

Nieman Reports

VOL. I. NO. 4

Published by the Society of Nieman Fellows

OCTOBER, 1947

PROBLEMS OF A NEWS MONOPOLY

by Barry Bingham

There is an old saying that every man knows how to poke a fire, drive a horse or run a newspaper better than the fellow who is doing it. There is no doubt about the truth of the adage as it applies to newspapers. Nobody is ever quite satisfied with the way a newspaper is run, least of all the people who work on it, or even the man who owns it. Working newspaper people are more aware than any others of what a paper should be, and they are acutely conscious of its daily deficiencies.

Disagreements over the conduct of the press in Louisville used to take rather violent forms. I cite three items from a history of the papers which eventually merged to form The Courier-Journal. "August 23, 1834. Personal encounter, with pistols, in Louisville between George D. Prentice, editor of The Journal-Focus, and George J. Trotter, editor of The Kentucky Gazette, Lexington; neither materially injured." "August 14, 1839. George D. Prentice, editor of The Louisville Journal, and Major Thomas P. Moore exchange pistol shots at the Harrodsburg Springs; neither party injured." "July 20, 1857. Editorial street encounter in Louisville between George D. Prentice of The Journal and Reuben T. Durrith of The Courier, of a very personal character; sharp correspondence preceded and followed the shooting."

From these episodes I draw two conclusions: that the editors of an earlier day were happily no Annie Oakleys for marksmanship; and that journalism in Kentucky, though still turbulent, is hardly as dangerous as it was a century ago.

If the conduct of a newspaper occasions

Barry Bingham is owner of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times and active editor of the Courier-Journal, certainly one of the half dozen most distinguished papers in America. During his long war service in the Navy where he became a captain, his editor, Mark Ethridge, assumed the duties of publisher. In Ethridge's long post-war absences in public service, Bingham has carried both jobs. When both are on the job, Ethridge and Bingham make one of the top teams running newspapers in the U.S.A. In this piece, which was first a talk to a Louisville service club, Mr. Bingham discusses frankly his consciousness of running a local news monopoly which he never intended.

many disagreements, the conduct of a newspaper monopoly brings them forth by the droves. We never aspired to a monopoly in Louisville. Though it has obvious commercial advantages, it also has drawbacks of a serious order. I believe Louisville is the second largest single-ownership city in America, exceeded only by Kansas City. I do not envy Roy Roberts the honor of leading that parade.

The Louisville monopoly developed by a process of attrition. Tom Wallace, who still flourishes as editor of The Louisville Times, tells me that when he first went into journalism here there were seven dailies in the town. That number shrank to three by the thirties, our two papers and one evening competitor, The Herald-Post. Repeated efforts were made to sell The Herald-Post to the ownership of our papers, but we had no desire whatever to buy out the opposition. On October 30, 1936, it shut down of its own accord.

The Louisville story is an illustration of a national trend toward monopoly in newspapers. In 1929 there were 2,086 dailies in the United States, this year there are only 1,744. The trend in Britain is even

more marked, from 151 dailies in 1921 to 98 today.

That does not make the problem of conducting a monopoly enterprise any easier. Monopoly forces a newspaper management to think over its course of action with painful care, to generate within itself the stimulus of competition, and to set itself ever rising goals of public service. Our effort here has been directed toward running a good newspaper, with the emphasis on news.

Our critics are many. Often they are constructive. At other times their attacks betray a notable lack of knowledge of what is actually in the papers. Some outbursts of indignation remind me of the classic stricture on the press in Sheridan's "The Critic:" "The newspapers! Sir, they are the most villainous, licentious, abominable infernal—not that I ever read them! No! I make it a rule never to look into a newspaper."

It would help us here if we could get across to all our readers the division of material into three categories, news, signed columns, and editorials. Many criticisms are based on a confusion of these three elements. It would help if readers would form the habit of identifying in their minds the wire service stories, and would think of copy as coming from A. P., U. P., New York Times, Chicago Daily News, or North American Newspaper Alliance. That would help to clear up in their minds the work and function of the local staff.

We would be glad if more readers understood the function of the signed column. In our papers we run columnists of all shades of political opinion, believing that in a monopoly we have a duty to give our readers a chance to see opinions widely opposed to our own editorial views. I need not belabor the point. When I note that we carry Westbrook Pegler and Frank Kent, I believe it is clear that we expect our columnists to speak for themselves, not for us.

The space devoted to editorials, however, is strictly our own. I believe we have a right and even a duty to express our opinions in our editorials as clearly, as sharply and as forcefully as we are able. Some monopoly towns have what I can

In This Issue

Problems of a News Monopoly

by Barry Bingham

"Journalism" in Turkey

by William J. Miller

The Paul Miller System in AP

by Gilbert W. Stewart, Jr.

A Lone Wolf Business

by Nathaniel R. Howard

John Gunther Inside U. S. Journalism

by Louis M. Lyons

The Human Side of the Press

by Leon Svirsky et al.

Getting the News and Playing It

by William M. Pinkerton

The Ahoskie Story

Cong. Miller and the Columnists

CBS Views New York Press

Reviews — Donald Grant on Hocking's

Freedom of the Press—Fitzpatrick's
Cartoons.

Complaints — Notes

only call a caponized editorial page. The editorials are watered down to the point where they can offend nobody, but neither can they stimulate or satisfy. All vigor is left to the syndicated columnists. I don't believe that even our severest critics in Kentucky would like that sort of editorial page in our papers. I am sure our own staff would never stand for it.

One more department I have not mentioned, the letters to the editor. With us they vie with the comics as the best read feature in the papers. In a monopoly town, they represent an invaluable safety valve. It was interesting to learn that in Germany letters to the editor have never been customary in their press. Especially under Hitler, opinion in the press was strictly a one-way street. The editor, who was only a mouthpiece for the Propaganda Ministry in Berlin, announced what his readers must think on all questions. It was unthinkable that a reader should retort, in print, that the editor was a fool or a knave, as they frequently do in Louisville. The letter to the editor is a very lively symbol of democracy.

Our monopoly problem is aggravated by the shortage of newsprint, a worldwide condition for which little relief is in sight. Confronted with an inadequate supply of paper, there are only three ways I can see to meet the situation: hold down the news content, hold down on advertising, or hold down circulation. It was our decision that news was the most important factor, and that it must flourish even at the expense of the other two. We continue to run better than 50 per cent news and feature material, less than 50 per cent advertising. Some papers let the ratio of advertising run up as high as 60 per cent, but I believe they are damaging themselves for the future.

This decision on newsprint use has not been easy, however. During the first six months of 1947, we turned down 3,000,000 lines of advertising, or about 25 per cent of the volume offered us. That meant loss of revenue to us, but it also meant a hardship to advertisers, particularly to new retail firms who need space to establish themselves with the public. Circulation promotion, too, has had to go into reverse. We have at the moment about 6,000 orders for the Sunday Courier-Journal which we cannot fill.

Our monopoly requires a special use of much of our news space. Clubs, charities and civic organizations can only reach the reading public through us, and we therefore carry a heavy volume of material on their activities. It is useless to pretend that all such stories are of general reader interest. They are not, but we cannot escape the duty to carry

them. Our Promotion Department, which cannot promote circulation or advertising under present circumstances, devotes most of its energies to working out publicity campaigns for all manner of local drives.

We get blamed, of course, for just about everything that happens. Our politics are too Democratic for the Republican regulars, too independent for the organization Democrats. We are even made responsible for the weather. I heard a woman grumbling as she hurried along the street in a sudden rainstorm: "The Courier-Journal said it would be fair, and now look at it."

I hardly dare mention the difficulties of running a society page in a community where no other such outlet exists. Hell hath no fury like the mother of a bride whose daughter's picture does not appear in the society columns.

There are things people want put into a monopoly newspaper, but there are still more things they want kept out. I hear about many of them when my telephone rings at three and four o'clock in the morning. People don't like stories that

He Erased the Color Line

by Gilbert W. Stewart, Jr.

No vote was taken among the Nieman Fellows of 1946-47, yet we all know that our "experiment" in race relations was a success. It was so successful that within a matter of weeks it was no longer an experiment.

Fletcher Martin city editor of the Louisville Defender, was the first Negro to receive a Nieman Fellowship. The announcement may have caused some apprehension among us; I, for one, had never associated with a Negro.

But Fletcher has a quiet way of making people comfortable. Quickly we found that the subject of race relations was not taboo at the luncheon table. More than that, we not only discussed but disagreed, and came back to talk again. So the year passed, Fletcher ate our cooking and we ate his, he laughed at our stories and we roared at his, he took our poker money and we took his. He had erased the color line as completely as any person could.

To write a general formula for interracial harmony from such a minute sampling of mixed humanity probably would not be justified. Yet positive results came out of our year together: not one of us will act, or speak, or frame an opinion on a racial question without first thinking how it will affect our friend, Fletcher Martin. So I think there was a formula—a very ancient one which translates in this day into the words, brotherly love.

say they were arrested, and I don't blame them. If we start suppressing news that somebody does not want in the paper, however, we would never be able to draw the line. My wife was arrested once for a traffic violation, and the story went on Page One of our papers. That is sometimes a useful fact to cite at three in the morning.

Our Louisville monopoly is blamed for many weaknesses that I believe are inherent in the press as a whole. The word monopoly is such a convenient term to use whenever a story or editorial sets the blood pressure soaring. The distinguished report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press had some harsh things to say about monopolies, and I could not help feeling gratified by a note in Fortune's review of the report: "None of Boston's competing local dailies approximates the Commission's standards as well as does the daily product of the 'monopolistic' publisher in, for example, Louisville, Kentucky."

My point is that all newspapers are subject to the same weaknesses of the flesh. They are operated by large numbers of fallible human beings. Every issue requires the exercise of hundreds of individual acts of judgment by dozens of staff members. I can only say that we try to lay down the broad principle for our staff that news is to be handled without fear or favor. We have no blacklist of people who are to be ignored, no sacred cows who must be treated with special consideration.

A famous editor, C. P. Scott of the Manchester Guardian, gave an interpretation of a newspaper's purpose which wins my whole-hearted concurrence: "A newspaper is, of necessity, something of a monopoly, and its first duty is to shun the temptations of monopoly. Its primary office is the gathering of news. At the peril of its soul, it must see that the supply is not tainted. Neither in what it gives nor in what it does not give, nor in the presentation, must the unclouded face of truth suffer wrong. Comment is free, but fact is sacred."

I have dwelt on some of the difficulties of a monopoly, but I have not meant to complain. Louisville and Kentucky are fine places for newspaper work. What our papers say gets a reaction, sometimes good, sometimes bad, but always quick and positive. However our readers regard us, they seem to feel a personal stake in their newspapers. I can wish nothing better for my own three sons than to carry on the newspaper enterprise my father took over 29 years ago. They will meet with much criticism but also much friendship, and the constant stimulus of an exciting and rewarding job.

WHEN YOU SPEAK OF TURKEY

An Inside War-Time Reminiscence of An Axis-Modeled Regime

by William J. Miller

Istanbul was a fabulous place in the fall of 1943. Almost every other person was an agent of some sort—if not for the Germans or the Allies, then for the Turks—and sometimes for any two or three of them. There were agents, double-agents and triple-agents.

All the best apartments in Istanbul were occupied by Germans. It was impossible to get a flat without leasing it for a year, and the prices rose by the month, yet the Germans never questioned any price. It was said a plane carrying gold bullion taken from Holland arrived each week to finance their myriad activities.

By contrast, Americans, acting under the vigilant eye of Congress and the controller, were pikers; but they were not without their triumphs. I shall never forget the pride with which the chief of the U. S. Commercial Corporation, which had charge of preclusive buying, confided to me that he had just succeeded in buying up the entire Turkish hazelnut crop (at a tremendously inflated price, of course), to keep it from the Germans, who badly needed fats of any kind. All over Turkey warehouses were bulging with the nuts. We could not give them to the Turks, since they were sure to sell them again, to the Germans; we could not spare the shipping to send them home; finally we got the Russians to accept them, though they insisted on delivery.

Those of us who handled the war of words had problems no less acute. Turkey was assumed to be an imminent member of the United Nations; one had to assume she was also dedicated to the Four Freedoms. The fact that she was engaged in persecuting her Greek, Armenian and Jewish minorities made that a bit difficult.

In November, 1942, the Turkish Assembly had passed a *varlik vergisi*, or capital levy. Its purpose was to finance the mo-

bilization of the Turkish Army for reasons which, as the years drew on, proved as mysterious to the Allies as they did to the Germans; (but valid, nonetheless, for the same Army, still mobilized, is being paid today with American dollars). To keep 500,000 men under arms in a nation of 18,000,000 makes for quick bankruptcy, so the Turks drew for their heaviest sustenance on those least likely to complain—namely, the Greeks, Armenians and Jews. The tax, secretly computed, invariably amounted to the total wealth of the victim. If he failed to pay, he was hustled off to the Anatolian hills to work on the roads. The concentration camps were modeled after Himmler's, which the Istanbul police chief went to Germany to study. There was scarcely an American in Istanbul who did not have some Greek or Armenian friend whose goods had been sequestered, and padlocked, and whose wife and family were wondering about his whereabouts. Thanks to the efficiency of British and American censorship, the outside world learned little of this somewhat barbaric pastime of our Turkish friends. C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, finally broke the story over the Turkish cables—through the ingenious method of suggesting that, since he was on his way to Moscow, he could just as easily send it from there. The Turkish censors cleared his story, to the utter confusion of Allied censors in Cairo who had been sitting on other *varlik* stories for months past.

The Turkish Army has not fought since World War I. For all its undoubted courage, it is an obsolete army, and for all the Lend-lease equipment we shipped her in the fatuous belief she would fight on our side, it is an obsolete army. If Russia started a war of aggression tomorrow, the Turkish Army would not buy us more than a few weeks' delay at the most.

In an age of atomic strategy, a mobilized Turkey is an anachronism. With present heavy-bomber cruising radiuses, a Turkish base is no more valuable than an Italian, or a German or Egyptian base

(all of which are readily available to us). From a military standpoint there is no excuse in our encouraging a bankrupt nation to remain armed to the teeth. If Russian aggression is what we fear, we can achieve the same result much cheaper—and for the greater good of Turkey—by announcing our guarantee of her sovereignty.

The tragedy of our present course is that we have given *carte blanche* to the feudal-minded rulers of Turkey to stifle such small stirrings of Western democratic thought as did exist. It was no exaggeration when Raymond Daniell of the New York Times wrote recently from Istanbul that the danger was not so much that Russia would invade Turkey, but that Turkey, feeling she had the might of America behind her, would herself provoke trouble. No American who has been in Turkey will doubt the truth of that.

When the \$1000,000,000 we are sending Turkey is squandered, as it soon will be, and her warlords are demanding more, I suggest that the next appropriation for Turkey be earmarked—not for the support of an obsolete and German-trained army—but for the education of Turkish students in American colleges. Every dollar spent on educating a Turk here will later become a seed of democracy in Turkey. At present the seeds that are flourishing there were mostly planted by Hitler.

As chief of the American news service in Istanbul, my own particular *bete noir* was Muvafak Menemencioğlu, director of the Anatolia Agency—the official Turkish news agency from which all newspapers received their foreign news. Muvafak Bey was the brother of Numan Menemencioğlu, the foreign minister, and like his brother leaned over backward so far to avoid offending the Germans that sometimes he seemed to be in a prone position. Under Muvafak Bey, the Anatolia Agency used a great deal of German news. DNB, the official German news agency, had obligingly installed a *heilschreiber* machine right in his private office. This was a wonderful device, which inked out on a

Bill Miller covered the Home Front and then a couple of war fronts for the Cleveland Press. A hitch in OWI led to the Turkish experiences described here. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

NIEMAN REPORTS

VOL. 1. NO. 4 OCTOBER, 1947

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House
Cambridge, Massachusetts
by the

SOCIETY OF NIEMAN FELLOWS**Editorial Council**

JOHN McL. CLARK, Hanover, N. H.
THOMAS GRIFFITH, New York
A. B. GUTHRIE, JR., Lexington, Ky.
PAUL J. HUGHES, Louisville, Ky.
CARROLL KILPATRICK, Washington
ROBERT LASCH, Chicago, Ill.
WILLIAM J. MILLER, New York
BEN YABLONKY, New York
PAUL L. EVANS, Mitchell, S. D.
LOUIS M. LYONS, Cambridge, Mass.
Chairman

Subscription \$2 a year

Application for entry as second class
matter is pending.

continuous tape, all the news that was
fit to print in Berlin.

This was a long step ahead of what the OWI could provide him. We were receiving Morse broadcasts, out at our monitoring villa in Motchka, from the United Press, and from OWI in New York. These were rushed by motorcycle to our OWI headquarters on the Istiklal Caddesi, where translators turned them into Turkish and French, and typists put them on mimeograph stencils. These stencils, when completed, were rushed to Muvafak Bey's office.

Anatolia's service to the Turkish newspapers consisted of thrice-a-day mimeographed bulletins of the "latest" news. The reason we stenciled our own offerings was so that Anatolia, if it approved of them, might run them off as their own. We counted it a good day when any of our stencils appeared in the Agency's releases. But, since the DNB *hellschrieber* was in Muvafak Bey's own office, its news frequently crowded us out.

To counter-act the *hellschrieber* advantage we had offered to pay the United Press \$10,000 for its press service, but managers of that organization refused to take money from the Government. They also did not like to provide it free, so we arranged to pay Anatolia the \$10,000, Anatolia paid it to UP, and everybody was happy. Everybody but Anatolia, since we monitored, translated and transcribed the UP broadcasts in the OWI office. Muvafak Bey complained that he was being cheated, since he was paying for

the full report, and we were sending him only partial, selected, and censored portions of it. He knew that we were doing this because one of his agents, Mlle. Iclal, worked in our office as a translator, and kept him abreast of what we did there. She also kept us abreast of what Muvafak Bey was doing, so we found it advantageous to keep her. We were censoring the copy for the reason that the broadcast we picked up was the same one which UP beamed to Johannesburg, and was heavy with race-riots, inflammatory speeches and other material which did not seem to contribute to wartime unity. We also eliminated the UP reports, emanating from Istanbul, that Hitler had just died, or assassinated Goering, or that Hitler's double had taken power. Once, however, just to tease Muvafak Bey, we did send him the text of Eleanor Packard's think piece (from Istanbul, via New York, to Istanbul) that Hitler had recalled Ambassador Von Papen and Von Papen had refused to leave Turkey. This item reached Anatolia, we learned later from Mlle. Iclal, when there was no one in the office but a sub-editor who had had too heavy a lunch, and he sleepily inserted it in the evening bulletin. It went out too late for any of the papers except *En Son Dakika* (which means "the last minute") but that paper excitedly printed it on Page One. Next morning Von Papen was burning the wires to Foreign Minister Menemencioglu's office demanding the head of his brother. To make amends, Muvafak Bey replaced his Istanbul editor with a notorious pro-Nazi, who for three weeks permitted none of our news to be used in the bulletin.

If we succeeded in getting our items into the Agency's bulletins, that was but the first of our worries. The bulletins were only the raw material from which Istanbul's eight dailies made up their foreign news. They printed, or omitted, as they pleased. It was quite predictable as to which would print and which would omit.

The two most important dailies of Istanbul—*Cumhuriyet*, and *Acsam*,—were both pro-Axis. They were to Istanbul what the *Times* and *Herald Tribune* are to New York. *Cumhuriyet* was the property of a virulent pro-Nazi, Yunus (called Yunus the Pig) Nadi. Turkey's best cartoonist, the pro-Nazi Cemal Nadir, whose style was reminiscent of Low's, worked for him. It was an open secret that the German Embassy subsidized *Cumhuriyet*. *Acsam* was only a bit less pro-Nazi.

There were really only three editors whom the Allies could count on; Zekirva Sertel, of Tan; Ahmet Emin Yalman, of

Vatan; and Cevat Yalchin of *Taber*. Yalman had gone to Columbia University at the time of Wilson's administration, and had acquired an American liberalism of that era. Sertel, who had been Ataturk's first press minister, was not only pro-Allied, but pro-Russian, which cast him under suspicion in a country whose rulers hated and feared Russia more than the Devil. Yalchin was an old man, a very courageous one, whose enemies said he was subsidized by the British.

Only in those three papers could the Allies count on getting a better-than-average treatment. And of these, Yalman occasionally leaned over backward to be fair to the Axis.

There was also a monthly magazine, called "*Adimlar*", (steps), which a group of liberals at the Ankara and Istanbul Universities had begun. It consisted mostly of translations of stories from American and English authors (Hemingway, Steinbeck, Dos Passos, etc.). The ring-leader of it was Muzafer Sherif, professor of psychology at the University of Ankara. Sherif, a Harvard and Columbia product, had won world academic renown as the author of the "theory of the social norm" in psychology.

I left Turkey in November, 1943, but I tried to keep track of what happened there after I left.

I was in Italy, the following May, when Churchill revealed, in his speech to Parliament, that all the Allied efforts to bring Turkey into the war had come to naught:

"The hopes we cherished of Turkey boldly entering the war in February or March—or at least according the necessary bases for air action—these hopes have faded. After giving L20,000,000 worth of British and American arms to Turkey in 1943 alone, we have suspended the process and have ceased to exhort Turkey to range herself with the victorious united powers. . . ." Turkey's recent cessation of chrome shipments to Germany, said Churchill, raised the hope that she might curtail other exports "of material assistance to the enemy."

Turkey waited until Germany was obviously beaten—until February, 1945—before she declared war. By that time, it was impossible for her to strike a single blow against Germany anywhere on her borders. But she remained, as she had been, completely mobilized—a tremendous strain on a country already near bankruptcy.

But, of course, she could now strike at the enemy within. One might expect that she arrested Yunus Nadi, the pro-Axis editor, and the pro-Axis members of the General Staff who had kept her

from ranging herself with the Allies. That was not the case.

Istanbul riots, which had all the earmarks of government support, wrecked the newspaper of Zekirya Sertel, who had dared to be not only pro-Allied, but pro-Russian.

The liberal monthly, Adimlar (modeled shall we say, after the Atlantic Monthly) was suppressed, and its founder, Muzafer Sherif, was imprisoned.

That other pro-Allied editor, Ahmet Yalman, went to America, under the auspices of Time Magazine, to speak at its Cleveland forum on foreign affairs. He spoke mildly liberal sentiments, and on his return, was arrested.

This is the country which America has decided to underwrite—to the extent of \$100,000,000 to keep her Army mobilized: the Army which did not hurt Hitler, which did not help us, but which kept Turkey bankrupt. The money won't last long. It will be quickly spent, and they will be back for more.

Turkey is not a democracy. The despotism of a Sultan was succeeded, in 1923, by the despotism of an inspired leader, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who, whatever the undisputed cruelties of his private vengeance, raised Turkey by her bootstraps into the Twentieth Century. By hanging to the nearest lamp-post people who continued to wear the fez instead of European dress; by blocking up with stones the apertures in the towers from which muezzins called the faithful to morning and evening prayers, he broke the hold of Muslim on literate Turks and replaced their Arabic shorthand with the Western alphabet. Ataturk was entirely too busy changing things ever to get around to giving the Turks democracy. Most of the things he changed were for the better but his so-called People's Party was a one party, one-vote system of government by Ataturk and the men around him. When he died the old superstitions began to creep back; the good he had accomplished quickly slipped back into the mire of oriental indifference; but the evil of the one-party dictatorship lived after him.

Turkey today is ruled by an "old guard" of a hundred or so of Ataturk's compatriots of the war for independence. At the beginning they had courage, prowess and zeal to recommend them, but in the lush days of power they grew fat, idle and rich. Today they are as cynically corrupt and sensuously indolent a group as ever Rome produced. They are typified, for me, by one owner of vast timber estates, called Shevcat Bey, who spends most of his waking hours in the elaborate municipal nightclub called the Taksim, swilling his konyak or raki and pinching

the Rumanian and Hungarian dancing girls. Some years ago, Shevcat Bey shot and killed a man in the Hotel Tokatlyan, on Istanbul's Istiklal Coddesi.

The incident created some unpleasantness; perhaps the dead man's relatives protested. To help Shevcat out of his difficulties, the authorities issued him a paper declaring him irresponsible for his actions. At the same time they issued him another paper authorizing him to carry a pistol. At the Taksim, Shevcat Bey was fond of exhibiting these papers side by side: "You see, with the pistol, I can kill a man; but then this other paper protects me from arrest."

After VE-Day, the ruling caste of Turkey decided it had to adopt at least the trappings of a democracy. This was not only a concession to Allied opinion, but to the Turkish people who were openly muttering resentment at the burdens piled on them by a five year mobilization of 1,000,000 men in a nation of 18,000,000. A Demokrat Partisi was formed. Celal Bayar, a conservative who was prime minister at the time of Ataturk's death, became its head. It was a mark of the popular discontent with the regime that most of the Istanbul dailies—including even the pro-Nazi Cumhuriyet supported the opposition.

The elections were held in July of 1946. Only the People's Party was allowed to have counters at the polling places. The opposition was "defeated." Thousands of its supporters rioted in Ankara in protest.

It soon became impossible for anyone of the mildest democratic sentiments to voice his thoughts without being pilloried as a "Communist." Carroll Pratt, an American who had been teaching psychology in Ankara prior to becoming the head of Princeton's psychology department in the fall of 1947, was denounced as a Communist by students of the law school, which had always been a hot-bed of Nazi sentiment at the University. Prof. Pratt was forced to cancel public lectures because of riotous heckling by the law stu-

Stimulus

The editors of Nieman Reports are to be congratulated on the first three issues. The publication provides for serious-minded journalists a stimulus not found elsewhere, and an excellent way of broadening the benefits envisioned by Mrs. Nieman when she created the Foundation. Too much has been said about your typographical errors, and too little about the potency of your articles.

Dwight E. Sargent
Portland Herald

dents, whom the police did not attempt to restrain.

When you speak of Turkey, you speak of that very thin crust of privileged or professional people who dominate a nation that is more than eighty per cent illiterate. You cannot speak of the Turkish "people." Many of the goatherders in the Anatolian hills do not know that the Sultan is gone. Others believe that the country is ruled by a new Sultan called Ataturk. Most of those who have heard of Ataturk do not know that he is dead. The only Turks that America can reach, by diplomacy, by financial aid, or by propaganda, are those who compromise the literate minority that rules the land.

But here is the rub—Turkish education is largely in the hands of teachers who were educated in Hitler Germany, and who are hopelessly imbued with the worst aspects of the Nazi philosophy—the superiority of race, the inferiority of "unequals," and violent chauvinism.

German general staff officers comprised the faculty of the Turkish Military Academy until August of 1944. Most of the present Turkish general officers are German-trained, and thoroughly saturated with German doctrines. In the Agricultural Institute in Ankara, and the Technical University in Istanbul, the great proportion of teachers and professors were German-trained during the 30's and 40's. Even during the war, while Turkey was technically a British ally, the flow of Turkish students to Germany continued uninterrupted. Almost every literate Turkish professional or technical man today works from German source material—his textbooks, his instruments, his method of thinking, are all German.

Both the present minister of education, Resat Semsettin Siner, and the Minister of Labor, Sadi Irmak, are Nazi-trained and are authors of numerous tracts expounding the Nazi superman philosophy.

The number of Turks who went to America, or Britain, for education is infinitesimal, but they provide the seed of what small stirrings of democracy exist. But they are either imprisoned or so terrorized that they dare not speak their thoughts. Turkey's leading psychologist, Dr. Sherif, is a good example. In America he was such an outstanding scholar and pioneer in experimental psychology that his texts are almost required reading. But Turkey, the nation one would have expected to be proudest of his achievements, court-martialed and imprisoned him for publishing the mildly liberal magazine Adimlar. Ironically, he had just been released from prison when the American State Department awarded him a fellowship at Princeton and sent him a general's priority to travel by plane to Washington. In 48

hours, he was sleeping in the Blair House, across from the White House. In Turkey, his name is still high on the list of suspected "subversives."

Does all of this provide a clew as to how we may best help Turkey? I think it does. The \$100,000,000 we have just

sent her will go, as all her own millions have gone, to keep her army mobilized—an army which has not struck a single blow for freedom, for democracy, or for the war aims or the Allies. It will be quickly spent, and Turkey will remain, as she was, on the verge of bankruptcy, with her own people growing more and

more restive at this abnormal burden of taxation and privation.

P.S. Some of the ministers named were replaced in the cabinet shuffle of early September. But since all members of the Old Guard act and think alike, replacing one with another is a game of musical chairs. W.J.M.

THE PAUL MILLER SYSTEM IN AP

by Gilbert W. Stewart, Jr.

Paul Miller is a news executive. He extracts news from a community by getting the most and the best out of his staff. He knows a good reporter when he sees one. He gives him reportorial freedom and encourages him to use it. He backs him up completely—with a pay raise when he is doing a good job, with moral support when he has to take a licking.

Miller knows news. He can whack out a good spot story when the occasion demands. But news gathering and news writing was the lesser part of his ability. When Frank Gannett hired him to help run his chain of newspapers, he picked not a famous name correspondent from the world news fronts but a friendly, easy-to-get-along-with desk man who knows best how to organize men for the collection of news.

Forty years old and with five years of Washington under his belt, Miller summarized some views on newspaper reporting for the Virginia Press Association in Roanoke last July.

"The general observation is that deadpan reporting isn't enough; that the announced facts don't always speak for themselves; that a reporter must be a lot more than a parrot; and that writing should be easy to follow—it should lead the reader on and fast. . .

"The backbone of the effort is the individual. No news report, however well planned, however carefully thought out, however highly principled its conception, can ever rise above the character and the ability of the reporters on the scene."

One AP man remembers rather vividly those early days of the Miller regime. He was one of the lesser desk men, not

too well paid. In the course of the day a story came through from the beat. Seeing feature possibilities, he rewrote it to make it sparkle. The next day he had a note from the boss with "orchids." The day following there was another note. It said, in effect:

"I got to thinking what I would have thought if I were a reporter, had turned out a good job, and got only a note from the boss. Next week you get a raise."

Miller had inaugurated one of his key policies. Like every other wartime bureau chief in the Capital, he was seeing the beginnings of staff dismemberment. The services were calling away some. Those who were left were getting offers of fancy pay from other employers. He couldn't do much about the Army and Navy, but his answer to the other problem was to open wide the cash drawer.

"You have to get and keep men who know as much about a subject as the government people who deal with it," he remarked. And most of the men he had at the time, he kept. Notch by notch the salary scale went up. Now scarcely an AP Washington reporter makes less than \$100 a week. He dished out fine titles, too, to go with by-lines but they slipped by the wayside. The salaries stayed.

John Hightower was spotted at the State Department and is still there. Harold Oliver is still on the national political run. Jack Bell is covering the Senate and legislative politics; Sterling Green remained in the center of the war's immense business developments, Ovid Martin on farm coverage; Sigrid Arne, James Marlow, Elton C. Fay and other key by-lines stayed throughout the war. At least one top notcher turned down a \$50-a-week higher offer without even consulting Miller.

Personal relationships got plenty of attention under the Miller system. He was on a first-name basis with every member of the staff. His rather bare office in the Star building on Pennsylvania avenue opened to AP men without a

knock. On a visit to the House one busy day, his chief House staffer called out, "Paul, watch the gallery for me while I get this story out." Paul watched the gallery. One evening a bunch of the AP boys overstayed a cocktail party. At midnight one suggested calling on the boss. The motion carried unanimously and two carloads of happy reporters awakened the Miller household. Miller, in bathrobe and slippers, supplied appropriate refreshments and joined the fun.

Today the reporter's judgment has a greater place in the file of AP Washington news than ever before. Reporters are expected to go behind and beyond the surface news. They do not have to name, as a news source, an official willing to be quoted: they are assumed to have good judgment as to which officials are responsible.

Under this system political reporting has been revamped. Miller picked out two of his most seasoned correspondents—Harold Oliver with years of White House experience and Jack Bell who headed up Senate coverage. He centered the job in them. He gave them their heads to write the political situation as they found it, with sources held confidential if necessary.

This year a new trick is being tried. Bureau chiefs in key political cities over the country have named their best political reporters. One by one they are being brought to Washington to work with Bell and Oliver. They exchange information and otherwise line up their ducks for the 1948 campaign.

Miller's most famous job of backing up his men came during the San Francisco United Nations conference. With the world on edge awaiting an armistice with Germany, Bell came up with a story that the peace was about to be signed. The source was Senator Connally, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, but this name at first was withheld. Bell still maintains the story was bona fide, that peace negotiations

"Pete" Stewart, native of North Dakota and graduate of its university in 1933, has been a Washington reporter since 1936, with United Press, Washington Star, Wall Street Journal and now Newsweek. He was a Nicman Fellow last year.

were in progress. But the events didn't materialize and criticism became intense.

Miller was in charge of the San Francisco coverage. He stood at Bell's elbow as Bell pounded out the bulletin. He shouldered the blame—if blame there was—and wrote an exposition of events for Editor and Publisher. Incidentally, Bell was the 25-year-old city editor of the Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City when Miller, still in college, was part time reporter and feature writer.

Miller himself generates little of the news that comes from his Washington bureau. He covered Willkie in Wisconsin, Pepper in Florida and Warren in California in 1944. He handled some of the leads at the 1944 political convention. But his main job in Washington is to ADMINISTER the newsgathering and to keep in touch with Government high policy.

Personnel management as a tool in getting the news has been more successful under Miller than his efforts to brighten up the writing. The AP report as a whole still is pretty dull.

Not long after he arrived in Washington he put a general message on the bulletin board. All leads, he ordered should contain no more than 30 words. Some dillies were produced. But writers sweated and desk men screamed. In a month the order came down but Miller was convinced he had impressed on his men the idea of terseness.

He believes in using the present tense where possible; thus Washington originated the type of lead that might say, "President is pursuing a tougher policy. . ." He dislikes "legislative" but AP wires still click with "The House today passed and sent to the Senate a bill to provide so and so 'n so 'n so 'n. . ."

To inject news significance, Miller assigned Marlow, a craftsman at simple English, to write a daily column. He was to explain, without expressing opinion, the various moves of Congress and the Executive and Judicial branches. It has a wide following. He sponsored the weekly AP feature "Looking Ahead" in which bureaus over the world contribute to a column of tidbits of inside news and speculation on future developments.

It may have kept reporters on their toes but it rattled both the desk and the staff on the street: Miller was likely to make sudden shifts in staff assignments. Without warning, a reporter might be moved to a new beat or a desk man put on the night shift.

With Gannett, Miller has "moved across the street", so to speak.

Said Gannett, according to the press,

"Mr. Miller will have special work of great importance and will relieve me of many of my burdens."

Said Miller, "I'm going up and dig in."

I, for one, will watch with interest Mr. Miller's operations in this new, rather nebulous assignment. On "the other side of the street" the matter of production

is different; the matter of the business office and of profit and loss is a different problem from the matter of collecting stipends from AP members. Miller may have access to Gannett's cash drawer and he may use it as effectively as he did in Washington. On the other hand, he may not . . .

Fitzpatrick Cartoons

The Nieman Foundation is proud possessor of one of the 300 copies of the limited Memorial Edition of Fitzpatrick Cartoons, inscribed characteristically, "To the Nieman Fellows, (God Help 'Em)."

Fitz' cartoons in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch are probably the most rugged single force in American journalism. Power is in them, the power of a man who feels strongly, draws as he thinks in simple straight hard lines. Fitz is an uninhibited force. He strikes for the jugular. He could have no place on a pussyfooting, fence-sitting newspaper, nor in working for any publisher who limited him with matters of policy. Fitz draws them as he sees them. They have often the bite of a lash. They show the heat of an angry man who slugs at greed, intolerance, smugness, hypocrisy, stupidity, dishonesty. His cartoons have a ring to them with the clash of battle, and fire and passion. Only a man easily moved to passionate heat could create the images expressing the hate and contempt that Fitz uses to pillory sham and chicanery and exploitation. And only a great artist can epitomize an issue in a few lines that hits you instantly right in the eye, as he does dally. He draws in strong black lines, with such stark directness and such ruthless economy of detail that often a single word is all the text needed.

The 160 cartoons selected from his work over the last dozen years have a one page foreword by his long-time editorial colleague, Ralph Coghlan, editor of the Post-Dispatch, which says this about Daniel R. Fitzpatrick and his work:

"I have watched Fitzpatrick work for more than 20 years and I still marvel at his mental qualities and his ability to distill his views of world events into pictures. Sometimes these pictures burn with wit or irony; others have a terrific emotional

thrust; still others hold a civilized balance against foolish extremism. Through all his cartoons runs the pattern of his philosophy.

"I would say this philosophy is a simple one: Fitz is against fascism in Washington or Kokomo, as well as in Berlin or Tokyo. He's for the underdog, whether he be a tragic figure at Dachau or a poor guy in an American soup line. Fitz has a profound contempt for "stuffed shirts" or, to put it more elegantly, the Ibsenesque "pillars of society." He sees through their masks. He hates the greed of this gentry. Fitz wants democracy to work, so he is against those who pervert capitalism for personal privilege, and he is against demagogues who front for them. By the same token, to preserve democracy, he despises those who foul the ballot box or who misuse democratic means for private ends.

"If Fitz is a radical, as he is called—and I hope the charge is true—it is a radicalism that grows out of American soil—the radicalism of Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine, William Lloyd Garrison and Robert M. LaFollette.

"This book gives a fine chance to study his work. It is a swift survey of the mighty forces loose in the world since 1935 screened through his incisive mind.

"Those who thumb through the book will be struck by his prophetic quality and the fact that his judgments stand up in the light of history. They will wonder more when they reflect that the cartoons were drawn not with the armchair perspective of the historian, but in the white heat of dally composition and against the nerve-racking pressure of deadlines. May I testify—and I know—that these drawings are born of passion and sometimes agony on the part of the man who wielded the crayon?"

THE NEWSPAPER IS A LONE WOLF BUSINESS

by Nathaniel R. Howard

Our business, and it stands to reason it is a business as well as a kind of zealous professional calling, is unlike any other in the universe. It has two particular characteristics I wish to explore in detail.

It is a lone-wolf business, without any real sentimental alliances in other businesses. For its success, it depends not on manufacturing or chopping up some commodity which the public will buy, and learning how to market it and produce efficiently. It depends on that strange combination of somebody's will to be heard in print, somebody's else ability to imagine what truth may be like without ever closing his mind to the opposite chance; somebody's else honest ingenuity about getting to the scene of the crime or getting the public official to talk, or going to some source no one else has thought of; somebody's else reflective thoughts at the last moment before going to press; somebody's money to back this combine to do two things, make at least enough money to exist, and as much more as possible, and to give the public a source of fact and counsel which will make that combine and everybody connected with it respectable, respected, and interesting.

The manufacturing and production end of it pales into insignificance alongside of the will of each performer in the combine to do something better than somebody else can do it. For if any member of the combine is listless or lacking in the necessary ideals, it will all flop. There is no co-operative effort in all civilization like the high-speed publishing of a daily newspaper, and I, who as a managing editor twice got out extras forgetting to notify the circulation department, and saw those extras rot away on the loading dock, ought to know it.

It is partly because there is no other business like this combine, this "manufacturing of intangibles," that ours is a lone-wolf business. But only partly. The historic psychology of the free American newspaper is a very odd one. That the

people depend greatly on our papers is obvious—you and I would not be here tonight if that were not true. But the people, which means all kinds of people, also take newspapers for granted, and are no more affectionate or enthusiastic about us than they are about the air they breathe or the water they drink, on which they likewise depend.

Who is ever conscious of the air until it becomes foul or one is deprived of it? In the public mind, it is the same with newspapers.

The men and women of the newspaper business have, in the opinion of the public, a certain magic which we pull down from the skies, and if this gets us a certain curious respect, it also makes people regard us as a little mystifying and uncanny. If we tried, we could not dispel the impression which has grown up around the business that it is a kind of secret society which ordinary minds cannot quite fathom. Whether you or I like it or not, we are all members of a kind of fraternity, in the judgement of the public. And this further makes our business a lone-wolf affair.

Almost everybody respects and likes doctors, teachers, and the learned lines of endeavor. All kinds of manufacturers considerably understand and sympathize with all other manufacturers; and they regard with sentimental favor the merchants and the bankers, who in turn enlist sympathetically with them. The precision of scientists gets them respect and affection from most other walks of life. Ours is the only business without a real ally. Ours is the only one the public attitude toward which is a curious mixture of awe, lack of comprehension, indifference, and constant hostility. And you or I can never change this, not as long as the freedom of our civilization and the workings of human nature remain as they are.

I want to dwell for a moment on this picture of a business which is surrounded, as the ocean surrounds an island, by a combination of hostile and apathetic hosts. To repeat, the elements of our Society which are benefited by the operations of our newspapers remain largely apathetic because most people take the newspaper and its services for granted. There are all kinds of other elements of our Society which make the existence of free newspapers precarious. These are the persons, the agencies, and the institutions that are hostile to public information and to news-

papers which supply it; who want to pollute the stream of information and truth for their selfish aims; or who from time to time find reasons to distrust the press because it is not sufficiently partisan in their behalf. Some highly respectable persons, agencies, and institutions move in and out of this last class.

Let us analyze these hostile forces which, I say, render precarious the continuous existence of every truth-serving newspaper. I refer you, in making this statement, to the recorded mortality of American newspapers, which rate is higher than that in most businesses, or at least many businesses; partly because a newspaper at best is an expensive and delicate property and partly because no other business attracts such a collection of hostilities.

First, there are the people of selfish intent who want to use newspapers for their ends. They are numerous and of many kinds of humanity. I am sure you are as familiar as I am with the local politician of considerable power and the various devices he has of getting "to" the newspaper's columns, either to slant things his way or to suppress or to get himself built up. In the history of this great and free republic there has never been a politician who has liked or wished well the newspaper which told all the truth about him; nor has there ever been one who would not trade his influence on the newspaper's behalf for a quid pro quo by the newspaper. He and his kind may approach the owner of the paper, the editor, or the reporter. If any of these newspaper individuals accept his favors and come to terms with him, the newspaper is bound to be compromised and suffer eventually. No politician exists who does not want all he can wring from the smallest deal he can make.

I am sure newspaper people can recognize this local political character who is at the bottom an enemy of the free and honest newspaper. Do you recognize him when he operates on the national level? The same motives, the same rules of life, apply to the national political leader. He is for the newspapers who believe as he does and will play his game; he is opposed to those who do not. He has no idealism about giving the people the whole truth. Every energy he has is devoted to getting the end he desires for himself, be it power or money.

The Guild, I noted, has dabbled to some

Nathaniel R. Howard is editor of the Cleveland News and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He has had 30 years of newspapering from cub reporter up through copy desk and city desk, and, as his copy shows, he loves it. That is one reason for printing this piece. The other is that it voices an editor's criticisms and anxieties about the Guild. It is taken from an address he made on invitation to the annual convention of the American Newspaper Guild.

slight extent in national politics. I am of the opinion, on the basis of historic experience, that the Guild will be asked to pay the politician for everything it has received of benefit from its political participation and for some things it has merely been convinced it has received. For the most high-sounding, or even the most well-meaning, politician who has tried or will try to ally your sympathies and energies does not, down at the bottom, believe in the ideal of the free newspaper as much as he believes in the newspaper which, right or wrong, is on his side. His goal is not the free and courageously independent newspaper. His goal is to win elections. Guildsmen are his friends as long as you represent to him help in winning elections.

Right back of the politician, in the ranks of those hostile to free dissemination of truth and free newspapers, is a shadier group, allied with modern political pressures,—the underworld of the cities in which our newspapers are published. Its denizens want to use the newspapers for gain and for protection whenever they can. Their methods are cruder. They can more often, unfortunately, posing as this or that kind of good fellow or underdog, work their ways into the confidences of reporters more often than they can reach a publisher or an editor. The newspaper man's casual good fellowship is often an invitation to them. I mention this class of haters of the truth that newspapers publish because I have noticed that this underworld society rallies around the Page One and Press Club and Guild public parties, and, without any apparent discouragement, tosses dollars into the pot, buys tickets, and takes ads in the program. Yet this is the class that will demand a pay-off in a good deal tougher manner than even the politicians. These are the enemies of the honest, truth-telling newspaper. Surely no self-respecting newspaper people want to make book with them.

Then there are the pressure groups which invariably set out to damage and to frighten those newspapers which oppose or are hesitant about the objectives of these groups. Included in these are the labor unions, or rather the labor union leaders, who are "for" you as long as you are "for" them, regardless of the tyranny and the excesses and the graft of some of these unions and their leaders. They do not want you or me to publish the cold, factual truth about all that they do, and they will exert all the pressures they can on honest editorial workers banded in a labor organization of their own to keep the facts from being exactly re-

ported and the judgments from being exactly and judiciously cast. I have to say here that I very much admire those Guild members on the labor union beats for their newspapers who have written what they learned to be the fact and have called the truth as they have seen it after hard digging for the truth. Those men at one time or another have been pressured by labor leaders, and some have been embarrassed and threatened and browbeaten, but still they have stayed with the facts. In equal judiciousness, I have to say that others, whose Guild membership I surmise, have in similiar posts of reporting duty evidently said to themselves, "To hell with the exact facts, this is the fight of Labor with a capital L, and I know where I stand in that fight." Because, I have read news stories and news wire stories about the Taft-Hartley bill and the President's position which I felt could only have been written, edited, or circulated by newspaper people who were desperately hoping the bill would not become law. What I took as bias in these stories was surely not that of the newspaper owner, nor likely of editor. All this is understandable to a student of human nature, but it is not factual loyalty nor adherence to the exact truth, on which the lasting character of our business depends, in a world of hostile forces.

Then, among enemies of the honest, truth-telling newspaper are the Communist-minded, who make up by their energies what they lack in numbers. These do not assail the owner or the editor of the newspaper; they go to work on the staff members whom they think they recognize as of violent under-dog psychology. Their appeal is not for Stalin or for the Soviet Russia or even for the party line. They ask, much more insidiously, that the news-

ALCOHOLICS SYNONYMOUS

A source with which newspapermen are supposed to have at best only a nodding acquaintance last week produced sobering statistics on the hard-drinking newspaperman of Hollywood legend. The Keeley Institute of Chicago reported that of 12,012 drunks treated between 1930 and 1946, only 95 were newspapermen.

This put newsmen in fifth place, a notch above clegymen (40) and a notch below saloonkeepers (133). As if this weren't enough to convince city-room romantics that newspapers have gone to pieces, the Keeley figures showed farmers in the lead with 1,347 cases; salesmen next with 1,138, and doctors third with 280.

—Newsweek, July 7

writer and the copy reader pivot all editorial conceptions on the lot of the great mass of less-privileged. There is a sharp line to be drawn here between the objective news-reporter and the zealot of despair. These spreaders of this particular poison hate the truth-telling newspaper with particular hatred, in the belief that they cannot come into their own—as they visualize it in their murkiest proletarian dreams—as long as newspapers regularly print the facts. One look at the slants in the Daily Worker ought to be enough to assure us all of that. The truthful and honest press stands as our greatest shield against the attack of this class.

In fact, there has developed a civilization of pressure groups in America which would like mightily to bend the newspapers to their will for their ends, regardless of the virtues of their movements. As another sample, I would remind you of those ten or twelve courageous newspapers of the deep South who in the 1920's took up the fight against the Ku Klux Klan when that secret society's membership had spread into every southern city. Those newspapers reported and editorialized at great danger to their existences. The Klan leaders went to their readers and demanded subscription cancellations and to their advertisers and took great chunks of revenue out of those papers' income. Not all of those courageous papers have survived to this day.

The records of newspapers which have fought for their lives against these "best people," in the interests of fairness to all the people, are very elaborate records. Let me call to mind the New York Times of George Jones's day in the 1870's, when such upstanding citizens as Peter Cooper and Cyrus Field tried to muzzle the Times' disclosures of graft that eventually sent Boss Tweed to jail. Let me remind you of the risk that the Chicago Tribune took when Boss Lorimer, himself a bank president, called on every banker in Chicago to boycott the Tribune because it was on its way to exposing his \$100,000 purchase of a seat in the United States Senate. Let me remind you of the reaction of the large real estate interests in Florida, in Connecticut, in New York, in Michigan, when newspapers in those states, at one time or another, began the factual investigation of holdups in the purchase of public lands for highways, parks, and institutions.

Let me refer you to the tactics of every public utility whose rates have been successfully attacked by a fact-finding newspaper whose exposure of the truth brought lower gas, electricity, traction, and tele-

phone charges to the people. All these groups hated the newspapers who were out to get the facts and print them; and all similar groups will always hate and fear and fight the honest, truth-telling newspaper, whenever the interests of these groups are trodden upon. Let me remind you of the antagonism of every target of the thousands of effective news campaigns for honesty, decency, and justice.

Life, in fact, is full of promoters, of sectarian movements, of industrial interests, of sincere evangelists, who do not want all the truth published and will fight the newspaper which tries to publish all the truth. I am sure you see why I referred to our business as a lone-wolf business. It has to be. It is our destiny. We must never sell out to, or pull our punches, for anybody. And, as a corollary axiom, we of our business are either for our business, or we line up against it.

I am no judge of the avowed aims and purposes of the Newspaper Guild as purely a labor organization. Possibly I am not objective enough to be a judge. But I know that every editor in the United States is wondering about the American Newspaper Guild; "Is it for us or against us? Is there included in the Guild's primary concept of its function a purpose to protect the existence of newspapers against the onslaught of ill wishers? Or is it merely one more enemy, one more pressure group, in the ocean of apathy and hostility which fate decrees must surround our business?"

As working newspaper people, honor will drive Guildsmen to say, "We are for the free and the honest and the courageous American newspaper and the fulfillment of its obligation to the people who depend on it." And I will believe it, because I want to believe it. And yet—as far as the newspaper-reading and newspaper-depending public of Chicago and Philadelphia could possibly tell, guild members were far more interested in putting newspapers out of business in those cities—regardless of rights and bargainings and which responsibilities were whose—than in seeing that the people who had depended on these papers for fact and truth and enlightenment continued to have them.

I knew the Philadelphia Record from afar. I could not approve of certain slants it gave to its news columns. But among other acts during its useful life it had fought, with courage, almost with tenacity, many reactionary or selfish interests of its community. I seem to remember its success in battling down privilege in the

form of high utility rates, political steals, and corporate evasions.

I knew the Philadelphia Record called it quits, as the result of the Newspaper Guild limitations on its publication, I would guess that there was great rejoicing in various quarters completely at variance with the philosophy of the Guild. There must have been quiet moments of celebration by certain predatory and undemocratic agencies and persons, and perhaps at these there were jocular expressions of thanks to the Newspaper Guild for having achieved a defeat of the Philadelphia Record which these more saturnine characters could not have achieved for themselves.

There is a tendency in the Guild history to date which I must view with some sorrow. When Guild units have become embroiled in labor disputes, there has emerged on its side of the controversy too often a propaganda campaign intended to convince the public of the newspaper's lack of honor, decency, and integrity. I had a taste of this myself, and it has rankled for several years in my heart as an injustice done to our newspaper and its character and to me and the whole staff. We had a labor election case which went into hearings and testimony, and the burden of the Guild's case was that there was no distinction to be made between our editorial staff operations and standards, and those of the sales and accounting practices of our business office. The Guild attempted to claim by testimony that finally was thrown out that our editorial operation was subservient to the almighty dollar even to the extent of publishing untrue propaganda as news; a very serious and damaging thing to say about the character of a newspaper. It hurt me and those in charge of our editorial performance very keenly.

The great majority of our staff knew us for a group in charge of editorial operations which was particularly independent of business office requests and suggestions, which the Guild prosecutors unfairly and untruly attempted to represent as commands. The thing that hurt the worst was to find there were those on our staff who would descend to such misrepresentation. A smear, I think it could be accurately called. The misrepresentation was exposed and thrown out; in fact, we won the election case. I have been sensitive ever since to the appearance of smear tactics in labor controversies in which the Guild engaged. I believe it has been almost the rule, whenever controversy reached the strike stage, that the Guild

members have widely attacked the integrity and public intentions of the newspaper as a newspaper, and not merely as an employer.

This is why I would emphasize that newspapermen are all members of the same fraternal order, in the eyes of the great reading public. When they go out to smear the truth-telling honor of a newspaper, they are talking in the public's appraisal, exactly as a resigned Mason or Knight of Columbus or Oddfellow might talk of a lodge with which he has been associated. The outside world, with its natural bent for believing the worst of everybody, may take him more seriously than he intended in the heat of battle—and when that battle is over he may discover he had irreparably damaged the virtuous name which a newspaper must have to remain in existence.

It is hard for all of us to tell the exact truth, in the heat of a labor battle. This is a failing not restricted to the labor union, but one which current labor union tactics for public appeal has undoubtedly sharpened. If you are in a labor row with a steel company, you may say whatever you please about that company, and the truth or falsity of your propaganda will not much injure its popularity with its consumers, when the fight is finally settled. The customer is used to the steel product being the right quality at the right price, and nothing else matters to him. And so with practically every other kind of business which may have labor disputes. But ours is different. A newspaper's good name with the public is something like a woman's reputation for chastity. You can foul our particular nest with lasting effect. I have read of public appeals by picket lines to hate and to distrust the embattled newspaper which have caused me to wonder whether the question could not fairly be asked of the dissident employes, "If these accusations of yours are true, how did your self-respect as a newspaper man let you work there?" After our labor election case was over, I asked some of our staff how they could justify the attempt to slur our editorial integrity. The only rational answer I got was that "all was fair in a fight." If that has to be the policy, then the Guild should recognize that it is a Frankenstein game. For whatever evil newspapermen speak of their newspaper, in this isolated business without allies, it will find a target which they will live to regret—unless it be the purpose of subversive zealots to destroy, and I cannot believe that it is.

John Gunther---

INSIDE U. S. JOURNALISM

As John Gunther's "Inside U. S. A." has everything in it, there is no surprise in finding it has more about current American journalism than any book devoted wholly to that field. Gunther's observations about newspapers turn up casually as items of local color or forces in politics. They are incomplete, with some surprising omissions. But many are extraordinarily interesting, perhaps more so because they are entwined with the other elements of his picture and come into it only when and if they interested him. Gunther's journalistic appraisals should be among his surest because he is a seasoned newspaperman himself; and very often the reader feels that they are. Some of his finest bouquets and some of his sharpest criticisms are tossed at the press. At the top of his list are the New York Herald Tribune, evidently Gunther's favorite paper, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "the most enterprising and courageous" of American papers. The Louisville Courier-Journal, Kansas City Star, San Francisco Chronicle, Portland Oregonian, both Atlanta papers and the Raleigh News and Observer are others that he singles out for distinction. The Post-Dispatch and Kansas City Star receive the most detailed attention of any except the Chicago Tribune to which he gives a whole chapter in a pathological study to account for some traits of the Mid West. He cites Leo Rosten's finding that the Chicago Tribune is second only to the Hearst Press as "the least fair and reliable" among American newspapers.

Gunther himself would certainly say that failure to give any special attention to some leading papers is without significance. He was not writing a book about newspapers. So there is only passing reference to the New York Times, none whatever to the Washington Post, nothing on the Milwaukee Journal, or the experiment of PM. The only mention of the Christian Science Monitor is as the setting for that hoary anecdote about the visitor who asked if he might smoke there and Editor Erwin Canham's courteous caution in reply: "Certainly—of course no one ever has." The Boston

papers made a negative impression on him and no present paper in Philadelphia is even mentioned. In fact Gunther rather took the papers on the eastern seaboard for granted. It was the inside of USA he was discovering.

He gets into those newspaper situations that offer color or commotion and recites with hilarity the outgivings of the rowdiest in Tulsa, Fort Worth and Denver. "The crudest newspaper in the United States is or was, the Denver Post." He quotes the Tulsa Tribune to demonstrate that Tulsa is the most reactionary and isolationist town in the country. He rates Houston next.

He keeps coming back to the local monopolies in journalism. It is one of the things he rubs in as a characteristic of the American scene, and one time or another he names most of the monopolies. He surveys in detail the unique newspaper situation in Montana, where most of the city dailies are dominated by "the company." He finds an almost equally complete though less oppressive tie-up of the papers of Wyoming. It interests him that Salt Lake City's leading paper, the Deseret News, is the official organ of the Mormon Church and expresses the Mormons' hatred of Stalinist Russia. With a sense of discovery he explores the Capper journalistic empire in Kansas. But despite that he describes Kansas as "a colony" of a single newspaper, which isn't even in the State, the Kansas City Star. This paper he feels, dominates its scene more than any other. For one thing the Star is a local monopoly, he points out.

Also it has Roy Roberts, a natural Boss. He contrasts the very potent St. Louis Post-Dispatch which under Joseph Pulitzer's policy of journalistic detachment, doesn't try to run the town but holds those who do run it to rigorous accountability. The difference between the two attitudes is between a Pulitzer and a Roy Roberts.

He was surprised to find that the late William Allen White of the Emporia Gazette seems to have less of a reputation in Kansas than out.

He found much of interest in the Negro

press and its journalists and has more to say about them than is to be found in very many places. He shrewdly turned to them for appraisal of the Negro's situation in various parts of America.

If Gunther's journalistic jottings were to be compartmentalized from out of their varied context in his 978 packed pages, some of his more pungent and pointed observations might be given this topical organization.

HERALD TRIBUNE

"The New York Herald Tribune, seldom flays a man without good reason." It is "not a muck raking organ, but one that guards zealously the public interest."

Gunther thought as did the Nieman Reports (April '47) that Vincent Sheean, reporting the trial of the Mink Slide Negroes in the Herald Tribune "contributed to the nation some of the finest journalism of our time." He rates The Herald Tribune the No. 1 U. S. newspaper.

TIMES

"James Reston's lively and sensible reporting deserves a place in the anthologies."

The microfilm edition of the New York Times costs \$175 a year.

DAILY NEWS

In the New York Daily News, "by all odds the biggest circulation of any newspaper in America, on Sunday around 4,750,000," he turns first to the "Voice of the People" which he rates "one of the saltiest things in American journalism—shrieks, moans and whistles that cover every conceivable topic. . . The News is very fair in presenting all sides in its correspondence columns."

NEW ENGLAND

Boston: New England has no outstanding newspaper that serves all six states . . . "there is no New York Times, no dominant paper with a pan-New England point of view."

"Mostly the (Boston) newspapers kept

their mouths shut after the 1946 federal conviction (of Mayor Curley), though the Herald which was once sued by Curley, did dare to say that "it would perhaps be a little regretful that a city of 770,816 should be run from a jail."

James M. Langley, editor of the Concord N. H. Monitor is described as one of the "wise men" of New England.

The Providence Journal is called "one of the worthiest and most conservative" of U. S. papers.

The Hartford Courant is cited as the oldest American paper of continuous publication. Gunther missed a point the Springfield Republican once made in describing the Courant: Federalist then as now.

CHICAGO

He gives a whole chapter to the Chicago Tribune as a force of the Mid West.

"What the Chicago Tribune reminds me of most is the state of Texas. It is a kind of principality. Like Texas it is aggressive, sensitive in the extreme, loaded with guts and braggadocio, expansionist and medieval. Also like Texas, it has its own foreign policy, though one very different."

Tribune editorials are "hard hitting. . . also they can distort issues with a cunning that can only be described as masterful, and with nonsequiters of astounding range."

Other Chicago newspapers: "Lusty journalism exists in five other Chicago papers." The Daily News under the John S. Knight ownership has dropped its feud with the Tribune, and its "Colonel McCosmic" cartoons with which Colonel Knox used to heckle McCormack. "The Times edited by Richard J. Finnegan is a vivid and effective tabloid that deserves more of a national reputation." "The Herald-American is a cut above other Hearst papers." The entry of the Sun by Marshall Field III in 1941 was "a gallant enterprise."

Gunther celebrates the glowing literary past of the Chicago journalistic field, notably the old Daily News of the Lawson and Strong eras. He names the notable authors and foreign correspondents who served under Henry Justin Smith. "I remember a day when Mr. Smith was happy. Fourteen Chicago Daily News authors and foreign correspondents were having books published in one season."

INDIANA

Indiana is a state famous for its newspapermen—Elmer Davis, Byron Price, Kent Cooper, "Stuffy" Walters and Roy Howard. "The Indianapolis Times is still

Howard's own favorite among the whole Scripps-Howard chain and the only one aside from the N. Y. World Telegram which still carries his name on the masthead."

OHIO

"Cleveland is quite well served in newspapers. The Plain Dealer (conservative Democrat) and News (Republican) are vigorous competitors though owned by the same company in the pattern familiar all over the U. S." Scripps-Howard is very important in Ohio with three papers, Cincinnati Post, Columbus Citizen and Cleveland Press. "This last is a good liberal sheet, is supposed to be the biggest money maker of all the Scripps-Howard properties."

The Cincinnati Times—Star—"What the Times-Star believes in, its publisher says, is only one thing—the American middle class." Its publisher, Hulbert Taft, half cousin to Robert and Charles Taft, "is the most conservative man I met in 48 states."

Columbus, Ohio—"One of the strangest and least known stories in America is that of the Columbus Wolfes. Several times when I asked people who ran Ohio, the answer was 'the Wolfe interests.' But this is an exaggeration. One eminent man of politics told me, 'Sure the Wolfes boss the town, but if you want to get licked just get the Dispatch (one of the Wolfe papers) on your side.'"

ST. LOUIS

"No paper has a more broadly generous record of public service than the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"The record of the paper's citations and crusades is almost endless. It won so many prizes that for a time it withdrew from the Pulitzer competitions. Its cartoonist, Daniel R. Fitzpatrick, is one of the two or three best in the world, and it has one of the most highly developed senses of smell in journalism: at the slightest sniff of graft or scandal the nostrils of the P-D quiver. When it goes after someone it all but throws the printing presses." "From the beginning, though it has had a large Catholic circulation, it has reported and interpreted the Russian Revolution as intelligently as possible, and for years it has been incisively and copiously anti-Franco, no matter what its Catholic readers may think, and will remain so until Franco is where he belongs, out of office or out of Spain."

Gunther describes the three competing papers in St. Louis; "The Globe-Democrat is a lusty sheet and the Star-Times an excellent paper, as liberal as the Post-

Dispatch, though not so prominent on the national scene."

CAPPER

Among the forces running Kansas, he lists second, the Capper interests. "Senator Arthur Capper is 81. His views on most subjects are roughly those of Beowulf or General Grant. But his position in Kansas rests on his formidable power in local journalism. A well informed man in Kansas, is, I heard, one who reads a Capper daily, a Capper weekly and a Capper monthly. The range and influence of this press is astonishing. Yet few folks outside Kansas have ever heard of it. He is publisher of the leading Topeka daily and he owns the local radio station. He publishes Capper's Weekly (circulation 353,000) and two monthlies, Household and Capper's Farmer, with circulations respectively of 1,850,000 and 1,250,000. The advertising rate for a full page in Household is \$7,500."

KANSAS CITY STAR

"Finally above all ((among forces running Kansas) is the Kansas City Star. This potent newspaper, one of the most distinguished in the U. S., has more influence in Kansas than in its own state, and its Kansas circulation of 170,000 is as big as that of any three Kansas dailies put together. Not only is Kansas a 'colony' of Kansas City, Mo., it is a colony of a newspaper, something that exists nowhere else in the entire country." "The head of the Kansas Dept. of the Star—incidentally Will White's brother-in-law—was for years a king-maker, and it is hard to name any Topeka politician, Democrat or Republican, whom he didn't help to put in office or keep from getting it."

He discovers an interesting paradox in contrasting The Kansas City Star and The Post-Dispatch.

"The Kansas City Star, once a great crusading newspaper, was left to its employees by its founder. This result was to make the Star progressively more conservative. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the other hand, a Pulitzer property and baronial in management, is probably the most effective newspaper in the United States."

OMAHA

Omaha like Kansas City "is one of the biggest cities in the country where local journalism is a monopoly." The World-Herald is the only paper, its editors, "distinguished." Gunther found three weather stories on its front page one issue.

DENVER POST

"The Denver Post is difficult to write about just now because it is in a state of rebirth. For a generation Tammen and Bonfils spattered Denver with red ink and made a fortune. Its readers lived in an intellectual vacuum comparatively rare in the United States. E. Palmer Hoyt became publisher in 1946. Already he has changed the paper beyond description."

COWLES PAPERS

Des Moines Register and Tribune, owned by the Cowles brothers who also own Look and all the dailies in Minneapolis. "John Cowles takes care of the Minneapolis end and Gardner ('Mike') runs the Register and Tribune. When the Cowles paper and the rural press agree on an issue, they are virtually unbeatable. The Register-Tribune has the largest daily mail circulation of any metropolitan newspaper in the United States, the largest daily farm circulation and the largest Sunday home-delivered farm circulation in the United States."

IDAHO

The Idaho Statesman (Boise) "consists in a word of a remarkable blue-blooded lady named Margaret Cobb Ailshie who is editor, owner, publisher and dominator. She owns the other Boise paper too and the town is thus one of the very many in America in which a single person or family has a complete monopoly on journalism. Mrs. Ailshie, who inherited the Statesman from her equally remarkable father, is an extreme reactionary—something to the right of Louis XIV or Boies Penrose say—and a genuine patrician. In north Idaho the leading newspaper is not the Idaho Statesman but the Spokane Spokesman-Review."

The publisher of the Daily Idahoan in Moscow, Idaho, also preaches by mail with correspondence courses in something called Psychiana.

The question "Who runs Oregon?" would have had a triple answer fifty years ago, with the Portland Oregonian in first place and the Southern Pacific and the lumber kings next, Gunther says. "Nowadays all three have lost most of their direct influence, though the Oregonian is still a force."

A powerful figure in Wyoming politics is Tracy S. McCracken, Democratic national committeeman, a hotel owner and real estate man. "What makes him count is the newspaper situation." Gunther finds he owns the Laramie Boomerang, Laramie Bulletin, Rock Springs Rocket, and the Sunday Miner, the Rawlins Daily News and the northern Wyoming News in Wor-

land. "More important he has a 50 per cent interest in the Cheyenne papers, the morning Eagle, staunchly Democratic, and the evening Tribune and Leader which is vehemently Republican. The other 50 per cent is owned by Merritt C. Speidel, who is also proprietor of papers in cities as widely scattered as Reno (where he owns both dailies), Poughkeepsie, Ohio City, Fort Collins (Colorado), and Salinas (California)." "That one man should, with apparent impartiality, control the only two newspapers in a capital city, and papers which take diametrically opposite sides politically and compete zealously for circulation and advertising, is of course a striking American phenomenon. The European mind will recoil from this, and see something fishy in it. Imagine a newspaper proprietor in prewar Paris owning both the *Matin* and *Humanite*—and letting *Humanite* say anything it wished. But American papers, particularly in smallish towns, are seldom party minded in any exclusive way; they have about as much domestic political slant as a department store."

CALIFORNIA

Newspapers are "a mixed bag in California."

The Los Angeles Times, "bitterly anti-New Deal and anti-labor, is a heavy stand-pat force." The Los Angeles News, edited by Manchester Boddy, "is eloquent and liberal, but it seems to be more an anthology of columns than a newspaper." The other three Los Angeles papers belong to Hearst. "The best paper in the state by far is the Chronicle of San Francisco which under George T. Cameron and Paul C. Smith, one of the most brilliant editors in the United States, maintains its tradition vigorously."

"That preposterous old aurochs, Hearst, is of course a Californian and the San Francisco Examiner is the home paper of the whole Hearst herd but the old man himself has little specifically California influence nowadays."

MONTANA

The newspaper situation in Montana is "unique in America." Of the fourteen dailies seven are company owned or controlled; in four of the five chief cities the company dailies are the only papers. "As to circulation the company papers run far behind. Mr. Warden's independent Great Falls Tribune has 27,000 in a town of 35,000. The company paper in Butte, the Montana Standard, has only 16,000 in a town of 31,000. . . The company press does its best to appear unslanted. But nobody is fooled."

LOUISVILLE C—J

The Louisville Courier-Journal, "the dominant newspaper in Kentucky and a splendid liberal force. This is Marse Henry Watterson's old paper and under Barry Bingham the present owner, and Mark Ethridge, the publisher, its valiant tradition is vigorously carried on."

ATLANTA

Atlanta has "two first class newspapers, the Journal and the Constitution that vie with each other not only in circulation but for the honor of being the more liberal." The Constitution is the more widely known outside Georgia but the Journal has the bigger circulation. "It is in fact the most widely circulated paper in the nation south of St. Louis and Baltimore. It outranks any paper in Washington, D.C., Kentucky or the whole state of Texas." It is owned by former Governor James M. Cox of Ohio who is also proprietor of the Miami Daily News. "Sometimes 100 per cent Atlantans express resentment that the Journal is 'absentee controlled.'"

While Gunther was in Atlanta he says the Journal for the first time in its history gave a Negro woman the title "Miss."

TIMES—PICAYUNE

George W. Healey Jr. editor of "the most famous of New Orleans newspapers, the Times-Picayune," drove Gunther to Baton Rouge. "This is still another American city [Baton Rouge] where there is a monopoly in journalism. Charles P. Manship is editor and publisher of both papers and also owns the local radio station."

CHARLESTON

"A salty picturesque character" is W. W. Ball, editor of the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier. "He likes to say that he is the last surviving Jeffersonian Democrat and has to go to 'my sister-in-law, a Vermonter, to find anyone who talks my language.' He writes a half dozen brief editorial paragraphs a day that are full of prejudice and pith."

BALTIMORE SUN

John W. Owens of the Baltimore Sun "one of the most irreproachable political reporters in the entire country." The locution "Maryland Free State" was invented by Hamilton Owens, editor in chief of the Baltimore Sun Papers "which as every civilized person knows are among the best newspapers in the land."

TENNESSEE

For Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, Gunther say Boss

Crump reserves his most sulphurous letters. One, after Evans led the poll tax fight against Crump, called Evans a man "with a foul mind and wicked heart" with "venosity" as his chief stock in trade. Jennings Perry, then editor of the Tennessean, "one of the ablest and disinterestedly sincere liberals in the South" Crump described as "a wanderoo" and as a venal and licentious scribbler with the brains of a quagga." These two with political columnist Joe Hatcher were "mangy bubonic rats, yellow to the core." Evans printed the letters on his front page with pictures of Crump and a wanderoo and a quagga.

Edward Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar is cited as one of Crump's most consistent critics, and recipient of "fantastically vituperative letters" from Crump.

SOUTHERN EDITORS

"The South contains a circle of useful editors—Virgilius Dabney, Mark Ethridge, Ralph Magill of the Atlanta Constitution and the whole group that edit the Atlanta Journal, Jennings Perry formerly of Nashville (now PM) and Hodding Carter, editor of the Greenville (Miss) Delta Democrat, one of the ablest progressives not merely in the South but in the nation."

One of the reasons North Carolina is a good deal the most liberal southern State, Gunther finds, is "the influence of independent newspapers, like the Raleigh News and Observer," Josephus Daniels' paper.

"An unusual number of southern papers carry a daily quotation from the Bible at the head of their editorial column: Raleigh News Observer, Florida Times-Union, Tampa Morning Tribune and the Nashville Banner."

The Arkansas Gazette has been continuously published under the same masthead for 126 years.

OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma City papers are "more respectable" than the "Chicago-Tribune-like papers in Tulsa." E. K. Gaylord, editor of both the Daily Oklahoman and the Times is called "the nearest thing to a boss the city has." Out there Gunther found the small country papers have much influence, a characteristic of the Mid-West, he thought.

TEXAS

The Dallas News is "probably the most professional paper in Texas."

The easily provoked wrath of the Forth Worth Star-Telegram amused Gunther. "Much of the rivalry between Forth Worth and Dallas rose from the antics of an exuberant hell raiser and professional Texan

named Amon Carter, publisher of the Star-Telegram and the town's most vociferous citizen."

"Houston, with the possible exception of Tulsa the most reactionary community in the United States, is the home of . . . distinguished women like Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby who is executive vice president of the Houston Post and who ran the Wacs."

When President Rainey was fired from the University of Texas, The Austin American headlined the story—"Multimillionaire Regents Fire Rainey." A few days later came another headline: "Big Business Plot to Rule Schools Told."

"Only five newspapers in the entire state (of Texas) have Guild organizations—The Houston Post, El Paso Herald, San Antonio Light, Fort Worth Herald and Beaumont Enterprise."

Amarillo Globe—"Amarillo's most conspicuous citizen is probably Gene Howe ('Panhandle Puck') a conservative and individualistic editor whose column 'The Tactless Texan' is widely read in the area. Also he is a considerable factor in the political life of the town, though his policy is to play down local politics."

NEGRO PRESS

Atlanta has "the only Negro daily in the country, The Atlanta Daily World, edited by C. B. Scott."

Harlem has several Negro papers "including the conservative Amsterdam News and the radical People's Voice."

"Most Negro journalists I met all over the country, think that the Journal-Guide of Norfolk is the best Negro paper in the nation, with the Chicago Defender as runner-up." The Pittsburgh Courier with a circulation of about 280,000 is the biggest, followed by the Afro-American group in Baltimore. "Often the Negro press is attacked for its sensationalism; on the other hand it seldom prints flagrant cheesecake and does not go in for the more salacious gossip columns. The Courier is a national institution. It prints 13 different editions which go all over the country. Next to Pennsylvania itself, its biggest circulation is in Florida. It was Republican until Roosevelt and liberal Negroes sometimes attack it as the organ of the black petite bourgeoisie; it supported Dewey in 1944, largely because its editors resented the draagooning of Negroes by southern white Democrats."

He calls George S. Schuyler, manager of the Courier's New York office "one of the best, and most provocative, political writers, white, black or of any color, in the nation."

William G. Nunn, managing editor of the Courier told him that the situation of Negroes in Pittsburgh is probably better

than that in any comparable American city. The 65,000 Negroes are roughly 10 per cent of the city's population.

MISCELLANY

On the importance of the Gridiron Club, Gunther records that Dewey spent 100 hours preparing and rehearsing his first Gridiron speech. Bricker evidently did not; "His performance, observers say, was something almost too horrible to talk about."

The Deseret News of Salt Lake City is listed as among the important institutions owned by the Mormon Church, as its official newspaper and as the leading paper of Utah. He cites its content to illustrate that the Mormon Church "mortally hates Stalinist Russia." This was carried so far as to denounce a Russian clothing relief drive during the war.

The public power issue greatly interests Gunther whose reporting of it is impressive. He notes that in the face of a heavy advertising program by 167 utilities in a joint national campaign in the weeklies, Collier's, Life and the Saturday Evening Post all printed extremely fair presentations of the issue, which on the whole favored MVA. One of MVA's most aggressive supporters has been the New York Daily News.

He deplores that "some of my colleagues in New York, like Dorothy Thompson, William L. Shirer and Vincent Sheean, know every corner and cranny of Sweden, Poland and Siam, but I don't think any of them ever visited TVA."

"An extremely responsible journalist—James Kerney Jr. of the Trenton Times."

"Bloomington, Illinois—a famous newspaper—the Pantagraph."

The rise of Senator Vandenberg is traced through his journalistic career that made him editor at 22 of the Grand Rapids Herald which Vandenberg says "dominated the morning field in western Michigan."

Newspapers cited most often as sources are New York Times, 44 times, Herald Tribune and PM 23 times each, St. Louis Post-Dispatch 16 times, New York Post 15 times, Chicago Tribune 14 times, New York Daily News 13 times, Kansas City Star, Louisville Courier-Journal, Boston Herald, Denver Post and San Francisco Chronicle, 6 times each.

Among weeklies, Time is cited 11 times, Life 17 times, New Republic 17 times, Saturday Evening Post 5 times, New Yorker 5 times, Nation 5 times, Colliers' 5 times, Newsweek once.

—Louis M. Lyons

The liberties taken with John Gunther's "Inside USA" are by permission of his publisher, Harper & Brothers.

From the Nieman Scrapbook--

THE AHOSKIE STORY

The American press, rising to a situation as it can, roused the public as it can, over the Ahoskie case in July. A Negro was denied the car for which he held the winning ticket in a Kiwanis lottery in the North Carolina town. Sam Ragan, State editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, got wind of it, dug it out and printed it a month later. The press associations picked it up and the wires vibrated with an instant response to an injustice anybody could understand. Editorials and letters to the editor and protests by Kiwanians and many others tingled in the press for the three days it took the Ahoskie club to decide to get another Cadillac for Harvey

Jones. He said he'd rather have the money —\$3200—and got it.

Here are Ragan's original story, the AP account of how he got it, and the Boston Globe's feature story on the girl who refused to make a second drawing. The Globe's lead editorial next day, "Sporting Instinct" described the "waves of indignation" that swept the country at the news from Ahoskie.

Sam Ragan wrote afterwards "I was highly gratified with the good results. It makes a newspaperman feel good to have evidence now and then that the press of the nation can wield worthy influence."

This is the AP account of how Sam Ragan got the Ahoskie story for the Raleigh News and Observer:

The story of the Ahoskie Cadillac lottery attracted nation-wide attention.

The Associated Press sent out the following account of how The News and Observer first broke the story:

The story of Harvey Jones, 23-year-old Negro war veteran who is going to get the Cadillac automobile that he won and lost at a Kiwanis Club dance festival at Ahoskie on June 19 simmered for nearly a month before it boiled over into the press of the nation.

It was finally broken by Sam Ragan, state editor of The Raleigh News and Observer, after many days were consumed in making a thorough check of facts in the case.

"I handled the story lightly instead of indignantly, stressing the idea that Jones had been lucky in the drawing and unlucky when he didn't get the car but that he was being philosophical about it," Ragan said.

"I had an idea that after the story got into print it would bring repercussions and get something started and it did," he added.

Ragan, who has been state editor for Josephus Daniels' crusading News and Observer since 1941 except for a three-year hitch in the Army, said he had no idea, though, that the story would arouse nationwide indignation.

Ragan said he first heard of Jones and the Cadillac several days ago from Woodrow Price, News and Observer reporter who had heard "rumors" while covering a race trial at Jackson, which is near Ahoskie.

Friend Checked Story.

A friend of the state editor, Nelson Stephenson who is studying rural sociology at N. C. State College, was asked to check the rumor. Stephenson, Ragan said, interviewed Jones, members of the Kiwanis Club, and other citizens of Ahoskie.

"Stephenson learned that when Jones' ticket was drawn at the festival, members of the Kiwanis Club and Sheriff Charles Parker, went to the Negro's home, told him that he was not eligible to win the car and repaid him the dollar he paid for his ticket. A second drawing was then held and the car was awarded to Dr. Charles Townes of Waverly, Va.

"The Kiwanis Club members told Ste-

This was Sam Ragan's original story in the Raleigh News and Observer

Hertford Negro Was Lucky But Luck Wasn't Enough

Ahoskie, July 14.—A young Negro war veteran of Hertford County is chagrined but philosophical about a \$3,200 Cadillac automobile he won in a local lottery but couldn't keep.

The Ahoskie Kiwanis Club, which sold the tickets on the automobile in connection with its annual festival, said it was all a mistake anyway. The festival is for whites and 23-year-old Harvey Jones wasn't entitled to buy a ticket, club officials said.

Jones, who is married and the father of one child and who lives with his father on a farm on Ahoskie, Route 3, bought the festival ticket and a chance on the new sedan from a coffee salesman who stopped at a store near his home. Three other Negroes bought tickets at the same time.

The ticket for the drawing for the automobile stated "You do not have to be present to win."

Jones wasn't present when his number was drawn the third and final night of the festival when Carmen Cavallero and his orchestra played for a dance. The pretty girl vocalist with the band drew the number, Sheriff Charlie Parker was present and realized that Jones was a Negro.

Sheriff Parker, accompanied by two attorneys, John Jenkins of Aulander and Alva Early of Ahoskie, called on Jones at

1:30 a.m. Jones' elation over being lucky was shortlived.

"The sheriff told me I had the lucky number, but I couldn't win the car because it wasn't for colored people," Jones said.

Sheriff Parker explained that since the Negro was not eligible to attend the festival and dance, he could not hold a chance on the automobile. So they returned to Jones the dollar he had paid for the ticket, went back to Ahoskie and held a second drawing. The vocalist refused to participate the second time, however.

Winner of the new Cadillac in the second drawing was a retired physician from Waverly, Va. Dr. Charles Townes, who already owned one.

Just how many tickets were sold to Negroes is not known. Rupert Massey, president of the Kiwanis Club, said he knew of six that had been sold to Negroes, although they were supposed to have gone to whites only. In an effort to make amends, the Kiwanis Club inserted an advertisement in the local newspaper stating that all Negroes who purchased tickets and chances on the automobile could have their money back by contacting club officials.

The Kiwanis Club annually sponsors the festival here for the benefit of its underprivileged children's fund.

phenson," Ragan said, "that they felt they did the right thing. That was their idea, but other folks, both whites and Negroes, felt that Jones had received a dirty deal."

After Stephenson had returned to Raleigh, Ragan said he checked his facts with Jack Rider, a reporter for The Hertford County Herald and "I found them all factual and true."

The Hertford County Herald, a semi-weekly at Ahoskie, published an official statement from the Kiwanis Club carrying the club's explanation of the incident in its issue immediately after it happened. The story, however, attracted little or no attention outside of Hertford County at the time.

"There was lots of discussion about it

at the time just as there is now in the nation," said Mayon Parker, who with his brother, Roy Parker, publishes The Herald.

"Immediately after the raffle and now, the majority of people here believed Jones should have had the car," Parker said. "They felt the Kiwanis Club made a big mistake in holding the second drawing."

Three days after Sam Ragan's story, a long distance telephone interview with the girl who refused to make a second drawing

was a page one story in the Boston Globe, July 17, with a three column head and picture and a page one protest by the

Boston Kiwanis Club against their Ahoskie club's action.

The Girl Who Wouldn't Help Do Negro Out of His Winning Ticket in Lottery

'I Kept Getting Maddier and Maddier'

by George McKinnon

The first person to protest the refusal of the Ahoskie, N. C., Kiwanis Club to award a car to a Negro who held the winning lottery ticket, was revealed last night to be Leslie Long, 22-year-old brunette vocalist with Carmen Cavallero's band.

She was the person who drew the winning ticket with the name of Negro war veteran Harvey Jones, and then refused to make a second drawing.

In a telephone interview last night with the Globe from Detroit, where she is now playing with the Cavallero outfit, the soprano from Pittsburgh said she was "completely delighted" that the club had changed its mind and that now Jones would get an automobile.

"Is it really true?" she asked. "I do hope so. It is the only fair thing to do."

Yesterday the Ahoskie Kiwanis Club, spurred on by a wave of protest, decided to provide a \$3200 car for the 23-year-old Jones, who held the lucky ticket in the club's raffle, but was told, after the drawing, that Negroes were not eligible for the prize.

Miss Long, who has been singing with the orchestra for the past three and a half months, said that "three men at the dance snickered when I refused to draw a ticket again and told me it wasn't good business. But I refused to do it.

"There must have been about 7000 people at the dance that night and just before intermission I was blindfolded and drew a ticket."

"I Thought It Was Strange"

"Apparently some of the persons knew right away that Jones was a Negro. Three men came up and took the ticket away. In about a half hour they came back and said there would be another drawing," continued Miss Long.

"I thought that was very strange and they told me the ticket was invalid because it was won by a Negro.

"I was shocked by that. It was my first tour through the South. I had never come up against that kind of prejudice before.

"In show business you meet all kinds of persons. And you judge them on their character, never on their color or race or creed," the blue-eyed singer said.

"I refused to draw again. I told them it just wasn't fair play. They hinted it would be bad business if I didn't. I kept getting madder and madder, when they asked me several times.

"Poor Mr. Cavallero"

"Poor Mr. Cavallero was approached then. He didn't want to do it any more than I did. But they had him on the spot," she continued. "He has been very unhappy about it ever since and feels people would not realize the predicament he was in. He is as happy as I am that Jones is getting a car.

"Another thing," Miss Long said, "the word just seemed to sweep through the hall that a Negro held a winning ticket, because, when they announced that there would be a second drawing, they just cheered and cheered."

In spite of the "unfortunate incident," Miss Long said she hopes to make another trip through the South soon.

"After all, my father came from the South and I hope to get down there again soon."

Scrapbook

This news dispatch was carried in the New York Times and other papers, July 4th.

'SPOONED NEWS' CHARGED

Miller Says 'Some Bureaucrat Fed' Attack on FPC Bill

WASHINGTON, July 3—Representative William J. Miller, Republican, of Connecticut, today asked the House to investigate what he called the spoon feeding of three nationally known newspaper columnists by some "Government bureaucrat."

He identified the columnists as Thomas L. Stokes, Lowell Mellett and Marquis Childs.

He said that on July 1 and 2 all three columns criticized proposed legislation to restrict the authority of the Federal Power Commission over hydro-electric power. Mr. Miller is the author of the legislation.

"While these columns were no doubt written independently of each other," Mr. Miller said, "each used the same arguments, made the same charge, each worked up to the same emotional pitch and each contained the same mixture of half-truths. The conclusion is inescapable that the Government through one of its employes directly or indirectly inspired the writing of these columns."

Miller's charges were made in a statement which he read to the House.

The three columnists accused by Cong. Mitchell did not long stand alone. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 18th made its lead editorial on the bills of the power lobby, under the title "Shade of Samuel Insull." Miller, it said, had introduced "two of the bills to return the power industry to the pre-Insull era." On July 25, Joseph and Stewart Alsop published a blistering column on the activity of "the blatant power lobby" and the subservience of the Republican Congress to it. "In the presence of lobbyists the 80th Congress has behaved like a blowsy chorus girl just starting on her second pint of rye."

In Cong. Miller's home state the New Haven Register's Washington column by Stagg and Allen went after the power lobby hard.

Power Companies Seeking Return To the Good Old Days

by Lowell Mellett

This column by Lowell Mellett, from the Boston Globe of July 3, is one of the three of which Mr. Miller complains:

As bold as any raid yet attempted on Congress is one now being undertaken by the private power companies. This is a fairly strong statement, having in mind that the insurance companies last year almost got themselves exempted from the operations of the anti-trust laws and that the railroads are in a fair way actually to accomplish that very thing—subject of course, to a probable veto by the President. It is a true statement, nevertheless and not withstanding—not withstanding even the success of the real estate interests in the matter of housing legislation and rent control, or even the success, up to the veto point, of the wool growers.

So quietly as to escape public attention, the private power companies are seeking to reverse national policy with respect to the use of the country's water resources. They appear to think that the present Congress is one that will undo all that has been accomplished in the past half century.

Last week a subcommittee of the House Interstate Commerce Committee heard power company witnesses on two innocent-sounding bills introduced in April by Representative William J. Miller of Connecticut. This week part of one day will be given to the Federal Power Commission, at the urgent request of the Commission members, who discovered at the 11th hour what was going on.

Among the things they discovered was a purpose to change the definition of stream "navigability" to make the term apply, as one commission lawyer expresses it, only to streams capable of floating superdreadnaughts. The judicial concept of navigability followed by the Supreme Court for 100 years and finally fixed, it was thought, for all time in the famous New River case, would be disregarded.

Also revealed was a maneuver to trans-

fer to the jurisdiction of the states about 75 percent of the utilities now subject to Federal regulation. It is notoriously true that virtually no state is equipped to handle such regulation. But one of the Miller bills would give the states authority over the development of watersheds and all water resources within their borders, regardless of what effect that might have on other states or whole contiguous regions.

This bill, taken in conjunction with a bill by Representative Byrnes of Wisconsin, also being considered, would take away from the Federal Government its present supervision of accounting practices in the case of the utilities transferred to state regulation.

Nothing more important has been accomplished by the Federal Power Commission than the job it has done in the past 15 years in cleaning up the books of the utility companies. The commission is prepared to demonstrate that it has eliminated more than \$1,400,000,000 of water from utility stock issues during that time. This has made possible the reduction of power and light rates throughout the country. Not only that, it has made utility stocks a much sounder investment. The Commission's seal of approval on any company's books has come to be the best argument brokers have to offer in dealing with widows and orphans.

Our memories are short, but padding of accounts, outrageous "write-ups," and inflation of expenditures to affiliated concerns were once common practices in the utility business. Our memories are indeed short. We have almost forgotten Sam Insull, Howard Hopson and others of their breed. The legislation sought by the power companies and being gravely considered by the House Interstate Commerce committee seems calculated to bring us a new crop of Insulls and Hopsons.

Query: Where were the other Washington columnists and reporters? By what definition of news did they decide there was no story in the attempt to change the national policy on public power in favor of the private power companies?

“SCOOP”

NOTE: On Wed. July 9, the New York Sun printed an exclusive story about the theft of atom bomb secrets, signed by Edward Nellor of its Washington bureau, which caused a national commotion and reactions concerning responsibility by the press that has had no parallel since the Chicago Tribune published the secret Army staff plans just before Pearl Harbor. This column by Marquis Childs gives more of the story of the Sun's "scoop" than has been published in equal space.

The Herald Tribune in an action very unusual for it criticized the Sun's publication in an editorial asking for a "sense of responsibility" in those who write about the atom. "The report yesterday alleging serious breaches in atomic security did not live up to this standard. . . Unless those who inspired it are in possession of information denied to Senator Hickenlooper. . . and to the security officer at Oak Ridge, it was in all important respects untrue." In the face of official denials

from President Truman down, the Sun stuck by its story. Col. Gilbert T. Hodges, chairman of the executive committee of the New York Sun, took exception to a "CBS Views the Press" broadcast which concluded with substantially the same verdict as the Herald Tribune and got time on the air to refute the criticism and reassert the original story. CBS in reply held that Col. Hodges statement had added nothing to the record.

Editor

Washington Calling

by Marquis Childs

One day last week, a three-bank banner headline in the New York "Sun" said: "Atom Bomb Secrets Stolen From Plant at Oak Ridge by Agents Not Yet Identified." It was as big a headline as was carried at the time of the atom bombing of Hiroshima.

The story was promptly denied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Senator Hickenlooper, chairman of the joint Senate and House Atomic Energy Commission. They said the story was untrue in the particular charge and in detail.

Examining the origin of the story and its consequences, I have talked with members of the Senate-House committee, members of the Atomic Energy Commission and officials charged with security and investigation.

The documents in question were removed from the atomic laboratory at Los Alamos, New Mexico, by two army sergeants in March, 1946. That was while the army was responsible for secrecy and security. It was not until January 1, 1947, that the new civilian commission assumed control and began to be responsible for security.

UNDER THE LAW, responsibility for investigation of security and secrecy was delegated to J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI. The commission asked Hoover to tighten security regulations.

His job was made more difficult by the fact that Major General Leslie R. Groves, who was head of the project for the army was not helpful in the transition stage. Until almost the end of army control, FBI agents were not permitted to visit areas in Oak Ridge unless accompanied by military guard.

In the course of tightening security regulations, Hoover's men discovered the thefts that had occurred under army control. The Atomic Energy Commission requested a through investigation by the FBI.

The theft was traced to the two former sergeants. They were questioned at great length. The documents were recovered and restored to secret files. The FBI was convinced that the two men wanted the documents to be able to boast years later of the vital part they had played in the atomic project. There was no evidence that they had been in contact with agents seeking secret information about the bomb.

The investigation was completed on June 9 and the file sent to Attorney General Tom C. Clark, with a recommendation that the former sergeants be prosecuted. After consulting with Hoover about the progress of the investigation, Chairman David Lilienthal of the Atomic Commission informed the joint congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in closed session of what had been learned.

WHILE THEY will not say it publicly, certain members of the congressional committee trace the leak to the "Sun" to Representative James E. Van Zandt of Pennsylvania. Van Zandt denies that he disclosed what he had learned at the secret session to anyone. He says he agrees with Chairman Hickenlooper's denial of the "Sun" story.

In an interview shortly after the "Sun" story was published, Van Zandt did disclose that among the documents taken from Los Alamos were photographic negatives. This greatly disturbed the FBI, because it would immediately stimulate foreign agents to search for such negatives.

One of the curious things about the "Sun" story is that parts of it closely paralleled an article sold to "Liberty" magazine by Representative J. Parnell Thomas, head of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Some members of Congress link Thomas to the sensational "Sun" story.

No top official connected with atomic

energy was asked about the accuracy of the "Sun" story prior to its publication. Less than half an hour before it was to appear, the information office of the Atomic Energy Commission was asked if the commission had any comment. Before any reply could be given, another New York newspaper had telephoned to ask about the "Sun" story, which was then on the street.

No warrant had at any time been issued for the arrest of the two sergeants, who were still at liberty pending a final decision by the attorney general. Although they have since been taken into custody, the disclosure's effect at the time was to make the FBI's problem doubly difficult. But that is not the only consequence to come out of this strange development in the attempt to control the power that is greater than any other power man has known.

John Gunther on New York journalists: "New York, a parasite would die without new blood. Herbert Bayard Swope was born in St. Louis, Henry R. Luce in China, Elsa Maxwell in Iowa, Harold Ross comes from Aspen Colo., Bruce Bliven from Iowa, Mrs. Ogden Reid derives from Wisconsin. Of course there are a few exceptions. Arthur H. Sulzberger, publisher of the Times, was actually born in Manhattan."

"New York used to be the promised land for out-of-town newspaper people, but John Ryan, executive vice president of the New York Newspaper Guild thinks that is no longer the case, although there are still comparatively few native-born New Yorkers on the city's papers. And comparatively few women too. Mr. Ryan believes the proportion of women is still too low and there are almost none of them on editorial desks."

—Don Hollenbeck, CBS.

Boss Crump's Methods

by Thomas L. Stokes

MEMPHIS, July 30—Tennessee is tugging again at the bonds imposed for so long by Boss Ed. H. Crump who sits in this city and cracks his whip over it with the sadistic pleasure of an ante-bellum overseer.

The ways in which he exercises his control are plainly revealed once again by what his henchmen are doing for the test of power in Thursday's primary. Boss Crump is backing the veteran Senator Kenneth D. McKellar for another term—he is serving his fifth—and Gov. Jim McCord for re-election.

Mr. Crump rules the state and makes the people pay for it. He exacted tribute from them, for example, to raise a campaign fund of \$300,000 to \$350,000 to beat off his foes at this election. His opponents are supporting Edward W. (Ned) Carmack, 48-year-old lawyer and editor of Murfreesboro, son of a former U. S. Senator, for the Senate; and Gordon Browning for governor. Mr. Browning is an ex-congressman, ex-governor and a Crump enemy who is in the American Military Government in Germany and running by remote control.

Deductions of 10 per cent were made for two months from the pay of state employes for the campaign fund. Also levied upon for contributions were liquor dealers who must have licenses to do business; insurance agents who write security bonds for Memphis and the state, and automobile dealers who compete for business with the city and state.

These people pay—or else. They risk the loss of their state jobs or loss of business with the state.

Levying upon state employes who work for agencies that are partially supported by Federal funds, which some are, is a violation of the Hatch Act. That is, if primaries are considered part of elections, and the Supreme Court has so ruled. There may be ground for Federal action in what is going on. Numerous cases have been brought under the Hatch Act.

How the trick works with private business is shown by the story of a retail liquor dealer. He was asked for a \$ 200 contribution. He said he couldn't afford it.

"Then I was reminded that if I wanted to stay in business I had to have a license. I was making money. So I paid."

There are other devices, familiar to other political machines by which Boss Crump keeps his minions in line. If a businessman, for instance, should get obstreperous and politically active against Boss Crump, he suddenly would be visited by a building inspector. Lawyers and preachers have felt the pressure in one way or another. Some men have been driven from the city and had to do business elsewhere.

This Memphis story has been told often. It is repeated now because once again the people are trying to break the Crump despotism, and it is appropriate to recall it because of the war we have been through. The Crump dictatorship is comparable to those which American boys fought to uproot abroad.

Why do the people stand for it?

The real truth is that a majority don't want it. But they roll up their votes year after year in the rest of the state, only to have them offset by the controlled

Crump vote here, or, if that doesn't do the job, by the famous "Crump count."

The ultimate evil and blame trace back to responsible and influential citizens who accept this state of affairs and supinely with the rationalization that Mr. Crump gives Memphis good government, good schools, good public health service and so on. So did Mussolini make the trains run on time.

It is a sad confession that only Mr. Crump can provide good government, good schools, and so on. Citizens as voters could get them from any city administration, as so many other cities prove. The loss of essential civil liberties, including freedom of speech, seems a rather high price to pay.

By it all Boss Crump has done nicely for himself in his own insurance and mortgage business.

As his power has grown, his sadistic impulses have gained full and free play. He loves to order around "my Senator" and "my Governor" and "my Mayor." He showed Senator McKellar who was boss once. Several years ago when the Senator made the mistake of supporting a different candidate for Governor, Boss Crump gave the Senator's candidate two votes in the Senators own precinct, one for Mr. McKellar and one for the Senator's brother. The Senator has followed orders since.

(Copyright, 1946, United Feature Syndicate.)

These representative columns of the three writers accused as stooges by Cong. Miller are reprinted with their permission.

NOTES

Harper & Bros plans to publish in October "Danger from the East" by Richard Lauterbach. It is a survey of the effects of U. S. foreign policy in the Far East since the end of the war, done by the author while working in the China regional studies at Harvard on a Nieman fellowship in 1946-7.

A son, Richard Snowden Hopkins, was born June 13 to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Snowden Hopkins, in Washington D. C. Now in the State Department, Frank Hopkins was one of the first group of Nieman Fellows, appointed in 1938 from the staff of the Baltimore Sun.

Kenneth Stewart, one of the original staff of PM is leaving that paper to become full time professor of journalism at New York University starting this Fall term. Stewart was a Nieman Fellow in 1941-2.

Another Nieman Fellow of the same year, Robert S. Dickson, is joining the journalism staff at NYU as lecturer this Fall. Dickson has served on the copy desks of the New York World Telegram and Herald Tribune. He was in England for the OWI during the war.

The seven Kentucky newspapermen who have held Nieman fellowships started a series of "Nieman dinners" in Louis-

ville, July 12. Their first meeting was held at the home of Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, with Wilson Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville and Federal housing expediter as discussion leader and Louis M. Lyons of the Nieman Foundation as moderator.

Boston front pages were not the same after Mayor James M. Curley went to jail and Mrs. Cote's murder trial ended the same day.

That mid-summer manifestation of "flying saucers" that ran like a front page rash through the press drew from Director Harlow Shapley of the Harvard Observatory the comment: "flying seaserpents."

The Human Side of the Paper

AN APPRAISAL OF THE SPECIAL DEPARTMENTS

SPORTS — SOCIETY — ARTS — COMICS — WOMEN'S PAGES

From "Your Newspaper" By Nine Nieman Fellows, 1945-6

READER surveys show that the most popular features of a newspaper are the special departments in the back of the paper—the comics, sports pages, movie columns, etc. These departments are shrewdly conceived and often skilfully executed. They not only offer humor and escape entertainment, but hit closer to people's natural interests than the stiff, formal news pages. The funnies and the cooking column have an intimate relation to personal experience. They talk a human language. It's a pity that the news columns don't talk it, too.

We see nothing sinful in entertainment per se. A newspaper should be fun to read. It could do with more fun in the front as well as the back of the paper.

But what price fun? Should the comics, most of which have degenerated into printed soap operas of a rather low order, take over the paper? Should a newspaper be pitched at the whiz bang level? There are many things in our newspapers that raise questions of taste—examples are the breast-obsessed school of nightclub reporting, and that crutch-funny institution, the "Miscellany" department of *Time*, which is convulsed every week at the amusing ways in which men die. There are also questions more important than that of taste. One of them is: How do the feature departments fit into a newspaper's function of information?

The special departments can be divided into two categories: (1) sheer entertainment, which includes the comics, nightclub columnists, sports, etc., and (2) "culture," which includes criticism of the arts, education, science and medicine, the woman's page, religion, etc. By and large newspapers do a more skilful job in category one than in category two. But how honest is it, in either category?

Should a movie column be devoted to "glamor" and wisecracks or to grown-up movie criticism? In education reporting, how much space should be apportioned to campus necking and how much to education? Should a medicine column devote itself to spectacular quacks and cures or to honest information?

Glamor, sex and quackery unquestion-

ably are a tested formula for building circulation. It is a pernicious formula, and it has a great deal to do with public cynicism about the press. In a newspaper even en-

(From the Macmillan Fall Catalog)

Nine working newspapermen and women—who met while they were all Nieman Fellows in journalism at Harvard University—let down their hair in a frank, lively discussion of what is wrong with the press, and what can be done about it.

In *Your Newspaper* they talk directly to the American reader. They take up his three major criticisms of newspapers: that the press is irresponsible; that it is biased in favor of property and privilege; and that it is too narrowly owned and controlled. With these complaints in mind, they examine all sections of the paper, from foreign correspondence to the comics, and tell what kind of job the papers are doing. They give examples and name names. In the quick, incisive style of good journalists, they point out what service the newspapers provide to the people, and what they fail to provide, what part of the truth they tell, and what part they suppress.

As newspapermen themselves, the authors have ideas of their own about how the press might be improved. Their book ends with a blueprint for a model newspaper—from layout and contents to staff requirements and financing. They suggest what we as readers can do about the press.

As the first systematic analysis and criticism of modern newspapers by working journalists, and as a long-range program for improving them, this book may well make newspaper history.

The authors of *Your Newspaper* are: James Batal of the Cleghorn (Mass.) *Courier*; Charlotte FitzHenry of the Associated Press, Chicago; Arthur Hepner of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*; Frank Hewlett of *World Report*; Frank Kelly, former staff member of the Associated Press, New York; Mary Ellen Leary of the *San Francisco News*; Cary Robertson of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*; Leon Svirsky of *Time*; and Ben Yablonky of *PM*.

November

Probably \$3.00

ertainment ought to be honest and self-respecting. There is no excuse, in the back of the paper any more than in the front, for cheapness or spoon-feeding. The comics, the sport pages, the automobile news and the department on the arts should confer no special license to puff advertisers, phonies or stupidity.

SPORTS

The sports pages are one of the things that the American press does best. They are lively and sometimes exceedingly well-written, perhaps because sports writers are usually well informed in their field and have greater freedom in writing than other reporters. The other news departments of a newspaper might well emulate the freewheeling lack of inhibition which is allowed to the sports page.

But the skill and imagination lavished on sports reporting have contrived to make the sports world a world apart, a never-never land seen dimly through a rosy haze. By the magic of the sports writer's high-powered writing, crooked fight promoters often become masterminds; professional athletes become the embodiment of all that is brave and honorable in the human spirit, and the commercial sports industry becomes a noble expression of selfless public service.

One might cite the hypocrisy of "amateur" tennis under the U. S. Lawn Tennis Association, which runs a hardheaded enterprise with a stable of subsidized tennis players, while pretending that it is promoting an amateur sport. The inside operations of horse racing and professional wrestling hardly bear discussion at the family table. But this is not the place to go into the details of the corruption and chicanery of commercial athletics. The sordid story was well told by Paul Gallico, an ex-sports writer, in his book, "Farewell to Sport."

If bigtime American sport is a shady business, operated in large part by touts, gangsters and chiselers, sports writers are not without responsibility. Some of them, it is true, occasionally call attention to suspicious happenings. But they are not active in exposing punishable

corruption. The 1946 professional football and boxing bribery scandals were not turned up, in the first instance, by sports writers. Most sports writers treat sports rackets with considerable tolerance. Indeed, they are sometimes participants in the rackets themselves. It has long been an open secret in sports rooms that some boxing writers have been on the payroll of promoters, and often had their columns written for them by fight managers' press agents. That may help to explain an observation made by Warren Brown, a Chicago Sun sports writer, after the Joe Louis-Billy Conn fight in the spring of 1946. The fight was given a tremendous advance build-up in sports pages all over the country. After the fight, Brown wrote: "Anyone who . . . gave Conn any sort of chance, much less selected him to win, either must have been actuated by ulterior motives, or was utterly lacking in common sense. The ballyhoo exceeded all previous bounds of good taste. Its tomtoms from the beginning beat out a rhythm of the public be damned."

Most baseball writers are partly subsidized by the major league clubs they travel with; with the full knowledge of their newspapers, the clubs pay the reporters' traveling expenses, and the expenses of their annual junkets to spring training camps. The close bond between baseball writers and club managements was well-illustrated at the time of the Pittsburgh Pirates' abortive "strike" in the spring of 1946.

It involved the ball players' pay. The fabulous salaries paid to a few baseball stars have always been well-aired in the sports pages, but sports writers have not had much to say about the low pay prevailing for most players, especially in the minor leagues. Even in the big leagues, players with niggardly clubs sometimes get as little as \$35 a week; Outfielders Pete Reiser of the Brooklyn Dodgers and Enos Slaughter of the St. Louis Cardinals for a time were paid little more than a sports room copy boy. When the Pittsburgh players joined a union, the American Baseball Guild, and threatened to strike for recognition of the union and higher pay, the baseball writers were caught by surprise. (The players had not confided in them.) The writers at first seemed undecided whether to be amused or shocked at the idea of a ball players' union. But the indecision was soon resolved. With remarkable co-ordination, they chorused their sympathy for low-paid players (though few of them seemed to think it necessary to mention figures), but suggested that the players could accomplish more through a "com-

pany union" than an "outside" organization.

Some sports writers sounded like mouthpieces for the baseball clubs' business offices. The New York World-Telegram's Dan Daniel said sternly that the Baseball Guild's organizer, Robert Murphy, was "going about union recognition the wrong way." Joe Williams, of the same paper, suggested brightly that Baseball Commissioner A. B. Chandler appoint a management hireling to look into the matter. "That would be so much better," wrote Williams, "than having an outsider sticking his beak into a business with which he has little familiarity and only a purely selfish interest."

A baseball writer for the New York Sun, who calls himself "The Old Scout," was horrified at the Baseball Guild's demand for a \$7,500 annual minimum for big league players. Said he: "That would be a cinch to put baseball out of business."

What the ball players thought of this ganging up by the sports writers is not recorded. Under great pressure from their management and alarmed fans, the Pirates weakened and (by four votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority) decided not to strike. This decision was greeted with fatherly approval in the sports pages. When the Pirates won a game after the vote, the New York Sun cried with pleasure: **CANCELED STRIKE HAS WINNING EFFECT ON UNIONIZED PIRATE PLAYERS.** In the New York Journal-American, the sports columnist Bill Corum exclaimed: "For the sake of a game that has its faults and whose organization is dated, but that never has been a crackpot operation, we are glad."

The same day, the New York Giants sent Vince DiMaggio, an outfielder, to the minor leagues. He had not made a base hit, it was pointed out, in twenty-five consecutive times at bat. Only one or two sports writers found it worth noting, as Jerry Mitchell did in the New York Post, that DiMaggio was an ardent unionist and had been a leader in organizing a Baseball Guild unit among the Giants.

The Baseball Guild was buried with suitable ceremonies in all the sports pages.

The case of the Pittsburgh Pirates is an unusually clear demonstration of a friendship between sports writers and club owners which many consider excessively warm. We suggest that the subsidization of reporters by the baseball business places newspapers in a humiliating, not to say scandalous, position. Self-respecting newspapers, one would suppose, ought to insist that their sports writers accept no "expenses," favors, entertainment or other emoluments from the sports business. That would be a start towards

independence, and freedom to write stories that might clean up commercial sport. A sports writer ought to be free to cover sports events with critique. He ought also to be reasonably sensitive to the perennial swindling of the all-American sucker, the sports fan.

It is strange that with all the space they devote to sports, newspapers give so little to the games in which vast numbers of Americans themselves take part: bowling and softball, for instance, which engage more players than any other sport, and weekend golf, hunting, fishing and hiking. Americans are eager for information about these matters, as shown by their huge purchases of books on how to become more proficient in games and what kind of equipment to buy. The sports pages could gain circulation and a greater sense of public service by providing such information.

There is also the matter of playgrounds for youngsters. The sports page is a force in the community; if it took an interest in getting more playgrounds, that would be more effective than a thousand editorials. There ought to be more sports editors like Royal Brougham, of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, who was selected as "Seattle's First Citizen for 1946" because of his campaigns for playgrounds.

Styles in sports writing are a fascinating study. The sports pages are at once the best and the worst-written in the paper. They often sparkle. But even at best, they abound in cliches. At worst, they sound as if they were written by fugitives from a high school composition class (as they often are). There is no more embarrassing sight than a sports writer lost in the jungle of the sports jargon.

In the sports pages, prize fighters don't fight; they "renew their feud," and a fighter's manager "inspects the precious dukes of his protegee" before the latter, "making his local debut," responds to the "initial gong" by "landing a haymaker" on his "hapless opponent," who is thereby deprived of a chance to "parade his stuff." The ball team, taking unusual precautions "to guard against injuries of the type which plagued them incessantly last spring," "figures to cop the flag" or "snare the honors" if it can only "grab" half a dozen good ballplayers somewhere. Wrestler Joe Grunt, fans of another "popular pastime" will be glad to hear, is "due to lock horns" with a "doughty opponent" in his "feverish quest for matdom's heavy-weight crown."

We suggest that a sports story can be good even if it is written in English. That is not to say that the vivid idiom of the ball park or arena should not be

reported—in quotes. Indeed, a good ear should be part of a sports writer's equipment. Take Dizzy Dean, the incredible character who, as nearly everyone knows, used to pitch for the St. Louis Cardinals. Did the sports writers ever really give us the full flavor of Dizzy? They did not. Not until the Great Man went on the radio as a baseball broadcaster and English teachers began to protest in horror to the Federal Communications Commission, did the basic facts about Dizzy's basic English emerge. "Slaughter slud safe into second," Dizzy was wont to announce. "Musial stands confidentially at the plate." "Don't fail to miss tomorrow's game."

When pressed about the school teachers' complaints, Dizzy retorted: "What do they want me to say—slidded? . . . I may not know that man Webster's first name, but, brother, I can learn you which is a ball and which is a strike—or vice vica."

There is fun and sorrow and rich human interest in sport. Sports writing has some great traditions. We have not forgotten that it produced such ring masters as Ring Lardner and the New York Herald Tribune's late, incomparable W. O. McGeehan. They wrote about sports with an insight and biting wit which unfortunately has almost vanished from sports pages. A great newspaper would look for and attract writers of their calibre.

REVIEWING THE ARTS

Few departments in a newspaper come in for as much pillorying, often deserved, as the ones dealing with news and criticism of the arts.

One extreme view as to what is wrong with contemporary criticism was that of James Gibbons Huneker, himself a consistent sinner, who, writing of musical criticism, said: "Music is technical, emotional as it may be; and when you try to write of it in terms of emotion, your pathos soon becomes bathos."

This seems to most of us far too precious a conception of criticism; certainly it should not be the guiding rule of a daily newspaper, whose function is to interpret the arts to laymen, as well as to experts interested primarily in technique. But we agree that all too often newspaper critics of the arts have no other equipment than emotion for their job.

The mortal sin of criticism at present is the critic's lack of qualifications. With few exceptions, even on the biggest dailies, critics lack technical know-how. In lieu of adequate knowledge, they indulge in literary flourishes which may have cadence, but are utter nonsense when examined for meaning.

This is the type of thing, picked at random from a music column:

"Many times since Mr. Wagner first appeared in St. Louis, this reviewer has attested his appreciation of the artist's pianism. His tone, smoothly-flowing and evenly sustained, has a jeweled opulence and glows with warm coruscance, as it is carved into melodic phrases with lapidarian care. His is a fine appreciation of rhythmic phrasing; he makes pace serve eloquence, his dynamics are impressive. But candidly his Beethoven left the reviewer somewhat cold despite July torridities."

Hmm. . . . Habitual column readers will recognize the author; there's at least one on every newspaper. If newspaper art and music columns were laid end to end, they would add up to an awful lot of dreary reading.

What newspapers need are critics who know their subject and can talk about it intelligently. A music critic should know something about harmony, counterpoint, composition, music history and dance techniques; a literary critic, the craft of writing and the field he is reviewing (such as the novel, poetry, political theory); a movie critic, film mechanics and the history of movie development; an art critic, art techniques and history.

Newspapers that can't afford to hire qualified critics ought to draw on special talent available in the community. Mr. Bingham and Mr. Ethridge pointed out that the Louisville Courier-Journal enlists the aid of department heads at the University of Louisville for its dramatic, art and music criticism. It also calls on the head of the department of economics at the University of Louisville for Sunday writing in that field, as well as in reviewing economics books. Mrs. Bingham, who conducts the paper's book reviewing section, uses this method to get specially qualified reviewers.

In book criticism, the reviewer ought to peer behind the glowing facade of best sellers to discover what more lasting literature has been corralled by the publishers. The public will hear about the best sellers anyway through the advertising columns. For many persons the reviewing column of a newspaper provides the only contact with less ballyhooed literary events. There should be more news about choice reprints of the "pocket book" type, and the well-printed, inexpensive series of classics which are increasingly available.

Clear, popular writing on the reviewing page can help enlarge the number of book readers. By clear writing we don't mean baby talk. A William Lyon Phelps does

more harm than good to literature. But reviews ought to create a desire to read books even among people who haven't cracked a book since they left school.

A department of literary criticism ought to be so planned that a reviewer has time to digest a book and consider its significance before he tells the public about it. It should also tell more than most reviewers do about the author, particularly what impelled him to write the book.

Perhaps the most influential members of the reviewing clan are the theater critics. Their verdict can make or break a play. The question of their competence got a public airing in 1946, when the New York critics mauled Maxwell Anderson's *Truckline Cafe*. With bad notices the play closed shortly after it opened. Anderson and his colleagues in the Playwrights Company, a group of producers, protested the reviewers' judgment and invested in advertising space in the New York papers to state their side of the argument. Soon everybody got into it. The experts connected with show business, while they did not agree on the merits of the play, did unanimously agree on one thing: that the New York critics were an incompetent crew.

Music critics, though they dutifully report all performances of symphonies and serious music, seldom touch on folk songs, musical comedies and operettas, a vast and important segment of Americana. In the past decade, techniques of electrical recordings have so improved that a substantial part of America's music listening takes place in the living room. Most of this is popular music and jazz. Jazz itself has become a cult, the subject of as hair-splitting controversies as those on existentialism or dadaism. If this is an integral part of the American cultural picture, music critics may as well cease looking down their noses at jive and view it for its merits and demerits. A music critic who covers only the concert hall and fails to review the new records is an anachronism.

We shall never have mature, intelligent movies as long as newspapers pander to Hollywood's philosophy that the only thing people want from the films is escape entertainment. Movie critics should compare fine British, French and Russian products with the American. They might well give more attention to the fine documentary films which are being produced in this country. Just as non-fiction books get a hearing on the book page, non-fiction films should be covered on the movie page.

Another side of arts reporting is news about people. As now conducted, the movie and theater gossip columns, con-

sisting largely of thrice-told tales, generally apocryphal, are a press agent's paradise. This is especially true of news about Hollywood, where reporters have practically surrendered to the publicity men. The star actors and actresses get so much press attention that the public has all but forgotten that there are writers, directors and technicians, without whose contributions there would be no films.

One healthy service newspapers can provide is to report Hollywood as it is, rather than as it appears under the rosy light played on it by press agents. The press ought to peel the glamor and grease paint off Hollywood and Broadway.

The journalists who cover Hollywood seem to have forgotten that they ought to be, first of all, reporters. They tell us little, for instance, about that very important institution, the Johnston Office, formerly the Hays Office. Movie censorship is as great a moral scandal as the Teapot Dome was a political one. The Victorian notions of happy endings, of countering bad with good and about the relation between punishment and crime deserve critical analysis. We have a right to expect from our movie critics something more than a complacent acceptance of Hollywood's self-righteous hypocrisy.

A newspaper should not stop with chronicling the doings of the professionals in the arts. Schools, community groups and private organizations make significant news in little theaters, dance recitals and art classes.

THE WOMAN'S PAGE

The era of calling cards and sixteen-button white kid gloves has faded from the memories of most American women, and in its place has come an age of active participation in public life. But on most women's pages in the American press the calling card dies hard and "society" still looms large.

Our woman's page would devote a large amount of space to news about women in public affairs. It would trim "society" down to proportion to its present place in American life. It would emphasize the informality and gracious living which largely has taken the place of formal receptions and balls.

It's hard to understand why editors allow women's pages to remain the frilly repositories of unconscious humor that they often are. When a really good story breaks in homemaking or some other feminine field, editors are likely to take it off the woman's page and assign it to a general news reporter—with consequent demoralization of the woman's page staff. The page is allowed, even

ordered sometimes, to twitter with exaggerated femininity. Not long ago a woman's page used the headline: CAKE IS A LOVELY WORD. The syndicated beauty columnist Josephine Lowman, once started a column as follows: "I do not know just why I am writing about milk, because judging from statistics practically everyone in the world now drinks it." (The Hottentots, not being readers of my beauty and health column, naturally don't count.)

Why not just drop the innocence and coyness and make the woman's page as solid as the rest of the paper? The homemaking section should include information from authoritative technical or professional sources on child care, diet, home decoration and house maintenance. Every one of these subjects can be treated with lively art—sketches or cartoons or photography, and in many cases a picture story will serve the purpose better than a written one. A newspaper could test recipes it prints, either in its own testing department, or if the paper were in a smaller city, it could enlist the services of a high school or college home economics department. The home department not only could show women new decoration ideas, but could tell how they can do the decorating themselves. The woman's page can tell how to make curtains or new pieces of furniture, as most women's magazines have been doing for years.

Attractive fashion photographs and sketches do much to liven a woman's page. But equally important is a pattern service giving information on how to make smart clothes.

A newspaper can be of considerable service, as PM has shown, in advising women where to buy and what the best values are. It should provide such technical buying information as Consumers' Union distributes. The newspaper could get plenty of data from such organizations as Consumers' Union and government and university research departments.

The "women in public affairs" department would report what women's organizations are doing. It would drop routine club announcements and replace them with a club calendar that gives all the information in much less space.

Besides stories on women in politics, social service, science, etc., a woman's page should run interpretative stories about legislation of special interest to women, stories about women in other countries and the role they are playing there.

Weddings can be handled conservatively yet colorfully. They would be the backbone of news in the space left to "society" activities. Since no paper can report all weddings and engagements in

a large metropolitan area, we would select them on a news basis—the ones of interest to the most people. Wedding photographs can be used effectively in a full page layout once a week or so, and instead of sticking to the hackneyed portrait photograph, we would hunt for colorful shots of the most picturesque nuptials. The pageantry of a Greek Orthodox wedding, the gaiety of a Hungarian wedding reception, are excellent picture material.

A Sunday women's section can effectively use magazine typography and make-up. It should have articles on child care by a pediatrician, stories on psychology by a trained psychologist, and the like. If technically feasible, the section should use color photography, illustrating foods, fashions and home decoration.

RELIGION

In most newspapers, the religion department is one of the weakest and dullest in the paper. Its reporting is superficial and perfunctory, rarely rising above the level of announcements and banal sermon excerpts. What news appears, arrives as handout material, and, published as a courtesy to churches, is not weighed by any normal standard of news value to the reader.

If religion has valid importance in the modern world, then it deserves to be reported vitally. For such a job, newspapers must come out from behind their timidity and give an honest account of how religion copes with the real concerns of our time. The churches play a role, direct or indirect, in economics, education, literature, entertainment, family life. Examples of their economic and social activities are the Quakers' work in Conscientious Objector camps; the Mormons' storehouses providing against want among their own members in depression times; the local activity of Zionists aiding European displaced persons; opening of a new Catholic boys' center. The press must have tolerance for every man's religious beliefs and give space to each faith. This should not prevent the religion department, however, from opening its columns to discussions of how religion sometimes fails to cope with modern problems. The department should also deal with the great basic religious questions of our day—the influence of religion, tolerance versus intolerance, relations between church and state in various parts of the world, relations between science and religion, conflicts between old and new interpretations of morality.

Clearly, in a democratic nation, mixing many faiths, the press has an obligation to work for religious tolerance with all its great power. The religion department

has many opportunities to help here; it could, to cite one small instance, compare the observance of Easter Sunday and the Feast of the Passover, showing their similarities of background and ritual. Yet such comparative stories in this field rarely appear. In campaigning for understanding between groups, the religion editor might well collaborate with the nationalities editor we suggested in an earlier chapter.

It should be clear that a newspaper cannot undertake to give religion or its servants immunity from controversy, or in any way treat religion as a specially privileged subject. Within the customary bounds of good taste and factual reporting, religion, any one church or any clergyman may be subject to news coverage in any other department of the paper—accident news, police news, political news, science news. Freedom of religion and freedom of the press go together.

When a church or clergyman steps into politics, newspapers should cover these activities with the same news and editorial treatment they would give any other organization or individual in the same affairs. If a church ventures into the field of medicine, it must expect its views in the press to compete with and be answered by the statements of medical men who may or may not agree. If it goes into labor, or farm organizations, its activities should get exactly the same treatment as would the Democratic or Republican Party, the Congress of Industrial Organizations or the American Farm Bureau Federation.

As churches take a greater part in public affairs, they become more newsworthy. A church convention or a meeting of the ministerial association is no longer concerned only with a discussion of doctrine or internal organization. It frequently is a forum in which a large body of the population voices its opinions on affairs of the day. Such a session deserves careful coverage.

OTHER DEPARTMENTS

One of the things that creates the keenest sense of frustration in newspapermen is that, though the structure of modern newspapers is admirably set up, in many ways, to serve readers, the contents of this structure are so barren. Most newspapers, for instance, have departments on real estate, automobiles, gardening, travel and the like, all theoretically designed to give readers useful information on matters of practical importance to them. But in practice these departments are virtually given over to advertisers; indeed, on some papers, the same person who solicits real estate or automobile advertising writes the department. The result is that these sections consist largely of advertisers' handouts rather than news.

We would like to see a department on real estate and building which would do a real reporting job, on house architecture, on town planning, on building problems, on home financing. Eric Hodgins, in his wonderful debunking book called *Mr. Blanding Builds His Dream*

House, showed up the real estate editors as well as the building industry. The press is partly responsible for the pathetic innocence of the home-buying or home-building sucker. It has made home ownership a fetish akin to mother love, cruelly betraying its readers by failing to give them the hard facts they need to know when buying or building a house.

Newspapers could do much to raise the standards of taste in architecture, to stimulate reforms in the building industry and to assist in better planning for our towns. One service, for instance, that we are sure readers would appreciate would be frank, intelligent discussion of house plans by sound architects.

We suggest similar treatment of the departments on automobiles, travel, gardening, photography and other hobbies. What these departments lack most, at present, and what readers need most, is evaluation of ideas and products. Newspapers should stop relying on the handouts of supply manufacturers and provide tested, unbiased information.

In many ways, the special departments are the most influential part of the newspaper, as influential as the movies and the radio. They give currency to changes in our language, mores and morals. At their best, they do more than report the new books, symphonies, folk songs, baseball stars and scientific discoveries. They mirror the folkways of the people, and describe our contribution to, or diminution of, world civilization. As such, they deserve as thorough and authoritative coverage as the biggest story on the front page.

CBS RIDES HERD ON NEW YORK PAPERS

DON HOLENBECK'S WEEKLY ROUNDUP CATCHES PRESS DELINQUENTS

None but a seasoned newsman as Don Hollenbeck is could do the skilled press criticism he turns in weekly in "CBS Views the Press," 6:15—6:30 Saturday nights on WCBS. His series started May 31. He covers only the New York papers but in the local field he mines expertly. He has a sure feel for a phoney and can extract the last drop of phoniness out of it. He specializes in exposing yellow journalism and in dragging out the anglings and slantings of 'policy' stories until it must make any honest newspaperman squirm to listen.

He doesn't pretend a complete review of the newspapers. He specializes. He goes out after the slick synthetic sensations of the day which the city room would

like to forget tomorrow. He makes it harder to forget. This is bound to have its effect. In fact it has already. At the end of three weeks he publicized cases of reporters reversing their field and doing an honest job after he'd exposed their slippery stories of the month before. He tries to balance his exposures with citations of examples of excellent reporting, and in the radio technique serves up bits of humor consciously or unconsciously committed in the press. But his strength is in pouncing on a news development familiar to the headline reader which the press, or a part of it, has distorted or confused or concealed. Hollenbeck must be a welcome reinforcement to the editor who believes in straight news. For he makes it easier for the honest editor to

ignore the competition that tries to win on fouls.

The Herald Tribune is evidently Hollenbeck's favorite newspaper. Its appearances on his program are almost always on the plus side. The Times seldom appears and then in a negative sort of innocuousness, as when Murray Schumach is praised for putting sparkle in a story of a better water supply for Flatbush, when his bright humor is contrasted with the dull soberness ascribed to his office colleagues. Delinquents are most apt to be the Hearst Journal-American and the Daily News, although the Sun and the World-Telegram are also frequently hauled up.

Here are a few examples from Hollenbeck's scripts:

A Case of Press Agency

And Two on the Press Associations

July 5—Readers of the Daily News last Monday morning might or might not have read an item which began, "Officials of the Hotel New Yorker—said yesterday they had learned that the Greater New York CIO Council plans to picket their establishment tomorrow night because of the presence there of Representative Fred A. Hartley, co-author of the Taft-Hartley labor act. The officials said they would ask police to disperse the pickets. . ." And then on Tuesday, some of those same readers might have seen an item in PM which began, "Representative Hartley will address the National Association of Personnel Directors at the Hotel New Yorker tonight without benefit either of police protection or a CIO picket line. . ." The exasperated reader might well have asked, why don't they make up their minds? and let it go at that. But behind these contradictory accounts, there is an interesting story of how things sometimes get into the papers, to the confusion of thereaders, and of the editors.

Here's what happened, as nearly as we can sort it out from some of the conflicting stories we got. The National Association of Personnel Directors did hold its annual dinner meeting at the New Yorker, and the meeting was addressed by Representative Hartley. That much was accur-

ate, but the rest of the original story was a pretty good example of how unverified information gets into the newspapers. Accompanying the personnel directors was a press agent from Chicago; his job, as press agents' jobs are, to get publicity for the organization he represents.

In a conversation with an official of the hotel, this press agent says he was told, and I quote him as quoting the official, "I hear the CIO is going to picket Hartley." From then on, its confused: the press agent says he tried to verify the story with the CIO, but couldn't reach anybody. He says he interpreted the hotel official's remark that such a picket line would be illegal as meaning that the hotel was going to ask for police protection. So he called the wire services: Associated Press United Press International News Service, told them the CIO was going to picket the Hotel New Yorker, and that the hotel was planning to ask for police protection. The hotel official denies all this: a number of police were assigned to the meeting, but this is not unusual in the case of a visiting celebrity who is going to address a large meeting. The CIO denied making any plans for picketing, and no pickets showed up. Saul Mills, head of the Greater New York CIO Council said he first learned of the story when

he read it in the World-Telegram on Monday, and that he immediately called all the papers with a denial, branding the story as, in his words, "a cheap bid by an unscrupulous hotel press agent to get publicity." This, as it turned out, was incorrect: The New Yorker's press agent had nothing to do with the story, which as PM intimated, can stand as a pretty good sample of something dreamed up out of nothing.

There's another footnote to the Taft-Hartley bill which illustrates a journalistic practice happily rare: the telling of a story before it has happened. When the Senate was voting on the measure and the counting of the vote proceeded, it became pretty apparent that Monday what was going to happen.

The veto was going to be over-riden, and so indeed it turned out. The actual official announcement that the labor bill had become law was made at fifteen minutes and some seconds after three o'clock; the voting had been completed at three-fifteen. But at twelve minutes past three, still some time before enough votes to override the veto had been cast, the International News Service sent a "flash": in wire service terms, a dispatch which takes precedence over everything.

bill veto." In the CBS newsroom at the time the flash came in, we were listening to the radio account of the vote still being taken, and the agile enterprise of INS in telling the story before it happened interested us very much. Because just conceivably, those late votes being taken might have brought an entirely different outcome—not likely, of course, and it turned out to be okay for International News Service, which had beaten its competitors into the offices of its subscribers by three minutes, even though by the standards of strict accuracy, the story it told wasn't yet a fact.

We have one or two other interesting samples of press association performances, and heading the list is that turned in by the United Press at a recent news conference held by Secretary of State Marshall. The Secretary had called the con-

ference for the purpose of answering some questions about his speech at Harvard, in which Mr. Marshall put forth the suggestion that before the United States can proceed much farther to help world recovery, the European nations themselves must come to some agreement as to their requirements.

Amplification was what the reporters wanted at that news conference, and the Secretary amplified as much as he felt it was possible to do at that early date. What the reporters got out of it is something else again, and our exhibit A is the United Press story of that afternoon which begins, and I quote it in part: "Secretary Marshall challenged the nations of Europe to draw and hold their own line against Communism if they want American economic help. . . . He put the issue of restoring political and economic stability squarely up to the peoples of the ravaged

continent, including the Russians themselves." That confused us: in one phrase. Mr. Marshall seemed to be barring the Russians out; in the next, he seemed to be inviting them in. Now exhibit B: The Associated Press dispatch of the same afternoon, to quote part of the opening paragraph: "Secretary Marshall today held open a door to Soviet Russia to aid in a voluntary European economic program to which the United States might give aid."—Somewhat different from that UP story, which contradicted itself, but which in the opening line, got in that anti-Russian crack, groundless as it turned out to be. We got hold of the transcript of that news conference, and careful reading of it discloses absolutely no basis in fact for the opening sentence of the United Press dispatch. As a member of our staff said, a preposterous interpretation of a news conference.

Un-American

June 14—The press generally reports fairly extensively on Communist activity in this country, and what is being done about it. We've made some notes on its recent handling of stories about the otherism over which the late war was fought. In a recent column, Walter Winchell wrote that the House committee on Un-American activities was closing its eyes and its conscience when it announced it could see no threat of fascism here. And the story of that announcement by the committee got very little attention in the New York newspapers: the only paper to put it on the front page was the Herald-Tribune, which also printed an editorial criticizing the committee for its announcement. Another Congressional Committee had been holding up authorization to publish a 325-page document entitled *Fascism in action*, prepared by Congressman Pat-

man of Texas. The story was sent by the Associated Press on June fifth, but PM and the Daily Worker alone gave it any prominence, demanding that the report be made public.

It is one of the sad facts of life that too often, not all newspapers—and not all of the radio—too consistently present both sides of a story. An example of that was Henry Wallace's controversial speaking tour of Europe: of all the New York papers, only the Herald-Tribune consistently gave equal space and prominence to stories both attacking and defending Mr. Wallace.

But the most flagrant case of distortion of news in that connection was a job turned in by Ruth Montgomery of the Daily News' Washington staff. Miss Montgomery

was reporting the agitation in Congress to have Mr. Wallace prosecuted under the Logan act passed by Congress in 1799 to prevent unauthorized Americans from advising foreign governments. Miss Montgomery's story said, and I quote it, "the act had been passed as a result of Aaron Burr's abortive conspiracy against the United States."—Now in 1799 Aaron Burr was about to become vice-president of the United States under Thomas Jefferson; his trial for treason—at which he was found not guilty, incidentally—didn't occur until eight years later, in 1807. By sloppy reporting and editing, or by design, the News's story was strictly phoney, but it did serve to bracket Mr. Wallace's name with that of another former vice-president who went traveling and talking, and whose reputation hasn't fared any too well in the history books.

Hearst Crusade

June 21—Readers of the Journal-American undoubtedly were impressed the other day by a full-page picture story: impressed first of all, perhaps, because the picture story was printed sideways on the page. If they turned the page around to study it, they saw pictures of two New York housing developments, one public, the other private.

The private job—Stuyvesant Town—was pretty well along, but the public one was still in the foundation stage. The headline accompanying the pictures pointed out that the private project had been started in 1945—tenants will move in soon,

it said. The public project was started in 1943—work barely started. Bureaucratic fumbling, it went on—here were two spectacular examples of private enterprise versus socialistic government planning. We collected a few facts on this matter, which are as follows: Excavation work on the private development began seven months before it did on the public one, and the latter will be ready for occupancy by November. Demolition, it is true, had been done on the government project in 1943, but the excavation for the private job had been ahead of the government one by seven months. Another point the Journal-American didn't mention

was that another public housing development—Elliot Houses—was started at the same time Stuyvesant Town was, and tenants are already living in Elliot Houses. Whatever the virtue of the arguments over public and private housing are, in these days when all kinds of housing are needed, it might not be a bad idea to report the complete facts on all efforts to relieve the shortage, before drawing conclusions.

Better reporting was done through the week by Walter Arm of the Herald-Tribune and Leon Edel of PM—both of them turned in good jobs of journalism on the Douglas Chandler treason trial in Boston.

Taft-Hartley and Press Freedom

June 28—The Taft-Hartley labor bill passed over President Truman's veto is now the law of the land—pending some tests of it in the courts—and as such, it has been given extensive publicity by the newspapers, most of which were for it from the outset. But one section of the Taft-Hartley bill was given the silent treatment by the press; strange, because that section (under some interpretations) could vitally affect the press itself, and its freedom of expression.

Usually, when even the smallest cloud appears which might seem to threaten that freedom, the press raises a concerted outcry, and quite properly too: freedom of speech is one of our dearest possessions.

Reference is made specifically to section 304 of the Taft-Hartley bill by which the Corrupt Practices Act has been amended. It now is not only unlawful for any corporation or labor organization to make a CONTRIBUTION to a political campaign, it's now also unlawful to make any EXPENDITURES in connection with federal elections. The key word that has been added to the old law is the word "expenditures." On the face of it, that sounds as if a union is forbidden to say, in effect, "we will spend a sum of money to support the candidacy of Mr. X for Senator."

But President Truman, in his veto message to Congress, said that this provision would prevent the ordinary union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections. The President said he regarded this as a dangerous intrusion on free speech, and he pointed out that it provided no exemption for corporations whose business is the publication of newspapers or the operation of radio stations. In his radio address later, the President pointed out that section 304 may be used to prevent the League of Women Voters from using its funds to inform its 72-thousand members about the record of a political candidate. If the President's interpretation is correct, it could mean that any group which is incorporated—whether it be a Labor union, the National Association of Manufacturers, a farmers' association, a religious group, a women's club—that's where the League of Women Voters come in—any such group would be prevented under the Taft-Hartley law from spending any money in connection with any election. It's that kind of interpretation that lends interest to Congressman Hartley's statement which the President referred to, when Mr. Hartley said: "There is more in this measure than meets the eye."

But the President wasn't the first to find more in the measure than met the eye; Senator Taft himself brought it out in the open in a Senate debate two weeks before the President did. That debate also got a journalistic snubbing; although the Associated Press reported it, the only New York newspaper to give the story the prominence necessary to understand it, was the Times.

In that Senate debate we heard and read so little about, Senator Pepper of Florida was the first to bring up the freedom of the press question. He said, suppose the newspaper "Labor," published by the railway labor union executives with a circulation of 700-thousand, suppose "Labor" should put out a special edition next year—election year—supporting Mr. Truman for president on the grounds that Mr. Truman is a friend of the working man and that Mr. Taft is not. Senator Taft replied that under the Taft-Hartley bill, if the newspaper "Labor" were supported by union funds (which it is) funds contributed by union members as union dues, it would be a violation of the law. Mr. Taft said it would be exactly as if the railroad itself, using its stockholders' funds, published such an advertisement in the newspaper supporting one candidate as against another. Mr. Pepper then asked if it wouldn't be a violation of freedom of the press to prevent a labor paper from taking sides in a campaign simply because it was owned by a union. Mr. Taft's reply to this—and he emphasized the point throughout the debate—was that such prevention would NOT be a denial of freedom of the press. He said, it applies only if the labor organization operates the newspaper, and uses union dues for the purpose. He added, "If the paper is operated independently, and if it derives its money from its subscribers, of course there would be no violation."

What that boils down to is this: as subscribers, we buy our daily newspapers, read their praise and denunciation of political candidates, and that's okay under the Taft-Hartley bill. But if we belong to the United Auto Workers Union, and part of our dues goes to support that union's publication,—and it has the largest circulation of a single newspaper in the country—then it's NOT okay, on the presumption that the editors of the publication are making use of members' money to pay for expression of opinions with which not all the members might agree. . . .

During the debate, Senator Barkley asked about the regular newspapers as corporations—he pointed out that newspapers take positions for and against candidates, and he asked if that would be a direct or indirect contribution to a campaign. Senator Taft thought not; he said such expression of opinion was simply the ordinary operation of the particular corporation's business.

But later, on June 23rd, according to the Congressional Record, Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming said that under Mr. Taft's interpretation, a newspaper couldn't even send reporters to the Republican national convention in connection with an election. That statement we didn't see in the paper either.

Then Senator Murray of Montana brought up a point. He said, how about an industrial corporation, owning a string of newspapers obviously operated for political purposes. The newspapers have a deficit each year, the deficit is made up by the corporation, and the newspapers are used for advancing the political interests of the corporation. To that, Senator Taft said he thought the corporation had better be careful; it might very easily be found to be violating the law, although he admitted it would be a more difficult case to prove, as the contribution is indirect. Senator Murray pointed out how difficult it was to find out where these papers got their money; he'd tried, he said, and couldn't. But, he added, a big corporation can operate in that manner, can control small newspapers by putting advertisements in them, whereas a union will not even be able to print the records of Congressmen, or to take sides. That point about the records of candidates was made in the discussion between Senators Pepper and Taft. The former asked, suppose a labor union wished to put out a pamphlet advising its members about the labor record of the candidate. Would that be forbidden? Senator Taft said he thought it would be.

We've been able to hit only the highest of the high spots of this debate, which was reported so meagerly at the time; unfortunately the Congressional Record is not easily available to the reading public. Now for the reaction from the labor press itself, and from other quarters. . . .

When Senator Taft interpreted Section 304 as preventing labor papers from taking any political position, the "CIO News" warned the American Society of Newspaper Editors that the bill might

conceivably apply to the general press, too. That warning had also been sounded in President Truman's interpretation. But, Editor de Caux of CIO News wrote, the publishers ignored this warning—he said it seemed they could not conceive of the bill being used against themselves. The daily papers largely ignored the warning too, although the "World-Telegram" said editorially that Section 304 does NOT

endanger freedom of the press. Rather, the "Telegram" said, it would prevent labor leaders from using members' dues to propagandize for ideas that union members personally might be opposed to. Many labor organizations and publications reacted violently, and made immediate plans to test the section—a fact also given silent treatment for the most part by the daily press.

Fred Keating, editor of the newspaper "Labor" wrote that a prison sentence under the Taft-Hartley bill would be a badge of honor: the penalty for violation, incidentally, runs from a one to a five thousand dollar fine, or a year in jail, or both. -Mr. -Fletcher, -of -the Federated Press, tried for some reaction from the newspaper world, but he didn't have much luck. . . .

Jim Crow is a Journalist

June 14—Jim Crow is a journalist, as we learn from reading the Daily Press. Jim Crow is a journalist, not only in the section of our country where the law gives him full sanction, but right here in New York City, where it does NOT. Jim Crow has one drinking fountain for whites, another for Negroes. It also has one code of ethics for writing about white people, and another for Negro people. During the past week we've had a good opportunity to note some examples of Jim Crow-ism in the Daily Newspapers, but before we comment on them, a little background may be helpful.

About ten years ago, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People asked the Press associations and the major newspapers of the nation to consider for possible adoption an order in force on the New York Post: that color or race shall NOT be used in describing anyone connected with a crime unless color or race is an essential part of the story. Typical of many replies was that received from the New York Herald Tribune which read, "It is our policy now in the treatment of news not to emphasize the color or race of a man involved in a crime. All our editors know this, and our reporters and copyreaders. Color and race are put into our stories only when essential. We endeavor to enforce this policy at all times."

Almost all the editors who replied made the reservation that when designation of race or color seemed essential to clarity, they would then designate race or color. One thing the NAACP request did stop pretty largely was the designation of race or color in headlines. It also helped a lot to reduce racial discrimination in news stories themselves, but it hasn't helped enough, as our examination of some evidence shows now. Last Monday morning, page three of the Daily News was quite a spectacle: all but six lines of type were devoted to crime news and pictures.

Most prominent on this page was the story of the 69-year-old Brooklyn Minister

who rescued his wife from an attacker, who was later quickly caught by the police. The opening paragraph of the Daily News story, in heavy type, identified the accused man as a Negro, not by a name, which he has as we all have, but simply by his color. The same identification was used three more times in the body of the story. Apparently the writers and editors who worked on this story felt it was essential to clarity to repeat this point.

A similar performance was turned in by the Journal-American which used the word Negro three times. The Mirror used it once, in the opening paragraph; so did the Sun. In the Times and Herald Tribune, the identification was made once, well down in their stories, and the Tribune used it only on direct quotation from the pastor.

To their credit, the World Telegram, the Post and PM did not once describe the accused attacker in terms of his color. The point made by the NAACP in its letter to newspaper editors was that repeated usage of color designation had aroused in the public mind a belief that the Negro is more addicted to crime than any other group, and to quote the letter, "a belief which impartial studies have revealed is not the case."

It seems scarcely necessary to point out that other groups and nationalities aren't marked for specific mention, and as the NAACP asks, "Is it too much to ask that the single exception which not all, but many newspapers make of singling out Negroes for designation in headlines and text of crime stories be done away with?"

That letter was written ten years ago. (and perhaps the consciences of editors) have succeeded in getting most of the Jim Crow-ism out of the headlines, but there are still some jobs to be done.

That fact is all too apparent in an example or two of the reporting turned in by some of the press associations, as well. Early this month, a tornado struck down South, and a number of people were killed. I quote now the opening sentence of an Associated Press dispatch of June third,

under a Pine Bluff, Arkansas dateline: "A Negro whose automobile was plucked from the highway and flung into a cotton field by Sunday's tornado died today of his injuries, bringing the official death toll of the storm to thirty-five." That man who was killed by the storm had a name, as we all do and the Associated Press is usually most reliable about getting names. In this case, the victim's color alone seemed to be enough identification.

Or another Associated Press dispatch of a few days earlier, from Raleigh, North Carolina, in which Godwin Bush, who escaped from a lynch mob, was described as "almost illiterate." Perhaps he hadn't been given the same opportunities for education as the Associated Press reporter. Incidentally, this reference to the young man's illiteracy was printed in both the Times and Herald Tribune, which are usually more scrupulous about such things. The fact of Godwin Bush's literacy was no more pertinent to the story than would have been the fact of his left-handedness, if he had been left-handed. As used, it was simply a slur. But that would appear to have been a case of momentary forgetfulness on the copy desk; both the Times and Herald Tribune are to be commended for their general policy on race relations. George Streater of the Times, for instance, has been going around the country studying the problem in terms of housing and employment.

The Tribune recently had an excellent series of articles by Robert J. Donovan on the Negro struggle for education in Texas. The Post, PM and the Daily Worker also deal extensively with stories of this type, but they confine their reports mostly to the New York area. When our CBS newsroom staff talked over this matter of Jim Crow in journalism, one member asked: "But if you leave out the color identification in a crime story, aren't you guilty of suppressing legitimate news?" The answer to that one was: "Are other persons so identified? White? Anglo-Saxon? Jewish, Danish, French, whatever? Not so you could notice it."

Personal Mention--Honorable and Otherwise

Robert S. Bird of the Herald Tribune was sent by his newspaper to report the recent Lynch trial at Greenville, South Carolina, and the CBS newsroom staff is in general agreement that Mr. Bird's dispatches were the best which appeared in the New York Press. Mr. Bird did a particularly excellent job of reporting the reactions of the community to the national attention which the story of the trial commanded. . . .

Most of us didn't like a comment by Westbrook Pegler in the Journal-American Thursday. In the course of his article, Mr. Pegler referred to Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, the labor leaders, with a slur on their use of the English language; dialect unioners, he called them.

Mr. Pegler's column was a sentimental recall of the days when newspaper men were figures of greater stature than they are today, which could be: they probably wouldn't find it amusing to comment on an immigrant's accent.

People of all degrees of means and influence in our town have been very much confused during the past week over what has been going on underground: the dispute between the transport workers' union and the subsequent protest move by the workers. Depending on which edition of which newspaper you read, you learned that trains were slowing down on one, two, or three lines, that they were not slowing down, that the board spokesman was blaming the union for a slowdown, that the union was denying any violation of the rules, the board later in the week saying there was no slowdown at all, and the union claiming that all lines were affected.

It must have been the most exasperating story a reporter could imagine; those condemned to follow it for the daily press can't be blamed at all for this confusion. Strange as it seems, almost every story the reporters wrote was correct at the time: conditions were changing so fast that it was impossible to get accounts of them in and out of print in time to keep accurate track of things. We thought the best job of covering this baffling story was done by Charles Grutzner of the

Times. He got all sides of the story, used no editorial catchwords, and seemed to be in touch with things all the time, although it must have been like trying to catch an eel with your bare hands. We like his touch of humor, which was hard to find in the transport story, when he wrote about asking a board spokesman what counter-measures it had in mind against the slowdown. The official's reply was, "does Macy's tell Gimbels?" which has become a part of New York's language.

It was fun this week reading H. I. Phillips' column in the Sun, in which he got going on two of his favorite topics, Russia and radio commercials. He did his column after the announcement that commercials will now be permitted on the Russian radio, and this time, Mr. Phillips was in his best form on a subject which, we must admit, he has a right now and then to poke fun at. As he wrote; "In the past, Moscow has scorned the sponsored broadcast, the theory being that if there was anything to be said to the people about pink toothbrush and dandruff, the Kremlin would say it." Also, to quote Mr. Phillips again, "The world will watch the Soviet experiment with interest. If Moscow falls for the jingle it will be taken as indicating the first crack in the Russian armor. Once any nation stands for those jingles, it proves it as weak as the next fellow, regardless of standing armies."

Christopher Rand's articles on China in Wednesday's Herald Tribune: a fearless speaking out against censorship, and a fine example of some of the problems a reporter is up against when he meets with censorship. We liked on the same day and in the same paper a dispatch from the Herald Tribune's Moscow bureau. It was unsigned, but the Herald Tribune tells us it was written by Joseph Newman, who has had his own problems with censorship in Argentina. The Moscow story was a fine example of a reporter's conscientiousness: Mr. Newman had been handed an official statement, and he tried to check up on it. He didn't get very far, but he tried.

On Wednesday, a correspondent asked

Emily Post in the "Mirror" how the expert on etiquette would explain the method of seating the bride's and groom's families at a church wedding. Very easily, Miss Post said blithely, and sailed in. "In a church with two main aisles," she wrote, "the guests are seated according to aisles, and not the church as a whole. All of the seats on the right aisle belongs to the bridegroom. For the processional, the bride's right aisle is chosen because people naturally turn to the right rather than to the left. After the ceremony, the bride and groom come down the groom's left aisle. If this is confusing, see the diagrams in my book, 'Etiquette,' at your nearest public library. However, if the church is very large, and the wedding small, so that only the right aisle is used, then the bride's family sits on the left of this aisle and the grooms family on the right, while the marriage takes place at the head of this aisle." We wondered if they probably didn't decide to call the whole thing off, and have the marriage done by a justice of the peace.

Nomination to the department of journalistic feet of clay goes this week to H. L. Mencken, who used to be a newspaperman himself. The nomination goes to him for the interview with Earl Wilson, printed in last Wednesday's New York Post—an interview into which Mr. Wilson had inserted a note that the opinions expressed were not his own, but Mr. Mencken's. It was an amazing interview: profanity, prejudice, insult, at one point, almost obscenity, were there. One sample: I quote Mr. Wilson as quoting Mr. Mencken as saying: "I'm in favor of war. . . . the country enjoys war. Look at soldiers wives—what a grand time they have while the men are away. Got rid of them for a few years. Sure, some get killed in automobile accidents too." Jimmy Cannon, of the same newspaper's sports department, followed up the next day with a bitter attack on Mr. Mencken—called his statements among the most dreadful of our time, which indeed they are.

As Mr. Cannon says of Mr. Mencken, "What minor services he gave to the foes of intolerance in his time have been shriveled by his monstrous proposal that war is an enjoyable event."

THE NEWSPAPERMAN III

GETTING THE NEWS AND PLAYING IT

by William M. Pinkerton

The work that newspapermen do usually is described in terms of a rather long series of titles: reporter, special writer, correspondent, feature writer, re-write, copy reader, desk editor, city editor, telegraph editor, state editor, news editor, managing editor, editorial writer, columnist, editor. The list of titles may be longer or shorter; usually it will center on these.

But newspaper organization is quite informal; the work done by men bearing a given title varies greatly from newspaper to newspaper. On one paper, the city editor may serve mainly as a personnel officer, directing the work of the reporting staff; on another, he may direct both the reporters and the staff of desk men who edit the news articles of local interest. A news editor may be a person of great importance, making major decisions as to the order in which news stories shall appear in the paper—which shall have positions of prominence and which shall be subordinated;—or he may be merely a liaison man between the editorial office and “the back shop,” directing printers in the mechanical arrangement of articles whose news value has been decided by others.

Most newspapermen recognize a vague hierarchy of positions ranging upward from the “cub” reporter, through the various levels of reporting, editing and editorial writing, to the managing editor and the editor. But the status of the various positions is so poorly established that a city editor may become in fact the directing force for the entire news-gathering and news-handling staff; a seasoned reporter may scorn, with justice, an extremely responsible desk position; a man may step directly from the position of “star” reporter to that of editor or managing editor; a man may leave the desk editor's chair to take a turn at reporting without losing his standing with his fellows.

The hierarchy is equally flexible on a salary basis. Some reporters will be paid higher wages than some desk editors on the same newspaper. An outstanding reporter or a Washington correspondent may draw a pay check as great as any save that of the managing editor.

For purposes of understanding the kind of work newspapermen do, therefore, it is easier to discuss the processes of newspaper work. These are three: coverage, play, interpretation. To a certain extent, every newspaper man performs each of these functions. In general, however, each function is associated with a group of positions, thus: **coverage** (reporters, re-write, special correspondents, feature writers, press services); **play** (copy readers, desk editors, news editors); **interpretation** (editorial writers, political correspondents, columnists).

COVERAGE may be defined as “getting the news.” To this end, each newspaper has its own network of runs, districts, specialists and general utility men. The press services assume the responsibility for providing the news of state, national and international interest. For the newspaper, the problem of coverage centers largely on the city and its trade area. The problem is further simplified by setting up various independent departments within the editorial staff. They are responsible for the news in fields of special interest—such as sports, society, financial. These departments operate apart from the general reporting staff, but follow in general the same methods.

The main body of reporters and special writers work under the city editor. His responsibility is to collect, in news form, material on all events within the city which might be of interest to a large number of persons. At first glance, this might seem an impossible task. However, the work has been greatly simplified by what is known as “routine coverage.” Whether correctly or not, newspapermen have come to work on the assumption that almost all major events of interest to newspaper readers center on certain official fulcrums of community life—the police station, the city hall, the county court house, the federal building, the business and financial offices. Each of these is

staffed by one or more “run men,” regularly assigned to visiting the same offices every day. For the duration of their assignment on the run, these men become specialists in the kind of public information with which they deal.

In some cities, newspapers work also through a geographical break-down, dividing the city into districts (usually according to police sub-stations) and assigning a “district man” to each section. The district man may handle police news within the district, neighborhood civic organizations, club notes, obituaries, “human interest” and a dozen-and-one other things. In some cities, suburban reporters serve the same function for their areas.

These run men and district men are the city editor's first line of coverage. Men assigned to runs are men of some experience in the gathering and writing of news. They know a story when they see one. The run man's keenness in spotting the significance of a dull item on a police blotter or a wordy legal document in the office of the clerk of court—and his friendship with persons who might tip him off to good stories—is a major factor in determining what is offered to the editors of the paper as grist for the news mill. While some men are better than others at spotting the importance of the day's dull fact, the factors of insight and intelligence are not alone in determining the run man's success.

The limitations of time and space bear as oppressively on him as on any newspaper worker. For reasons of cost, he is apt to be assigned a rather large number of offices and people to cover. Often, he faces the problem of whom to visit first, or which set of records to dig into first. He must determine how often it is necessary to see certain minor officials. How long can he afford to sit in on a potentially-important hearing or trial where nothing seems to be happening? How far can he afford to dig into the legal documents without risk of missing an equally-important story elsewhere? These are matters of judgment and intuition. The reporter plays his hunches—he sometimes takes a chance on missing to story at one place to get a better story at another place. When he guesses wrong, he must repair

This continues Mr. Pinkerton's series of *The Newspaperman*, written out of a dozen years experience of newspapers in Wisconsin and Nebraska, with the Associated Press in Washington and the United States News. A Nieman Fellow in 1940-41, Pinkerton is now director of the news office at Harvard.

the loss by checking the stories of eye-witnesses and the statements of officials to reconstruct the action.

In the nature of things, much reporting must be of this second-hand nature, rather than the first-hand observation of events. The murder already has been committed, the brief filed, the little courtroom drama enacted when the reporter gets his tip.

With the remainder of his staff—the "general assignments men"—the city editor must fill in the gaps between the runs and catch the unexpected incidents of community life. The measure of a great city editor is his ability to spot the places where a story is lurking unwritten. Because of this, the city editor is ideally the best-informed man on the newspaper staff. His interests are all the scattered affairs of the city and its people; but with this, he needs an intimate knowledge of affairs in general. He must sense when a visit of some outside politician or financier or labor leader may have special significance. He must know what trains or planes or buses might bring a missing gangster or movie star into the city's limits. He must know what clubs men frequent, and who their friends are. He must know who paid for whose election campaign, and why. And he must know what local persons and places are good for a light "human interest" story on a dull day.

Nor does the city editor neglect areas covered by run men. He is answerable for the work of the run men, and he must know when a man is missing a story on his run or when he is shirking his job. A good city editor will sense the fact that a run man has missed part of the story or has mistaken the facts. He advises the run men on possible leads, and coordinates the work of men on separate runs when their fields converge. He will decide when to send an extra man onto a run to devote long hours to a story which the run man cannot handle for lack of time. In short, with a small staff of reporters of varying degrees of training and skill, the city editor must contrive to keep informed of all those events which would interest large groups in the community.

In a far less mechanical job, the city editor must function like the traffic manager of an airline or a railroad. He must sort and shuffle his men to meet the most pressing news demands of the moment. Keeping pace with the changing importance to public affairs of various news sources is part of the job. He must know when a new office needs to be added to the routine daily coverage of the run men. In some midwestern cities the Federal Land Bank suddenly became, in 1933, the major financial institution of the city. The as-

signment of run men to cover relief agencies in the depth of the depression was a measure of the city editors' alertness to the changing scene. In Washington, similarly, variously agencies grow and die in news importance. The early years of the New Deal saw "downtown" Washington—the departments and administrative agencies—eclipsing "the Hill" in news importance. The Supreme Court took on a special importance during the days when the constitutionality of New Deal laws was in question.

Alert general assignments men who dig up stories on their own hook, help the city editor keep pace with the ever-changing news picture. Although the top general assignments men usually will be working on only one story at a time, their problems are similar to those of the run man. The sources of their news are not as neatly catalogued as those of the run man. A general assignments man may find himself in a strange neighborhood, seeking data from informants he has never seen before. Here, as in the run man's work, judgment and intuition are valuable tools. Who will talk? Who can be trusted? How long can he afford to search for a missing fact? Shall he purr or shall he bluster? Among run men, only police reporters face the difficulties of gathering facts in strange settings as often as the general assignments men.

In the informal atmosphere of the newspaper office, the city editor gets valuable aid in his problem of "covering the town" from almost everyone. The publisher may call with an idea he picked up while talking with cronies at the country club. A desk editor may pass on a tip. Telephone girls, typographers, elevator operators, pressmen, advertising solicitors—any one may come in some day with "an idea for a story" that will reveal a dramatic or important event overlooked.

Obviously, there is selection in the matter of coverage. If the responsible reporter or editor fails to perceive the implications of the changing course of daily happenings, a news-center of vital interest to large groups of people may be overlooked. An alert newspaperman must be resurveying and checking his position constantly. This is done, but not by any self-conscious method, not by the keeping of charts and graphs. It is done almost subconsciously by an all-but-mechanical habit of repeatedly asking oneself, whenever one meets a new idea, a new person or a new situation: "Is there a story in it?" "Am I missing a news angle here?"

There is no rigid, scientific standard for deciding what constitutes effective cover-

age of a city's news. There is a certain traditional pattern—built largely around the official sources of public information. Around this pattern has developed an ever-growing periphery of news-possibilities. The break-down of the concept of privacy—partly through the labors of the gossip columnists, partly through the unceasing efforts of Hollywood press agents, partly, perhaps, through a change in people's attitudes toward the affairs of others—has contributed a great deal to this shadow-area. The changing emphasis in public affairs has contributed heavily, too—the new awareness of political, economic and social problems which came with the depression and was underlined by the war. Newspapermen responsible for coverage must try to see the day's affairs in the day's social setting. In short, they must try to see the day's events in terms of people's interests, anxieties, desires, fears, loves and hatreds.

It is amply clear that "coverage" is a selective process. From the city's thousands, the city editor selects each day a very small number to pursue and interview. From the hundreds of happenings in the city's daily life, he selects a comparatively small number to investigate. His resources of coverage are limited by the size and competence of his staff. The constant ticking of the clock and the daily supply of blank pages to be filled enforce a kind of economy of effort. In the repeated decisions to pursue one story rather than another, he is guided by a ratio of the potential news involved and the expenditure of time and effort needed to get it.

Chance spins the wheel. A happening which might make "a good story" on a dull day may be ignored completely on a day when great events are crowding the paper's pages or on a day when manpower is concentrated on a particular event of moment—a man-hunt, a national convention or a flood. Unfortunately, newspapers seldom turn back to do justice to an important turn of events once its newday has passed. It is covered or missed that day.

The real challenge of "coverage," however, lies in the discovery of new interests and ideas, and their introduction to the general public. Too few newspapermen succeed in resisting the mold of routine thinking about what is news. But outstanding men with enquiring minds repeatedly have shown that the making of news is a creative task.

PLAY is a matter of what goes into the newspaper, and how. Here the mass of

data written during the day is formed into a scheme of value—"news value." Here the desk editors, with their cold hearts and black pencils, go into action.

The colonial precursors of American journalism displayed a grand indifference to the arrangement of materials in their papers. It was enough that the bill-collectors were staved off long enough to get another edition printed—and the latest bit of world-shaking intelligence from the continent was apt to be fudged into an inside page.

Today, few metropolitan newspapers would think of inserting the last-minute, latest and greatest, bit of news anywhere but on page one. By definition and by common understanding between the editors and the readers, page one IS the big news of the day.

Below the big type of page one which marks the day's major news offering in the modern newspaper there is ranged a whole series of news stories, each rated more or less as to its interest and importance. To achieve this rating, the newspapers have evolved an elaborate series of techniques and principles. The varying size of headline type is only one method of rating the news. Mechanically, a major story may be set apart further by being set in two-column measure, by "leading" of the opening paragraphs, by setting significant passages in bold-face, by associating pictures with the story. A lesser story may be set apart by a margin of white-space around it, or by a box of black lines. Furthermore, the columns on a page are rated in order of their eye-catching location; the right-hand column is best, then the left-hand column, and so forth. Usually, a two-column headline will claim special notice within this structure. Inside, the right-hand page is considered more eye-catching than the left-hand page. The top of the page is considered more prominent than space "below the fold." Excepting special departments, news rates in descending order as the reader turns page after page from the front of the paper to the back. Insignificant items appear "with the medicine ads" in the back of the paper.

A further measure of the news is given by the amount of space devoted to a given event. Thus, an event of major import may call forth a lengthy and detailed main story, and three or four "sidebars," giving related information—comment, background, incidental developments. Such a story, with pictures, may cover whole pages of the newspaper. Another event which might come close to equalling the first in length of treatment—if told in equal de-

tail—may be brushed off in a single paragraph buried inside the paper.

Thus, the modern newspaper is committed by practise to rating its news, almost item for item, on a long scale of "news value." Actually, such rating is attempted seriously only for stories of positive interest or importance. Except on the very largest newspapers, make-up of the bottom half of inside pages is likely to be determined mainly by the exigencies of fitting a definite amount of type into a given space. A minor story may be placed on page 14 instead of page 12 because it fits there, in a typographical sense.

On some large newspapers, there is an attempt to arrange the news in the paper according to subject matter. Thus, the New York Times usually associates with its major stories on Washington developments, for instance, such other minor Washington news as may be printed; the same with news from London and Berlin; with news from the Orient. Within this quasi-departmentalization of the news, however, the principles of play still apply. For an afternoon newspaper with a smaller staff, the mechanical difficulties of such a combination of play and departmentalization would be almost insuperable.

Fitting the day's reams of news copy into this hierarchy of "news value," on an hour-to-hour basis, implies a continuing series of rapid judgments on matters of great moment. The judgments must go even farther. Since the output of a metropolitan news machine is always far greater than the day's advertising will warrant publishing (or the readers read), someone must decide what to throw away, what to cut down, what to let run at some length.

The dispatch with which hundreds of items clamoring for attention are woven into a pattern and prepared for quick delivery to the reader is certainly one of the most amazing aspects of newspaper practise. To an outsider, it must seem an unnerving process to pick from the day's events at home, around the country and abroad a neatly-scaled selection of those things which are the news.

While the executive function of arraying the news in a scale of importance lodges in a small group of newspapermen—sometimes, for all practical purposes, in a single person—every worker in the editorial department of a newspaper is conditioned by the idea of "play."

The reporter "writes for the play." The re-write man angles his lead paragraph "to get the play." The copy reader checks

the story to see that the main news fact is played up in the first paragraph, writes a headline to stress the news value of the story. In hurried conferences during the day, desk editors argue over whether a new development will "take the play away" from the story which has been featured in the first edition.

"Play" becomes the ultimate measure of news value. It is the final answer to the question: What is news? While the grand insult of newspapermen is to say "he doesn't know a story when it comes up and bites him;" while any newspaperman will tell you quickly whether a given fact is news, few have any clearly-defined concept of what factors govern news judgment.

Various writers have sought to define the elements of news in maxims—"when a man bites a dog, that's news," and "the best news is a good fight"—and in categories of human interest—money, love, humor, the unusual, etc. Dozens of definitions have been attempted; and probably no one has come closer to a fool-proof definition than this: "News is anything published in a newspaper which interests a large number of people."

Like the politician and the preacher, the newspaperman carries in his head a rough picture of "the public." It is this public to which the news is directed. It is usually a conglomerate public—rich and poor, men, women and children, Old Americans and immigrants, farmers and factory hands and white collar workers. The story must be written to the non-technical level of the John Q. Citizen, reading his paper over his morning coffee, on the jostling subway, or in an arm chair at the end of a harrying day. No wonder a wise press service executive in Washington kept reminding his men: "Write for the milkman in Omaha."

Because the newspaper is produced for "the public," another factor enters into play. It is not sufficient to judge the day's events in order of importance and interest. The newspaper's content must be "balanced;" the offerings must be varied. Thus, at a time when the news is heavy with catastrophic events of fearful import, a news executive may call on his men to keep a lookout for lighter items to brighten up the page. Newspapers of general circulation are mindful of the need for keeping the front-page fare varied. Rarely will a news executive allow his front page to be completely dominated by foreign news or by news of local politics or by any other single interest. Most executives strive to scatter "human interest copy"—humorous anecdotes, news of personalities,

freaks and oddities—through the paper as spice for the raw meat of important events.

Some executives attempt in various ways to check statistically on the day-to-day contents of their newspapers, by counting the number of items devoted to various broad categories of news, or by measuring the column-inches of "local," "state," "national," and "foreign." This is always done in retrospect, as a post-mortem. While the content of most magazines is cut to a rigid formula of reader interest, I have never heard of a newspaper laying out such a formula of space-relationships to govern 'play.' To any newspaperman, such a suggestion would seem absurd.

It is apparent, I think, that "news" is not a scientific term, even in the limited sense that "health" might be in medicine or "legal" in the law. It is apparent that news judgment—play—is not a scientific process even in the limited sense that a doctor's diagnosis or a lawyer's brief might be called scientific. There is no organized body of principle which will explain the varied play of news in such successful organs as the New York Times, The Chicago Tribune, The Cincinnati Enquirer, The Daily Mirror and the Washington Evening Star. Certainly, no reporter or editor ever applied any set of principles, in a conscious way, to decide whether a given set of facts constituted "news."

The play of news varies from newspaper to newspaper, and from month to month on the same newspaper. It seems to be a compound of the newspaper's own tradition, the composition of the particular public to which the newspaper is addressed, certain general principles of human psychology, "hunches" and a kind of directed intuition developed within the craft.

There are "big stories" which "would be news in anybody's paper." There is a continuity of practise on each newspaper which any good newspaperman will grasp quickly. And there are stories that are "made" because of an editor's hunch or a reporter's curiosity.

Reviews--

The Moral Climate of the Press

Freedom of the Press—by Wm. E. Hocking. U. of Chicago Press. \$3.

by Donald Grant

Harvard's Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, William Ernest Hocking, has written his own comment, in book form, expanding the report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press. In "Freedom of the Press," published by the University of Chicago Press, he is attempting to state a framework of principle in an effort to improve the quality of American newspapers (and incidentally, it appears, of American films and radio).

What he seems to be saying, in effect, is that the people who own, edit and write for newspapers must find their consciences, at their own peril. Freedom from restraint by exterior forces, even if it perfectly existed—which it does not—is not enough. Newspapers can remain free only if they perform their necessary tasks. Otherwise, "Government remains the residuary legatee of responsibility for an adequate press performance. It is bound to consider whether self-administered standards and the normal self-righting elements within community life are sufficient to meet the public interest and and eliminate emerging abuses. If they are not sufficient, government action may be indicated. . ."

Such action may take several forms. Pro-

fessor Hocking is not writing legislation, but quite properly stating generalities. The state, he says, "without intruding on press activities . . . may regulate the conditions under which those activities take place . . . The state may extend the scope of present legal remedies, if a given type of abuse amounts to 'poisoning the wells of public opinion' . . . The state may itself enter the field of news supply, not to compete with or to displace, but to supplement the yield of private agencies . . . The state may make a strictly limited use of censorship . . ."

How is it possible that the "freedom of the press" can thus be challenged? Since a philosopher is speaking we are bound to listen to a philosophical statement. "The answer is that . . . fundamental human rights can be regarded as unconditional only if we refrain from giving reasons for them (as by calling them self-evident or axiomatic). If we give reasons for them—and there are reasons for our belief in them—those reasons state the condition on which the right is claimed. For if the facts proposed in the given reason are not present in any case, the ground for the claim in that case vanishes. This point is so obvious that it has generally escaped attention."

There is very little innocence in this statement. If, for instance, we say that the press should be free to perform its moral duty of enlightening the public mind (and what publisher would fail to

make such a claim?) then, "if the claimant ignores or rejects his nonpolitical duty—as by using his liberty to disseminate falsehood, or to propagate for financial inducement views as his own which are not his own, or to distort for fees the true proportion of things (the essence of the perverse type of propoganda and 'publicity')—the ground for his claim disappears . . . in the absence of accepted moral duties there are no moral rights. Hence, as addressed to society, there are no unconditional rights."

Professor Hocking, here, is implementing the general conclusion of the Commission that the free press is imperiled by its own abuses. The premise that the abuses exist needs to be proven, but should not require any lengthy documentation at this point. Hocking feels particularly revolted by the shocking bad taste of some sections of the press, a familiar and certainly justified complaint.

"If I were personally to challenge one product of an uncontrolled liberty more than another," he says, "it would not be the liberty to confuse public debate, nor even the perverse liberty to breed rancor in the world by maligning an ally or spreading international falsehood; it would be the liberty to degrade, and especially to degrade the arts, which are man's own religion of self-evaluation. I confess I am angry with the defilers of this religion, and still more angry when they bleat 'freedom of the press' to cover their trea-

Donald Grant was appointed to a Nieman Fellowship in 1941 from the staff of the Des Moines Register and Tribune. Later he was a war correspondent for Look Magazine and is now on the news staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

sons . . . It seems fair to suggest . . . that if we reject the aid of the state as an incompetent in these matters we would seem bound to recognize of this common good we call culture, that it is at once particularly precious and particularly defenseless against wanton assault by the more brutal individual impulses which still claim freedom, and that if we fight off the state, we must see our way to some other effective community protection of that common good and to its active promotion."

By now the general drift of Professor Hocking's comment should be fairly clear, although no attempt has been made to summarize his argument completely. The book itself is well worth reading, if only for its incidental speculations. If these sometimes seem obscure, one cannot chide a philosopher for splitting hairs, for the making of distinctions is as much his business as the statement of principles.

Nor, perhaps, is it an indictment to say that Hocking has not solved all of the problems he has raised. The press, he says for instance, "is ex officio judge of the system in which it is enmeshed; it is inescapably enmeshed in the system which it is bound to judge. . ." Any amateur Marxian can follow this argument so far.

Hocking, however, specifically rejects the Marxian conclusion that newspapers are the prisoners of their economic self-interest. The sins of our editors cannot so pleasantly be excused. "If . . . an editor remains mentally in chains . . . it is his free choice and his bad conscience." Hocking moves on to state that "The press is capable of more adequate self-regulation." He believes that the press "needs perhaps chiefly to have pointed out to it how fundamental its work is."

Does Professor Hocking really think this? Editors and publishers and reporters know full well how important a job they are doing; they are familiar with most if not all of the criticisms Hocking has leveled. The question, rather, is how to make a bad conscience good.

In the early part of the book Hocking sidles up to this question—a philosophical nut which we should well enjoy watching the good professor crack—then ambles off into a footnote. "Civilizations," he says in the main body of his text, "are built, not haphazard, (but) by all cumulative insights which, like those of science, enter a pattern; civilization itself is the honor paid

by free individuals to the standards which define truth and excellence . . . it is these standards which unite men . . . Such objects are the standard of right thinking, the requirement of justice, the firm code of an honest beauty. Without these the very talents of civilization unbuild civilization."

After a footnote in which he allows one of his colleagues on the Commission to raise a question, Hocking replies by stating that civilization is possible only when men have "a common object of thought and regard," meaning, he says, "a common object of devotion . . . worshipping the same god—as still, in substance, they must, in precisely the sense that scientists can meet only by worshipping the same god of truth."

We seem, at last, not only, to have a moral question on our hands, but to have identified the source of human conscience as religion, however reluctant modern man is to pronounce the word. Despite the fashions of liberalism, Professor Hocking can make a very good case for this view. What are the alternatives? Marx, obviously—or Machievelli. Men publish newspapers, if not for moral aims, to get rich or to pursue power, or for both reasons. Lesser newspapermen, leaving morality out of it, work for wages, for the incidental satisfactions of keeping busy, and for little more. The product of such motives, even

Boston Globe Did Print Hutchins Report Story

I owe the Boston Globe a correction and apology for the statement in my article in Nieman Reports for July that the Globe was one of the papers that carried no news on the Report of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. The Evening Globe of March 27 carried a report of 16 inches length, an adequate story. The Report was released for morning papers of March 27 and my search was unhappily limited to that issue in papers having morning editions, as the Globe has. It was still news in Boston the evening after its release, when the Globe carried it. Walter Lippman's column, which was on the report, was also carried in the Globe, as I had stated.

Louis M. Lyons

given a good deal of technical competence on the part of the manufacturers of news reports and opinions, can be no better than, the Chicago Tribune.

The Tribune, in fact, exists. But so does the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Can we follow Professor Hocking's argument to its pragmatic conclusion and identify the difference between the Tribune and the Post-Dispatch as a moral difference?

I think we can. There is no difference, except a moral difference, in the operation of Marxian economic determination. There is no impediment, except a moral impediment, to the desire for the irresponsible exercise of power. In concrete, a great many practical editorial judgments both in the news room and in the editorial offices of the Post-Dispatch are moral decisions. The Post-Dispatch platform, as stated by the late Joseph Pulitzer, is a statement of moral values, still operative for that newspaper.

But if editors are creatures of their own consciences and not of their economic self-interest or their raw will to power, we still have to determine how the press conscience is to be bettered. After all of Hocking's discussion that problem remains pretty much unsolved.

If there are today too many "bad" newspapers and too few "good" newspapers, that fact would seem to be an indictment of the moral climate which has produced the current crop of publishers, editors and writers. There can be little doubt that Professor Hocking has considered this.

In fact, he seems to be seeking in the newspapers themselves a lever for elevating the moral climate of our times. To that end his whole book, and much of the report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, can be read as an exhortation and a lash.

When the Cleveland Press asked its readers for suggestions on running the paper, the heaviest vote to get rid of a writer was 77 letters against Westbrook Pegler. He also had the highest favorable vote, 25 letters. Best score was Tom Stokes' with 20 letters for him to one against. Seventy-one wanted less crime news, four wanted more. Thirty-six wanted more pictures, 10 less. Forty-three wanted more printed for children, and they didn't mean comics. Fifty-three criticized the comics, mostly saying they aren't funny.

Complaints and Otherwise

MOUTHPIECE ONLY

Reuben Maury Defines Editorial Writing

Reference is made to the following unsigned statements on page 20 of your July, 1947, issue:

CBS announced a series "CBS Views the Press" . . . by Don Hollenbeck. . . Returning to the air for his second critical review June 7, Hollenbeck picked up the New Yorker's profile on Reuben Maury, editorial writer of the New York Daily News and also of Collier's. Hollenbeck made the most of the deadly parallels that John Bainbridge had exploited in his profile, showing Mr. Maury writing out of one side of his mouth in the Daily News and the other side in Collier's.

"In the News, he's against feeding Europe; in Collier's he's for it. In Collier's he's been an internationalist; in the News, an isolationist."

I will defend with my life anybody's right to say or print that he or she is jealous of middling successful professional writing gents who started from scratch.

But I won't defend anybody's right to distort facts knowingly, because I doubt that there is such a right.

The fact pertinent to the passage quoted above (as was made clear by both Messrs. Bainbridge and Hollenbeck) is that when a hired editorial writer is writing editorials he is not writing out of either side of his mouth or out of the middle or any other part of it.

He is acting as mouthpiece(s) for the publication(s) for which he works. His job is to express the publications' policies with all the force and skill he can summon up, and without regard to his private opinions.

There is nothing "deadly" about all this. No editorial writer owes any apologies for it to anybody. It is merely a phase of the editorial writing job.

Talking out of my own mouth in the present document, I will say that if the person who wrote the remarks above quoted is a newspaperman, either he chooses words too carelessly or he is surprisingly ignorant of the facts of life in his own business or he was a deliberate liar in this instance.

If he isn't a newspaperman, why is he permitted to discuss technical aspects of newspapers in a sort of newspaper trade journal?

Whoever he is, you, by printing this distortion of facts, smeared me, and, by implication, all other honest editorial writers.

I resent it; will sue if you keep it up and if I can prove damage; and do not herein waive any right to sue on the original smear in your July, 1947, issue.

Disrespectfully not yours,

Reuben Maury

The Lasseter Article

I have read the Nieman Reports with immense interest and enclose my subscription check. You are making a sizable contribution to better journalism.

I was particularly interested in the article by Robert Lasseter which strikes me as a more substantial critique of our freedom of the press than the report of the Hutchins Commission.

It is an unfortunate aspect of today's economy in America that newspaper monopolies must exist. The days when the elder James Gordon Bennett could establish the New York Herald with a capital of \$500 are past. The operation of a newspaper today is a complex business calling for the expenditure of thousands of dollars daily. It is unavoidable that monopolies will develop under an economy where competition is so costly. I see no way to correct the evils that occasionally occur under this system except by constant vigilance of the press itself.

As one who has for a number of years edited a newspaper which is a monopoly in our community, I am more conscious than the average editor of the difficulties attendant on responsible newspaper operation under such conditions. The job of public critic is not a happy one at best, and much less delightful when the editor-monopolist must bend over backward to be fair, to see that the other side gets adequate opportunity to express itself.

Some of Mr. Lasseter's suggestions go more deeply to the root of the evil than the Hutchins Commission. There is no doubt that good pay and good working conditions naturally beget a better product from better newspapermen. On the other hand, the suggestions made by Mr. Lasseter for a sharply controlled newspaper economy present immense problems.

It would be ideal to have only one newspaper in the hands of any one owner, and that owner a local citizen. Such a situation cannot be obtained without goring many corporate oxen. It is difficult to see how the large chains can be broken down without abolishing capitalism. I agree completely that no person controlling editorial policy should hold public office. But since most newspapers are corporate structures, it is difficult to devise a law or constitutional amendment which prevents newspaper ownership without insisting that all stocks and bonds be removed from public officeholders' hands. While the ideals of Mr. Lasseter will meet agreement from most editors, they propose a utopia which appears beyond the reach of capitalistic democracy. And the other kind of "democracy" offers an infinitely worse press.

The biggest difficulty is the fact that some publishers confuse freedom of the press with freedom to do as they please. Nevertheless, most efforts to define and control freedom of the press have the inherent possibility of so weighting the press with regulations that there will result a limitation on freedom of expression. Not being a wonder worker, I can offer no panacea. Such discussions as are created by the Hutchins Report and Mr. Lasseter's article, however, keep alive an interest in freedom of expression as a major tenet of democratic faith. One of the strongest safeguards of a free press is lively and continued discussion of the faults of American newspapers.

Faithfully yours,

James Kerney

Editor Trenton Times

I thought the piece on the freedom of the press problem by Lasseter in your last issue was the finest thing I have read on the subject, comprehensive and calm and right to the point, and he said it all, and in fewer words, than the Hutchins report, and I thought said it much better. I have recommended it among my friends and acquaintances.

Also thank you for the comment there on my shirt piece.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Stokes

Washington, D. C.

I want to compliment you on "Nieman Reports."

I have taken out a subscription down here and am passing it around to our entire staff.

Sincerely,

Nelson Poynter,

editor

St. Petersburg Times, Fla.

NOTES

Robert C. Miller who went direct from his Nieman fellowship in May to a roving assignment abroad for United Press, writes that the first war a correspondent has to fight in Greece is for permission from an interlocking bureaucracy to go looking for your war. What Miller calls "Operation Bird Dog" requires a fast talking Greek friend to out-argue a multiple officialdom for the necessary papers.

The August 16th issue of Saturday Evening Post found two Nieman Fellows as authors on opposite pages, A. B. Guthrie, Jr. (1945) with a story, "Mountain Medicine"; and Herbert Yahraes (1944) with an article, "Wood Detective."

Fortune for August studied Paducah, Ky. as a "One Newspaper Town." The paper, the Paducah Sun-Democrat, published by Edwin J. Paxton and his son, Edwin Jr., comes off very well in the article. Edwin Jr., a Nieman Fellow in 1938-39, runs the paper's radio station, WKYB which has competition. Fortune says, "Ed Paxton believes with his father that a competing paper would improve the Sun-Democrat but it would take a million dollars to start one." An advertiser is quoted as saying, "We'd rather have one good paper than two poor ones."

Harry S. Ashmore, a Nieman Fellow in 1941-2, left the editorship of the Charlotte (NC) News in August to become editor of the Arkansas Gazette.

Succeeding Harry Ashmore as editor of the Charlotte News is William M. Reddig, 47, feature editor of the Kansas City Star, one time reporter on the Baltimore Sun.

Carl Sandburg returned to reporting for the opening of the new Lincoln material in Washington and turned in a superb job. About reporting, he said: "I long ago learned not to try to be smart."

WHAT DO YOU MEAN RESPONSIBLE

"A peculiarly persistent avoidance of the word, Responsibility," was noted in the press reaction to the Hutchins Report as reviewed in the last issue of this quarterly. That was particularly marked because the key to the report, and its title, was the imperative importance that the press be responsible. With certain distinguished exceptions the attitude of the press in general seemed to be that this notion was wholly extraneous and none of the commission's business anyway.

What about responsibility in a newspaper? How do you measure it? Certainly one rough and ready index is the attitude of the paper toward criticism and correction of its reports and editorials. Twenty years ago an indelible impression was registered with this reporter by the comment of an eminent public official concerning two newspapers, published within 100 miles of Boston. One he described as "a responsible newspaper" and the other he declared was not. He was looking at the letter columns and noted how one had proved hospitable to dissents that had come in to a published statement on a controversial issue and one had not.

Considering the highly impersonal nature of the processing of news and the obvious chances for error in the time and space limitations in journalism, it is curious that so many newspapers are so highly sensitive to any letters that correct their reports, and so generally evade publishing corrections. Why should not an editor feel about the published record precisely as a scientist does: that this appears to be the fact as of our present knowledge, subject to correction or amplification as further information becomes available.

How exceptional that attitude is any newspaper reader knows. It makes newsworthy two exceptions that come to hand.

1 The Seattle Star in a front page story June 23 reported a fire in which two children, aged three and seven, escaped by jumping from a window. The paper's story included the statement "Fire department officials said the parents were not at home. . . . an unidentified man was supposed to be taking care of the children but they were alone."

Next day, June 24, on the front page

under a headline of equal size to that given the fire, the Seattle Star stated "The fire department was in error when it reported yesterday that Karin and Richard Abbot were alone when fire swept the family home. . . . Caring for them was Herbert Abbot, brother of the children's father who fought the blaze with fire extinguishers before the fire department arrived . . ."

The Star went to the limits of its typography to correct the error as promptly and conspicuously as it printed the story of the fire. What did it lose to balance against this public evidence of fair intent?

2 The New York Times on July 2d gave more than a half column to a denunciation by Col. William R. Hodgson, Australian delegate to UN, of reports that had appeared in the Times and Herald Tribune on June 20. The Times did not flinch from the invective of which Col. Hodgson is master. Their story began: "Press coverage of atomic affairs was criticized today by Col. William Hodgson of Australia who said that the majority of newspapermen were incapable of giving a fair and faithful report of a meeting . . . The basis for the Australian's comments was a statement by Prof. Dmitri Skowelsky of Russia that an article in the New York Times of June 20 and a headline in the New York Herald Tribune of the same date had misrepresented a new approach to atomic control presented by five delegates. . . . He declared that he was not accusing anybody and that as a matter of fact the committee itself sometimes did not know what it was talking about. Col. Hodgson was a good deal sharper and pointed out that he had favored opening the meetings to the press. Open or closed, he said, it was apparently almost impossible to get a fair and faithful account in the press. But if the meetings were open, he said, the responsibility would belong entirely to the press."

One doesn't have to be a psychologist to make a guess that readers will be more apt to accept the accuracy of the Times' reports after seeing them give a belligerent critic his exasperated say. The Times figured that what Hodgson said was news, whether he was lambasting the Times or somebody else. Why not?

LML