sentences too foul to print in the *News-Globe* are too foul for school libraries."

The Los Angeles *Herald and Express* (now the *Herald-Examiner*), in a series of articles opposing the adoption of 13 school books, warned that many phrases and terms were un-American and pro-Communist. It even found a subversive music book. "Swing the Shining Sickle," which it called "a ditty from behind the Iron Curtain," was found to have replaced, of all things, "God Bless America," in the new edition of the book! The truth was that the song was composed in 1897 as an American harvest song relating to Thanksgiving. The *Herald and Express* attacked one history text because it contained *only* two pictures of the American flag and devoted only one paragraph to "Washington and his comrades." The newspaper put "comrades" in capital letters and commented that it was a "key word in designating members of the Soviet Party."

The Jacksonville, Ala., *News*, supporting the DAR's current book-banning campaign in Alabama, printed an editorial which, at first glance, I thought must be poking fun at the Daughters. The *News* noted that the DAR, and I quote, "exposes to Alabama parents a sample of socialism, first-grade style, which appears as a story in one of the basic first grade readers. . . *The New Our New Friends* by Gray, published in 1956 by Scott Foresman." The *News* said the story called "Ask For It" contains "an objectionable and destructive lesson" about a squirrel named Bobby who was not willing to work.

It seems that Bobby watched a nut roll out of a birdhouse every time a Redbird (the *News* set "Redbird" in bold-face type) would tap on the door. Bobby tried the Redbird's trick and it worked and then, in the words of the story, he thought: "I know how to get my dinner. All

I have to do is ask for it." The *News* was shocked. It very soberly asked its readers: "Have you ever heard or read about a more subtle way of undermining the American system of work and profit and replacing it with a collectivist welfare system? Can you recall a socialistic idea more seductively presented to an innocent child?"

No state escapes the effects of attacks on school books. When censors in Mississippi force a publisher to alter a textbook, that book is sold as altered, in Missouri and other states.

More important, perhaps, is the impact widespread attacks, when left unchecked, have on textbook publishers, who are highly competitive. Wherever possible publishers try to avoid controversy and offending special interest groups in order to avoid the attacks and sell books. Works by widely acclaimed novelists, poets and playwrights are disappearing from the texts and compliant publishers are not solely to blame. Teachers have been fired for putting such novels as J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* or George Orwell's *1984* on classroom reading lists.

Last year the Texas State Textbook Committee told a publishing firm it could not market its history book in Texas schools of it did not drop Vera Micheles Dean's name from a supplementary reading list. The Committee, under pressure from ultra-conservative organizations, complained that the author "is on a list of persons who are extremely well-listed as to their Communist and Communist-front affiliations by various government investigating committees."

The publisher agreed to this forced censorship and commented: "Imagine objecting to Vera Dean. But in a case like this, we will have to sacrifice her name in all books. It would be too expensive to make a special edition just for Texas."

Publishers also have deleted references to other authors in order to compete in the big Texas textbook market, and one publishing firm went so far as to say it was "not only willing but anxious to delete any references" to the names of authors whose loyalty might be successfully questioned by the Texans for America, J. Evetts Haley's militant right-wing organization.

Gene Roberts and I, in researching *The Censors and the Schools*, found that in most cases where teachers and librarians fought back and the press adequately covered the controversy, censorship efforts were thwarted. The same is true, of course, in textbook battles; censors score their most notable successes when they operate with little public exposure.

In Georgia recently a high school teacher with a zeal for stimulating his pupils to read was dismissed for making available to them John Hersey's war-time novel, *A Bell for Adano*, a Pulitzer Prize winner.

The press gave the matter full coverage and the teacher

fought back. John Hersey was interviewed and quoted as saying the teacher "has been done a grave injustice by self-appointed censors of the type who are not interested in what a book tries to say as a whole, but are only interested in words taken out of context."

In a page one column in the Atlanta *Constitution*, Publisher Ralph McGill, defending the teacher and the book, wrote:

"The school children deprived of this book likely had fathers or older brothers in the Italian campaign. These will testify there isn't a false note in Hersey's book and no language that wasn't heard every day and night. . . .

The issue of Hersey's book and the Georgia teacher was debated editorially and at education meetings.

The teacher was re-instated.

A newspaper survey showed that, unfortunately, school librarians in three other Georgia cities removed the book from their shelves to avoid possible criticism during the controversy. And one public librarian said she had not withdrawn the book, but added: "I've put it in a special place and haven't told anyone about it. Isn't that a good way to handle it?"

However, librarians, educators and the press did overwhelmingly defend the book and those who removed it have now returned it to the library shelves.

The point is that in our pursuit of the truth we need to operate with full exposure. Too often a librarian or a teacher quietly discontinues the use of a book—or never begins the use of it—because of pressure.

Those who exert these pressures and who are, in fact, perverting freedom of the press, would wilt under public scrutiny.

The dominant forces that bring this pressure today include the Daughters of the American Revolution, the John Birch Society, the New Rochelle-based America's Future, and many smaller groups. These organizations, through pressure, have managed to force restrictions on what students may read. And the public still is largely apathetic about such pressure.

The DAR, which regularly mails out a list of almost 170 textbooks it has determined to be "subversive," operates as a respectable patriotic organization whose own values seldom are publicly examined. In 1959, when the DAR

first began mailing out its incredible blacklist of books, the American Library Committee warned of censorship activities and declared:

"Of all the programs by organized groups, the DAR textbook investigation, at both the state and national level, was the most specific. . . and most threatening."

The Daughters' attacks on books need to be evaluated in light of their constant concern about Communist infiltration in religion, mental health programs, public schools and colleges, the Federal Government, metropolitan government, urban renewal, Christmas cards, and all international activities, including cultural interchange.

It also should be taken into account that the DAR circulates a long list of literature from other ultra-conservative groups attacking fluoridation, the U. S. Supreme Court, the Peace Corps, immigration, the UN, the National Council of Churches, the public school system, the National Education Association, and other aspects of American life.

Pressure groups are an integral part of our society and I am not suggesting that any steps be taken—even if such were possible—to restrict their censorship activities. But these groups and their charges need to be put in perspective for the public.

When America's Future literature is used in an attack on school books, it is important for the public to know of this organization's fears that the public school system, not just textbooks, is purposely subverting the nation's youth. An official of the organization has written:

"No one who has watched closely what has been going on in our public school system in America these past two decades can escape the feeling that something drastic—and rather terrible—has happened to it. What is more, it is rather difficult to believe that it has happened by accident, that there has not been a planned, slyly executed, and almost successful attempt to deliberately undereducate our children in order to make them into an unquestioning mass who would follow meekly those who wish to turn the American Republic into a socialistic society."

The public, in evaluating these attacks, also should be aware of their basis in order to determine whether the group is judging a book on its merits or on the basis of its own fears and prejudices.

Our Public Morality

ALL HONORABLE MEN: CORRUPTION AND COMPROMISE IN AMERICAN LIFE. By Walter Goodman. Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown. 342 pp. \$5.95.

The postures most often adopted for viewing breaches of ethics and morality in our society are 1, breast-beating (We Are All Guilty) and 2, tub-thumping (Throw The Rascals Out). Walter Goodman, in his book, *All Honorable Men*, has steered a steady and balanced course between both of these dramatic stances, and the result is a far more thoughtful and rewarding consideration of our country's recent scandals than is commonly found. Rather than beat us over the head with guilt or inflame us to righteous indignation, Mr. Goodman has chosen quietly to plant a few seeds of doubt and self-reflection that may grow to occupy our thoughts long after the louder harangues and calls to conscience are forgotten.

In considering some of the notable breaches of public morality in the past half decade or so, Mr. Goodman sets the tone of his ruminations by noting in an introduction that "the author does assume that, like himself, his readers were not eating berries in the wilderness while Bernard Goldfine and the vice-president of General Electric were running things back home. If we now go on to make judgments about these men anyway, let it be without smugness. We are not all in the same boat, but we are traveling on one sea."

Mr. Goodman is not concerned with colorful scoundrels or flamboyant rogues, but rather with that increasing number of solid citizens who have crossed the shadow line from respectability and even prestige into public dishonor and sometimes criminality—and with just how shadowy that line has become in our present society. Describing the assorted subjects of his inquiry, Goodman explains that "Wholesomely unexceptional for the most part, they remained true to the codes that had brought them wealth and esteem; far from rebels or outlaws, they accepted the society on the society's terms, served it and prospered along with it. Their indiscretions, flowing naturally with

their careers, make up the less attractive side of success in America." These then are not Valachis and Johnny Dios, but the well-respected folk who were often regarded, even after their indiscretions, as—in the words of Professor Bergen Evans describing the producers of the fixed TV quiz shows—"all honorable men."

Dividing his inquiry into three fields, Mr. Goodman deals with Business, as represented by the General Electric price fixers; Government, with concentration on Sherman Adams as well as conflict-of-interest cases in the Eisenhower administration such as Harold Talbot and Richard Mack; and the mass media, mainly looking at the TV quiz rigging scandals.

Since we have already made the acquaintance of these names and cases in the headlines of several years ago, it is possible now to see them in perspective and to cull, as Goodman does, more than a daily deadline meaning from their publicized transgressions. While the story of the TV quiz fixes, for instance, is still familiar to us, Goodman sifts the meaningful points out and can bolster his view of the deep-seated nature of these recent crimes when he reminds the reader of the still startling fact that "In the experience of the producer of 'Twenty-One,' from Charles Van Doren through to the exposure of the fix, not a single contestant, knowing the necessary conditions, refused to go on with the show." Considering the curious but curiously unheated reactions of the public to the quiz fix exposures, Goodman asks "What, after all, had been taken from them [the public]? Only their time—and there was nothing with which they would rather part withal." In re-examining these happenings the author can come up with some insights that go beyond the events themselves to general strains in the national life. Surely he is speaking of a whole trend in our current psychoanalytically-oriented behavior when he writes of Charles Van Doren's maudlin soul-searching: "That his search was in earnest goes without argument, but despite his advertised intelligence and sensibility it was flatly inept, as though he enjoyed the looking too much to want to find." Getting behind the mere facts of the fixes to the ground they sprang from, Goodman

observes that "Television is filled with jobs that are sought after, not because they offer much in the way of accomplishment, but because of the *sense* of accomplishment they provide, the creative kick even when nothing worth noticing is created."

The same observation could be made of other branches of the mass media, but Goodman concentrates on TV and only briefly—though profitably—on the mass magazines. As a veteran editor in the field of magazine journalism both small (*The New Republic*) and large (*Playboy* and *Redbook*), Mr. Goodman obviously feels strongly about this area and speaks with unmistakable authority on it; yet he drops only a few choice morsels, such as "Magazine editors have a tradition of not being able to read the short stories they print," and "The touchstone of professionalism in television, movies and popular magazines is the ability not to be distracted by what one is up to." Later on Mr. Goodman remarks that "Although work in the mass media is not a noble calling, it need not be ignoble if one keeps one's perspective—and many producers and directors, editors and illustrators, manage to do their jobs in a decent way, paying a price, yet not losing themselves in the process."

But how in fact does one keep this perspective, and of what value is such a perspective to, say, the magazine editor who can't stomach the short stories he prints? What in fact is the price he pays at the expense of his own best instincts and values? Of what real value is it to the professionals who "do their jobs in a decent way" if they consider the jobs indecent? How can this "professionalism" be reconciled with Edmund Wilson's quote, which Goodman cites elsewhere, that "What is fatal is to be brilliant at a disgraceful job." Perhaps all this is the subject for another book, but it is certainly one that needs to be written.

—DAN WAKEFIELD.

REUNION

A Reunion of former Nieman Fellows is planned for June 3-4-5 with special emphasis on Friday, June 5.

Professor Schlesinger: His Book

IN RETROSPECT: The History of An Historian. By Arthur M. Schlesinger. Harcourt, Brace, N.Y. 212 pp. \$4.50.

An effort to bring history to life for future students has yielded to the present a lively memoir by one of America's most creative historical scholars.

As autobiography it is all too brief and restrained. But its crowded pages will be welcomed by the throngs of Professor Schlesinger's devoted students, by the colleagues in the political and academic activities here recalled, and by the Nieman Fellows at Harvard to whom Arthur Schlesinger gave so much of himself through twenty-five years.

This book grew out of tape-recorded interviews for the Oral History Research Office at Columbia University. A publisher pressed for present publication and then for enlargement of its scope. Its author did not permit it to become a full autobiography; rather it is the autobiography of his professional career. But it includes memories of his boyhood in the small Ohio town of Xenia, which is itself a vignette of a time past, and descriptions of the places and associations where he passed his education and his professional life—Columbus, Ohio, in 1910, Columbia University in 1912, Iowa City in the first world war, Cambridge since 1924.

Its larger emphasis is on the changing character of the study of American history in these years of such revolutionary changes in the world; and, all too modestly, on the pioneer role of Arthur Schlesinger in opening a whole new area of social history that looked beyond wars and politics to show what was happening in the lives and institutions of the American community. The first brilliant fruit of this, his *New Viewpoints in American History*, was a landmark in history. This brought him to Harvard where for a long generation he was one of a great triumvirate in American history—Morison, Merk, Schlesinger. His Ph.D. students have written the great part of the social and intellectual history of American that he had not already written

himself or edited in the 13 volume *History of American Life* that demanded his marginal energy for 21 years.

But Arthur Schlesinger never lived for history alone. "The life of an age inescapably enters in some degree into the life of each individual" he notes. He entered into the most controversial issues of his times for the protection of academic freedom, to support liberal causes, to combat McCarthyism, to seek reform, and justice. Among the issues recorded are his part in founding Americans for Democratic Action, in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, in the Committee of Eight, which, arising from the Walsh-Sweezy crisis at Harvard, instituted a new system of tenure and appointment, and the Commission on Freedom of the Press.

His pages are enlivened with observation of notable colleagues, contemporaries, teachers and students; Felix Frankfurter, Thomas Reed Powell, Dexter Perkins, A. Lawrence Lowell, James Bryant Conant, Robert M. Hutchins, Ralph Barton Perry, Gardner Jackson, Harold Laski, David K. Niles, Charles A. Beard, Frederick Jackson Turner, James Thurber.

Brandeis alone, of all he has met, "wholly fulfills the requirements" of greatness.

His own first venture in political activity came after Theodore Roosevelt had left the Progressive movement stranded in 1916. Schlesinger was drawn into a Third Party movement, the Committee of Forty-eight. This led the President of Ohio State "to seek me out and shake his head dubiously over this activity." Dubious head shakings by his college presidents never deterred Arthur Schlesinger from a course chosen. But his own sense of history soon led him to withdraw from this one and thence to stay out of Third Party movements. Instead he chose, through the ADA and by coordinating labor and liberal efforts in Massachusetts, to exert a liberal thrust within the two-party system.

He lovingly records his long association with Radcliffe College, which he served for years as a trustee; and heartily sup-

ported President Conant's war-time initiative to join Harvard and Radcliffe classes. He quotes Conant's dry observation that "Harvard does not believe in co-education in principle, only in practice."

"The other project of Conant's close to my heart was the Nieman Foundation. . . For some years I served on the selection committee, travelling to various parts of the country to interview candidates. A special feature of the plan was the Nieman dinners at which well known columnists, foreign correspondents, editors and publishers spoke, with a sprinkling of faculty guests to join in the lively discussions which always ensued.

"After retiring from the Faculty, I dedicated a book *Prelude to Independence* to 'The Nieman Fellows at Harvard University, past and present.'"

He also records one of the striking moments of his memory: "I was dining with the Nieman Fellows at the *Christian Science Monitor* when the editor, Erwin Canham, was called aside for a moment, and then announced in stricken ones 'The President has died.' We looked at each other in mute dismay, for Roosevelt's magnetic personality had made us feel we had each lost a near and dear friend."

In "retirement" since 1955, Arthur Schlesinger has revised his *Paths to the Present*, written the history of the American newspapers' role in bringing on the Revolution, served on the National Historical Publications Commission and on a Commission on the Rights, Liberties and Responsibilities of the American Indians ("an illuminating if depressing experience") surveyed contemporary historians to grade American Presidents, which proved again a controversial activity, Truman rating higher than Eisenhower and the second Roosevelt than the first.

"In all honesty however, extraneous activities have never seemed necessary; scholarship itself has proved infinitely stimulating."

In a few of the rare personal passages in what grew out of a wholly professional memoir, the warmth of Arthur Schlesinger illuminates his rich family life, his pride

and joy in his vibrant and devoted wife, Elizabeth, and in his exceptional sons, Tom and Arthur, who, on growing up changed his middle name so he could be junior to Arthur Meier Schlesinger. Briefly of the boys' childhood, he writes: "Skeptical of any cut-and-dried formula for rearing them, we treated them from the earliest years in accordance with what seemed natural and sensible. They were expected to perform minor tasks about the yard in return for small allowances, and as they grew older, to assume increasing responsibility for their decisions and actions. . . In practically every room in the house they were exposed to books, books, books, from juvenile stories to standard literature. We always sought to respect their opinions, and if unfounded to meet them with reasoning."

His final chapter "Reflections" sets down his feelings about history and life. As to religion: "What is essential is that people, whatever their spiritual motivation, should strive to act on right impulses for decent and humane ends. Had I joined any religious denomination, it would have been the Unitarian, because of their central concern with ethical conduct."

"My liberalism in secular affairs dates back to childhood." His parents were immigrants. "Immigrants, I never forgot, were voluntary Americans, not a chosen people, but what seemed better, a choosing people."

The study of history, he says, only reinforced his liberal and democratic instincts.

The advances in historical scholarship in his time he lays to the foundations of scientific method by Osgood, Channing, Andrews, Dunning, Turner.

"These criteria continued to be the guidelines for the historians of my generation, notwithstanding a greater recognition that disciplined insight is sometimes justifiable to bridge gaps in documented knowledge, and that the suppression of personal bias is sometimes unattainable. . . The very selection of material from the abundance at hand involves a subjective evaluation of which the investigator may be unconscious, and constant self-appraisal is called for."

"The principal thrust of fresh and contagious interpretations in my years came from Turner and Beard, each rebelling

against the views of his time. Both overstated their theses, but they deemed this essential in order to break through the crust of established conceptions."

He finds that no American historian since Henry Adams has, like Toynbee in England, attempted a cosmic interpretation of history. "Perhaps there is not enough poetry—or religion—in the American historian's make-up for this sort of venture. At any rate, with very few exceptions, he has rejected the very thought of immutable laws in human affairs. He finds causative factors too complex, as well as too inconstant . . . to be reduced to the equivalent, say, of the force of gravity in the physical world. He chooses to explain events in the small, rather than in the large, and when more daring, to generalize only in regard to particular lines of development."

His own interpretative essay in *Paths to the Present* he says "possess this limited character." He cites his cycle theory in politics as an example, and relates it to the economists' concept of business cycles. But he notes "it has not set historians to probing analogous recurrences in other fields of thought and action."

But he finds the most significant development in American historical study has been in enlarging its base to go beyond the more easily documented record of politics.

He takes satisfaction that his own great project, *The History of American Life* series, was a trail blazer in this process.

If he were to live his life over, he would again be an historian. "No other career could have afforded greater personal satisfaction."

"For the student of United States history, there is in addition the special joy of discovering and understanding how one's own people have reached their present condition. . . The record of things once thought and wrought should reassure us in facing the troubled times which now prevail. . . The United States dramatically evinces the underlying unity of mankind, the triumph in a free society of men's inborn likenesses over their acquired differences, and thereby foreshadows a world in which the force of law will replace the law of force. . ."

—LOUIS M. LYONS

Letter

Effective Forum

To the Editor:

To make his point that much of the press failed to provide an "effective forum" for enlightening the public about the "new departure" fiscal policy President Kennedy unveiled last January, Fred Zimmerman said in the September *Nieman Reports* that he had read some 25 metropolitan dailies for the month in question, "concentrating on news coverage, not editorials."

"My conclusion," he concluded, "is that the performance of most of these papers ranged from miserable to barely adequate."

I don't know which other papers he read, but if he gave them all the same twisted treatment he did the Buffalo *Evening News*, my conclusion is that his critique is a hatchet job, pure and simple.

His only indication that the *News* was one of the papers studied was this comment: "There was a considerable amount of reportorial sniping at the President's program, usually the sign of a biased newspaperman at work. Here is an example from the Buffalo (N.Y.) *Evening News*:"

What followed was an excerpt pulled from the middle of one sidebar story on the Economic Report, for which Mr. Zimmerman had to reach inside the paper on a day when the *News* had devoted a banner line and 2½ columns of Page 1 type to the President's fiscal message.

Mr. Zimmerman picked the month of January to study because the Kennedy story ran through the month with his "State of the Union message, budget message, economic report and tax message."

His complaint sent me to our files for a recheck on the Page 1 treatment given each of the four messages by the Buffalo *Evening News*. Here is a recap:

STATE OF THE UNION—Jan. 14. Under an 8-column line, "JFK ASKS BIGGEST TAX CUT IN HISTORY," we used a straight wire story for two full columns and carried a condensed text inside along with a sidebar noting that "Kennedy Prefers a Tax Cut to More Federal Spending."

This was followed the next day—January 15—with two Page 1 top-head stories. One, "Congress Favors Tax Cut,

Won't Rush Passage," carried this lead: "Congress registered unmistakable signs today that it intends to accept President Kennedy's invitation to cut taxes this year." The other, "President's Tax Proposals Enter Uncharted Waters," was a sidebar analysis by our Washington bureau with this lead: "The Kennedy Administration has now taken a historic decision to cut the traces of conventional fiscal policy and 'go for broke' in its effort to promote economic growth."

BUDGET—This story, on January 17, got four full columns of Page 1 treatment in the *News*, under this lead: "President Kennedy today proposed an unprecedented \$98.8 billion budget keyed to deficit-boosting tax-cuts. He said the cuts would spark the nation toward full employment, production and purchasing power."

A one-column sidebar carried this Page 1 top head, "Budget Reshaped for a Fuller View of Operations," over this lead: "President Kennedy went the whole way today in reshaping the federal budget into what he called 'more meaningful and comprehensive form.'" Another Page 1 sidebar reported—accurately, I submit—"Kennedy's Proposed Deficit Alarms Congressional Leaders."

ECONOMIC REPORT—The third big fiscal story, January 21, was handled for two and one-half Page 1 columns under banner treatment.

A Page 1 sidebar that day carried this head: "Congress Divides in Viewing JFK's Fiscal Program. Republicans Call It 'Irresponsible' and Democrats Say it Repels Recession."

This was the same day when an analytical sidebar story by our Washington bureau chief was carried inside—on Page 5—under the headline: "Kennedy Economic Advisers Apply 'Feedback Principle.'" The lead was: "President Kennedy and his Council of Economic Advisers today borrowed the 'feedback principle' from engineering to justify their belief that a series of budget deficits will eventually produce enough revenues to cover federal expenditures."

(The CEA report itself had used the

"feed-back" phrase, as Treasury Secretary Dillon has since in explaining "the economic expansion we can expect from passage of the tax-cut will thus 'feed back' increased tax revenues sufficient to achieve a balanced budget at substantially reduced tax rates.")

It was from this Page 5 sidebar story that Mr. Zimmerman excerpted his only reference to the Buffalo *Evening News'* entire coverage of the Kennedy fiscal program. He did not quote the lead or the main point of the story even then, but rather plucked three paragraphs from the body relating mostly to a separate question—one on which, incidentally, our correspondent had built a background in previous dispatches.

On the basis of this, Mr. Zimmerman archly concluded that, while the "reporter's grumbling over such petty matters" may do "no significant damage," his long article "certainly contributes nothing to public understanding of real issues."

Well, I would contend—without going overboard for this particular story—that the paragraphs *not quoted* in Mr. Zimmerman's article *did* contribute something to public understanding. But I would contend even more loudly that Mr. Zimmerman's single-shot sniping at this one semi-buried story leaves a grossly distorted impression of the kind and quality of Page 1 treatment the *News* gave to the fiscal issue during the entire month he was writing about.

TAX MESSAGE—Let us continue to the fourth story, January 24. Once again, the *News* gave it two full columns of straight coverage under a Page 1 banner, with a short box in the shoulder at the top of Col. 8 which said: "Kennedy Defends Deficit Plan" and quoted him as telling congressional critics it would be "a grave mistake" to balance the budget by offsetting his tax reduction by a corresponding cut in federal spending.

All of this treatment, I submit, did give a fair and balanced coverage of the top economic story of that month. It made very clear that the President's fiscal program represented a sharp departure for public policy, and it gave an entirely un-

distorted and unslanted picture of the claims the President and his advisers were making for the policy.

Perhaps my more fundamental quarrel with Mr. Zimmerman's shallow "exposé," however, is his opening confession that—in a study purporting to examine whether the press has provided an effective local forum for the airing of a complex idea—he concentrated "on news coverage, not editorials."

Why not editorials, for heaven's sake?

During the month when he presumably was reading our news columns, the Buffalo *Evening News* devoted no fewer than 15 editorials, covering 127 wide-column inches of space, to a discussion in depth of each and every one of the Presidential economic messages.

Both as chief editorial writer of the *News*, and as retiring chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, I contend that the editorial page is *pre-eminently* the place to look for the "effective forum" Mr. Zimmerman calls for.

If he had read our 15 editorials and disagreed with them, I should have been happy at having provoked him into an exchange of views, from which the "effective forum" could have resulted.

But to conclude that a "large segment" of the 24 papers he studied failed to provide this "effective forum," when by his own admission he has not even bothered to read their editorials, seems to me to reflect a gross misunderstanding and disregard of the editorial function of a modern newspaper.

If he really wants to know what kind of forum the Buffalo *Evening News* provided for local enlightenment on the Kennedy Administration's new fiscal policy of last January, I would be glad to send him our 15 editorials to supplement his pick-and-choose reading in the inside pages of our news columns. But I still can't understand why he would judge and condemn us for what we printed one day on page 5 while ignoring everything we printed on Page 1 and refusing even to read our editorials.

MILLARD C. BROWNE
(Nieman Fellow 1943)

NIEMAN NOTES

1939

Colby College made its 12th annual Lovejoy Fellowship award to **Louis M. Lyons**, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, who delivered the Lovejoy Lecture at a convocation at Colby, November 21, and received the honorary degree, LL.D.

1940

Hodding Carter, publisher of the *Delta-Democrat-Times* in Greenville, Mississippi looks back over three decades of an editor's life in *First Person Rural*, published by Doubleday in October. Reviewing it in the *New York Times*, Oct. 20, Ralph McGill writes:

In the early thirties Hodding Carter and his wife Betty sold a small tabloid in Hammond, La., and established a small, competitive afternoon paper in Greenville, Miss. Now, after three decades and 12 books (three in collaboration), the development of a strongly established nationally respected newspaper and a Pulitzer Prize, Mr. Carter looks back with love in *First Person Rural* and finds it good. So will those who read it.

* * *

In his gentle, kindly and sharply perceptive book, an urbane man is looking back with love at his life and experience in his region. In the last section, "Something Different Every Day," there is a summing up. Hodding Carter is probably the only editor in America ever to be labeled a liar by action of a State Legislature. Members objected to a magazine article he had written and charged that it libeled the state—the "great" state, of course. It was a happy coincidence that the Legislature acted on April Fools Day.

Hodding Carter has lived—and still is living—a useful life of purpose and

meaning. He would, he concludes, "rather be a small city newspaper editor and publisher than anything I know." The reader finds himself wishing that the tribe of such editors may somehow be made to increase.

1943

Time, Inc. has announced that **Thomas Griffith** will become assistant editorial director of all the Luce publications, starting January 1. He has been assistant managing editor of *Time* magazine since 1960. In 20 years with *Time*, he has edited every department of the magazine.

Frank K. Kelly, vice-president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was honored by his alma mater, the University of Missouri, with an achievement award, at a dinner in Kansas City, November 7.

1947

Robert C. Miller, UPI correspondent, will give the first Scripps Lecture in Journalism at the University of Nevada. The activity is financed by a grant from Ted Scripps, Scripps-Howard vice-president and a University of Nevada journalism graduate.

1950

More than 100 African newsmen attended the first seminars conducted by the American-African Institute in Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam and Lagos. **John McCormally**, editor of the *Hutchinson (Kansas) News* was one of the four American journalists who conducted the Institute. The Institute is a private agency devoted to American educational and cultural development. Its seminars this Summer were in response to requests from 15 African countries at the 1962 UNESCO meeting in Paris.

John McCormally said of the seminars:

Development of communications in Africa is an essential part of the whole educational development of the continent, and the political development as well. Americans should play the major role in providing assistance to this development. The American effort, insofar as is possible, should be a private, rather than a governmental one, for the chief lesson to be taught African journalists is that the press should be independent of government. . . .

1951

Malcolm Bauer, associate editor of the *Portland Oregonian*, will go to England in 1964 on an English Speaking Union fellowship.

Sylvan Meyer, editor of the *Gainesville (Ga.) Times*, presented a 30-minute program for the National Educational Television network on "The Southern Moderate," a series of interviews, used during November by the large number of educational TV stations served by NET.

1952

Lawrence Nakatsuka is serving as legislative assistant to Sen. Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii. Before coming to Washington, Nakatsuka had served as press secretary to two governors since he left the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*.

1954

In the closing days of the Diem regime in South Vietnam that government denied a visa to **Richard Dudman** of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

The *P-D* reported that Dudman had spent three weeks in South Vietnam last year and that some of his dispatches were highly critical of the Diem government. When the visa was de-

denied, **Robert Manning** (1946), Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, issued this statement:

We consider one of the vital elements in Vietnam is the ability of American newsmen to be there and to move in and out of the country and to report what is going on.

Sen. Mansfield had inserted Dudman's articles in the *Congressional Record* as "a job of first-rate and careful reporting on this region, in which we are deeply involved and about which we are inadequately informed."

Douglas Lieterman is executive producer of a series of six special programs on "The Peace Makers" for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The first, Nov. 26, was introduced by John Freeman, editor of the *New Statesman*. Norman Cousins, Seymour Melman, Bertrand Russell, Herman Kahn, Paul Goodman, the Rev. Donald Soper, Norman Alcock and Canon Collins are among those who will join in discussions of war and peace.

1955

Albert L. Kraus of the New York *Times* was named an assistant financial-business news editor in October.

1956

Best story of 1962, in New England AP competition, was written by **Robert Healy**, Boston *Globe* political editor. Published Dec. 5, it said President Kennedy would not tolerate any attempt to dislodge Adlai Stevenson as UN Ambassador.

1957

The Minneapolis *Tribune* Sunday magazine featured Nov. 10 "An Editor's Love Affair with Main Street." The editor is **John Obert**, editor of the *Park Region Echo*, Alexandria, Minn. The double truck picture spread shows the broad Main Street and John at his cluttered desk, fishing in a lake ten minutes from his home, playing golf, and walking in the woods with his wife and four children.

He describes the advantages he's found in his fifteen years as a small town editor

—beauty of the place, serenity, pride of the citizens in their town, "the good life," and "the absolutely free editorial hand I am given by my board of directors."

The other side of the coin is the concern to manage enough good jobs to hold young people. "Our town is uniting in an all-out effort to create new jobs through new industry."

The USIA is translating a new book of Obert's, *Adventures in Enterprise*, into French for distribution to students in Africa.

1958

Tom Wicker, the New York *Times* national political correspondent, appears monthly on a new educational television program of New York's Channel 13, called "News in Perspective" with Max Frankel, *Times*' diplomatic correspondent, and Lester Markel, Sunday *Times* editor, as moderator.

Jack Gould wrote of the second of these programs, Nov. 6:

"The *Times* could live to regret the success (of this program). In the personalities of Mr. Wicker and Mr. Frankel there is obviously prime network material. Their discussion of national and international affairs had real style, informality and humor. By allowing Mr. Frankel and Mr. Wicker to talk at their own pace, the program elicited their background knowledge of the news and had a chance to show the type of information the networks hardly cover at all. . . Mr. Wicker, with an opportunity at last to unbend on TV, gave a fascinating insight into the realities of Washington. Mr. Markel has obviously found the secret to TV; it is relaxation in public."

Piyal Wickramasinghe writes that he has published three books since his Nieman year. One, on his impressions of American life, won the UNESCO prize for the best book of the year on international understanding. He is president of the Sihala Writers' Association and a member of the National Book Trust of Ceylon.

He left his post as Sunday editor of *Lankadipa* in May 1961, for the *Times of Ceylon*; then with a colleague started a

new daily, *Silhala Day*, which they built up to 50,000 circulation in two years.

My former editor was at the top and I operated as deputy editor. I made use of all I gained during the Nieman year. Yet in keeping with the universal tradition of journalists, I had to part with it over policy, and I am now working with the Asia Foundation as the program adviser.

1959

Esquire Magazine announced October 1 that **Harold Hayes** had been appointed editor. He had been managing editor for two years. At 37 he is one of the youngest editors of a major magazine. He joined *Esquire* in 1956 as assistant to the publisher, after earlier experience with the United Press, *Pageant* and *Tempo* magazines. *Esquire* publisher Arnold Gingrich, in announcing Hayes' appointment as editor, said he had been editor pro tem for a year, and credited Hayes with a major role in the metamorphosis *Esquire* has undergone in the past seven years.

1960

Mr. and Mrs. **Dominic Bonafede** (Miami *Herald*) announced the birth of a son, Christopher Atwater, October 6.

1961

John Herbers has joined the New York *Times* as correspondent in the South, to team with Claude Sitton. Herbers has been in the Washington bureau of the United Press for the past year, after serving them in Mississippi for ten years, the last three as State manager.

The Peoria *Journal Star* sent **Thomas Pugh**, associate editor, on an extensive trip to Asia this fall.

The *Journal Star* explained the tour to its readers:

Pugh plans to study community life intensively in India, particularly, as the Indians face this critical "dry season" after the monsoon rains, with the Red Chinese poised on their northern frontier. His schedule will also take him to troubled South Vietnam, Bur-

ma, Japan, and a look at the "windows" to Red China at Hong Kong and Macao.

He also expects to spend several days at Tashkent in Central Asia, the nearest Soviet major city to the border of China's Sinkiang, which border has been the focus of Red Chinese charges against Russia.

Pugh is a 15-year veteran of the *Journal Star* news staff, who specialized during most of those years in political and civic coverage in this community. He is uniquely qualified, not only by experience in the field of community affairs, but by specialized education including a master's degree in social studies from Bradley University and, recently, a year in special studies involving the basic elements of community life as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard University.

He has been honored by the American Political Science Association for distinguished reporting of governmental affairs.

As an associate editor of the *Peoria Journal Star*, Pugh participates in editorial conferences in which policy decisions are made as to the editorial opinions in community affairs we ex-

press, and in the writing of such editorial opinions.

It is our policy to constantly broaden the experience and related study of people contributing to our decisions of judgment and opinion, and this journey was projected to give Pugh an opportunity to study the down-to-earth community life and functions of people in the Orient, specifically, where he had already acquired considerable knowledge and a number of friends during his Harvard stint.

We are confident that the resulting series of reports will be of interest and value to readers of the *Peoria Journal Star*, and his experience of permanent value to the *Journal Star* editors in evaluating news and events from that critical part of the world.

1962

The new Washington bureau of the *Washington Post-Los Angeles Times* syndicate, under Robert Donovan, captured David Kraslow from the Knight Papers bureau, and also Robert Toth (1961) from the *New York Times* bureau. Toth was an old colleague of Donovan on the *New York Herald Tribune*.

On TV

National Educational Television started a new 30-minute program this Fall, called "At Issue." Douglass Cater of *The Reporter Magazine* was commentator on the first program. Three former Nieman Fellows were commentators on the following three programs: Clark Mollenhoff of the Washington Bureau of the Cowles publications, Louis M. Lyons of Harvard, and Howard Simons, science writer on the *Washington Post*.

Wanted

A shelf of books by Nieman Fellows occupies a special place in the new quarters of the Nieman Foundation, 77 Dunster St.

This is incomplete. It would be a more distinguished feature of the room if it held all books by Nieman Fellows. We'd much appreciate copies autographed by the authors.

One more appeal: I have been asked to collect apt quotations by public men and by writers on public affairs, over the past decade, for the next edition of *Barlett's*. I'd be grateful for any contributions to this.

LOUIS M. LYONS.