Nieman Reports

October, 1950

The Business of Informing the Public

Frank J. Starzel

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, elected by former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession. Nine out of ten subscribers to Nieman Reports and very many of its contributors are not themselves former Nieman Fellows but share a belief in the purpose of the Nieman Foundation "to promote and elevate st andards of journalism in the U. S."

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: John McL. Clark, Claremont, N. H.; Paul L. Evans, Mitchell, S. D.; Lawrence A. Fernsworth, New York City; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John L. Hulteng, Providence, R. I.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Robert Lasch, St. Louis, Mo.; Justin G. McCarthy, Washington, D. C.; William J. Miller, New York City; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Lawrence G. Weiss, Cambridge, Mass.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription $2 a year. Entered as second-class matter December 31, 1947, at the post office at Boston, Massachusetts, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. IV, NO. 3 OCTOBER, 1950

Richard E. Lauterbach

June 18, 1914 — Sept. 20, 1950

Death struck suddenly to take Richard E. Lauterbach September twentieth, just a few days after he was stricken with poliomyelitis. He was thirty-six. His wife, Elizabeth Wardwell (Tina) Lauterbach is left with three young children—David, Jennifer and Ann, at their home, 142 East Eighteenth Street, New York. Few deaths have brought such a sharp sense of shock to so large a circle. The Campbell funeral church at Eighty-first and Madison, New York, overflowed with friends and associates of his crowded journalistic career as John Hersey spoke at the memorial service of the qualities that made Dick Lauterbach so distinguished and so well loved.

He was born in New York City, only son of Mr. and Mrs. Morton E. Lauterbach, now of California. He was an honor student at Dartmouth College, class of 1936, editor of the Lantern and Phi Beta Kappa. He started writing immediately after college and by 1941 was an editor of *Life* magazine. He served the Luce publications until 1947 with superb and versatile talent, as war correspondent in the Middle East, as bureau chief in Moscow, as foreign editor and then roving editor in the Far East. Out of the years of war correspondence came his two books on Russia: *These are the Russians* and *Through Russia's Back Door.*

In 1946 he won a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard to study in the China regional program. His book, *Danger from the East* was a product of that fellowship. The editorial board of the short-lived Magazine of the Year, which started as " '47" persuaded him to take over its editorship in 1948. When Joseph Barnes became editor of the New York *Star* he secured Dick Lauterbach as feature editor. With the end of the *Star,* Dick returned to his earlier free lance writing to tackle many magazine assignments that sought him and to lecture widely. But he had begun on another book this past year, a biography of Charles Chaplin. A man of brilliant imagination and versatile literary capacity, Lauterbach applied his talented energy to many enterprises, as writer, editor, lecturer, in education (as trustee of the Downtown Community School) in politics, (as executive director of the Young Voters of the Democratic Party in 1948), as a director of the China Aid Council and on the Council of the Authors Guild.

In all these groups and others he was welcome for the fertility of his ideas and for his sane counsel and for the high gay confidence which he brought to every task and was enlivening and inspiriting to all his associates. John Hersey spoke of his qualities of courage and integrity, of humor and hard work. He had also that great quality of awareness and of interest in people and ideas that made him great in friendship and made him the livest as well as the liveliest member of a group. So he leaves a greatly felt void among a host who hold him in affectionate memory.

"Back Numbers"

"Special Issue" is still available.

The Special Issue of Nieman Reports for April, "Reading, Writing and Newspapers," has gone into its third printing. More than 40 schools or departments of journalism have obtained copies for class use and more than 50 newspapers have ordered a supply for staff distribution. Associated Newspapers Ltd. of Australia obtained permission to reprint it in Australia for staff use.

A limited supply has been held for Fall class use of journalism courses or for newspapers. So long as the supply lasts, it will be mailed for 50 cents a single copy, 30 cents a copy in orders of ten or more.

Other back numbers are available in quite limited supply for the issues of 1949 and 1950 except that October, 1949, is out of print. No issues are available back of Jan., 1949. Single copies of back numbers will be mailed for 50 cents a copy. Issues in stock are January, April, July of 1949 and January, April, July of 1950.

Best in the World

The American daily press is, since the moral collapse of so many of the British penny papers, the best in the world. Unfortunately, it is not really as good as its owners and operators believe it to be. And it is not improving. Nor is it likely to improve as long as the present mood of mutual congratulation obscures the need for self-examination. Plenty of stirring speeches are made at banquets, where the freedom of expression in the United States is extolled and compared with its absence behind the iron curtain. But such speeches are unnecessary. Nobody denies that even the Hearst press is preferable to *Pravda* and any comparisons should be drawn with some higher standard.

—*The Economist,* Dec. 31, 1949

THE BUSINESS OF INFORMING THE PUBLIC

by Frank J. Starzel

Frank J. Starzel, new general manager of the Associated Press, discussed "the business of informing the public" before the last Idaho-Utah Associated Press members' meeting. As his first major public address as operating head of AP, the full text was put out on the AP log.

Some years ago I was present at the conclusion of a long and tedious hearing in a state legislative committee on a piece of particularly dull legislation. The record had been closed when up stepped a perennial witness and asked to be heard.

"Give me one minute and I'll tell you all I know about this bill," he told the chairman, who responded: "We'll give you two minutes and you can tell us everything you know about everything."

I am somewhat at a loss whether I should take the one-minute or the two-minute deal. If I take more minutes than you think the subject justitifies, I can only plead the extenuating circumstance that it is of vital importance to all of us.

I want to discuss the business of informing the public, basically providing for the human mind, furnishing the facts upon which the public will reach conclusions, and giving information essential to the functioning of democracy.

Providing information is our specialized business and means of livelihood. It is in a broader sense essentially everyone's business and of the greatest consequence to everybody. The channels of information flow side-by-side with all forms of progress.

This rich Inland Empire was built and is being expanded on a philosophy of which a free flow of information is an integral part. The pioneers who established your commercial and social foundations came here unhindered by nationalistic barriers at state lines. Natural resources were developed, manufacturing and agriculture prospered, and your population grew because here was opportunity unimpeded by artificialities. Each city, region, section and state worked and traded with the others to achieve a broad and prosperous development.

The difference between an empire and a province is basically a state of mind. An empire—and I use the term not in its political sense—is welded together into an economic and social unit by a broad outlook. A province—as the world implies—has a short-range. short-distance view that rarely extends beyond its borders.

There developed here an empire in the broader sense, because its people enjoy complete freedom to do business, complete freedom to travel, complete freedom to worship, and complete freedom to think, speak and write from their own point of view .

It is axiomatic, however, that commerce follows information. Examine the development of Britain's once far-flung empire and you will inevitably find that it grew by its lines of communications. In their era of development, the British showed great foresight in sending their communications facilities ahead of their commercial forces. First sailing vessels and later mechanically propelled ships provided the link.

When wireless telegraphy came into being, the sputtering dots-and-dashes became the vehicle for progress. To this day, the best communications lines for virtually the entire eastern hemisphere emanate to and from London. The genius of our country was able to achieve a fairly dominant communications position in respect to South America and the eastern fringes of Asia, but London remains the communications hub for the rest of the world.

Over these lines of communications flowed information to cause men and women to seek their future in distant lands. It did more than that. Information about people, about science, about new discoveries, concerning markets and prices, concerning concepts of government, morals and life —this information is the raw material which spawns a unity of the people in very great nation.

This was particularly true in our own country where we were building a nation physically with tremendous speed. Information freely provided was the instrument that brought the spiritual unity which really makes a nation out of a collection of individuals. Consider for a moment the possibilities inherent in the development of this country. We have 48 sub-divisions which we call states. These commonwealths have jealously-guarded functions and prerogatives, but impose no substantial barrier to national unity. Would it not have been possible to create 100 such or 200 or 25 or 50 and have each of these become a principality or province sufficient unto itself and cut off from

the others except as intercourse was grudgingly tolerated?

Through our less than 200 years of existence as a nation, we have witnessed a somewhat continuing dispute over the balance of power between our governmental units, but only once did it erupt into a temporary schism. Unity was quickly re-established.

The rest of the world frequently expresses its amazement and wonderment over our achievements that are visible to the eye. But only occasionally is expression given to the realization of a greater although intangible achievement—namely, the spiritual national unity of as diverse and heterogeneous a population that ever lived together in peace and prosperity.

Americans are essentially no different from other men and women. Why then can some 150 million of us overcome the age-old barriers of race, class, color, religion and economic status to live and work in unity? It would be presumptuous to take the whole credit for our system of public information. But I submit that it is not coincidence that the American people are the best informed in the world as to their nation, their government, their neighbors, at home and abroad.

Even if we were to forget entirely the lessons of the past, it would still be evident that the future in large measure depends on the adequacy of our information about the affairs of the world. This nation and all other nations face great decisions. Some of these might easily involve the question of whether what has been achieved here will actually endure.

It is not to be taken for granted that, because we generally have been fortunate as a people in making the right decisions through the democratic process, we will always be equally fortunate in the future. The decisions are becoming more difficult and fraught with greater significance. We have emerged victorious from the struggle against nature. We have solved some problems of production, distribution and economics. We have reached the heights in science and medicine. We have made progress in sociological matters—and so on.

But the problems are becoming more complex. There was a time when actions alone needed to be considered. Today we must beware of their reactions. We cannot be unmindful that our economic, political and social lives have come to depend upon checks and balances. Disturbing one can have far-reaching effects on others. Public questions are no longer debated just pro and con. Scores upon scores of corollary considerations are consistently being injected into the discussion, some because of a genuine desire by their proponents to shed light on the merits of the case. But others are brought into the arena by advocates more interested in indirect reaction or confusion.

It cannot be taken for granted either that the flow of factual, honest, truthful information cannot be stemmed in this country or elsewhere where it exists. Of course, no one will seriously confront us with a demand that free speech and the free press be openly curtailed. Quite to the contrary every such effort is always clothed in the trappings of more and better freedom for the people.

The western democracies know that no freedom of information whatever exists in Russia or in the Soviet's satellites. Yet the Kremlin aacknowledges no such condition. Its agents never hesitate to denounce the western press as being servile to Wall Street and reactionary interests. The Communist view is that the agencies of information—newspapers, magazines, radio and even handbills—must be controlled by the state because only through such state control can they serve the interests of the people.

There is more to this than a perversion of words. We must recognize that it reflects a difference in the philosophy of government. We assume that government exists solely for the benefit of the governed. The Soviet theory is based on the assumption that the individual exists solely for the benefit of the state.

It isn't enough to say "I want no part of the Soviet theory." Surely no one will seriously propose that we adopt it. But bear in mind that many countries now under the heel of the Soviet actually once had governments such as our own.

I want at this point to emphasize my awareness that news gatherers and distributors are not infallible. We make mistakes and we fall on our faces as individuals and even as organizations. All I would claim is that the system evolved in this country is the best anyone has ever been able to devise. It amounts to this: everyone has the privilege to write, print or broadcast whatever he pleases, subject only to the laws governing slander, libel or offenses against decency. This license is broad enough to permit the presentation of every point of view, reasonable or otherwise. Above all else, the system is beyond the control of any individual, organization, political party or government.

I would like to consider briefly some of the manifest threats against the continuation of this system. Please never assume that this freedom of information is pleasing to all people, even to those who at the drop of a hatband will make speeches about preserving the people's liberties. It is the plain unadulterated fact that, more often than not, honest, truthful reporting on controversial subjects is a bitter pill for the principals involved.

Truth can be a sharp barb. Facts often are cruel. Honest reporting may influence people but it doesn't uniformly win friends. Public figures frequently find it distasteful. This aversion to seeing or hearing the cold, hard facts exposed for all to observe isn't limited to the individuals involved. We are a nation of hero worshippers—individuals

or groups of heroes. We innately dislike having our heroes crumble even a little bit. Some people may revel in the discomfiture of someone they dislike, but become wrathful when it happens to a friend.

The question is whether as a people we want to swallow the occasional bitter pill of "bad news" to preserve a keystone of our system of life. I suspect there are those—and more of them than I would like—who would prefer a more pollyanna-ish presentation of the facts of life. They would have newsmen minimize a crime wave on the exploded theory that crime begets crime instead of focusing public attention on the failure of constituted authority to curb lawlessness. This element in our population would have the media of information concentrate on pleasant facts and disregard the unpleasant.

We have been hearing for some months that world tensions are intensified because press and radio report what is called the areas of disagreement instead of concentrating on the areas of agreement. Certainly no one disputes that the nations of the world are not constantly at each other's throats; they do in fact find matters on which they agree. Such agreements are duly reported by responsible newsmen, but it would be the sheerest folly for the media of public information to subordinate the larger issues of violent disagreement and controversy from which another holocaust of war might erupt. Any such misrepresentation would be akin to reporting that the fire department had extinguished a grass blaze on a city's outskirts but failing to mention that the business district is being destroyed by an unchecked fire.

A United Nations Subcommission on Freedom of Information and of the Press met recently at Montevideo, Uruguay, to draft a code of ethics for news correspondents. The proposed code will be placed before the UN Economic and Social Council next month. The American, British and Filipino delegates opposed the draft of the code in virtually every detail, but were always outvoted. This is an interesting manifestation of a trend which might have serious consequences.

No one could seriously disagree with the apparent meaning of the proposed code. It could be described as a collection of pious platitudes, but it also could be the entering wedge by which governments gain control of public information. Words hinge on interpretations, and we Americans have never believed a government bureau, functionary or official, could be entrusted with power to vitiate indirectly a constitutional guarantee. Just as the Russians profess having a completely free press, they would find it simple enough to interpret the proposed code to suit their own propaganda purposes. More important perhaps is how far our government would go in interpreting the code and taking action thereunder, should the United States adhere to the convention finally adopted in the UN.

Here is some language typical of what some government representatives propose for such documents: it is a provision to prohibit in effect the dissemination of "information which is likely to cause prejudice, mistrust, hatred or contempt for other peoples or states, or convey a false impression concerning their civilization or culture."

I am quite willing to agree to the principle of not causing "prejudice, mistrust, hatred or contempt" among peoples of the world, or not "conveying a false impression" concerning any phase of their life, economy or civilization. These are well-meaning and high-sounding words. Who can possibly object to them? Well, American citizens and all other freedom-loving people can and should object with all the vigor at their command. Please note there is not the slightest reference to the truth or falsity of the information. The language concerns itself solely with the effect of the information on others.

Consider the correspondent who wrote a strictly factual, honest, balanced account of intolerable conditions imposed by a dictatorial government upon the people of some country. Inevitably, publication of the expose would create contempt for the government of that country, especially if the government had been proclaiming to the world the marvelous conditions prevailing because of its benign autocracy.

Make no mistake and be not deluded. Fine-sounding phrases hide cunning and insidious intent. Whenever any government starts tampering with the free flow of information, it is time for the people to beware. The most sinister purposes can be and always are clothed in innocent or alluring phrases.

Criticism is healthy for individuals and institutions. In the news collecting and distributing business we criticize ourselves without limit or mercy, and I am convinced it improves our operation. The Associated Press membership representatives present have been here for two days for the sole purpose of telling us what's wrong with our service and exploring with us the ways and means of improving it.

It is only fair, however, to ask for credentials from him who elects to offer criticism, especially in a specialized or technical field. A layman might reasonably criticize nontechnical aspects of the medical professions. But when he undertakes to criticize the surgeon's technique in performing an appendectomy, he soon discloses that he doesn't know the difference between a scalpel and a suture, and is appropriately laughed out of the hall.

Some recent criticis of the mass information media have elected to confuse the trees and the forests. They might well ponder the old puzzle about the priority of the hen

over the egg or vice versa. They suggest that press and radio fail to discharge their responsibilities. Responsibility for what? For informing the public? No! Examine their thesis closely and you'll find the same old argument that public information media should be reporting constructive developments and not emphasizing the dismal and discouraging aspects of world and human affairs.

This is strictly the propagandist instead of the reporter. The Hitler philosophy on propaganda was simple and devastatingly effective—repeat a lie often enough and a lot of people will begin to believe. Another approach is to tell the people often enough that God's in His Heaven and all is well below, and our problems will automatically disappear. If someone comes up with a Utopian dream, it would be the duty of press and radio to spread the idea far and wide, but the reporter must never point out that it's a lot of hokum.

This particular group of critics doesn't stop at telling us what's wrong. They propose a remedy, somewhat vaguely, but nevertheless it has alarming implications. They propose some means of policing for the information media to force them to discharge their responsibilities. They don't specify who shall exercise this life-and-death power over public information. I suppose some of them would be willing to undertake the job—there are always people campaigning for the office of editor. What they really mean is governmental control through licensing power, and they also mean the end of a free press and free speech.

We have always prided ourselves as Americans on being tough and resilient. We can take shocks and blows, dig in and move forward. We aren't afraid to face the facts. We might prefer "good news," but we want to know whenever the news is "bad." We recognize that press and radio reflect what is happening in the world; they may influence events, but they never cause them.

If you want to live realistically and awake in a world as it really exists, then you want the right to know what is going on, exactly as it occurs and not as some supermind wants it to happen. If you prefer to live in a dream world, under the opiate of planned propaganda, then what we have today is not your dish. Before you decide on making the change, I suggest you put in a very large stock of whatever opiates you prefer, because you'll certainly need it for a long time thereafter to alleviate the pains and horrors of the life you're going to live.

Nieman Fellows

1950-51

Malcolm C. Bauer	Portland *Oregonian*	75 Garfield Street
Simeon S. Booker	Cleveland *Call-Post*	69 Dana Street
Bob Eddy	St. Paul *Pioneer Press*	10 Prescott Street
Roy M. Fisher	Chicago *Daily News*	Kirkland A-25
Edwin O. Guthman	Seattle *Times*	135 Oxford Street
Sylvan H. Meyer	Gainesville (Ga.) *Daily Times*	395 Broadway
Hugh Morris	Louisville *Courier-Journal*	10 Prescott Street
Hoke M. Norris	Winston-Salem *Journal*	12 Farwell Place
Dwight E. Sargent	Portland (Me.) *Press Herald*	Adams G-43
Dana Adams Schmidt	New York *Times*	2A Aberdeen Court
Angus MacLean Thuermer	AP, Chicago	124 Walker Street
Wellington Wales	Auburn (N.Y.) *Citizen-Advertiser*	Kirkland A-25

William J. Lederer, commander, U. S. Navy, on assignment to Harvard by the Navy, is associated with the Nieman program for this year. His address: 27 Dorset Rd., Belmont.

THE RIGHT TO NEWS

Only Constant Struggle Protects and Extends It

by J. Russell Wiggins

This discussion of the practical aspects of the exercise of press freedom is from an address by the managing editor of the Washington Post to the 33rd Annual Short Course at the University of Minnesota.

The press, and all the related agencies of communication, have a role in the world that will be changed only in degree by the actual outbreak of hostilities. The skill with which it discharges these responsibilities will fix the outcome of the cold war, influence the result of a hot war if one breaks out, shape the postwar period that follows when peace is regained. Methods of the press may be altered by the particular crisis that history imposes but its central purpose will remain the same. We can take up our tasks with the certainty and the confidence that whatever betides, our contribution will serve the purpose of our country and advance the cause of mankind.

Each of us has a dual role in society, as a professional newspaperman and as a citizen. The two roles we fill, of course, are not separable; but for the purposes of convenience it is appropriate to regard them separately.

I wish to speak first of our role as newspapermen in the professional positions we occupy. It is a role not unrelated to the world crisis, whatever our capacity on whatever media we serve. The most distinguishing attribute of the way of life we seek to preserve is the freedom of the individual; and of all the individual freedoms none is more indispensable to this way of life than the freedom of expression of which we are the custodians.

We have a solemn obligation to see that this freedom is not impaired. We have a professional duty to see that it is extended and enlarged. This freedom is a moral good in itself. But it is more than that. It is the freedom upon which all the other freedoms depend. No tyrant will successfully attack the other freedoms while freedom of speech remains unimpaired.

James Fenimore Cooper described opinion in America as "the lever by which all things are moved."

It still is true!

In discharging its daily duties to its public, the press provides what Woodrow Wilson called "the raw material of opinion." Without an uninterrupted flow of this "raw material" there can be no informed opinion in a democracy and without that informed opinion governments cannot function in response to the popular will, no matter what the form and structure of government.

A free speech and a free press are institutions with which we as a people are so familiar that it is often difficult for us to imagine how they might be put in jeopardy in this country. The comfortable assurance that they are forever secured to us springs in part from the normal tendency to accept things as they are as a part of an immutable order. And it springs in part from a too great reliance upon the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. That amendment is, to be sure, a sturdy bulwark.

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," it declares. And generations of judicial opinion have strengthened and broadened the basic guarantee, year by year. Alexander Hamilton was wrong when he argued against the First Amendment; but he was right when he stated that "whatever fine declarations may be inserted in any constitution respecting liberty of the press must altogether depend on public opinion, and on the general spirit of the people and the government."

Article 125 of the Soviet constitution provides: "* * * the citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics are guaranteed by law: a. Freedom of speech; b. Freedom of press; c. Freedom of assembly; d. Freedom of street processions and demonstrations." The fact that they do not enjoy any of these liberties suggests the frailty of constitutions generally, where the spirit of the government and the genius of the people do not operate in accord with announced principles.

Besides this contemporary example, there are a hundred others in history, that ought to warn us that the freedom of the press, more than it depends upon the statutes, depends upon the vigor with which it is asserted and the energy with which it is exercised by the press and all the agencies of communication that the term encompasses.

Another often overlooked aspect of our press freedom in this country is the fact that only one of the five freedoms essential to a democratic press is guaranteed in our fundamental law. That is the freedom from prior restraint.

The first of these essential freedoms is the right to get the news.

The second is the right to transmit the news without obstruction.

The third (and the only one mentioned in the Constitution) is the right to print the news without prior restraint.

The fourth is the right to print the news without penalties for wrongful publication disproportionate to the offense.

The fifth is the right to distribute the news.

A tyrant who wished to destroy the free press of the United States would be foolish to attack it at its strongest point—the point where the First Amendment puts up the sturdiest barriers to invasion. An effort to put a restraint on the press prior to publication, would alert the whole country to a tyrant's wicked intentions. We have been made sensitive on this point by the Constitution and by 150 years of judicial interpretation of the Constitution.

The right of the press to get the news is by no means as secure. Federal laws open up the proceedings of Congress to us. They protect our access to the Federal courts, under some circumstances. State constitutions, in many cases, require open proceedings generally, but only one state constitution keeps the legislature open by express provision. Many local ordinances in the country keep the doors of council chambers open to us. Our right of access to most news about government, however, is a right that depends primarily upon the vigor with which we assert it, the energy with which we exercise it, and the clamor we raise when we are denied access to the public's business. The executive departments of state and Federal governments frequently in our history have attempted to deny the press access to transactions invested with the greatest public interest.

It is often said in defense of secrecy in government transactions that there are stages in the transaction of the public business when privacy is essential to the accomplishment of the public business. This was the feeling of the founding fathers when they closed to the public and the press the doors of the constitutional convention. Newspapers have had to cope with this precedent ever since. I was gratified, the other day, to come across the opinion of one great American upon this decision. When informed of it, Jefferson said:

> "Nothing can justify this example but the innocence of their intentions; and their ignorance of the value of public discussion."

He was abundantly vindicated by the long and dangerous struggle to secure ratification, successfully accomplished only by the skill with which Madison and Hamilton made up for the initial error by the frank and illuminating expositions of *The Federalist.*

From the beginning, the country has been plagued by the inclination of the executive to keep from it details of its foreign policy. It is an inclination which the State Department is only today tardily escaping by a vigorous and forthright information policy. Even a president as wise as George Washington did not escape the temptation to conduct our foreign policy behind closed doors. Thanks to the American press of that day, this initial effort did not succeed. In 1794, Washington wished to prevent public discussion of the Jay Treaty, which he knew would have an unfavorable reception. The text of the Treaty was communicated (in spite of the express orders of the President) to the *Aurora,* which published it immediately and caused it to be reproduced everywhere. Adrienne Kock in her book on Madison and Jefferson describes this as the "first struggle between the executive and the press in America."

The press won, but the struggle continues. The example is one to which we ought to resort whenever honest officials out of good motive appeal to us to suppress news about public business. We ought to be sturdy enough to vindicate the faith of a weak colonial press that had courage enough to defy the express orders of the most beloved and most popular Chief Executive in American history.

The right to print the news, in spite of the plain guarantee of the Constitution, also had to be fought out early in American history, in the federal courts, and in the higher court of public opinion. The Alien and Sedition Laws were allowed to terminate upon their statutory expiration, after a turbulent period, only because American newspapermen dared defy them. deliberately incurred their barbarous penalties for critical publication, and courageously relied upon popular opinion to vindicate their course. There is a lesson for us in this period of our history, too. Not all the editors who incurred the wrath of the Adams administration were admirable characters. Those who defended them were familiar with their faults; but they did not allow these faults to obscure the principles involved. In our own time, we may have to invoke the same constitutional provisions in behalf of men we do not admire. We ought to be prepared to do so, whenever the occasion requires.

After 150 years these issues continue to arise between the press and the federal government. Even in peace-time, access to the business of the executive establishments is not always as complete as we might wish. There would be far less access to the public business if the press, by its own indifference, permitted officials to draw about the conduct of federal affairs the convenient cloak of secrecy. In times of war and near-war these problems are even more acute.

"Military security" is the argument for secrecy that is

most frequently encountered, most commonly invoked, and most difficult with which to cope. No patriotic newspaperman deliberately would jeopardize national defense to print a news story. There is, however, a strange paradox here: no part of the public business more vitally concerns and interests the people than facts about the measures devised to protect the country from external aggression; and no part of the public business is so largely conducted without their knowledge or information. The news about our atomic defenses is a case in point. Decisions in this whole area must be in the nature of compromises. Considerations of security must give way a little or the public will get no information at all; our right of access to the news must give way a little or the country will have no security at all. The basic decisions, it seems plain to me, ought to be made by an authority capable of considering both the need for security and the need for information. They ought not be made by people whose sole concern is military security.

There ought to be some agency in which military and civilian representatives are joined, to which the press can appeal when military decisions to withhold the facts seem unreasonable and arbitrary. Without such a tribunal we run the terrible risk that secrecy rules some day may be invoked to hide from the public a knowledge of the inadequacy of our military establishment.

It is not, I hasten to say, at the national level that the right to get the news is most frequently challenged. There is not an experienced editor here who has not been denied access to public transactions, in city council, county board, local courts, or legislatures.

Within the month, my own newspaper has had to deal with one police department effort to withhold news and two court attempts to bar access to the news. The whole area of law enforcement is one in which we must wage perpetual battle to maintain our right to get the news. Yet, there is no part of the public business in which this right to get the news ought to be more secure. Since the abolition of the court of the Star Chamber in England in 1641, it has been a well-established principle that criminal trials should be conducted in public, to defend the rights of the accused, to keep the court under the scrutiny of the people, and to invite the possibility that light might be shed upon a case by the public in attendance. In spite of this, the press frequently encounters efforts to exclude it from judicial proceedings.

In 1949, press and radio fought out this issue in Baltimore where the courts, under an administrative provision known as rule 9, held in contempt reporters venturing to relate to the public any of the details of a criminal case from the apprehension of the accused to his trial. The rule was overthrown. Had it been allowed to stand, this pernicious precedent might easily have been extended to other jurisdictions. At the very time of its overthrow, this was being advocated in legislation before the Maryland legislature.

In the past, newspapermen sometimes have acquiesced when judges have included the press, in exercising the right of the court to clear the court in certain cases. Last month, in the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, Judge Aubrey Fennel entertained the objections of newspapermen to this practice. He then ruled that where there has been a waiver by the defendant of the right to an open hearing, those parties, and only those parties, falling in four general categories have a right to remain in the court room during the progress of the trial.

"The first category is the party to the action and their counsel.

"The second category is the officers of the law.

"The third category embraces members of the Bar; and

"The fourth category embraces representatives of the press."

This is the ruling of a minor court; but it is a ruling to which enormous importance attaches. It is the kind of progress the press can make only by asserting its rights whenever and wherever challenged.

I have dealt with this case in some detail only because I think it illustrates the universality of our problem. Each of us is the custodian of the rights of the press within the area he serves. If any of us, by oversight, neglect, indifference, or cowardice, allows a local precedent adverse to the press, to be established without challenge, we create restraints on press freedom which some more enlightened, interested and courageous editor somewhere must remove.

Sometimes these precedents seem trivial. Sometimes the objections to them seem unreasonable. Sometimes the commotion we are required to raise in order to maintain press freedom seems disproportionate to the importance of the case involved. Let none of these considerations stay your hand. We have rights only because editors who have gone before us have asserted and exercised them; those who succeed us will enjoy only the rights that we assert and exercise.

Extreme penalties for publications that are wrongful or alleged to be wrongful can also cripple a free press. Newspapermen ought ever to be alert to the legislative or judicial imposition of unreasonable penalties for libel or contempt. The United States Supreme Court, in the Bridges case and in the Miami *Herald* case, has made it plain that the press cannot be held in contempt of court except for plain obstruction of justice.

There has been similar progress in the field of libel. Our gains in both these fields can be safeguarded best by scrupulous care not to permit the exercise of the right

of free speech to invade the right to a fair trial, and by a sense of responsibility for accuracy and fairness in the news.

Perhaps I have dwelt too long on these practical matters; but it is in the practical, day to day tasks of news gathering that the challenges to press freedom are encountered. And it is the response of individual editors to every such challenge that helps fix the real freedom the press enjoys. It is our conduct in gathering news about legislatures, councils, county boards, and courts that gives reality to the abstract principles and the fundamental guaranties of the Constitution.

We have duties here in which our private interests and the public's interest are happily the same. If we discharge them with credit, freedom of the press will be secure in the United States, the people will be informed, and democratic government will have the benefit of enlightened public opinion.

A Newspaperman's Impressions of P.R. Men

by Will Lindley
Business Editor, The Salt Lake Tribune

Dial a certain Salt Lake diaper laundry, tell them there's a new baby in your family and that you'd like to subscribe to their service, and you get action fast. Soon there's a knock on the door. You open it and say: "Wait a minute, I'll get the diapers."

"Oh, no," the pert young thing replies. "I'm not a route girl. I'm in charge of public relations "

Then she comes in, sits down for a short chat about the company's service, and tells you to call her any time you have questions. She says the route girl will be along shortly, and she departs.

That gives you an idea of just how widespread this public relations idea is getting to be.

They say that in the good old days many respectable citizens would not talk to a newspaper reporter. Today it seems that most everyone wants to. This has complicated the business of producing a newspaper considerably, because:

1. More people and organizations demand attention. Instead of choosing his sources and asking his questions, the reporter is sought out and badgered with "news" promotion schemes.

2. Cities are continuously increasing in size, and the number of clubs and organizations seems to keep increasing, too.

3. Newspapers continue to consolidate or discontinue publication.

Thus each newspaper has more events to cover, each reporter has more persons to contact (or to avoid) and the competition for space in papers becomes keen. It has become so keen, in fact, that some individuals and groups retain men whose chief job is to compete for that space—public relations men, they are called, though some more correctly could be termed "press relations men," as they apparently feel the most effortless way to influence the public is through the press.

Newspaper men see many of these gentlemen every day, and business news writers probably see more "professionals" than does the average reporter, i.e., they see more of those paid to do the job, as distinguished from those elected by some club or organization to handle public relations on a gratis basis.

These public relations men are good, bad and indifferent. Some are good newspapermen; it's a shame that more are not. The former group includes many graduates from the city rooms of newspapers. Some of them have left for a softer touch, some because they didn't seem to be getting ahead too rapidly in the newspaper business. But the chief attraction is the money. It is an irony of the newspaper business that many times a green reporter or one of average ability has to cope with a newsroom-graduate public relations man of better-than-average background and mental agility because P.R. work can pay the money to attract some of the best talent away from newspapers.

Then, too, qualifications for public relations work and newspapering are not the same in some important respects. A public relations man need not be a writer of good news copy—an unfortunate fact—but should be a good mixer. Yet there are newspapermen who aren't good at mixing with people, who don't make friends easily, but who are excellent reporters. There even are some brash newspapermen who enjoy "telling off" their news sources, yet they are good reporters nonetheless.

Many reporters look down on public relations. A newsman often cannot take a job in P.R. and retain the same degree of respect among his friends of the city room, though he still will be greeted smilingly at the bank. Thus many a good reporter who takes pride in his work and in the newspaper business will not venture into public relations. This leaves the field open, at least as far as some of the less remunerative positions are concerned, to men of average or indifferent ability as press contacts.

Furthermore, many employers of publicity men have had no news training. They may not know a good newspaperman when they see one.

Now are these P.R. men a help or hindrance to the press? Quite a bit of both, probably. Let's look at the bright side first:

Many public relations men do their employers and the press some good. Some spend a lot of time just keeping top executives public relations conscious. That awareness of the public can in itself be beneficial both to the press and its readers.

One type of press relations expert makes it his special business to furnish to the reporter all the background information he needs. That type of service is greatly appreciated.

Other organizations have P.R. men who process rapidly and accurately a large quantity of routine news matter, thus taking a load off the reporter. Sometimes these men are fast with the hot news, but often their caution increases in relation to the size of the story.

But there are other kinds of men (and women) in P.R. work.

Quite common is the obstructionist, who feels it his duty to shield the boss from the press. His attitude may stem from a belief that if reporters went directly to the front office regularly, he soon would be out of a job. He might be right, at that.

Another trial to the city desk is the public relations man without a news sense. He runs over constantly with reams of trivia about some insignificant development. But when something big breaks he either doesn't see the significance of it or is so slow to do so that a reporter has to come to him and start prodding for information.

Then there is the P.R. man who knows little of newspaper production problems, who pesters every day to see if that lengthy piece you agreed to run is going to be in the paper tomorrow, when a blind man could see you've been so short on space the last couple of days you'd have had to set the governor's obit in agate. This type of gentleman also likes to call you a few minutes before art deadline with a dandy idea for a picture which just won't wait until tomorrow. If you turn him down, he'll wail and/or threaten to take the matter to the front office.

For better or worse, P.R. men are popping up out of the city room floor every day. It's interesting to speculate as to just what percentage of copy now appearing in newspapers is written or "inspired" by P.R. men.

Too much copy is from such sources, perhaps. But what can be done about it? In many cases, newsapers cannot refuse "handouts" and insist on gathering their own news, for the growing "press release" system often is the only course open to news gatherers. Many an executive finds it a handy way to dismiss reporters, and simultaneously, he believes, his press relations problems. He simply has a "news release" prepared on whatever topic he desires covered, checks it over for boners—and often for anything controversial—and then hands it out. Sometimes his P.R. man handles all the details. At some offices reporters seldom see the top executives. Before they can get to them, a junior executive or secretary has channeled their efforts firmly toward the public relations department.

Actually most reporters would prefer to see "Mr. Big" in person. They probably could get just as good a story—perhaps a better one. In other words, public relations men are not necessary to the production of newspapers—that's a matter of personal opinion, and a strong opinion it is. However, they are not hired by newspapers. Their main duty is not toward newspapers, but toward their employers. Hence it is not for the press to decide whether it wants P.R. men in its midst. Their employers obviously consider them an advantage. It is for the newspapers to make the best of the situation, and perhaps try to derive some benefit from it.

This can be done by close cooperation between the press and P.R. men. Frequent discussions of mutual problems can be most helpful.

When a public relations man comes through with a good story, he should be commended. When he fails, it should be called to his attention. If the matter is a serious one, it should be taken up with his employers. They hire public relations men to do a job, and certainly will want to know whether they are getting the service for which they are paying. This works both ways, of course; the P.R. man's employer has a right to fair and equitable treatment in the news columns. The P.R. man should see that he gets it.

No doubt about it, P.R. men are here to stay. They can be useful if newspapermen will give the guidance necessary to direct efforts along lines which will benefit our free press.

"WINTER OF OUR DISCONTENT"

An Editor's Worries About Adequate News in an "All-Purpose" Newspaper

by William M. Tugman

A thorny personality and a crusty critic, William M. Tugman has impressed the exacting standards of his discontent upon the Register-Guard of Eugene, Ore. Under his editorship this exceptional newspaper has proved a training ground for a stream of young newspapermen. His alumni have carried the Tugman standards to the staffs of many West Coast papers.

Every now and then the editor is confronted by a challenging visitor—and the challenges take many forms from the physical to the metaphysical. The most challenging of them all, however, is a woman, young, (and rather attractive, if you like the intellectual type) who has a habit of planting herself squarely in front of the editor's desk to ask:

"Why don't you print ALL the news in your paper?"

Time and again she has confounded us by pulling out of her capacious handbag items clipped from labor papers, church papers, scientific journals—or from other newspapers of general circulation. Invariably, the items deserve to be rated "newsworthy in anybody's paper." Usually we begin by paging Danny:

> EDITOR: Hey, Danny, come in here a minute! Did AP or UP give us anything Monday on this conference at Johnstown, Pa?
>
> DANNY: Gosh, I dunno. I'll ask Ted or Bunk. Just a minute . . . .
>
> DANNY: They don't remember seeing anything on it. Of course that was the day of the murder at Cresswell and the riot at The Dalles and the President's budget message. We might o' missed it or it might have got crowded out. Besides, we had that workup on hospitals you said had to go. I'm sorry, but . . . .
>
> EDITOR: Never mind, Danny. Thanks. You see, lady, it isn't a matter of INTENT when we miss significant news, etc., etc., etc.

Comes then the patient explanation of how big this old world is, and how tremendous the volume of daily news has come to be, what with the amazing advances in all the devices for communication—how the teletypes have trebled the output of the old-time manual telegraph operations, how the news floods in from every quarter of the globe in a matter of minutes after the happening, how the obligations to local news compete with world news and national news, how reader demand compels a certain amount of trivia along with the news of great import, how the most conscientious news editors are faced with an impossible task of selection in the four or five hours before DEADLINE, the ever-present factor of "human error" (how one of our best news editors once lost one of Herbert Hoover's most important speeches entirely, after the copy had been completely edited and headlined). The old alibi:

> Any editor in the world could be hanged any day in the week for what he puts in or leaves out.

Like most ardent "libruls," the pretty lady is never quite convinced. Her pout spells suspicion of this "capitalistic press." This usually spurs us into the "frank confession" routine:

> Sure, we do a lousy job of telling the world's news, lady. But, for the love of Mike, give us credit for trying. Even the New York *Times* is a liar if it pretends to print "All The News That's Fit To Print." In my 36 years in this cockeyed business, the whole character of the daily newspaper job has changed. There isn't any newspaper in the world can tell it all as fast as it happens, much less give it the proper context, uninterrupted sequence and adequate interpretation. That's why *Time* and *Newsweek* and the whole host of gleaner publications have sprung up and have grown rich and powerful picking up what we have missed, improving on what we have muffed. We can do only a 'spot' job; we cannot give much more than bulletins and highlights, leaving other agencies to mop up. We are just the shock troops on the far-flung news fronts.

This usually mollifies the lady—but not much. She points to the volume of advertising and remarks dryly:

> The ads never seem to get left out.

This calls for the routine on advertising as not only a highly important source of revenue to the publisher but as a SERVICE to both advertiser and reader, especially classified, the "people's market place":

> A newspaper has to be solvent to have any freedom at all. There is an old saying in this business that "a newspaper lives on two losses." Neither the advertising revenue nor the circulation revenue alone would support a paper. The two put together may make a profit possible in good years and prevent bankruptcy in bad ones. You pay just about one-third of what it costs to make your daily paper possible. If we had no advertising, the price of the paper might have to be so high that poor people couldn't afford to have any paper.

That spiel doesn't get too much sympathy:

> Haven't you, Lords of the Press, any sense of of your social responsibility at a time like this when you yourself have been preaching editorially that only a completely informed world can save itself from destruction? Why must you think only of profits? Why must you concern yourself so much with petty local fights such as the school budget or the metropolitan sewer system when the atom bomb is loose in the world?

Patience wears a bit thin at this point:

> Doggone it, lady, this little whistle-stop gazette of ours can't bear the entire responsibility of saving the world. If I thought we could do some good with Joe Stalin or even Harry Truman and Jumping Joe McCarthy, I'd put 'em all on the mailing list and pay the subscription myself. We try to give you a reasonably BALANCED PAPER, as good as we can get out. Personally, I don't think most of our funnies are even funny. Personally, I could do without most of the society news and about half of the sports and country correspondence. If we were smart, we'd probably abolish the editorials and give the whole page to "Letters to the Editor." I'm willing to accept most of the blame for the *Register-Guard's* shortcomings, but don't forget, lady, you are not the "average citizen." You are probably somewhere in the TOP TENTH for intellectual and cultural interests. In this or any other community we are dealing with a public which is NOT DUMB but merely preoccupied, unfortunately, with food, fun and sex.

This tirade produces disarming overtures for peace. She packs up her clippings, smiles her friendliest smile and says resignedly:

> Of courses, I understand. You have your problems too. You try hard, and I must say that on many local matters you've done a good job. I know that to be completely informed one must supplement his daily paper with a vast amount of reading. I get *Time* and *Newsweek* and *The Nation* and *The New Republic* and *The Atlantic* and *Harper's,* and I have access to many other publications including the latest books. But what about the poor fellow who can afford only one paper and for whom your paper is the ONLY source of news? I can understand your limitations, but I think it's too bad, don't you?

She sails out while we shout something about public libraries and reading rooms for those who really want to get it all, but that last question has a haunting quality:

> Are we doing a good job for the people for whom our paper is the main or only source of day by day news? Are we doing all we could do?

Through the taunting visitor, I have tried to set forth a problem which, in my opinion, has received too little attention in most of the current criticisms of the press with the possible exception of *Nieman Reports,* the continuing studies of Associated Press Managing Editors, and occasional articles buried in the *Journalism Quarterly* and "trade" magazines.

Most of the critiques, such as the elaborate report of the commission on Freedom of the Press, and Chafee's able volumes on *Government and Mass Communications* and Morris Ernst's *First Freedom,* approach the problem at the stratospheric level of ownership and overall management in relation to public policy and public welfare. It is quite evident that most of the critics are thinking mainly in terms of the metropolitan press or at least the relatively big city press.

At least, they do not see some of the problems which I see in attempting to put out an "all-purpose" newspaper (circulation 28,000) in a rapidly expanding and extremely vigorous community—the only daily (except for Portland's infiltration) serving an area as large as the state of Connecticut and a population of more than 125,000.

World news is not our only problem. In Lane county we have 93 separate and distinct taxing units, including 8 incorporated cities and 12 major school districts, and close to 50 state and federal agencies; at least 100 separate labor unions, including AFL, CIO and rail brotherhoods. There are more than 1,000 listed civic and commercial organizations, of which at least 200 can be classed as "majority." To weeklies in some of the outlying communities we are glad to relinquish much of the "personal" matter we used to carry, but the major burden of a prompt and adequate report for all of these community interests still falls on us.

In what might be called the field of "public business," we do a better job than many papers, thanks to reporters

who are well trained to analyze and translate complicated public problems. It is part of our pattern to lend every possible help to Community Chest, Red Cross, hospital campaigns and to all the major education, musical, cultural enterprises.

We are conspicuously weak in day by day coverage of labor, industry, markets, agriculture, courts, local features, although our "spot" pictures are usually very good. We are usually heavy on sports and "society," cramped on editorial page. We probably use less "canned feature material" than any paper of comparable size, having deliberately sacrificed these things to news hole.

With papers bounding up and down from 10 or 12 pages on Saturday to 40 or 48 on Sundays and in the middle of the week, "erratic" would be the word to describe "world coverage" and many departments of local news. A new plant with adequate press facilities will straighten out some of the problems of type production and story placement, but the deluge of demanding copy will continue. Sometimes I have stated the problem with these questions:

> Are we going to "drown" in our news reports—full day and night AP and UP, plus the output of 21 staffers, plus 100 country correspondents?
>
> Do we really know anything about how to tell a story, or are we so bound by the conventions of newswriting and makeup that we don't know how to be either informative or interesting?
>
> Is it physically or financially possible to do an effective job of editing an average daily news flow of 100 columns into a news hole which is jumping from 55 columns to 100 and back again—not making allowances for pictures or headlines?
>
> Will the concepts of "full news coverage" be changed, in spite of us, under the sheer pressure of news volume?
>
> Should we stop pretending to be "complete" and confess that within the limits of time, space and money we can do only a swift and partial summary of each day's newsworthy events?
>
> Can we afford to be content with the job we are doing, or must we find some practical answers?

I am aware of all the stock anwers to criticisms of the American press:

> With circulations at an all-time high—more than 40 million for dailies—why pay too much attention to the inevitable squawks from the few who don't like what's put in or left out?
>
> In news content, even the smallest paper today can offer more than the great papers of a bygone era.
>
> The American press is doing the best news job that has ever been done in the world's history; the American people get more unbiased truth than any other people.
>
> You can't make readers read more than they want to read, and the development of the super-newspaper will have to wait till the moronic public grows up to it.

A small town newspaper editor enjoys the (sometimes uncomfortable) advantage of being much closer to his readers than the big city Big Shot who seldom sees his public except through the Circulation Manager's reports (and what he hears from the neighbors or Mortgage Heights or at the round table in the Union Club). The door of the small town editor is always open and all kinds of animals walk in. They bring all kinds of problems and questions to the editor's desk. They sit on his desk!

If the annoying lady were the only demanding customer, I would not be so uneasy as to the sufficiency of our job. On today's front page Truman's message to Congress, the landing of the 1st Cavalry Division, Acheson's answer to Nehru and Uncle Joe, together with a report on how the new housing restrictions will affect the lumber industry; have crowded "The Lost Wagon Train of '53" into a corner and shoved many normal "local tops" inside or clear out of the paper. There will be numerous visitors tomorrow.

Reader surveys (Gallup style) are not too conforming. They indicate that we do a better-than-average job of compelling reader attention to stories, but the dwindling percentages on many an important story leave me wondering how much we really know about "how" or "how much."

It is 36 years this July since Mr. Samuel Bowles permitted me to go to work for his Springfield *Republican* at $9 a week. World War I was hovering over an unsuspecting public, but newspaper life was relatively simple. One telegraph operator could peck out the entire AP report, perhaps 10,000 words in a night. When the Germans marched into Belgium, Mr. Bowles, Solomon Griffin, Waldo Cook, Richard Hooker and Howard Regal could hold a two hour parley over whether to set aside the ancient tra- On this paper, in one desk trick, three or four people must handle at least three times the total news volume which flowed over the *Republican's* news desks, to be meticulously "brushed and combed."

It is nearly 20 years since I disturbed a winter conference of Oregon publishers by displaying two great armloads of white and yellow paper—the complete day wire file of AP and UP—raising some questions of quality vs quantity, suggesting that haphazard news volume had become a problem if not a menace. There was some follow-up correspondence with New York which developed the expected arguments that time and money limitations would not permit much tinkering with news reports—and besides

"very few editors seemed to have any complaints."

In recent years has come the organization of the AP Managing Editors' Conference for the specific purpose of self-criticism and improvement of news reports. With most of the recommendations of this body I am in entire accord, and I think I see some visible evidence of improvements. Perhaps I should not complain, because I have not attended meetings and I have not contributed anything to APME, except the filling out of many questionnaires, but there is a paragraph preamble to the 1949 recommendations which catches my eyes (and makes them slightly red):

> APME study committee dug deep. They labored diligently and microscopically to uncover errors, malpractices and bad habits. They found BLEMISHES RATHER THAN DEFECTS (caps mine). They now prescribe the slight plastic surgery which should remove some of the blemishes.

How cozy! Should we be using microscopes, to look for pimples; or telescopes, to search the skies for new guiding stars and revelations? Do we need plastic surgery or some major operations and medications to give the daily press the vigor to meet its responsibilities in these times?

Now and again I have been asked this question:

> Have newspapers lost or gained in influence during your time in the business?

In my observation, they have lost—horribly! Nor is this loss of influence due entirely to the much discussed "decline of the editorial page"—although most of the editorial pages have declined, due partly to lazy or repressed editorial writers, partly to that devotion to editorial page conventions which results in dullness (which on any page in the paper should be the sin unpardonable).

> Is the decline of influence to be attributed to Hearst and McCormick and the big bad boys of journalism?

In my opinion, "the big bad boys" have not been the worst offenders. No matter how deplorable their tactics may be, at least they usually stand for something and are seldom dull. The chief offenders are the "contented cows," the many, many owners and editors who have no policy at all, in either editorials or news, except to "avoid trouble." And the most dangerous offenses against public confidence are *not* "opposing Roosevelt" but the intentional or unintentional mis-handling of the news.

It is tough enough to try to explain why many newsworthy stories are missed, omitted or bobtailed every day, in spite of the most conscientious effort (as our opening story reveals), but it is "dynamite" to be caught in the act of deliberate suppression, and that is a lesson which many never seem to learn.

In the metropolitan field, there may be more "margin for error" because of the nature of a great city—although a metropolitan daily can have a most unpleasant time trying to live down the damage caused by even *seeming* to have overlooked a most important proceeding affecting a major advertiser. In the community field, relentless publication of "adverse news" is actually imperative. No explanations are possible when a local paper has ignored completely the arrest, trial, conviction and sentence of a prominent citizen, and the damage to public trust is almost irreparable (without a change of editors). The people RESENT "twists" and "coverups."

In Oregon, we pride ourselves that we have very few instances of "news delinquency," but we have had enough to show that the demagogues and propagandists are lurking to profit, at our expense, by any slip, fanning the always smouldering fires of popular suspicion.

There are many able and completely conscientious editors and publishers in the field of the community newspaper, but there are too few like the venerable George Putnam of the Salem (Ore.) *Capital-Journal* who is prouder of his battles than he is of his linage, and has lived and prospered by the maxim:

> A newspaper without enemies is a newspaper without friends.

There are too many who have discovered that it is cheaper and easier (on the golf score) to buy another page of canned features than to hire another first class reporter to tear hell out of the court or city hall. There are too many who are brave enough as to Stalin, or even Truman, but avoid the hazards and labors of documenting a blast which will unravel a gambling racket or a crooked politician regime. There is a lamentable tendency to soft pedal labor controversies and to sit silent when self-appointed patriots organize mob movements to restrict the basic freedoms of *other* people, even other people's freedom of the press.

However, it is the purpose of this paper to show that the greatest "sin," at least in the community field, is indifference to the increasingly difficult problem of adequate news service. Even schools of journalism are to some degree infected because they live in this atmosphere of self-satisfaction and contentment:

> "A paper must have a front page, an editorial page, a woman's page, and, of course, at least one page of comics. A story must tell where, when, what and how and it must begin thus and so. A headline looks like this (depending on what great paper exerts the most influence on the teacher).
>
> The repressive influence of publishers and circulation managers does not excuse entirely the stereotyped judgment of news values and styles in the working press.

There are, however, some encouraging experiments in content criticism and with improved methods of presentation and "reader training." Some papers (including ours) have learned that—if results are desired—it is not sufficient to pontificate in long editorials on urgent public issues. It is extremely effective to explain the issues on Page 1 and follow them with an editorial wallop. Pictures and graphic diagrams will often save a thousand words. It is necessary to be fair, but it is not fatal to be positive.

Ralph Casey, director of the Minnesota department of journalism, tells us that in his state the Cowles papers and some others are making some notable experiments to see if such complex but vitally important matters as the North Atlantic Pact and the operations of ECA can be translated from "officialese" into terms which will be personal to every reader, whether farmer, millhand or campus intellectual. The experiment involves the selection and employment of exceptionally well-trained and highly paid writers.

Nieman Fellows have been turning their Harvard tours into a "busman's holiday" (which was inevitable). Last spring's special edition of *Nieman Reports,* with its functional critique of every news and editorial operation, was a constructive contribution to the problem with which we are dealing—at working level.

The American Press Institute at Columbia has been bringing together members of the "working press" for periods of serious study and exploration of newspaper problems. Stanford's summer session for editors and Oregon's winter session are now offering something much more substantial than can be found in the traditional boisterous conventions, although even the conventions do some good in so far as they draw some of us out of parochial preoccupations for a day or two.

My pick of all the recent efforts to shake the profession out of its lethargy is the book *Your Newspaper* which was published by nine former Niemanites a few years ago—because, while recognizing many of the current and perhaps permanent limitations on daily news publications, they dared to dream of what a newspaper could be and should be to be adequate to its day.

In my 36 years, I have seen amazing improvements in American journalism, not the least important being the improvement in reporter types. Gone from most offices is the habitual drunkard and his pal the moocher who was always borrowing a five or a ten "till pay day." Gone are many of the semi-illiterates and the a-moral scavengers (although some of these have moved into upper brackets as paper columnists). Much of this improvement may be credited to the better schools of journalism, to the Guild, and to the many publishers who have recognized that first class news and editorial presentation is something more than "an expense item," to attract circulation, to sell advertising. News is WHY we exist.

The picture isn't all black, but in our business above all others, and especially in these times, there is danger in smugness and in dull devotion to the "tried and true," and in that inherent resistance to change which bedevils every established occupation. Some cynic will probably quote:

> Now is the winter of our discontent
> Made glorious summer by this sun of York.

I do not pretend to know all the answers to the many questions I have raised. This piece is intended only to convey how things look from where I sit. I do not think we can "laugh off" any of the criticisms which are being levelled at us. The most thoughtful critics have told us that it is not enough to have a free press. It must be a FREE AND RESPONSIBLE PRESS. And ADEQUATE. That verdict is confirmed by what I hear from the many different kinds of people who come in and out of this office. I am bothered by the question of the persistent lady:

> What about the poor devil for whom your paper is the only source of news?

I am not at all sure that we know HOW to do an adequate job, even if we could cast off all of the problems of mechanical limitations and sky-rocketing costs, and if all owners and trustees and controlling directors of newspaper properties became imbued immediately with the highest ideals of public responsibility and service (which isn't likely to happen). If the newspaper publishing field were open to unlimited newcomers, I doubt if they would bring any notable improvements with them.

> Have we kept pace with the technological advances in this business? Are we doing as good a job as we could with what we have?

It may be naive to say that the American people are ready and waiting to follow an intelligent and competent newspaper leadership, and that they prefer to trust rather than to distrust the newspaper, whenever given good and convincing evidence of complete faithfulness and integrity. Anyhow, that's what I believe, working very close to people in this community.

Colorado Newspapers

As Seen by a Neighbor Editor

At Colorado Newspaper Week at Boulder, Ernest H. Linford, editorial writer on the Salt Lake Tribune, was invited to review and criticize editorial pages of the Colorado press. Some of his more general observations make this article. A former Nieman Fellow (1946) Mr. Linford has contributed a number of articles to Nieman Reports.

In my opinion, the editorial pages of the Denver papers match any in the country published in cities Denver's size, and I believe the Colorado people—the residents of the whole Rocky Mountain region—are fortunate to have the excellent metropolitan press coverage and editorial comment they get.

The *Rocky Mountain News,* I think, gives its own editorial column its toughest competition. I suspect that most readers spend more time with the interesting, human-interest, home-grown special columns than they do with the less attractive-appearing editorials. The editorials are good too, but the columns catch the eye first. That brings up a serious mid-twentieth century newspaper problem which I hope to touch on more fully later.

It is gratifying to the thinking people of the region to note the tremendous strides taken in five years by the Denver *Post.* Once a reactionary paper, it currently shines with enlightenment and fair dealing. The editorials and editorial page sparkle and inform. I am impressed by the way the *Post* endeavors to give both sides the opportunity to be heard. I think syndicating Norman Thomas' column was a master stroke.

Some signs of journalistic schizophrenia are still apparent on occasion. Most metropolitan papers are troubled with split personalities because they represent the blending of many viewpoints and efforts. More than anything else the change in the *Post* dramatizes that a newspaper is only as good as the man who runs it.

It was a special delight to see several papers, weekly and daily, courageously plugging for conservation of natural resources. It is an uphill fight in some sections of the West. Our job, it seems to me, is to try to educate the people, avoiding, if we can, fanning the fires of antagonism between the stockmen and the forest service. We must constructively show the dangers of erosion and its effect on communities downstream as well as on the economy of the grazing industry. Orchids are due the Gunnison *News Champion* for its conservation editorials. The same paper had a splendid explanation of the proposed school reorganiation problem and an accompanying editorial.

The Limon *Leader* and Craig *Empire-Courier* are among the papers which use the personal pronoun "I" instead of the often overworked editorial "we." I was interested in the effect.

The Durango *Herald-Democrat* applied the whip to NEA canned editorials, which all conscientious journalists should applaud.

I have nothing against the work of Mr. Thrasher of the N.E.A. His editorials are superior to mine in most cases. But I recognize the danger of one man writing for 700 newspapers, many of which use his stuff as editorials under their mastheads. It's dishonest; it lowers the paper's prestige and it is dangerous. Seeds can be planted in canned editorials which the hurried editor may not detect. This has been shown by the propaganda done up in neat packages in the Industrial News Review, a journalistic sham and delusion.

Compliments of press and public are due the *Bent County Democrat* for its fight for access to police court records at Las Animas. Editors, not mayors, nor governors nor presidents, must decide what is news, what is fit to print and what is not. We may make mistakes but we are better judges in this field than public officials. Censorship must be fought with all weapons at our command whenever it occurs. It was good to see the Denver papers take up the cudgels in this fight. Most of us have had experience with officials like the mayor of Las Animas. Hospital superintendents and chiefs of police have been my waterloos.

I suspect that the journalism college has had much to do with the overall excellence of the press in Colorado. The late Ralph Crosman and Gayle Waldrop could never be content merely to turn out first-rate journalism graduates. They have to be gad flies, to remind editors of their duties and responsibilities. Workshops and meetings and personal help to editors and reporters are among their services. Having operated 35 miles from the Colorado state line for years, I received invaluable help and friendly guidance.

I noticed no "Afghanistanism" in Colorado's weekly press. The contrary was true. There was scant attention paid editorially to international affairs. A notable excep-

tion was Hous Waring's Littleton *Independent.* I believe his is the only weekly in the area using Walter Lippmann.

I understand that, outside of Denver, there are only two Colorado papers with full-time editorial writing staffs—the Colorado Springs *Gazette-Telegraph* and Pueblo *Star-Journal and Chieftain.* Both have well-written, forthright editorials. Several show considerable thought and research.

The World in the Weekly

It's altogether too easy to rail at conditions several thousand miles away because nobody is going to call us out of bed at night to reply, or hammer on our desks and demand a retraction. It takes double courage to raise particular cain with the chief of police and then go around by his office the next day in search of news.

There are reasons galore for concentrating on local and state issues. 1) The weekly editor has limited time and space and local problems usually are considered more urgent; 2) the editor may be convinced that the daily papers, magazines and radio are handling adequately the national field; 3) the weekly editor may be too busy or feel too isolated to be an authority on international relations.

Since international affairs play such a tremendous importance in our daily lives, since the world is now on our doorsteps, I wonder if weekly editors shouldn't give world events more attention. If they don't feel the urge to present at least one editorial on world conditions, why not run a good column like Lippmann, Doris Fleeson, or the Alsops? Such columns, of course, cannot be substitutes for editorial opinion, but they help to evaluate and point up the news. (We must not forget balance in that regard, however.)

The news is so complex these days, there are so many tag ends left dangling, that I am afraid the old-fashioned "objective" news writing isn't quite enough. Developments in the cold war and the maniacal McCarthy circus in Washington have proved that "factual journalism" cannot be attained merely by printing noteworthy statements of prominent persons on both sides.

Several years ago the Commission on Freedom of the Press said: "It is no longer enough to report the fact truthfully. It is now necessary to report the truth about the fact."

Without Being Dull

Objective reporting has to be supplemented by interpretive reporting. More and more, newspapers are coming to the realization of this.

Honest interpretation of the news is often more important than reporting spot news these days.

The problem of how to do it without writing to a "line" as do some news magazines is vexing indeed.

And so, in addition to buying syndicated comment, we have the responsibility of interpreting for our readers and I think that much of this can be done in the editorial column.

To try to tie up the tag ends of the news each week, the Salt Lake *Tribune* has a review of the news, written interpretively. It is still in the experiment stage. The idea is not new but we are trying to develop it into something different from the usual weekend news summaries.

The many editorials on behalf of the cancer drive, the crippled children's fund and the countless other civic and charitable campaigns pointed up the question of how we can do the job required without being repetitious and dull. Do eyes turn away when they see an appeal for funds? Every day or two we are called upon to support editorially some worthy enterprise. If we do so perfunctorily, our appeal will lack color and be useless. We've got to make these editorials sing to do any good.

My own attitude must be fairly representative. When I start an editorial I am altogether too aware of the prestige and dignity of the paper. So I put on kid gloves. No slang, no silliness, is allowed—the result is often pontifical dullness. The columnist, who is stealing the ball from the editorialist, is not held down by exaggerated ideas of dignity. They often go too far in sensationalizing, in breeziness, but they are capturing our readership. Without them and the comics, I'm afraid some papers wouldn't stay in business.

It is unavoidable, of course, to write space-filler editorials on occasion. Most of us do this altogether too much. A short column is preferable to one written half-heartedly or while preoccupied with something else. If we can't do more than preview a news story, the editorial is useless. Continuous applauding can wear thin, although I think we can do much good in giving credit where credit is due. A reader sits up and takes notice when a paper takes issue with the chamber of commerce or the public relations office for the community's biggest payroll. Friendly disagreement with the "interests" in the town doesn't necessarily spell disaster. It often helps to persuade the business community to clean up a situation. It takes courage, of course, but I know of many instances where it has been done successfully without loss of advertising.

I have a great deal of understanding and sympathy for the small-town editor and the pressures upon him. I have seen dozens fall by the wayside with ulcers, high blood pressure and worse. I know of the demands upon him, his lack of time and opportunity to relax away from the office and the telephone.

There are no foolproof formulas. Long words are harder to understand than short words and, generally, short sentences are easier to understand than long ones, but the Flesch theory can be carried to extremes. Like stories, editorials aren't meant to be great literary masterpieces. They should be written to be read quickly and absorbed readily.

Limited Liability Theory of the Press

by Arthur Musgrave

COMMUNICATING IDEAS TO THE PUBLIC. By Stephen E. Fitzgerald. Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1950. $3.50.

Newspapermen who have trouble conceiving of public relations as a profession —an understandable trouble in view of the different ways of defining "profession" as well as the different types of jobs that are designated by the term "public relations"— will find this book both interesting and rewarding.

Author Fitzgerald has obviously thought carefully about the nature of the public relations function in business and industry during his decade-long journey from being a Baltimore newspaperman to a New York public relations counsel. In this well-written book he sets forth his thinking.

It is sensible thinking. Indeed, his book is the best single volume on what public relations as a professional skill is all about that this reviewer has read.

A minor aspect of his book, but one of particular interest to persons concerned with the press, is Mr. Fitzgerald's comments on the nature of the press as a mass communication medium. In evaluating various communication media he is concerned with how people get information, not with what they are exposed to in newspapers or on radio or television programs—especially information on which people base their opinions and actions.

In making this evaluation, he raises the question of what are the essential characteristics of any *mass* communication medium, and answers by listing the following distinguishing criteria:

It must provide broad coverage of heterogeneous groups;

It must have low unit cost for all concerned, producer as well as consumer;

It must have speed;

It must deal with the common denominators of mass interest, not with selective interests;

It must have some entertainment value;

It must be able to communicate easily and simply to the average intelligence.

On the basis of this list of characteristics of all mass media, he then comments on some of the major criticisms of the press. In reference to the concentration of the press into fewer and bigger dailies, for example, Mr. Fitzgerald observes that if one of the essential qualities of a mass medium is low unit cost, there is little likelihood that bigness in the press will suddenly reverse itself.

Changes in printing technology, of course, may reverse this trend by reducing mechanical costs. But Mr. Fitzgerald's basic point would still be well taken.

A more important example is his observation on the highlight approach in newspaper reporting and editing that disturbs so many academic critics:

"Another familiar charge is that the press is superficial—that it deals with 'highlights' and seldom with the real inner complexities of most situations.

"There is a good deal of truth to this, especially with respect to the news columns. But again, it is a little like accusing the oak of being an oak when we would prefer it to be a rosebush. The course of a mass medium is determined not by our individual preferences but its own innate qualities. And three of the criteria for a mass medium are: speed, broad coverage and the ability to communicate to the average intelligence. If the press is going to live up to its own yardsticks, then it is obvious that its news columns are going to deal with highlights."

Mr. Fitzgerald goes on to comment that an interesting court decision will be handled differently in the New York *Times* and the *Yale Law Review,* but that every medium is not going to fill every need. His point is the simple, yet frequently overlooked, one that the press is not a universal communicator. He sums up his point as follows:

"Most of the other stock criticisms of the press reveal themselves in a slightly different light when they are stacked up against the basic characteristics of mass media. For very often what we dislike in the press—the glib headlines, the sensationalism, the underplay given a story we think is important—is not the 'fault' of some editor or owner but rather some inherent quality of the medium. . . .

"If you want to put a name on what I am saying, you might call it the theory of 'limited liability' for the press. Let us agree that the press is not supposed to do everything. The press has a job to do and, since it is in a sense a public utility, we as readers have a right to demand that it do this job well. But the job is one of reporting the world—not one of reforming it.

"None of what has been said can serve as an excuse for bad journalism, nor does it in any way lessen the public responsibility of the press. A cheap and irresponsible newspaper can be and often is an evil thing; the editor cannot escape responsibility by claiming that he is acting the way editors have to act to stay in business. Neither my theory of 'limited responsibility' for the press, nor the assumption that all mass media have certain innate characteristics, is an excuse for a bad newspaper. Fortunately, there *are* standards. . . ."

Whatever else may be said of the press, radio, movies and television, they are convenient and complex subjects for criticism and research. One value of Mr. Fitzgerald's formulations is that much criticism would be more useful if there were a sharper focus among critics on the virtues and defects which are inherent in mass communication media.

This focus would likewise be useful for newspaper readers interested in what kind of stories are likely to be handled adequately and reliably in the press—election results, for example—and what kind are likely to be distorted—a foreign policy story, for example—because only the highlights can be presented from the point of view of readers interested largely in the conflict aspect of the story.

To generalize about even one mass communication medium, such as the daily newspaper, is not easy, and doubtless there are limits to the value of scholarly studies of the inherent virtues and defects of the press. But it is a problem that presents many opportunities for useful research in the field of journalism—more useful, in fact, than many topics that engage many scholars.

In evaluating the various communication media from the point of view of effective communication (irrespective of such factors as type of material, cost, ease

of presentation, the prestige of the medium, etc.) Mr. Fitzgerald agrees with Pliny the Younger that "we are more affected by words we hear, for though what we read in books may be more pointed, there is something about the voice that makes a deeper impression on the mind."

He points out that what evidence we have indicates that the various communication methods are *in general* likely to be effective in this order: face-to-face discourse; oral-plus-visual presentation, such as television and the motion picture; radio; and finally, print.

Mr. Fitzgerald does very well in this fourth-choice medium.

Arthur Musgrave is professor of journalism at the University of Massachusetts. A Nieman Fellow in 1943, he, like **Stephen Fitzgerald,** is a graduate of the Sunpapers of Baltimore. Mr. Fitzgerald also was a Nieman Fellow, in 1940.

The Climate of Western Thought

by William M. Stucky

IDEAS AND MEN, the Story of Western Thought, by Crane Brinton. Prentice Hall, $6.

Prof. Crane Brinton has set himself a staggering task in *Ideas and Men*: Not only to trace the thought of Western man but also to show that thought has affected his institutions and his every-day life.

In the hands of a less able organizer or writer, Brinton's material could have turned into a chaotic, bone-dry mass, a stock-piling of pedantic detail without direction or meaning. Instead, *Ideas and Men* is a well-charted, almost sprightly tour through 3,000 years of intellectual history.

'Lover of Wisdom'

Brinton's success is due to three things:

First, he is, in the literal sense of the word, a philosopher, a "lover of wisdom."

Second, he is a teacher, full of enthusiasm for his subject, and capable of making even the dullest aspect of it interesting.

Third, he is a writer. His style is easy and lean, and perfectly suited to his material.

His approach to history is not that of a Spengler, a Marx, a Toynbee or of any of their determinist brothers. His approach to the greatest single influence in Western thought—Christianity—is neither scoffing nor devout. To him the high Middle Ages are neither the zenith nor the nadir. He is, in all respects, the reasonable man, looking at the Big Questions that have bothered men since the times of early Athens, examining the answers those questions have received, and asking himself and his reader what new answers Western man will give in the next 50 years.

In his view, only three big generalizations can be made about the intellectual climate of the West: 1) "in no other culture have the natural sciences flourished so;" 2) "there is in Western intellectual history a feeling for what is commonly called the 'dignity of man,' " and 3) "there is a striking continuity of Western ideas of the good life here on earth."

Doesn't Predict

These three ideas have found their expression in various ways, the latest of which has been the democratic world-view in which democracy (in its many forms) has become a surrogate for the revealed faith of Christianity. But in the last 150 years the inconsistencies within democracy have become apparent and, more importantly, the average man and his leaders have become "constantly and naggingly aware of the gap" between what ought to be and what is.

Brinton doesn't pretend to be able to extrapolate the curve of history and predict what will happen. Victory for Russia might change everything. But victory for the West would give the West a choice. That choice he concludes with:

"An idealistic democracy, a believing democracy (in the old transcendental sense of religious belief) is perhaps possible, though such a democracy would find it hard to accommodate its this-worldly and scientific heritage to an outer-worldly faith. Its God would at the very least need to make some difficult compromises with the psychiatrist. A realistic, pessimistic democracy—a democracy in which ordinary citizens approach morals and politics with the willingness to cope with imperfection that characterizes the good farmer, the good physician, the good holder of the cure of souls, be he priest, clergyman, counselor or psychiatrist—such a democracy would demand more of its citizens than any human culture has ever demanded. Were its demands met, it might well be the most successful of cultures. Finally, a clinical democracy, a democracy whose citizens profess in this world one set of beliefs anl live another, is wholly impossible. No such society can long endure anywhere. The tension between the ideal and the real may be resolved in many ways in a healthy society; but it can never be taken as nonexistent."

—Lexington *Leader,* (Ky.) Sept.3

SOVIET POLITICS: THE DILEMMA OF POWER, by D. Barrington Moore, Jr., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, $6.00. 465 pp.

Power politics is the dominating element in Russia's postwar drive for expansion, and Russian foreign policy in recent years "has been much less influenced by revolutionary considerations than is commonly supposed."

This is the conclusion of a researcher in Harvard University's Russian Research Center, after an intensive study of the relationship between the Bolshevik doctrines and the practical operations of the Russian state.

The Russians themselves, he points out, talk more about the Red Army now than about "world revolution."

"If in the Asiatic arena they succeed in making long-term social trends serve their power interests," he says, "they may achieve a fundamental victory in the struggle with the United States."

These conclusions of Dr. Barrington Moore Jr. appear in a new book, *Soviet Politics: The Dilemma of Power,* just published by the Harvard University Press.

"While adding some new twists of their own, the Communist rulers of Russia have depended to a great extent on techniques that owe more to Bismarck, Machiavelli and even Aristotle than they do to Karl Marx or Lenin," says Dr. Moore.

"They have always aligned themselves against their 'natural' antagonist in the balance of power at a given time," he explains. "The choice of antagonist or allies has been determined not primarily by ideological factors, but by the structure

of the balance-of-power system itself."

The speeches and writings of Russian leaders, even before World War II, indicate, he says, "that the Soviets had begun to doubt very seriously that 'spontaneous' proletarian revolutions, even if assisted by Moscow, would succeed in parts of the world over which the Soviets exercised no direct control." Instead, the Red Army is talked of as the chief instrument of revolution.

"It is necessary to go back to 1929 to find any statement by a top Soviet leader to the effect that the proletarian revolution would take place in the near future," he reports.

"There are several indications that the Leninist theses concerning imperialism, war and revolution underwent skeptical scrutiny in high Soviet circles as a consequence of the experiences of World War II."

Older documents that talk of world revolution are still circulated in Russia, however, and this point of view "remains a latent one, which could reappear in a modified form under favorable circumstances."

In foreign relations, Communist doctrine has contributed to the Russian drive to expand its control over other countries and "Leninist theory makes it almost impossible for Russian leaders to believe in the friendly intentions of American leaders."

"Soviet leaders acquire Communist virtue by extending the influence of the Kremlin to foreign lands, no matter how this is done. If there is any central goal behind the policy of the Soviet leaders, it is the preservation and extension of their own power, by any means whatever, rather than the spread of a specific social system or the realization of a doctrinal blueprint."

Wm. M. Pinkerton

A British Glance at U. S. Trial Reporting

by Alistair Cook

Chief American correspondent of Manchester Guardian

(These observation are passages from the preface, text and footnotes of his new book, A Generation on Trial: U. S. A. vs. Alger Hiss, published Sept. 12 by Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y. $3.50.)

Certain principles, which are irrespective of the innocence or guilt of Alger Hiss, and which I take to be fundamental to our survival as a free society that is also a decent one, were flouted long before this affair came to trial. It was these excesses that disturbed me most and that especially, I thought, ought to be editorialized about in the proper place. About these things—the gallivantings of a drunken press, and the interferences in personal liberty of Congressional committees undoubtedly sweating in the cause of virtue —I find it hard to be temperate. . . .

The newspaper reporter, watching his front page and his city editor, simply glorifies in one plunging "lead" the most obviously dramatic topic of the day and makes it up to his conscience by corralling the unreported hours of testimony into a pen of final paragraphs in which "earlier in the day" rubs shoulders with "under questioning in the morning" and "the defense also touched on." Consequently, most newspaper reports of a trial are, inevitably, inadequate. To write a bare, faithful sequence of the testimony of the average court day would require a piece of about five thousand words, which would then constitute a little less than one-sixth of the testimony taken. Very few papers allowed their men covering these Trials more than fifteen hundred or two thousand words at best. In consequence, most of the reporting I saw was meager or atrociously slanted in one direction or another.

There is also the painful practical question of accurate hearing and transcribing. I doubt that one American newspaperman in a hundred is even moderately proficient in a reliable system of shorthand.. My own is a mixture of the relics of Pitman learned at a tender age, a dash of Gregg, a flourish of Speedwriting, and frantic personal abbreviations. While the Trials were on, I thought my own dispatches compared favorably with the work of the American dailies I saw, with the exception of the excellent summaries done by Murrey Marder, of the Washington *Post* in the First Trial, and the incomparable reports by Thomas O'Neill of the Baltimore *Sun* in both Trials. But even when I was convinced I had got what was essential, and correctly transcribed what was decisive or moving, a later study of the court transcript destroyed even this lingering professional pride. It is appalling to discover what mishearings a man is capable of unless he has fortified his ears with the ability to transcribe a steady two hundred words a minute.

A tragedy is disturbing, and too strong meat for many people, to the extent that it involves all the human elements. One way of making it tolerable, and therefore untrue to the human situation, is to reduce it to the limited conflict of cops and robbers and so join the cheering squad of one side or the other.

* * *

It would be better, I think, to limit public hearings (of Committees), ban all forms of news photography, and forbid public hearings altogether for some defined sorts of testimony, that, for instance, attacking the character of absent persons.) It seems fair enough to forbid a committee to accuse any one in its printed reports who has not been acquainted with the charge and had the chance to defend himself. The readers will already sense that once committees were restored to a prescribed dignity in their conduct, the fundamental problem would remain of restricting the press reports of them. As long as there are public hearings, there is bound to be good and bad, responsible and malevolent, newspaper accounts. A revision of the libel and slander laws, as they apply to the press, has been long overdue. And I can see no good argument against forbidding the publication of anything "alleged" to have gone on at a private hearing, or against holding newspapers responsible for airing such leaks.

* * *

In the First Trial, the newspapers had printed attacks on the fitness and presumed political sympathies of the judge,

series of feature articles on the character of the principals, free speculation among editorial writers, and a wealth of invective from the columnists; all this, while the Trial was on, made up a fairly obscene travesty of our boasted freedom of the press. It was a little better in the Second Trial, partly because Judge Goddard's warning made the lawyers less disposed to hint at alarming testimony to come; but in the main because city editors severely cut the space they assigned to a topic they guessed, often incorrectly, was no longer of public interest. All in all, though, the indignities some newspapers forced on the judicial system seemed to strengthen the argument for the adoption sometime soon of the English rule, whereby all comment, dramatization, and editorial opinion of any kind, may not be printed while a case is under judgment; and whereby, because of the risk of defamation, the reporting of trials falls to newspapermen at least half as competent as the court stenographers in taking down verbatim testimony. This hard rule is nothing that adults might not get to accept with a good grace, and is not, I believe, inconsistent with any decent definition of a free press.

Letters

Significant Source

To the Editor:

I have read *Nieman Reports* for several years and consider it one of the most significant sources of reading available to student journalists. I should like to know if back issues are available, if so, how far back, and at what price. I should like to have the library here place an order for the paper to be added to the files to be used in the development of the school of journalism here.

O. M. Montgomery,
Professor of Journalism,
University of Corpus Christi.

Berger's Poetic Prose

To the Editor:

The April issue proved to be a journalism student's dream. May I add the thanks of my wife and the many friends who have passed the quarterly from hand to hand and its contents from mind to mind.

Before my introduction to *Nieman Reports,* I was convinced the Medill School of Journalism possessed the finest and most complete staff to prepare myself and others for the field. Now, it appears obvious to many here that we have, in effect, an added staff-at-large, the Nieman Fellows and their valuable publications.

Today, your July *Reports* made me particularly happy. No youthful candidate for a permanent typewriter in a city office loves the work of Meyer Berger more. A *well done* to Robert H. Fleming for telling those unfortunate enough not to have enjoyed Berger of that reporter's poetic prose.

We look to you for some enlightening background on the journalistic doings in Korea.

May God lift your efforts to greater heights, new light, and a greater understanding in the seemingly dark days ahead.

Thomas F. Greene,
Evanston, Ill.

Punching Bag

To the Editor:

The *Nieman Reports* is one of the most useful publications that reaches my desk. As you know, a danger that continually besets an editorial writer is that of becoming a common scold. Editorial writers, by the nature of their vocation, feel strongly about many matters. They are sensitive persons of high intelligence and lofty standards of justice. Consequently, they are continually driven almost to the point of jibbering profanity by the spectacles their public servants stage in the course of performing their public duties. Editorial writers need a punching bag on which to exhaust their fury, and so spare their readers. The *Nieman Reports* is my punching bag. On its chaste pages I can spill my spleen and then with Jovian calm and detachment address my editorial self to the follies of the Administration.

The July issue was ideal for my purposes.

For the first time in my life I read the stuff that wins Pulitzer prizes and the awards were revealed to me as recognition of the mediocre and the routine and of the unsatisfactory performance. Meyer Berger's story of the Camden maniac was a competent job, but it was not a distinguished piece of writing for my money. It was a demonstration of routine competency that I am sure a hundred police reporters could equal.

Ed Guthman's investigation of the University of Washington case merely proved that the accused professor did not attend a Communist school in the Summer of 1938. It left unanswered such questions as: What motive did the former Communist have for telling a lie about the professor? Or was this a case of mistaken identity? Or is it conceivable that the former Communist was confused with his dates?

The prize editorial discussed a noble and timely theme, but without the literary brillance and without the irresistible force of logic that I assume would be basic requirements for Pulitzer recognition. The award certainly suggests that editorial writing in 1949 was below acceptable standards. Surely some editorial writer in the land must have said more eloquently, Oremus.

Douglass Cater's specious analysis of the press and Senator McCarthy was a labored mountain-out-of-molehill performance that could have been done by a ghost-writer for the Tydings committee, or by a cub reporter for the *Daily Worker* eager to demonstrate his skill with the smear.

Finally, there is Ernest H. Linford's question: Have you noticed that when there is a good newspaper in a town, and there is competition, the other paper is usually good too? The answer is: No. It isn't competition that makes a good newspaper, it is the dominance in a newspaper of a vigorous, noble personality. And Mr. Linford's opinion that a paper should try hard to balance comment and columns, as it does the news: News of course should be objective, complete, accurate; but why should a conscientious, self-respecting editor print comment and opinion that he believes in his heart to be false?

I didn't read more of your July issue, but I got my money's worth. I'm saving the rest until I feel again the symptoms of the common scold. But couldn't you manage to get out issues more frequently? These are vexatious times.

William H. Heath,
Editor Haverhill (Mass.) *Gazette*

Competition Isn't Enough

After hearing Ernest H. Linford of the Salt Lake *Tribune* at the journalism teachers' convention two years ago, I came away convinced that as long as there were Linfords connected with the press, there was still blood in the beast. But when he yammers about the awful trend toward monopoly newspapers ("Two Newspapers Are Better Than Either," *Nieman Reports,* IV:3, July 1950, p. 2), I find I react as I do when our popular pooch starts to bark at the moon.

Sure, we'd all like more newspapers, but might as well inveigh against old age as to lament the rise of the single-newspaper town. We have monopoly newspapers, perversely, because our free enterprise system allows the strong to absorb the weak until one publisher emerges as king of the mountain. It's a good old American custom. To change it would cause anguished howls, even from the Linfords.

Twenty-one cities of 100,000 or more have newspapers owned by only one company, Mr. Linford points out sadly. So what? Linford brings out only the bad side. How about the reverse of the coin? Let us assume that I am publisher of the Endocrine, Miss., *Morning Republican Warhoop and Battlecry of Freedom.* By hard work and marriage to my rival's daughter, I eventually acquire controlling interest in the opposition *Daily Jacksonian* and *Evening Tocsin.* I am now the bossman of the only mass medium in a town of 100,000.

At this point I could throw my weight around and be undemocratic as hell. On the other hand, I can do a lot more for my readers—and make more money doing it —than ever before. I don't have to be against the Ten Commandments, for example, just because the *Tocsin* came out in favor of them ahead of me. Formerly, only Republicans read my sheet, and since they were on my side anyway, I didn't actually draw much water as a molder of public opinion. Now some of the *Tocsin's* old Democratic readers are looking at my stuff, if their scathing letters are any indication, and I'm asking my editorial writers to give the people light so they can find their way, instead of giving them heat to burn them up by partisan orneriness.

For the first time in my life I am able to tell Snide, the leading merchant, to go rub salt on his ego when he threatens to throw his advertising to my rival because I reported that his son, Murgatroyd, had been hauled to jail in the police pie wagon after a rugged evening at the local bistro. I no longer have to outshout my rival over the latest torso murder. Now I give crime the play it is worth and sometimes even tuck it inside. No one has squawked, and I don't hate myself the next morning, as I once did. Last week, just after the merger was completed, I got a bit noisy myself. When the local politico came in and offered to bail me out of my financial difficulties if I would plug the moron he had selected to run for mayor, I gave him the old collar-and-pants heave-ho. The week before, I had seriously considered a deal with him in order to survive against seven lean years of sharing inadequate revenue with the *Tocsin.* In short, I am offering more democracy per line of type than Endocrine ever saw in its press before. But listen to Mr. Linford:

"Competition—healthy competition—is the blood stream of . . . the newspaper business." Is it? It should be, for unless there is regulation, competition is the only protection for the public. But "leave us look at the record." Let's take Boston as an illustration. There are five newspaper competitors producing eight newspapers. That should be enough "healthy competition" for the newspaper blood stream. Yet the only Boston paper I've ever seen on any newspaperman's list of ten best—or twenty-five best—is the *Christian Science Monitor,* and the *Monitor's* character was not influenced by its competition. It would be the same great paper if it were published in Hounds Ditch, Arkansas. A few miles south of Boston is Providence, R. I., a "monopoly" newspaper city. Would Mr. Linford say that the people of Providence fare less well with their excellent monopoly paper than the people of Boston with their journalistic potpourri?

"Have you noticed," asks Mr. Linford, "that when there is a good newspaper in a town, and there is competition, the other paper is good, too?" Frankly, Mr. Linford, I *haven't* noticed this particularly. I cite Baltimore as my one example because it is far enough away to mention safely, but I could point out several other cities where the situation is similar. What competitive towns offer readers better products than the newspapers of Louisville, Kansas City, Des Moines, Providence, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Akron—all "monopoly" towns. This does not prove that monopoly is better than competition, but it does prove that the latter isn't necessarily a corpuscular tonic.

The big factor in determining the quality of a newspaper is not competition, but the social responsibility of the publisher and editor. There can be good newspapers in competitive cities like St. Louis and Portland, and mediocre products where the rivalry is hot. And there isn't much the Linfords, or anyone else, can do about the trend to monopoly, in any case. Responsible publishing is a much more important factor. Maybe if our intelligent critics would chew on this problem a while, instead of butting against the immovable wall of economics, we could develop a few more Barry Binghams, Mark Ethridges, Sevellon Browns, Houstoun Warings—and E. H. Linfords.

H. L. Smith,
Madison, Wis.

Kentucky Dinner

Twelve Nieman Fellows joined with other newspapermen of Louisville and Lexington, Kentucky, in a special dinner, Sept. 2, to speed Hugh Morris, capital correspondent of the Louisville *Courier-Journal,* on his leave for a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard. The Lexington *Herald-Leader* was host and its city editor, William M. Stucky, was toastmaster. Francis Russell, director of the office of public affairs in the State Department, went down to lead the evening's discussion of foreign policy problems. Fred Wachs, general manager of the Lexington *Herald-Leader,* and Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville *Courier-Journal,* were among the diners. Nieman Fellows present were Irving Dilliard, editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* editorial page; Osburn Zuber, Birmingham *Post;* Edwin Paxton, manager of Radio Station WBKY of Paducah, Ky.; Nat Caldwell of the Nashville *Tennessean;* Clark Porteous and Richard Wallace of the Memphis *Press-Scimitar;* Henry Hornsby, and Bill Stucky of the Lexington (Ky.) *Herald* and *Leader;* Paul Hughes, Weldon James, Ed Edstrom, Carey Robertson, Grady Clay, Hugh Morris and Edwin Kieckhefer of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and Fletcher Martin of the Louisville *Defender.*

Nieman Scrapbook

Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 20, 1950

Kentucky Toll-Call Rates Climb As The National Scale Declines

A very frequent criticism of newspapers is that they fail in aggressive and continuous reporting of public utility companies' rates and rate-making methods. As Public Service commissions in many states are inadequately staffed for effective scrutiny of complicated utility financial set-ups, the public sometimes fares poorly in rates cases.

These two articles by Hugh Morris, State capital correspondent of the Louisville Courier-Journal, make an interesting instance of the kind of candid reporting that is revealing to the consumer. These were the last two articles Mr. Morris did before taking a leave of absence for a year at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship.

by Hugh Morris, *Courier-Journal—Frankfort Bureau*

Louisvillians calling other Kentucky cities could save about 50 per cent by using the telephone from Jeffersonville, Ind. They can call Milwaukee or Little Rock cheaper than Ashland. That's because Southern Bell has made four rate increases in 3½ years.

FRANKFORT, KY., Aug. 19.—You can telephone from Louisville to Milwaukee, or Little Rock, or Macon, Ga., or Cumberland, Md., cheaper than you can call Ashland, Ky.

It costs Louisvillians an average of 50 per cent more to telephone other Kentucky cities than it would cost if the calls were placed from across the river in Jeffersonville, Ind.

Covington residents can save money on long-distance calls to Kentucky points by placing the calls in Cincinnati.

A three-minute, daytime, person-to-person call from Louisville to Frankfort, a distance of 50 miles, costs 75 cents plus State and federal tax, a total of 96 cents.

The same type of call from Jeffersonville through Louisville to Frankfort costs 55 cents plus federal tax, a total of 69 cents.

Four Rate Increases

This disparity between in-state and out-of-state long-distance rates has grown in the last 3½ years as a result of four successive Kentucky rate increases by Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company. Final approval of its latest raise on July 6 awaits action of the Public Service Commission.

Each time Southern Bell has come before the P.S.C., it has complained that rising costs of labor, material, taxes, etc., were eating up its Kentucky profits. To offset this, monthly charges for service and in-state long-distance rates were boosted.

You might assume that if rising costs were forcing Kentucky toll charges upward, they also would be boosting the cost of placing out-of-state toll calls. Not only is this NOT the case, but the reverse is true. Of the changes made in recent years in interstate telephone rates, all have been reductions. Interstate toll charges have not been increased since 1926.

The harsh fact is that Kentucky telephone users are being forced to pay more and more for in-state toll service so that out-of-state long-distance rates can be kept at low levels.

This subsidy of interstate operations by intrastate revenues is outright discrimination. The situation is all the more distressing when we realize how difficult it is for the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, or that of any other State for that matter, to do anything about it.

Let's look for a moment at the nationwide telephone system. Bear in mind that Southern Bell is just one of the children of that corporate giant, American Telephone & Telegraph Company:

1. A. T. & T. owns and operates, through its Long Lines Department, a system of long-distance toll circuits extending into each state.

2. A. T. & T. owns 21 subsidiary companies, including Southern Bell. These Bell companies furnish local service and supply long-distance service that supplements that of the Long Lines Department.

3. A. T. & T. owns Western Electric Company, with its chain of subsidiaries. Western Electric manufactures and sells telephone equipment. More than 90 per cent of its billion-dollar-a-year sales is made to the Bell system affiliates.

4. A. T. & T. and Western Electric, together own Bell Telephone Laboratories,

a $35,000,000 corporation doing telephone research and development.

5. A. T. & T. maintains a General Department for centralizing work of the nationwide Bell System, an enterprise with assets of more than $10,000,000,000.

A. T . & T. Gets A Cut

The Southern Bell cog in this huge corporate machine operates in nine Southern states, including Kentucky. Southern Bell's capital stock is wholly owned by its parent, A. T. & T.

Southern Bell contributes to the profits of A. T. & T. by purchasing practically all of its materials, supplies and equipment from Western Electric. In addition, Western Electric does much of the installation and salvage work of Southern Bell.

Southern Bell contributes to the support of Bell Telephone Laboratories by paying to A. T. & T. 1 per cent of its gross revenues. Southern Bell also contributes to the Long Lines Department by sharing with it all interstate toll revenues, whether or not Long Lines furnished any part of the service.

Much of Southern Bell's plant is owned jointly by it and A.T. & T. Many of their operations are joint enterprises. A. T. & T. controls Southern Bell's policy and its activities. Whatever Southern Bell's net income may be at the end of any year, it goes as a dividend to A. T. & T., or into surplus for its ultimate benefit.

For 29 consecutive years, A. T. & T. has paid holders of its $100-par stock a dividend of $9 a share.

Since the P.S.C. has jurisdiction only over Kentucky rates, it is confronted with the difficult task of separating Southern Bell's total Kentucky business into two piles—state and interstate.

Strong Case Presented

There is no exact way to do this. Most of the telephone plant is used interchangeably for local calls and for long-distance calls both inside and outside of Kentucky.

Southern Bell presents a strong case for higher Kentucky rates by separating its state and interstate operations largely on a "use" basis. Here's an example of how this method works:

The average Kentucky telephone is used 4 per cent of the time for interstate calls and 99 per cent of the time for local and state toll calls. The telephone instrument represents an investment of about $10.

Southern Bell allots 4 per cent of the $10, or 40 cents, to interstate operations, and charges intrastate business with $9.60.

Under this "use" method, it is not hard to see why Kentucky profits appear to be so small when so large a percentage of operating cost has to be offset by state revenue.

Utility experts point out that this use method overlooks the fact that a telephone is used only about 25 to 30 minutes a day. The rest of the time it is idle, but ready for instant use. Nevertheless, the investment is still there; depreciation is taking place; obsolescence goes on, and maintenance and repair are necessary, no matter how little conversation flows over it.

A more realistic basis is the relationship of state income to interstate revenue. This division is about 80 per cent and 20 per cent. Using this method, only $8 of the $10 investment in an instrument would be charged to state operations, and $2 would be charged to interstate use.

On this basis, Southern Bell's Kentucky operations would show a better profit than the company contends it is earning. It might even show that the July 6 rate increase is not justified at all.

Things to Remember

The question of separating state and out-of-state costs and revenues is the heart of telephone-rate cases. An alert P.S.C. will find it hard to overlook these facts:

1. Southern Bell will have to raise its rates $1 in order to collect 59 cents more in revenue. The rest goes for State and federal taxes.

2. A. T. & T. profits directly from every Kentucky rate increase because it collects 1 per cent of Southern Bell's gross revenues.

3. State toll charges have been pushed so much higher than out-of-state charges that a clear-cut case of discrimination exists.

4. The Federal Communications Commission, anxious to keep interstate rates down, is not likely to act to remedy the situation.

Here is a comparison of state and out-of-state long-distance rates for three- minute daytime person-to-person telephone calls:

	Rate	U.S. Tax	Ky. Tax	To'l
Louisville-Ashland	$1.45	.36	.04	$1.85
Jeffersonville, Ind.-Ashland	1.05	.26	—	1.31
Louisville-Middlesboro	1.40	.35	.04	1.79
Jeffersonville-Middlesboro	.95	.24	—	1.19
Louisville-Frankfort	.75	.19	.02	.96
Jeffersonville-Frankfort	.55	.14	—	.69
Louisville-Hickman, Ky.	1.55	.39	.05	1.99
Jeffersonville-Hickman	1.10	.28	—	1.38
Louisville-Paducah	1.45	.36	.04	1.85
Jeffersonville-Paducah	1.05	.26	—	1.31
Louisville-Bowling Green	1.10	.28	.03	1.41
Jeffersonville-Bowl. Green	.70	.18	—	.88
Cincinnati-Lexington	.65	.16	—	.81
Covington-Lexington	1.00	.25	.03	1.28
Cincinnati-Bowling Green	1.05	.26	—	1.31
Covington-Bowling Green	1.45	.36	.04	1.85
Cincinnati-Ashland, Ky.	.75	.19	—	.94
Covington-Ashland	1.25	.31	.04	1.60

Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 21, 1950

The Case of Jim Honaker Shows Why Utility Rates Are High in Kentucky

by Hugh Morris, *Courier-Journal—Frankfort Bureau*

FRANKFORT KY.—Once upon a time there was a telephone-rate expert. His name was James M. Honaker of Frankfort. He started working for the Public Service Commission in 1936 and, after three years in the Army, returned to his old job.

As the P.S.C.'s "principal accountant and statistician," Honaker performed yeoman service for the three P.S.C. commissioners. Chiefly his task was to analyze the growing number of requests for higher utility rates from gas, electric, street railway and telephone companies.

This 35-year-old attorney-accountant-statistician was very adept at penetrating the smoke and haze thrown up in almost every rate case by the utility companies.

He developed an uncanny ability to drive through a maze of company statistics and come up with a true picture. He was at his best working with the complex telephone cases.

Naturally, this $4,500-a-year staff statistician was a valuable asset to the P.S.C. as well as to the public. Consistently aligned on the public's side in the rate cases, Honaker was instrumental in keeping utility rates down. He worked on the third successive rate-increase request of Southern Bell Telephone Company, which was flatly denied by the P.S.C.

Although Southern Bell later won a reversal in the courts, the decision denying them a $2,000,000-a-year rate increase attracted widespread attention. Utility commissions in other States, battling a similar wave of higher-rate requests from their own Bell System affiliates, began to notice Honaker's work.

It wasn't long before Honaker was hired by the City of Pittsburgh to help it fight a rate increase asked by the Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania.

Other States Want Him

Next he was hired by the Public Service Commission of West Virginia to study the higher-rate request of Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company, a Bell subsidiary. With Honaker's help, the West Virginia P.S.C. denied the increase and its decision was upheld by the State Supreme Court of Appeals.

Then came a request for help from a firm of consulting engineers who had been employed to fight Indiana Bell Telephone Company's request for higher rates. But when the Indiana P.S.C. saw Honaker in action, they hired him outright as their own consultant in the case.

Next the Indiana P.S.C. wanted Honaker to work on a second job. This was the higher-rate case of Illinois Bell Telephone Company, which operates also in northern Indiana. Later the Illinois P.S.C. joined forces with the Indiana P.S.C. to examine this two-State telephone system together.

Meantime, Southern Bell was seeking higher rates in Tennessee and Honaker's services were sought. But the busy expert had to decline the offer. The latest request comes from Kansas, where a Bell System subsidiary is trying to obtain a rate increase. Honaker hopes to be able to help out there.

Honaker is a conferee of the National Association of Railroad Utility Commissioners and was one of the group which helped a joint F.C.C.-N.A.R.U.C. committee prepare a manual on the separation of telephone utility accounts.

It was a shock and a surprise when, five days before Southern Bell asked for its fourth successive Kentucky rate increase, Honaker left the P.S.C. for a job with the Division of Motor Transportation. Honaker's salary in April had been raised to $4,800 and he had been promoted to "chief accountant and statistician" of the P.S.C.

But the new post as head of rates and services of the Motor Transportation Division paid Honaker $5,760 to start, with a ceiling of $6,500 a year.

And Here's Why:

These three enlightening things stand out as a result of Honaker's change of jobs:

1. Honaker had never met John C. Watts, director of Motor Transportation, until Watts asked him to head the newly-created "rates and services division."

2. It seems that State Senator Louis Cox had recommended Honaker for the job and strongly urged Watts to hire him.

3. Cox is one of the Kentucky attorneys for Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company.

THE RESULT

Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 6, 1950

Honaker Rehired As Aide to P.S.C.

Expert To Handle Accounting End Of Southern Bell Rate-Raise Plea

by The Associated Press

Frankfort, Ky., Sept. 5.—James M. Honaker has been re-employed by the Public Service Commission to handle the accounting end of the Southern Bell Telephone-rate-increase application.

Robert M. Coleman, chairman of the Public Service Commission, made the announcement following a conference today with Louisville and Middlesboro officials and Carl Wachs, executive secretary of the Kentucky Municipal League. The league has passed a resolution urging the commission to employ extra help to resist the increase.

Honaker worked for the commission from 1936 until a few weeks ago when he was appointed director of the Rates and Service Division in the Motor Transportation Department. He has studied toll rates charged by companies in the American Telephone & Telegraph Company network and has appeared as a witness for West Virginia and Indiana in Bell Telephone rate applications in those states.

West Virginia Beat A. T. & T.

The West Virginia Public Service Commission denied the A. T. & T. affiliate there a $4,000,000 rate-increase application. The commission was sustained in the courts. Today the Indiana commission gave Indiana Bell about half of what the company wanted.

Southern Bell is seeking permanent authority to raise its Kentucky rates by $2,691,000 annually. It put the higher rates into effect June 8 under a refund-guaranteeing bond in event any or all of the raise is denied.

Those attending today's conference included Coleman, Public Service Commissioners Cass and Walden and Clay Kaufman; Gilbert Burnett, Louisville law director, and his aide, Alan Schneider; Roy

Scrapbook

Owsley, executive assistant to the Mayor of Louisville; Sherman Chasteen, Mayor of Middlesboro; E. V. Williams, a Middlesboro City Commissioner, and Wachs.

Company Won Court Fight

Coleman said the commission wants to help the Cities fight the rate case and is willing to hire outside help if the persons are agreeable to both the Cities and the commission. Southern Bell serves 152 cities in Kentucky and has 303,000 telephones.

The commissioners pointed out that two Southern Bell rate-increase applications, totalling about $2,000,000, were consolidated in 1947 and the commission awarded the firm $1,600,000. In 1948, Southern Bell applied for a $2,000,000 increase. The commission rejected the application in its entirety but the company went to the courts and won.

Owsley, Wachs Feel Better

Southern Bell has presented its side of the $2,691,000 application. The commission's staff is examining the testimony before reopening the case for cross-examination.

Following the meeting, Owsley and Wachs said they felt better about the chances of the commission and the Cities of giving Southern Bell a good tussle during the remainder of the hearing.

Delta Democrat-Times (Greenville, Miss.), Sept. 3, 1950

Frank Smith Goes To Washington

The Delta is the real winner in the congressional campaign which ended last night with Frank Smith's convincing victory. We congratulate him, and the voters who gave him seven of the district's eleven counties. He will become a worthy successor to Will Whittington.

We also congratulate Oscar Wolfe who personally waged a clean fight. If he could have persuaded his principal supporters, particularly in Washington county, to have fought as cleanly, he would have come a lot closer to winning. More of that a little later.

Frank's victory represents more than the triumph of one candidate over another. It marks what one longtime citizen describes as the arrival of the twentieth century in Delta politics. By that he meant that Frank Smith and his amateur backers, and the rank and file who supported him, have broken the hold of that handful of old-timers and professionals who have dominated the distirct's and the county's politics for so long.

Now to borrow a phrase from Walter Sillers, we are going to pay our respects to a few people. We mean particularly the handful of legal eagles, pouter pigeons and prematurely hatched elder statesmen who roost in the Weinberg building and from that lofty eminence try to befoul anyone who differs politically or otherwise with them.

Some folks say bygones should be bygones after an election is over. In ordinary cases, we would agree. But in every election since we returned from the army, the same tired lies and smears have been dragged out and used against us whenever we have exercized our right as a citizen and editor to support a candidate for office. Up to the time we give such support, the professionals keep quiet, trying to get that support themselves. It happened when John Stennis ran for the Senate. It happened in this campaign. John Stennis wouldn't have so acted if we had opposed him. Nor would Frank Smith have done so. But the professionals would and have and will.

And we're more than fed up with it. We've tried to be a good citizen and to publish a good newspaper—a newspaper, incidentally, which in the 14 years we have lived in Greenville has risen from less than 3,000 to nearly 13,000 circulation, and which among other honors has received for the last two years the Mississippi Press Association's award for the best daily in the state. So what? Let a political campaign come around, and the vultures start swooping. We become a "pink," a "Negro-lover," a person unfit to live in the South, a diabolical conspirator who manipulates Negro votes and is planning to mongrelize the nation, backed no doubt by gold from Mr. Truman (whom we did not support, if Elder Statesman Sillers will 'scuse our contradicting him; we were Dewey-eyed in 1948).

Funny part is we aren't sore at Walter. In fact, we don't blame him for getting peeved after we caught him with his political pants down and kicked him accidentally in his gubernatorial aspirations. We shall always cherish a letter he wrote us just four months ago, which begins, "Thank you for the nice editorial appearing in last night's paper. It was good of you to speak so well of me and I appreciate it." Maybe we'll even frame it.

But we're not so charitably disposed toward some folks closer to home. Honest political and other differences are one thing. We have them with a good many people. But deliberate character assassination is another.

And that's why we're especially glad that Frank Smith carried both Greenville boxes and Washington county. Maybe after this the boys will decide the lies aren't worth anything.

—(Hodding Carter editorial)

The New Leader, August 26, 1950

How Low Can a Newspaper Get?

New York's 'Enquirer' is so Adept at Crying 'Wolf' it Even Weeps Over Mae West's Ankles.

by Richard M. Clurman

Although the headline unmistakably said in two-inch-high red letters across the top of page one that Russia had exploded its second atomic bomb, scarcely a person in all of New York City on a quiet Sunday afternoon six months ago, gave the news a second thought. A visitor from, say, Canton, Ohio, might have observed that New Yorkers seemed remarkably indifferent to news of such far-reaching consequence. The visitor could not have known—as his hosts did—that the New York *Enquirer,* where the headline appeared, specializes in news that never happens. And when the Korean Communist army marched southward, the *Enquirer* could not find type large enough, nor words strong enough, to write a headline that its numbed readers would believe after so many false alarms.

Some may question the *Enquirer's* exclusive rights to complete and utter unreliability among this country's newspapers. But no one, at least, can dispute its claim to uniqueness as the only metropolitan paper in America published on a Sunday afternoon.* The *Enquirer* shatters the sabbath each week with its loud, unruly pages, unchallenged by any competitors.

Consider a single edition with three banner headlines each running a full eight columns across the top of page one:

URGE DEWEY CALL GUARD
IF EDISON MEN STRIKE

MAE WEST INJURED

BLOODSHED NEAR IN EIRE

Looking at page one more closely, a reader finds that no one—save the *Enquirer's* reporter—had urged Governor Dewey to call out the National (or State) Guard, or if anyone had, the writer neglected to mention who the person or organization was. The injury suffered by Mae West was a "slight but extremely painful sprained ankle" that she acquired while "prettying up for a television show" Saturday night. And the approaching bloodshed in Eire was nothing more than a dire prediction from the American League for an Undivided Ireland, a little known organization with a melodramatic press agent.

Though it is published but once weekly, the Enquirer is really a daily newspaper,† bearing most of the benchmarks and all of the sores of daily journalism. Unlike America's other dailies, however, the *Enquirer* has never permitted its circulation claim to be examined by the Audit Bureau of Circulation. At one time the paper placed its readers at upward of eighty thousand. Today, in one of the few modest acts it has been known to commit, it claims a scant forty-seven thousand, mostly in New York, but enough out of town to require a mail edition on Saturday night. Its advertising rate is roughly equivalent to the standards set by papers of similar—though audited—circulation. It no more checks the *bona fides* of its advertising than it does the accuracy of its news stories.

To add to its confusing appearance, the *Enquirer,* which is unquestionably a Sunday paper, bears a Monday dateline on every page so that it can carry the wealth of legal advertising it receives from the city and state courts. (Legal notices cannot be printed on Sunday. Converting a necessity into a virtue, the *Enquirer* for some time used the slogan: "Monday Morning's News on Sunday Afternoon.") Although it carries United Press dispatches, it fits the news to its own design, garnishing the stories with such headlines, in red and black atop the first page, as: "MEXICO BARS AMERICANS!" (Americans who had been exposed to poliomyelitis, that is); "ASK A-WAR TRAINING" (the request came from the commandant of an unnamed college ROTC unit); "STOCKS CRASH, BILLION IS LOST!" (thirty-six hours earlier the stock market had shown a downward trend at closing).

Whatever success the *Enquirer* has achieved—at ten cents a copy and thirty cents an advertising line—demonstrates, in part, the drawing power of its sensational headlines. Although the *Enquirer* is certainly a headline newspaper, it must also attract some of its readers by its fulsome columnists, and its racing, entertainment, and Sunday sports news. Still others—personified in the crackpot letters the paper prints—are devoted to the *Enquirer's* editorials, which make Hearst and McCormick, by comparison, seem as restrained as the London *Times.*

To produce its twenty pages in at least two, and sometimes three and even four editions, the *Enquirer* employs four on its news desk, and a scattering of part-time reporters around the city. By Friday morning, most of the paper's columns, features, and editorials are safely within the *Enquirer's* dirt-gray offices in lower Manhattan's factory district. By late Saturday

*There is actually one other Sunday afternoon English-language paper: the Westerly, Rhode Island *Sun* (circ 6,793), published by a group of Seventh Day Adventists whose religious conviction requires that their weekend edition be produced on Sunday, rather than Saturday, which is their sabbath. But the *Sun*—unlike the *Enquirer*—has neither a metropolitan nor a general circulation.

†Weekly papers are usually community papers devoted largely to local news. They seldom attempt to compete with dailies by keeping up with national and international events. The *Enquirer,* on the other hand, in scope, format, content, and purpose, is a daily newspaper, though published only once a week.

night, the staff is busy finishing its two-star final, while at the same time anxiously eyeing Sunday's weather forecast. For the *Enquirer* is not so indispensable to New York life that it can survive the perils of a rainy Sunday, when its circulation goes plummeting downward.

The spirit behind this weekly outpouring is William Griffin, who twenty-four years ago launched the *Enquirer* to fill New York's Sunday news gap. Though William Griffin died in June of last year, the *Enquirer* is in the life and times of William Griffin, who was in his own way an American success story. Not that Griffin ever achieved the stature of his model William Randolph Hearst, at whose feet he sputtered admiringly for most of his life. Inevitably Griffin was destined to stand in the second (or third) ranks, though he played his part real and genuine with the vivacity of a master buffoon of the comic opera.

Griffin began his publishing career at the age of twelve with a magazine called the *Young American Golfer*. In 1914 he left Illinois and his second-generation Irish parents for an advertising and political career in California, interrupted by two war years in the Navy. The early 1920s found him working for the New York *American,* followed by a post on *Cosmopolitan*. He finally left Hearst for the New York *Graphic,* a newspaper irreverently but accurately known as the New York "Porno-Graphic," and dedicated to its own proposition that the "great crimes, the terrific accidents, the society-shaking scandals *must* be illustrated."

In September 1926, against everybody's advice, Griffin published the first copy of the *Enquirer*. Where he got the paper's initial capital of one hundred thousand dollars is still a mystery, although he was imbedded in Tammany politics as firmly as a traffic-court magistrate; and, if this were not enough, his good friend Hearst is said to have come to Griffin's aid more than once. From the start the *Enquirer* looked like nothing so much as an uninhibited member of the Hearst chain. It was violently anti-British, plugged relentlessly for Irish independence, opposed vivisection, and filled its pages with a patriotism that would have made a Fourth of July orator blush. By 1931—his political stock rising—William Griffin was asked by the Governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to deliver a seconding speech at the Democratic nominating convention. In 1936 he was petitioned to run for mayor; one year later Hearst boomed him for the U. S. Senate. President Roosevelt appointed him a member of an international commission to Poland. In 1939, with characteristic crankishness, Griffin sued Winston Churchill for slander in a million-dollar suit. The case was hastily thrown out of court and Griffin ordered to pay the British First Lord of the Admiralty some one hundred dollars in legal expenses—a small price for the clippings he collected.

Griffin bustled back and forth between Ireland and the United States regularly, with side trips to England and the Continent, all dutifully reported in the *Enquirer* and the Hearst papers. In one of his excursions he proposed to Britain's Viscount Cecil that England's war debt be liquidated by giving America the *Queen Mary* and Bermuda. To President Albert Lebrun he suggested that France give up the *Normandie*. By 1942 Griffin and his newspaper were internationally known loudmouths. The Attorney General indicted Griffin along with twenty-seven others—including Elizabeth Dilling, Gerald B. Winrod, Prescott Dennet (the *Enquirer's* Washington correspondent), et al.—for conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces. The government charged that Griffin had met with the already convicted George Sylvester Viereck to distribute seditious literature. Griffin had his usual bold rejoinder. He admitted meeting Viereck frequently, but only to plead the cause of the Jews, he said. Had not the *Enquirer* been banned in Germany for its hostility to Nazism? Through one mishap after another, including the death of the trial judge, none of the defendants was ever convicted. William Griffin and the *Enquirer* narrowly escaped one of the few opportunities they ever had to be taken seriously by the government.

Up to his death, Griffith quoted freely in the *Enquirer* from America's vermin press. Though he was a Democratic party hack in every pore, his paper was not above reprinting at length from Gerald L. K. Smith's *The Roosevelt Death: A Super Mystery,* and other similar books, topped by such banner headlines as "ROOSEVELT DEATH STILL A MYSTERY," or "ASK IMMEDIATE AUTOPSY ON FDR," the latter being a report that Stalin poisoned Roosevelt at Teheran.

When Griffin died on June 28, 1949, scores of Tammany politicians flocked to his funeral. Cardinal Spellman intoned a prayer over his bier. Governor Dewey called his death "a great loss to our community." And James Farley wrote a letter to Griffin's sons two weeks later: ["Your father] would be very proud of you if he could see the manner in which you have taken hold [of the *Enquirer*]." Others New Yorkers can see every Sunday of the year, all too evidently, the manner in which Griffin's sons have taken hold.

Oswald Garrison Villard once observed that the office of an irresponsible newspaper was the nearest thing to hell in a Christian state, since in brothels, gambling houses, and pirate's caves, there was at least a constant fear of the police to act as a restraining influence. The *Enquirer* need have no fear of the police. And, as with a good many other newspapers, the only restraining hand it feels comes from the realities of its circulation chart.

In this last regard it is not very different from many other American newspapers. What sets the *Enquirer* apart is that it pathetically lacks any semblance of craftsmanship. But the *Enquirer,* after all, could not exist for two weeks were it not for the conditioning to low journalism that Americans get six and seven days a week from more respectable papers. Two sociologists with a limited gift for phrase-making have labeled this effect the "narcotizing dysfunction," a term which signifies that American readers have been so accustomed to unreality in newspapers that they remain forever impenetrable, and placid in the face of the most shattering news.

The *Enquirer*, unhappily, is no freak. Though it rest firmly on the bottom rung of the journalist ladder, at any moment it could easily be joined by a crowd of other papers. What readers of the Los Angeles *Examiner* (circ. 357,000), the Chicago *Tribune* (944,000), of the Boston *Post* (330,000)—to mention only three examples—will not see shades of the New York *Enquirer* in the paper delivered to his home every day of the year? To be sure, it is a long way from the New York *Enquirer,* through two thousand English-language dailies, to papers like the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* the Washington *Post,* or the New York *Times*. But William Griffin—were he alive today—would be happy to know that there is a little bit of the New York *Enquirer* in a surprisingly large number of American newspapers.

TO INFORM OR MISINFORM

World Crisis Puts Reporting to Acid Test

In an address to the Medill School of Journalism, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, emphasized the exacting standards required of today's newspaperman.

EVANSTON, ILL., May 3—Today's newspaperman must measure up to more exacting standards than ever before, for his role in sustaining our values in the "cold war" is as basic as any function in our society, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York *Times,* told a group of journalism students from Northwestern University's Medill School of Journalism.

Mr. Sulzberger described also a second reason for high requirements among newspaper men, besides the pressures of the "cold war." This is competition—stiffer economic competition among progressively fewer daily newspapers, resulting in a keener competition for jobs; and competition for serious public attention to significant news in the face of emphasis on entertainment or diverting attention from "the real facts of life" on the part of some newspapers.

"These new responsibilities, and new pressures on the newspaper business, are not, to my mind, a bad thing—just as the Soviet challenge to America need not necessarily be a bad thing," the publisher held.

"For these pressures are forcing self-examination, which is always a healthy exercise in a democracy or anywhere else. They call for better educated, better balanced newspapermen and, I venture to suggest, more intelligent and better balanced newspapers."

The newspaper reader has a responsibility as well as the newspaper, Mr. Sulzberger observed, in the "imperative" task of conveying today's complex and serious news as contrasted with the easier-to-read "trivial and sensational."

What raises newspapering standards so high is that the United States is "involved in a violent struggle with powerful adversaries over what life is all about," with the likelihood that American decisions in the next few decades will determine "not only the issue of war or peace, but the issue of freedom in the world," Mr. Sulzberger said.

But our decisions are made by the consent of the people, which "is secured only through the distribution of reliable information on which people can base sound judgments," he continued.

"That puts those who gather and present the news in a position of primary responsibility," he said.

"They are not mere observers of ordinary events, remote and secondary in the struggles of their time. They are, or they have the possibility of being, in the forefront of the battle."

On what it takes to meet these responsibilities, Mr. Sulzberger said:

"These tasks obviously require standards of character, judgment, education and experience of a very high order.

"The mastery of certain techniques is certainly imperative in the newspaper business, but those who gather and present news on the intricate questions of today need much more than mere technical skill if they are really to understand what they are handling and convey their understanding to the reader.

"We have spent a good deal of time and energy in this business on how to display things, and maybe not quite enough time on how to evaluate things.

"We are very concerned about the length of our sentences and the brightness of our verbs (and on the *Times* that is a good thing) but the length of our minds is more important.

"If a man can think clearly, the chances are that he can write clearly, and probably even vividly. Any number of experts can be found who can tidy up a reporter's sentences, but what we need is somebody to tidy up our minds."

"The reporter who is ignorant, or wilfully biased, or weakly credulous, or more concerned with the form of what he writes rather than the substance of what he writes, is no longer a mere handicap but a downright menace.

"For the peculiar quality of the newspaper business, at a serious time like this, is that it either informs or misinforms."

The publisher contended that "reporters, like doctors, poison people when they are wrong," the main difference being that "newspaper errors poison them in somewhat larger numbers."

"The Man Said It"

Factual political reporting must be supplemented by the writer's background knowledge and his judgment, tempered by experience, to give meaning to current developments in politics and government, Warren Moscow, political reporter of the New York *Times,* declared yesterday.

Mr. Moscow discussed problems of political reporting before 500 teachers at the twelfth meeting of the sixth annual course on "Education and the News," given by the *Times* in cooperation with the Board of Education at Times Hall, 240 West Forty-fourth Street.

Facts themselves mean nothing, Mr. Moscow held, since they can be aligned in a manner designed to prove any point the writer wants to make.

"I think nothing is more puerile," he declared, "than the type of reporting which says, 'The man said it, therefore I will write it.' Many things are said to reporters covering government, with no restrictions against publication, which the reporter knows are just plain silly or perversions of the truth, as it has already been established. Any reporter worth his salt doesn't bother writing them.

"But the problem becomes even more complicated when the remark comes from a high authority, say a Governor or a Mayor, who may even issue a formal statement. In that formal statement he may be issuing a half-truth, or no truth at all."

Should the reporter simply use the statement, Mr. Moscow said, he would be misinforming a large part of the public that "cannot possibly keep in mind that events of a week or even a year ago show the declaration to be sham and self-service."

Mr. Moscow said that the solution to such a problem was to weave directly into the opening of the story the fact that the official issued a statement that did not conform to the known facts. In this way, he added, the casual reader is warned and the diligent one informed.

"To me this is an obligation," he continued, "to be met whenever the reporter is equipped with the knowledge to make his stand unassailable. It cannot be done lightly on the basis of suspicion alone. The reporter must call his shots, not pepper away at any target."

—N. Y. *Times,* May 3.

Editorials---With or Without Salt

by Bill Vaughan, in the Kansas City *Star*

An editorial writer for the *Daily Kansan,* student newspaper of the University of Kansas, has publicly eaten one of his own compositions, with pepper and salt. There had been one of those arguments between the university of Kansas State college over the size, age, eligibility or something of a basketball player. The journalist had offered to consume his own brain child if he were proven wrong in whatever it was he said. He was and he did.

The incident interested and saddened us, not as a basketball fan, but as an old editorial eater. The salt and pepper were particularly distressing.

To add condiments to an editorial before eating it is like soaking a steak in strong tasting sauce. It is an admission that the food is inferior. An editorial that does not contain its own spice is not worth writing or printing, much less eating.

Had we been that hapless editorial writer we would have eaten that editorial with all the enthusiasm of a gourmet tasting something served under glass. Bystanders would have been invited to try a morsel.

"Note, if you will," we would have said, "the delicate irony of the adjectives which seem to melt upon the tongue like the memory of a dream. Judge of the deceptive fluffiness of the rhetoric, composed as it is of the juice of sun-ripened nouns, crushed by lovely native girls treading barefoot upon a vintage edition of Webster's. Thrill to the crunchiness of the verbs. Dangle this participle upon your taste buds. Roll these sonorous sentences in your mouth."

Editorial eating has, admittedly, fallen upon evil days.

Who now revels in the delight of hitting upon a chewy "however" in the middle of a salty second paragraph or savors that delicate, indescribable taste of a properly qualified "on the other hand?"

The "whereas," a favorite of editorial eaters of another day, is not much in favor currently as it tends to get in the teeth.

Not all editorials, of course, are equally suitable for the table. Those on foreign affairs, for example, while they highlight the festive board, may be too rich for everyday tastes.

For plain, wholesome morning fare, editorials on traffic safety, domestic politics and public works are vitamin packed yet not so heavy as to make the eater logey or listless. By midday a person of normal appetite should have something more solid—perhaps about a half column of analysis of the drift toward the welfare state.

For dinner why not try a fricassee of opinion on the British election, followed by something light and frothy about the hydrogen bomb?

Some forms of editorial are, of course, completely indigestible. Among these are humorous editorials. We once heard of a man who was forced in desperation to consume an entire humorous editorial.

"It really wasn't so bad," he told us. "Only it tasted a little funny."

This we can hardly believe.

—*Mo. Journal,* March 29.

Nieman Notes

1939

The Dial Press published in September a first novel—*The Rest They Need*—by **Herbert Lyons,** and announced a second one in process to come out in 1951. Herbert Lyons is dividing his work between the novel and writing for *Holiday* magazine, and his time between Memphis and Mobile. He has returned to the South, where he began newspaper work in Mobile, after a decade in New York journalism, with time out for the war. He served on the *New Republic,* the *Sunday Times, Stars and Stripes* (Mediterranean edition), and *Yank.*

Catherine F. Malone, secretary of the Nieman Foundation office, was married, July 31, to **Louis M. Lyons,** curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. They spent most of August at Windham, Vermont and in September began living at 4 Shady Hill Sq., Cambridge.

1941

John H. Crider, editor-in-chief of the Boston *Herald,* was the guest speaker at the Convocation, September 21, opening the 116th year of Wheaton College at Norton, Mass. Mr. Crider spoke on "The Autumn of Peace."

1942

Stanley Allen is serving as press secretary to Governor Chester Bowles of Connecticut during the campaign period, on leave of absence from his public relations office with the AMVETS. "It is wonderfully stimulating to be working so closely with Bowles, who is a terrific person in every respect. With a four-year term for the governor coming up for the first time plus two seats in the Senate at stake, I couldn't resist the opportunity to have a key role in the wheeling and dealing of a nationally crucial campaign." Allen's early newspaper work was in Connecticut, on the New Haven *Register* and he did a political column for them for a time after going to Washington.

Robert Lasch of the editorial page of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* has a son, Christopher, entering Harvard this Fall.

1943

Starting his fifth year as professor of

Nieman Notes

journalism at the University of Massachusetts, **Arthur B. Musgrave** is directing four courses: an introductory course in reporting, a course in feature writing, a new course on the weekly newspaper, besides a more informal course for his seniors, whom he directs in individual writing and research. Their work includes one day a week in the offices of nearby newspapers, the Holyoke *Transcript,* the Hampshire *Gazette,* and the Springfield *Union.* Of 11 journalism students who have received special awards for their studies in the last three years, 10 are employed on newspapers of the State.

1945

Holiday magazine for September published a special article on Montana, done by **A. B. Guthrie, Jr.,** author of *The Big Sky,* and *The Way West.* Native of Montana, although he spent nearly 20 years in newspaper work in Kentucky, Guthrie now spends long Summers on a Montana ranch where he has done much of the work on his books. He returned to Lexington in September to resume his seminar in writing at the State University.

1947

Henry H. Hornsby has moved over from the Lexington (Ky.) *Leader* to its morning sister, the *Herald,* in the new post of farm editor. On the city desk of the *Leader,* Henry edited the mammoth special Horse number of the Sunday *Herald-Leader* last Winter. **William M. Stucky** has returned to the city editor's desk on the *Leader* that Hornsby occupied while Stucky was at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship last year.

William H. McDougall, author of *Six Bells Off Java* and *By Eastern Windows,* spent part of the Summer in Europe gathering material for a small book "about certain shrines where occurred apparitions of the Virgin Mary." Bill explains that "it will be a running story, sort of travelogish, with two mythical characters doing the travelling instead of me. All in all a fascinating trip. Hope I can do justice to it in the extremely short writing time available. Have to finish it before I return to the seminary." He wrote from his old home in Salt Lake City where he did his early newspaper work on the *Tribune.*

Ernest H. Linford, editorial writer on the Salt Lake *Tribune,* attended the ten-day seminar on foreign relations sponsored by Brookings Institution in Denver where he was the speaker at the opening meeting of the season of the Denver Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi.

1948

Robert W. Glasgow, who has been mid-West correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune,* joined the staff of *Time,* Inc. in September. He will continue to cover the mid-West assignment.

Lester Grant, who won the 1949 Westinghouse award for science writing with his cancer series in the New York *Herald Tribune,* has started a three-way activity this Fall. Returning to Boston, he has enrolled for premedical studies at Harvard and is continuing his writing of special medical articles and reports, and has undertaken a job of research and writing for the Medical School. As a Nieman Fellow from the *Herald Tribune,* Grant pursued studies chiefly in medical science.

Christopher Rand is returning to his China post at Hongkong for the New York *Herald Tribune* after a Summer at home in California working on a book on Hongkong, to be published by Knopf. He entered his oldest son, Temple, in his own old school, Groton, before returning to the Orient.

Mr. and Mrs. **Walter H. Waggoner** (New York *Times,* Washington) announce the birth of a son, Geoffrey Howe Waggoner, on September 9.

George Weller, stationed in Rome for the Chicago *Daily News,* reports on a visit to George Santayana at the Convent of the Blue Sisters, in company with Professor Perry Miller of Harvard, who had spent a year as American guest lecturer at the University of Leyden.

1950

A third daughter, Nancy Jean, was born to Mr. and Mrs. **Donald J. Gonzales** (UP, Washington, D. C.) on August 28.

1951

Since his appointment to a Nieman Fellowship last June, **Wellington Wales** has been appointed editor of the Auburn (N.Y.) *Citizen-Advertiser* where he had served as editorial writer. Mrs. Wales, of the *Citizen-Advertiser* staff, is handling the editorial page during her husband's leave of absence for the year at Harvard where his interest centers on the problems of the small city.