Nieman Reports

October, 1952

Does Press Freedom Include Photography?

Joseph Costa

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.

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Malcolm C. Bauer, Portland, Ore.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John L. Hulteng, Providence, R. I.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, Ohio; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, Ohio; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, New York City; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Washington, D. C.; 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. VI NO. 4 OCTOBER, 1952

TV and the Press

by William S. White

(From the International Press Institute Report for September.)

The year 1952 beyond question will be a year of memorable development in the technique of television and of memorable adaptation in the older art of printing the news.

The political conventions in Chicago were, of course, the most thoroughly "covered" by television of any events in its brief and urgent history. That the job was on the whole a good one, granted the necessary limitations of the machine, seems to be accepted almost everywhere in this country.

And now that the national campaign itself is on the boards, perhaps the outstanding impression of interest to newspapermen is that the participants look with greater respect toward television than toward the press in their immediate purpose to appeal to masses of men.

Only for the final viewing, however. The personal experience of this correspondent suggests that these same politicians tend to look with far greater respect to the press for guidance on how to make these very appeals to the mass. There is hardly a United States senator who will not gladly go before a national television audience to answer, in the most public fashion possible, questions carrying a degree of embarrassment, and even sometimes of impertinence. He would instantly wave these away in an old-fashioned press conference.

There is, on the other hand, hardly a United States senator who is not immeasurably more influenced personally by the views and attitudes of the principal papers than by any number of flattering responses from television audiences. The politician, in short, has quickly grasped a point of some subtlety. This point is that there are now open and available to him two quite disparate channels of great promise *and* of great danger.

On one of these channels, television, he is able to influence vast numbers of people with almost frightening speed.

On this channel, at any rate, the politician appears for the most part on his own terms, in every sense. He is here the classic picture of man in motion. His degree of handsomeness, of seeming earnestness, is often more important than what he says. Here, he is being self-reported, and in a single, flat dimension.

But on the channel of the press, the politician is, of course, seen only through interposing eyes—the eyes of the reporter, the columnist, the editor—and what he says, in the responsible press at least, is put to certain objective tests and caveats. He is by no means on his own terms.

The situation therefore arises that the response he gets over television is, as it must be, fundamentally uncritical, subjective, quick and simplified. If the impression is good, it may not necessarily be lasting. The public impression gained of him from the press, on the other hand, is to some degree founded upon exercise of the critical faculty. It hardens more slowly and in the nature of things is therefore likely to endure longer. It is not, relatively, so simplified.

Experience in reporting events at which television was ever-present—the late Chicago conventions are excellent examples—makes one certain that the newspapers have found in the mere existence of this new instrument a challenge without exact example and an opportunity without any parallel.

First for the challenge: It is abundantly clear, if indeed it had not been clear since the early days of radio's success, that press articles that are merely "accurate" and wholly withdrawn from the spirit and color and aura of the scene—those things so infallibly transmitted by camera and sound — will not do. The dispatch reaching the breakfast table in the folded newspaper must not have broken with those small but very human realities so recently seen and heard, and all but felt, over the television set in the living room. There must be some faithful atmosphere in this dispatch.

As for the opportunity: The time has not come, and perhaps it will never come, when the television camera, even with the aid of running commentaries, can get behind the scene of what seems to be happening, to disclose what is really happening, and why and what it really means. In the famous "smoke-filled hotel rooms" there are no cameras.

The profound opportunity open to the press is the opportunity for reporting in multi-dimensions, grown-up reporting with its long pants on.

Does Press Freedom Include Photography?

Consider the Record of Smashed Cameras and the Arbitrary Barring of News Photographers

by Joseph Costa

A distinguished news photographer presents the case of the all-too-frequent barring or restricting or interfering with cameramen, whose picture record is an essential part of the news.

Nieman Reports requested this article from Joseph Costa of King Features Syndicate, chairman of the board of the National Press Photographers' Association. In his 32 years of photographic journalism he has seen too many cameras smashed and too many arbitrary instances of preventing the picture record to which the public is entitled.

The case he makes is as timely and important as its record is shocking and dangerous to the cause of freedom of information.

The proper dissemination of news by a free press is not accomplished solely by the printed word. There is a visual record, too, that must be transmitted to do the complete job. The object of this complete job, of course, is the informed public upon which our democracy stands.

Our American public gets as much of its news through pictures as it does the printed word, that is, when it is permitted to see photographs of newsworthy happenings.

Freedom of the press implies exemption from censorship and the right of all persons to publish what seems to be in the public interest, providing, of course, they do not violate the various laws of libel, treason and sedition. And yet, insofar as pictures in the news are concerned, we have anything but a free press.

Admittedly, this is a biased report—biased in the public interest—biased in favor of complete freedom of information so that the public may not only read about events, but also see for themselves—biased because the writer has lived through 32 years of news photography and has seen attempts at censorship of news pictures by individuals in every walk of life.

The censorship of photographic news starts with our courts and the American Bar Association and goes right down to U. S. Marshals and the Department of Justice, firemen, policemen, private citizens, industry, labor union members, etc. These and many more act the role of self-appointed censors at-the-source of the news in trying to determine what news the public shall or shall not get.

There is hardly an organized group, whether it concerns industry or labor, professional or amateur, that doesn't think of pictures and the press photographer when trying to promote campaigns in which their own interests are involved. Yet scarcely a week goes by without physical attacks on press photographers peacefully engaged in covering their news assignments in the public interest.

As a social instrument which serves the public so well in providing visual information, it is subjected to more abuse and restrictions than any other legitimate field of endeavor known to this writer.

Press photography is hampered in the courts, because of the archaic thinking of some of the most powerful leaders in legal circles, individuals whose thinking is still in the horse and buggy area. The American Bar Association and the entire legal profession which is supposed to protect the interests of the people, has adopted a canon of judicial ethics which states arbitrarily that the taking of pictures is, "calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, degrade the court, and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted."

Many judges and law makers disagree with this fallacious line of reasoning, not based on facts. They feel that news photography in the courtrooms would bring to the American public more accurate reports of the tribunals, but few of these dare to oppose the old diehards by publicly favoring press photography.

Originally there was good reason for banning pictures in courtrooms. Large bulky cameas, flash powder which went off like a miniature atom bomb, tripods, etc. etc. made this prohibition necessary.

As Max Ehrlich, a prominent New York attorney, in discussing this problem pointed out to the Brooklyn Bar Association, "When the reason for a law perishes, the law itself perishes."

Today becaue of technological advancements in photog-

raphy, pictures can be taken in any courtroom in the land by means of the existing light only and with cameras so small as to be relatively as inconspicuous as are the reporters taking notes.

"When the reason for a law perishes, the law itself perishes."

Mr. Ehrlich was quoting the famed Mr. Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo in "The Nature of the Judicial Process," who said, "I think that when a rule, after it has been duly tested by experience, has been found to be inconsistent with the sense of justice or with the social welfare, there should be less hesitation in frank avowal and full abandonment." Yet, it is those who guide this same legal profession today. who refuse to see the logic of this forthright thinking.

Back in 1928 the writer had the good fortune to make a picture, unknown to the subjects therein, which showed the chief defense attorney in a sensational murder trial lunching with the forelady of the jury at the courthouse sandwich bar. As a result, the judge excused the juror from service in the particular trial. That picture was a great service to both the court and the taxpayers. Had the relationship between the chief defense attorney and the forelady been discovered after the trial was finished or after it was well underway, it could easily have necessitated a retrial. This would have meant many additional thousands of dollars expense to the taxpayers.

Although news photography had performed a great service to the court and it had been convincingly demonstrated that pictures could be taken in existing light, without distraction to the subjects or their even being aware of the camera's presence, the judge refused to permit coverage of the trial by press photographers.

Have you ever seen a picture of the Supreme Court of the United States in session? If you have, you are one of the few who saw such a picture once taken in spite of the rules and published in a national magazine. This writer cannot understand the logic of depriving the people of photographs of their highest tribunal; photographs which would give the people a better understanding of and a higher respect for this important court.

To date the only argument advanced by the legal profession in defense of this censorship-at-the-source is that it "detracts from the dignity of the proceedings." This excuse simply does not square with the facts. In view of the fact that churches of all denominations permit pictures of their services, one naturally is led to ask, "Are the courts more sacrosanct than the Houses of God?"

Did you know that newspictures are never permitted in the U. S. Senate? That the elected representatives of the people, through their archaic thinking, prevent visual reports of their deliberations from reaching the people they are elected to represent?

This year the Legislature of the State of New York passed, and Governor Dewey signed, a Bill which prohibits the televising or radio broadcasting of official hearings at which witnesses are required to testify under subpoena. To our knowledge, not one newspaper raised its voice against this law. This is regrettable for the enactment of this law established a precedent—a precedent which can be used to justify further legislation barring still newspaper photos or even the reporting of these hearings. Gov. Dewey's reason for signing the bill was that broadcasting equipment tended to make a witness nervous. Could that not also be said about a press table which is crowded with reporters taking notes of the witness' testimony?

Senator Pat McCarran (D. Nev.) recently introduced a resolution before the Rules Committee of the Senate which would prohibit "Any photograph to be taken in any room during the conduct therein of any hearing before such (standing, special or select) committee."

In answer to a protest by the NPPA, Senator McCarran referred to the American Bar Association Canon 35 on Judicial Ethics as his justification. Mr. McCarran also cited his desire "to protect witnesses before Congressional committees, (from) being made public spectacles, (from) having lights shining or flashing or cameras grinding in their faces, as well as to protect the proper decorum which should characterize Senate hearings." Surely the Senator knows of the remarkable photo coverage of the Nuremberg trials. Would he say that these were not conducted with proper dignity and decorum?

Senator McCarran also pointed to the bill enacted in New York State to show that he was not alone in his opinions.

Many judges in various parts of the country have been persuaded to permit press photographers to cover trials of great public interest. In every instance both the attorneys for the people and the defense, and the judges, have agreed that the taking of pictures in the manner prescribed by the NPPA in no way detracted from the dignity of the proceedings and that the interests of the people or the accused were not jeopardized. Perhaps the words of District Court Judge Raymond L. Sauter of the 13th Judicial District of Colorado express the opinion of all those in the judiciary who now champion the cause of courtroom press photography. Judge Sauter said:

> The judicial branch of our government in some instances operates with restrictions which, to me, seem unwarranted. This attitude at times expresses itself by the exclusion of news photographers from courtrooms.
>
> Judicial officers should not seek the headlines, or endeavor to adorn the news page, and courtroom photography need not produce such results. Readers are little concerned over the identity of a jurist, but they are tremendously concerned over what takes place in court and are genuinely interested in participants in the drama of the courtroom. Words alone many times cannot por-

tray the tenseness of a moment of crisis in an important trial. A picture can, and often does, tell more than a thousand words.

In this age, when visual impressions are assuming increasing importance, courts should not be too reluctant to permit photographs of judicial proceedings, if they can be accomplished without interfering with the orderly progress of a trial. It has been my experience in some cases of great public interest that news photographers not only functioned without disturbing the normal progress of the trial, but performed unnoticed by the jury, the attorneys, and the witnesses. Certainly such photography in the courtroom entitles the news photographer to consideration, and so long as his work is carried on in this manner, the news photographer will be welcome at any trial where I preside.

Press photographers are the victims of physical attacks almost daily, but what do you think of a fire department which turns its hoses away from a burning building in order to douse the photographers who are taking pictures of the fire and of the efforts to extinguish it? Impossible you say? Well according to the Lexington *Herald* (Kentucky), this actually happened and quite recently, too. On orders of Fire Chief Frank Dillon, members of the Fayette County, Kentucky, Fire Department, turned their hoses away from a burning structure and directed them on to Lexington *Herald* photographers covering the fire.

Attacks of one kind or another are growing in number. They are inflicted by self-appointed censors at-the-source in every part of the country. This has been going on almost unchallenged for years and lately has shown a great increase. Most of these attacks result because every Tom, Dick and Harry seems to think that he can push around news cameramen engaged in doing their legitimate task and get away with it. Unfortunately in many cases, that is exactly what happens.

Let me cite some of the recent cases that have been brought to the attention of the National Press Photographers Association:

A story in the Tulsa, Okla. *Tribune* told how Royce Craig, staff photographer, was slugged in the face by Police Lt. Arthur Graves, while Graves held Craig defenseless by shoving his service revolver in Craig's stomach. The assault took place in a federal building corridor after the photographer had taken a picture of Lt. Graves outside the courtroom.

In Pawtucket, Rhode Island, the son of a hold-up victim attacked Pawtucket *Times* photographer Morris Dumin, demolishing his photographic equipment and causing severe hand and knee injuries to the photographer. Mr. Dumin was doing nothing more than covering a routine news assignment to which he had been assigned by his editor.

The Los Angeles *Examiner* reported how demonstrating members of the CIO United Automobile Workers beat Floyd McCarthy, staff photographer, with a rubber hose and smashed his camera completely, while photographer Bob Hecht, of the same paper, was forcibly ejected and his camera taken away from him.

At a recent Iowa State Fair, auto race drivers, spectators and police banded together in an unsuccessful attempt to prevent photographing the crack-up of two racing cars. One of the photographers had his trousers badly ripped and his leg severely scratched.

At Fayetteville, Tenn., a defense attorney smashed the camera of a staff photographer of the Nashville *Tennessean,* for taking the picture of a defense witness.

In Borger, Texas, a deputy sheriff confiscated the camera of a staff photographer of the Borger *News Herald,* who was taking pictures of the crash of an obsolete Navy Bearcat Fighter on a public highway. The Deputy Sheriff said he did it on "orders" of a Navy Commander who was Executive Officer at a nearby Navy Base. The Navy Commander explained that he wanted to avoid "bad publicity" for the Navy. As a result of a protest from the NPPA, the Navy policy on the photographing and publicizing of Navy activities was made clear by Admiral R. F. Hickey, the Navy's Public Information Chief at Washington. In a letter to the NPPA, Admiral Hickey said "The Navy's policy with regard to photography and other public information coverage of any event, *accidents included,* is to cooperate to the fullest extent. This is true when the incident occurs inside a naval establishment. In the Borger incident . . . there was no reason at all why full coverage was not appropriate, and it appears to me that one of our field personnel did not appreciate what would or would not start *'bad Navy publicity.' I have found that giving honest facts is the best procedure."*

The Navy recognizes the public's right to see and to be informed, but that recognition and apology did not fill the blank 3-column rectangle, which the Borger *News Herald* ran on its front page in lieu of the suppressed photograph.

In Troy, New Hampshire, Air Police confiscated both exposed and unexposed film of a staff photographer of the Keene *Evening Sentinel,* who had taken pictures of the crack-up of an F-47 Thunderbolt propeller-driven airplane.

A reporter and photographer of the Columbus *Citizen* were arrested by police of Jackson, Ohio, when the two newspapermen attempted to cover a clash between union and non-union coal miners, in a southeastern coal field.

A photographer and reporter assigned to provide sympathetic coverage of the dislocation of Ellentown, S. C., to make way for a new H-bomb site, were attacked by members of a church congregation who had agreed to pose after the service. The newsmen had explained their intentions to the Mayor and other civic leaders and emphasized the

fact that their story would be restrained and factual. Their appearance outside the church on Sunday morning was by appointment and by prior agreement.

In Oakland, Cal., Army Base Military Police barred newsmen from covering the wedding of an Army Captain to a Japanese girl. One photographer for United Press Pictures was jailed for an hour before he was finally released. The wedding had aroused considerable public interest because of the importance of the girl's family in Japan.

Another report in the Los Angeles *Examiner* told how members of the Hollywood American Legion Post roughed up a staff photographer when they decided to prevent the taking of pictures of the removal of the body of a boxer, who had died in the ring during a Legion-sponsored bout.

One of the most unpardonable attacks on a photographer took place at the recent Republican National Convention. Stanley Tretick, United Press Photographer nursed a bruised ear as a result of the slugging he received when he tried to take a picture of a delegate who had fainted. Photographer Tretick was covering the floor of the convention and he was wearing the credentials issued by the Convention Committee, which authorized him to take pictures of goings on during the sessions. Photographs of the slugging were published in papers across the country.

Surely not even politicians can expect to stage a national "circus," issue credentials to the legitimate members of the press and then permit delegates to attack photographers performing their assigned duties. Despite the fact that the published photographs very clearly showed one individual with fist raised as he was striking the photographer, while another individual had his arms locked around him, no effort has been made by the Republican National Committee to have these two would-be "censors" reprimanded for their attack on Tretick, nor has the press association taken any legal action against the culprit to protect its own photographer.

In at least one instance of an unprovoked attack on a press photographer, the attacker not only came out second best, but received severe physical injuries which the court refused to recognize as an assault on the part of the photographer. Wayne Winters of the Prestott, Arizona *Courier* was seized upon from behind after he had taken a picture at a town budget hearing. His attacker had already secured a firm grip on Winters' camera when Winters swung around and struck one solid blow to his attacker's eye. The blow cut the offender's face so severely as to require a number of stitches. Whereupon the attacker swore out a warrant charging Winters with aggravated assault. I am happy to report that the charges against Winters, his managing editor and two others so accused, were dismissed on the grounds that Winters acted in self defense.

There are more, many more, but why go on? Whether it's New York or California, New Hampshire or Texas, press photographer's and a supposedly free press are continually being interfered with in their efforts to bring visual news to the public.

You can see from the geographical locations and people involved, that these attacks are not restricted to any one section of the country or to any particular type of news story.

Every single attack on a working newspaperman who is conscientiously and properly covering the story to which he is assigned, is in effect censorship-at-the-source and is an attack on freedom of the press, as well as the civil rights of the photographer or reporter.

Several editors have already recognized this fact and publicly expressed their views in their editorial columns. It would be helpful if more editors took vigorous action in their news columns and in the courts when circumstances indicate such procedure to be proper.

The Pawtucket *Times* said editorially after the attack on its photographer, "Civil rights supposedly guaranteed to every American went out the window when a *Times* photographer was assaulted recently. Looking at it as a *suppression of the freedom of the press*—which it was—might mean missing the really personal side of the unprovoked attack." The editorial closed with these words, "The work of these men, in keeping the public alert to what is going on, should not be made any harder. They don't ask special treatment. They ought to be able to expect common courtesy and assurance against lawless assault."

In contrast to this, the Atlanta *Constitution,* whose photographer was attacked and his camera smashed, did not even reply to a letter when it was urged by the National Press Photographers Association, to prosecute to the limit of the law "both for the protection of their own personnel who were attacked in the line of duty, and in the public interest."

Generally speaking, the press appears largely to overlook the cumulative effect of these many personal attacks on its photographers and reporters, as they go about their assigned tasks. Although these attacks are spontaneous and completely unorganized, they constitute a continuing threat to freedom of the press.

We can bring our fight directly to the people when censorship concerns an Executive Order or where that order is misused by public officials as an excuse to cover up unfavorable information about their public responsibilities, but censorship-at-the-source which stems from myriad small roots scattered all over the United States is more dangerous and presents a much more difficult problem.

Newspapers could build much pressure to protect their cameramen and reporters through an informed public opinion. This is not a wholly selfish consideration, for every attack on a photographer who is doing his legitimate duty is also an infringement on the public's right to be informed by news pictures that are in the public domain.

However, there are many other ways in which the public's right to information is interfered with. The rules of the Department of Justice have been a continuous source of trouble to press photographers ever since the inception of the National Press Photographers Association in 1946. How many years this had gone on before, it is hard to tell, since there is no record of specific cases prior to that date.

On page 703.01 (dated August 16, 1946) of the United States Marshals Manual regarding the photographing of prisoners, there is a provision which reads in part, "Under no circumstances will the U. S. Marshal permit reporters, photographers or other persons to photograph a prisoner." U. S. Marshals have done everything in their power both on federal property and in public places to prevent the photographing of prisoners. As a result of protests by the the NPPA, a circular was issued on May 14, 1948, which reads (referring to the prohibition quoted above), "These instructions are not to be construed as meaning that the U. S. Marshals are required to take active steps to prevent the taking of unposed photographs of prisoners on the street or in other public places outside of the Federal courthouse."

Evidence that this circular has not succeeded in its objective reaches us continually. One which perhaps is the most flagrant in its disregard of the freedom of the press guaranteed by the constitution and the civil rights of the photographer, took place on May 8, 1952. The incident occurred when Jack Moebes of the Greenboro, N. C. *Record* sought to make an unposed photograph on a public street of a man who had been arrested in connection with the robbery of a bank. Deputy U. S. Marshal H. C. Stallings, of Greensboro, N. C., struck at Jack Moebes, hitting his camera and damaging it.

The National Press Photographers Association has lodged a protest with Attorney General James P. McGranery and is awaiting his reply. At the time that he was named to his high post by President Truman, Mr. McGranery said that he wanted to restore the confidence of the American people in their government. We have pointed out in our protest that incidents involving the interferences of U. S. Marshals with the legitimate gathering of news in public places, are given wide publicity and that such publicity does not help in that objective.

Other incidents of interference by United States marshals with the work of press photographers continue in all parts of the country.

While Circular # 4041 specifically refers to places "outside the Federal courthouse or in public places," we feel that this restriction is an infringement of the public's right to information. Are not corridors of Federal courthouses public places? Should not any place that is open to the public also to be open to the press photographer?

In many parts of the country, news photographers who shoot newsreels on film for television are barred from many events of public interest because "television is entertainment and not a news media." This is something that the television companies had better get after without delay. A good educational program undertaken now might mean freedom from interference in the years to come.

The reporting of college sports events are hampered by arbitrary rules of the institutions staging these events. While the situation is not entirely under control, the NPPA has made headway in getting the universities and colleges to understand that such arbitrary rules actually hurt the publicity which they regard as so valuable.

The NPPA conducted a survey which showed that some institutions of learning provide excellent facilities and allow photographers to work without a lot of unnecessary restrictions. The survey also revealed which universities and colleges did not provide adequate facilities for coverage and that did impose a lot of unnecessary restrictions on the photographers. In almost every case, the colleges that took a liberal viewpoint of the press photographers' work were the ones that were getting the best sports picture coverage and the most publicity. The results of this survey were presented to the annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Directors .

At subsequent meetings of groups of these men, we have been helped by executives in the news picture business like Mr. Harold Blumenfeld, Executive Editor of United Press Newspictures. Together we've shown them the picture editor's need for better eye-stopping sports pictures. Thus they heard it from the highest authority, that good sports pictures of relatively unimportant college events, would be used in preference to dull uninteresting shots of important games.

As social instruments, news pictures have been responsible for the speeding up of many social reforms which we enjoy today. Whether they be new rules for mine safety, safety on the high seas or on the highways ,they were hastened into being by dramatic photographs of bad conditions that were responsible for the disasters.

Slum clearance projects have been hastened by pictures informing the public about the actual condition. Every social effort of modern civilization is helped by the judicious use of news photographs which reveal to the public the conditions that need correcting.

The terror of war has never been brought to the attention of the people with greater impact than was the case in World War II and in the current Korean conflict because of pictures.

Whether it is the bedlam of a political convention; the daily street scene; the glamor, pathos and tragedy of everyday life; or the horror of that worst of all killers, the traffic accidents on Americas' highways; press photography brings it to us in a manner which everyone—the literate and illiterate—can readily understand.

The Editor's Job Today

An Independent Editor *deplores* editorials that are banal, poorly written, parochial; *urges* change of pace, awareness of realities, packing a wallop.

by Charles A. Sprague

Historically the differences between journalism in Oregon and California have paralleled somewhat other differences between the two states. A century ago, as the files of my own paper will show, we had what has been called the Oregon style of editorial writing, a style intensely personal. Editors dipped their pens in vitriol, indulged in harsh invective and a running exchange of epithets with their rivals. It was the same or worse in California but it was punctuated more often with libel suits, personal assaults and challenges to duels. California editors carried a derringer in those days, as well as makeup rules in their pockets, and carried them for use. A cane or horsewhip was the usual limit of reaction in Oregon to editorial vituperation. This style lasted to the turn of the century and we still have some masters of this old art of verbal duelling—Westbrook Pegler for example. I recall my boyhood in a town in the Midwest where two weekly papers struggled, one Republican, the other Democratic in its affiliation. One editor regularly reviled his competitor whose initials were O. I. by referring to him as Oily Iry, while the latter retaliated with reference to his rival as Mount Pelee Todd—that gives you my dating as well as a bit of evidence of the persistence of this type of personal journalism.

This century has brought many changes. Editorials are cast in different molds, and newspapers themselves have been greatly altered. We often hear that newspapers have declined in power and influence. This is old stuff to us. We recognize it as having been incubated in politics and kept alive by politicians. It is extremely difficult to prove or disprove this allegation. For example, how do we know that newspapers ever did have much influence? The criteria for comparison are not at hand. I do know, and I think you do too, that newspapers today enjoy far greater independence and hence more freedom for expression, and are less often in pawn to bank, railroad, utility or political party than in those "good old days."

OUR CRITICS SHOULD UNDERSTAND that newspapers are serving a different public, under different conditions. The newspaper is no longer virtually the sole medium of mass communication. Others have been developed with great popular appeal. The mass audience has a higher level of education and a wider range of interest. Today people are more completely and closely organized around group interests, and thus self-insulated. In the controlling of opinion the voice of the newspaper heard through its editorial columns is only one of many, and some of the others have much greater powers of amplification.

Moreover the newspaper has done a job of interior remodeling. It is no longer chiefly a political tract with a smattering of news and fillers of miscellany. It is more than ever a purveyor of news. To widen its appeal it has developed and expanded special departments such as sports, society, business, and has added entertainment features such as comics. The editorial page suffers not only from the competition of other vehicles to convey opinion; it has to compete for reader attention with every other part of the newspaper from page one news to classified ads.

Reader surveys show the effect of this competition. In the "Continuing Study of Newspaper Reading" made by the Advertising Research Foundation, the median studies to date show readership of editorials standing at 43 per cent for men and 27 per cent for women. Compare that with the showing of other portions of the paper: Editorial page items 83 per cent for men, 79 per cent for women; comics 81 per cent for men, 78 per cent for women; sports 76 per cent for men, 49 per cent for women. Only financial news rates lower with 28 per cent for men and ten per cent for women. Advertising consistently rates higher. Retail display advertising scored 80 per cent for men and 95 per cent for women.

WE EDITORS MAY FLATTER OURSELVES that our readership lies among the leaders of thought and affairs, so that our editorial influence is more far-reaching than these percentage figures indicate. There is some truth in that; but the filtering of influence through a select group to the mass of non-readers must be a slow process. In brief, increased competition for attention both from without and from within the newspaper does reduce the extent of editorial influence regardless of editorial content.

These statistics in themselves offer a challenge. Have

Charles A. Sprague, former Governor of Oregon, is editor of the *Oregon Statesman* of Salem, Ore. This is from a talk to the California State Editors Conference of Stanford University, June 21.

newspapers or the public outgrown the editorial page? I am one who doesn't think so, though that may be just occupational bias on my part. The great majority of publishers do not think so, for they continue to give space to the editorial column. If we are going to have editorials, then by all means we ought to be doing something which will insure greater readership for them. Influence will follow. The first chore is to get our editorials read.

WELL, WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR EDITORIALS? One thing, I would say, is poor writing. Since newspapering became more of a business than a profession editorial writing has been neglected. Keeping a paper alive in times of mounting costs has required publishers to concentrate on the financial side of their operations: revenues, circulation, advertising and subscription rates, labor contracts and production costs. Except in the larger papers the job of writing editorials is part-time, handled by reporters or desk men with limited time for composition and virtually none for research. Syndicated columns, sometimes a whole stable of them, are bought at low costs to give customers a heavy diet in deference to tradition.

One of the best editorial writers I have known used to say that the unpardonable sin of an editor is to be dull. All of us are guilty far too often, and some most all the time. Small wonder then if readers skip the dreary column which never sparkles with a clever phrase or a well-turned sentence. Sports writers do far better at vivid writing—and their stuff is read. Good writing—and I don't mean highbrow writing—will draw a constant following; and certainly the editorial column merits the very best writing the staff can produce.

ANOTHER MORTAL SIN of editorialists is to be banal. The editorial masthead often is the roof for sorry platitude, the recitation of the obvious. This offense is by no means confined to small papers. Some of the biggest papers are the worst offenders. Newsprint at $126 a ton is too valuable a commodity to be used for banalities.

THERE ARE NO TRADE SECRETS for good editorial writing. The tools are exposed in the daily output. I might however make a few suggestions in the way of editorial technique which may be helpful.

For the past nine years I have run a personal column, spotting it on column one, page one, usually with a breakover to the editorial page. The column permits more informal style in the treatment of material. The position helps to snare the eye of the reader when he opens up the paper, and the carry-over exposes him to the editorial page. The regular editorial column is maintained.

I think there is great value in change of pace, which I try to employ both in the column and in the editorials, mixing the ration to please various appetities. The play of whimsy or a dose of satire add variety to the fare. Editorial shorts are used to fill out the column, and catch readers who take fright at a half-column of type. These briefs need to be sharp and pungent—which, unfortunately, they rarely are.

An editorial, except one written in lighter vein, ought to pack a wallop. None of this "On the one hand . . . but on the other hand," which gets nowhere. And be sure to wrap your package and tie a knot in the string. Readers carry your ideas by the closing paragraph, and if the knot isn't tied the ideas spill out and never get home. Often giving a clever twist to the final sentence gives the editorial the satisfying "happy ending."

I STRONGLY RECOMMEND THAT YOU FIELD THE HOT ONES. Avoid the vice of Afghanistanism—dealing with controversies only if they are very remote. It's an editor's duty—and his privilege—to mix in brawls whether local, state or national. Those who agree with you will praise you and those who don't will usually respect you. At times there still is occasion for resort to the whip of castigation. The editorial column which limits its punch to endorsing the Blood Bank and the March of Dimes and condemning Joe Stalin and the Administration offers its customers a sorry dish. A newspaper ought to throw its weight around in local as in national affairs if it is going to do its part in the service of the public.

So much for what one might call editorial technique.

At this point I want to mention the very interesting experiment which the San Francisco *Chronicle* is making with its two-page spread of editorials and kindred features. Matter is given more breathing space. The larger size of type makes for easy reading, and the accompanying illustrations attract attention. It is indeed a venture in "editorial dynamics" and editors will watch with interest for the appraisal of its results. I just have this question, whether the looser display will carry the punch of hot words in cold type.

I want to turn now to discuss the enlarged responsibility which falls on the editor today. His function remains the same: to interpret the news, to guide opinion and to crusade for righteous causes. But the area in which he must perform has been greatly extended.

AMERICANS ARE THRUST into a new role in world affairs which they carry haltingly. Confusion abounds, much of it artificially stimulated. Strident voices are heard, and people are bewildered by claims and charges. Self-reliant, self-satisfied, boastful even, Americans find a great power challenging them, or bluffing them, they are not sure which. Accustomed to quick victory they chafe under stalemate in Korea. Prodigal with money they can't understand why money does not insure friendship. Our attitude toward Russia is a mixed one of fear and hate. The flushing of subversion has become a phobia both for politicians and for volunteer amateurs. Freedom often is ravished among her worshippers.

A global orientation is thus forced on editors who too

often have been parochially minded. In all honesty we are poorly prepared to make the necessary readjustment. Franklin Roosevelt once remarked that American diplomacy was on a 24-hour basis. The editor today is under a similar pressure of urgency. In the space between editions he must decide on whether to bomb bases in Manchuria, whether the President has inherent powers to seize a great industry, whether to recognize Red China or back up Britain in Iran and Egypt.

THE FIRST ESSENTIAL for an editor today is an awareness of realities. He sees old civilizations fall and temples to new faiths arise, some of them to collapse in early ruin. He is not just a spectator sitting on the bank watching the turbulent flow of the stream of history. He is in the stream, part of it; and he ought to be out in midcurrent seeking to measure its force and if possible to guide it into deep channels.

In the last half-century the principles of government we older men learned out of the textbook have been sharply challenged. How much of the old is valid, how much of the new should be accepted, are questions that tax the mind of every editor except one who already knows all the answers and Prometheus-like stretches or hacks the body of truth to make it fit his preconceptions.

Here are some examples of the vulcanism of our times: the emergence of large-scale capitalism, of monopoly unions, of megalithic government, of earth-shaking technology. We try to fit the economic revolution in the frame of 18th century political liberalism. We see the backward peoples of the world telescoping centuries, moving in a few decades from the crude hand tool and the pushcart to the age of the airplane and electronics and sometimes carrying forward, sometimes throwing off their primitive religions and culture patterns.

In this country we have observed abrupt shifts as from a debtor to a creditor status. We have seen the welfare state emerge to rescue the unrugged individuals. What at the end of the Spanish war was our Manifest Destiny is being transformed into Point Four. The tradition of no entangling alliances which survived even the appeal of Woodrow Wilson for adherence to the League of Nations has been succeeded by fashioning and joining United Nations and NATO.

What confronts the editor every day is the task of trying to make sense in the bedlam; to attempt to guide public opinion out of the confusing fog into the sunlight of clear thinking, if that is at all possible. The responsibility indeed is staggering, and is by no means to be borne alone. The editor must seek out the best counsel, the best sources of information. He cannot always rely on those he calls statesmen, for they in turn may be relying on editors—and if the blind lead the blind the country may fall into the ditch.

The alert editor is fully aware of the vast amount of propaganda that swirls over his desk. Printing presses and mimeograph machines are burdened with the job of producing materials of prejudice propagated sometimes by ignorant and sometimes by sinister elements in our society. Much of this comes from a chain of termites, each feeding and in turn feeding on the other. Even the virtuous resort to the new science of Propaganda, and the Voice of America seeks to counter the infiltration of Communism. The editor must sort out the false and the vicious and tend fires on the altar of Truth.

TODAY'S EDITOR IS CONSCIOUS—or ought to be—of the settling down of a new Dark Age. In large measure what we call McCarthyism is a product rather than a cause of this cycle of repression which threatens freedom of intellectual inquiry and buttons the lips of teachers and public servants and writers and artists and scientists. The editor who prizes his constitutionally guaranteed freedom should do valiant battle against the irrational fears, the unreasoning hates which would convert the country into an intellectual desert. He must not let Truth be suffocated in the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

The equipment of today's editor consists, as always, of an informed mind, literary talent and a lively conscience. But it must be of superior quality. For one I am deeply conscious of my own inadequacy for handling the great and grave issues which call for comment day by day. My range of study, of travel, of acquaintanceship is far too limited. Looking ahead to the continued complexity and scope of editorial subject-matter I think we must move to provide far better preparation for those who are to become editors, and give them greater opportunity for professional growth. This will require thorough undergraduate study supplemented by graduate work and travel, and perhaps a form of interneship. We should have short courses and seminars for working editors—and why not sabbatical years for them as well as college professors? A start in this direction has been made at a few of our universities, but only a start.

The newspaper will have power as it demonstrates it is entitled to exercise power and influence. It will speak with authority when its word is buttressed by fact and sound logic and honest purpose. Integrity still shines through the printed word and builds confidence in the newspaper. As in the past the opportunity is open to the editor to mold public opinion; and in this confused and shifting period of history it is necessary as never before that opinion be guided wisely.

In this connection I should like to refer to the recent survey of newspapers made by Edward L. Bernays. It was based on a questionnaire sent to publishers and to leaders of groups. The query was on how well newspapers today measure up to the goals set by such men as Joseph Pulitzer of the New York *World* and Adolph Ochs of the New

York *Times* and Thomas Gibson of the old *Rocky Mountain Herald*. The first stressed crusading, the second full publication of news and the third strict editorial independence. Twenty-five per cent of the publishers and 44 per cent of the group leaders replied with an unequivocal no. That reaction is arresting, we must admit. I do not want to probe further into the subject; but I would like to point out the selections which publishers themselves and the group leaders made of the papers which came closest to meeting the ideals.

Publishers put these ten at the top:

New York *Times*
St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*
Christian Science Monitor
Louisville *Courier-Journal*
Kansas City *Star*
New York *Herald Tribune*
Chicago *Daily News*
Washington *Post*
Baltimore *Sun*
Milwaukee *Journal*

The singular thing is that the selection by the other group was identical save for two papers: The New York *World-Telegram* and *Sun* and Cleveland *Plain Dealer* were substituted for the Chicago *Daily News* and Milwaukee *Journal*.

I want to call your attention to certain facts: All the papers listed are independent papers [i.e., not members of chains] with the exception of the *World-Telegram and Sun* and the Chicago *Daily News*. Also most of them are distinguished for their editorial leadership. They are the shining lights of America's free and independent press, and they are by no means alone. In cities large and small editors are laboring honestly and valiantly to adhere to the highest ideals of their profession and their efforts are being recognized in the trust which readers repose in them and their papers.

In the field of news-gathering and transmission, newspapers have competition from the new media of radio and television, each with its values, each with its limitations. The newspaper though should remain the major medium for interpreting the news and making it meaningful to the people, and for helping in the formulation of public policy. Publishers should point their papers definitely in this direction. This will require that the editor be restored to eminence in the newspaper hierarchy and given the status and the reward which the importance of his office warrants.

Today's editor should throw himself zestfully into his job, multiplying what talents he has and employing them freely and fearlessly in the fight against ignorance, fear, hypocrisy, kluxism and fuzzy thinking. He should not hesitate to tackle dragons abroad and crackpots and rascals at home. He should aim at the mass audience and not fire till he sees the whites of their eyes—then let them have it. If he does this he will win a place in whatever Valhalla is reserved for good ex-editors, and have a heap of fun as he goes along.

Failure of a Mission

Not Freedom but Restriction is Aim of Majority of UN Subcommission on Information.

by Carroll Binder

Mr. Binder wrote this report of the UN Subcommission on Freedom of Information especially for Nieman Reports as he finished his term on the commission and returned to his editorship of the Minneapolis Tribune.

This is essentially an analysis of an unsuccessful assignment.

When, in 1949, I was elected by the Human Rights Commission to a place on the 12 member subcommission on freedom of information and of the press I had hopes that our three years' service at the United Nations might help create an international climate more favorable to the free flow of information between peoples. I hoped we might direct critical attention to the obstacles to the free flow of news if we failed to remove any of the major obstacles. I hoped we might convince people who distrust or detest freedom of information and of the press that there are greater dangers to their well-being in governmental controls than in freedom, even when freedom is abused.

I am sorry to say that these hopes were not fulfilled. Probably they would not have been fulfilled if the subcommission had been largely made up of experienced journalists ardently devoted to the advancement of free principles. The subcommission, like all other United Nations bodies, is a reflection of the deep differences which beset the contemporary world. When great nations are divided over such issues as totalitarianism versus freedom and when smaller nations hesitate to take sides in this fateful struggle, it is inevitable that any UN body is going to be one of the battlegrounds of that struggle. It is inevitable that those who wish to avoid taking sides should try to divert such a subcommission to less challenging endeavors.

The first subcommission had a number of representatives from countries with considerable experience in the practice of freedom and highly developed media of information. When the second subcommission was elected, Canada, Norway and the Netherlands were not kept on as members. The membership of the second subcommission, the one about which I am speaking here, is worth noting in this connection. In addition to the United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia and China, which automatically have representation on any such body, the members come from Egypt, Lebanon, Chile, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, India, and the Philippines.

The first subcommission was largely concerned with preparations for a conference on freedom of information at Geneva which took a liberal view on many phases of freedom of information. The second subcommission was much less interested in considering ways of lowering barriers to the free flow of information. It was wary of discussing censorship and other restrictions, perhaps partly because some of the subcommission members are not working journalists but governmental representatives in the United Nations. Other members are more concerned about protecting governments and readers against what they consider abuses of freedom than with safeguarding and increasing freedom.

If the subcommission served no other purpose it called attention to the profound differences existing among the 60 members of the UN in freedom of information matters. And the differences are not merely between those who insist that the press must be free and those who insist that the press must publish only what a government wishes published. There are a number of views between the sort of freedom we favor and the sort of censorship and indoctrination favored by the totalitarians which are increasingly manifest in all UN discussions on freedom of information.

While the Russian member of the subcommission frequently assailed the "monopolistic, war-mongering" American press and the American, British, Filipino and some other members exposed the falsities and hypocrisies of Soviet claims, a majority of the subcommission members preferred to devote most of the sessions to work on a draft code of ethics for journalists. This gave free play to the philosophical bent of a number of members and used up time which otherwise might have been devoted to a candid discussion of what governments are doing to prevent people from knowing what goes on and other topics distasteful to governments.

When the code-minded majority committed the subcommission to code drafting, those of us who were convinced that no code could be drafted which would be equally acceptable to the free and totalitarian worlds did what we could to keep restrictive and indoctrinating con-

cepts out of the draft. We proposed formulations which reflected the aspirations of free journalists. We were more successful in eliminating restrictive concepts than in incorpating what we regarded as enlightened concepts.

The end product is not likely to command any great degree of attention in the free world for either its lofty concepts or the quality of its prose. Some members are sure, however, that it will have a good influence in some of the less developed parts of the world.

The code can best be judged in the free world by an examination of what was *not* incorporated. It could have been a great deal worse than it is. The text adopted at the United Nations in 1952 is a considerable improvement over the text adopted at Montevideo, Uruguay, in 1950. This may be taken as an argument that if an international conference of journalists is called, as most members of the subcommission recommend, a still better code can be adopted.

The Russian member and I voted against the calling of such a conference for opposite reasons. He sees little prospect that such a conference would adopt a code incorporating all the restrictive and indoctrinating concepts insisted upon by the Communists.

I think any such a conference would bog down on the same irreconcilable differences which stalemate all attempts to reach a meeting of minds on such matters at this time.

I tried to acquaint my colleagues of the subcommission with my minority views about its promise and performance in the following terms.

The informational media of the United States and the government of the United States were instrumental in committing the United Nations to an attempt to lower barriers to the free flow of information between peoples. They saw in this new international organization an opportunity to examine the causes for obstructions to the gathering and transmission of news and a means of removing those obstructions through international compacts.

The United States Government was reflecting one of the deepest aspirations of the American people when it took the initiative in committing the United Nations to this high aspiration. For in the United States the people are sovereign. Our basic decisions are not made by the executive or legislative branches of our government but by the 50 or more million citizens who vote in our national elections. Now these citizens cannot make wise decisions unless they have accurate information as to what goes on at home and abroad. They need the fullest information as to the attitudes of other peoples and the policies of other governments in order to take wise decisions about what the United States should do and not do. When some official or branch of the government tries to hide information which the people require for correct evaluation of performance or policies, he is called to account by the press, speaking for the people.

This has been our law and custom from the beginning of our history. It is one of our greatest strengths.

We attach so much importance to it that we do not believe there can be lasting peace with freedom, justice and security for all the peoples of the world until all peoples enjoy the right to know, to publish and to discuss. It was in that spirit that the United States raised freedom of information issues in the United Nations. Perhaps naively, we believed that if other nations looked into them they too would put their trust in free principles and practices.

We also were concerned at the diminution of the quality and quantity of the news available to the peoples of the world, including ourselves. We noted with alarm that while the destinies of the peoples of the world were increasingly interdependent the amount of information about each other was increasingly limited.

This is because governments place obstacles in the way of independent newsgatherers and restrict what may be sent abroad. Correspondents are not permitted to obtain reliable information about what goes on in many countries.

So this Subcommission on Freedom of Information was created for the consideration of freedom of information and of the press on a non-govermental level. The subcommission was supposed to be composed of experts—men with wide experience in the field of information—who could deal with problems in this field in a more uninhibited and constructive manner than could be expected of some government representatives. It was expressly provided that the members of the subcommission should not be answerable to their governments. While serving, their modest honorariums are paid not by their governments but by the United Nations. Once elected they cannot be recalled by their governments for they are chosen for stated terms by the United Nations.

It was assumed that such experts, assured such independence, would realistically examine and report on the adequacy of the news available to the peoples of the world. It was assumed they would call attention to obstacles to the free flow of information and thus create an international public opinion which governments could not disregard. It was on that assumption that I accepted election to the subcommission. I hoped that at the end of the three years I was chosen to serve I could feel that some useful contribution had been made to the profession I have been engaged in for 34 years and to the cause of freedom of information.

I am sorry to say that the subcommission has embarrassingly little to its credit. It has given little attention either to the adequacy of the news available to the peoples of the world or to a consideration of ways of removing obstacles to the free flow of information.

The subcommission did note in passing the fact that today there is far less news available to the peoples of the world than at any time since newsgatherers began making the world their beat and that this is an alarming state of affairs calling for far more realistic consideration than it thus far has obtained.

For those who govern large parts of the world no longer permit independent correspondents to visit their countries, or so severely circumscribe their movements and contacts that they cannot possibly know what goes on in the country to which they are accredited. What they write is censored, often by officials who are inaccessible and who do not let the correspondent know what has been deleted or why. The end result all too often is merely a duplication of the versions put out by the governmental propaganda apparatus. The reader knows only what the government thinks he should know, which in many instances is far from adequate for a correct appraisal of governmental policies or their import for the peace and security of other nations.

Unless one deals with news day in and day out, as I do and as several other members of the subcommission do, I doubt if one realizes how appallingly the volume and quality is diminishing. I tried during my service on the subcommission to have this matter periodically examined by the United Nations. At the fourth session I proposed that information about obstacles to the free flow of news be made available to members of the subcommission. The Economic and Social Council adopted resolution 306 F at its eleventh session in response to our request. The resolution in question had as its purpose the obtaining of information from press services on "the current status of freedom of information in any part of the world."

Unfortunately, the response to the UN's inquiry has not been good. The only material received to date has been from the Associated Press. This is a comprehensive report which simply tells what is being done in the way of censoring news country by country. It has the merit of being a continuous survey so that changes from year to year can be noted.

It tells the deplorable story of newspapers shut down, correspondents restricted and even imprisoned, and censorships and other restrictions being practiced. When the world is surveyed it becomes apparent that independent newsgatherers are barred from all of Communist China and have only limited access to Russia and countries associated with Russia. This is a very large part of the world and a most important one. How much better would be the prospects for peace with security and justice for all if there could be a free flow of information between the people on the two sides of the iron and bamboo curtains!

At this point I shall attempt an analysis of what the subcommission's terms of reference called the "adequacy" of news. What elements go into a judgment as to whether the public is getting an "adequate" supply of news?

The first criterion I would say is volume. As an editorial writer, I would be greatly handicapped if I were forced to form opinions and write editorials on the basis of fragmentary information. I think the same is true with the general public.

The second element of adequacy is a multiplicity of news sources. I would find myself very much handicapped if I could not read the reports of the Associated Press, International News Service, the United Press, Agence France Presse, Reuters and Tass as well as those of my newspaper's own correspondents, of the New York *Times,* the Chicago *Daily News* and the *Christian Science Monitor,* each of which has many of its own correspondents overseas.

The third and in some ways the most important quality of adequacy I would say is objectivity. No news is adequate, no matter how great its volume, if it uniformly tells one side of the story. If it is slanted, if it is prejudiced, if it leaves out essential facts and overemphasizes non-essentials for ulterior motives, that news is inadequate. The international press community could do no greater service to their people than to find ways, and employ them, of spreading the gospel of news objectivity.

Taking these three criteria of news adequacy as a guide, I have come to the conclusion that there are three main soft spots or weaknesses in the news picture in the world today.

There are numerous obstacles to the development of journalism, some of which exist in developed countries as well as underdeveloped. Besides technical and economic difficulties, there are feudal political systems which dislike change and oppose development of government by an informed electorate.

In addition, there are those flagrant instances in which a powerful government, backed up by mob rule, deliberately chokes the life from the living freedom which exists. Such was the case of the great newspaper *La Prensa* in Argentina. Here freedom existed. It stood against tyranny. In the face of the condemnation of the free people of the globe, a dictatorial regime brought fear and death to that paper's editors and workmen. Such a barrier as this must be broken. I confess I do not know the full and complete answer. But freedom will not be safe so long as *La Prensa* and scores of other independent newspapers in Argentina remain the prisoners of a tyrant.

The second principal weakness in our news situation today is the growing tendency to impose restrictions on the international flow of news—restrictions on the movement of correspondents, censorship of what they write and other extreme measures. It raises the most important questions connected with the peace-keeping activities of the nations. How could we in America learn about Egypt or India, or

France, or any other country if these nations should build little iron curtains around themselves. How moreover, could the people and the officials of Lebanon, of India or of China hope to understand the people and the policy of the United States if little iron curtains continue to drape themselves around the borders of many countries?

The third weak spot in the news picture which needs attention, is the developing of traditions of objectivity in news reporting.

I am of the opinion that a tradition of objective fact-finding and fact-reporting is one of the highest attributes of democracy because it is the clearest evidence of the faith of government in its own people.

My point is that no society—especially a society mature enough to govern itself—is so lacking in innate intelligence and wisdom that it has to be spoon-fed on a diet of information that somebody else thinks is good for it. The citizens of each of our countries are quite capable of separating for themselves the good facts from the bad. No people is so immature that it cannot stand the shock of the facts.

In objectivity, in the straight telling of the facts, lies the quickest solution to the problems which so frequently are laid at the doorstep of newspapermen—the promotion of peace, the promotion of racial and religious friendship, and tolerance and respect for human rights.

These are the primary spheres, the primary problems of information in the world which ECOSOC and the United Nations and the press of the world must struggle with and seek to amend.

Needed: More Interpretative Education Reporting

by Chaplain (1st Lt.) James W. Carty, Jr.

Educational movements, leaders and events are not being interpreted accurately and adequately in daily newspapers. The school scene is treated as an insignificant aspect of American culture.

The majority of education articles deal with surface events, superficially and objectively reported. They factually encompass administrative changes, unimaginative recordings of school board proceedings, contemplated building programs, routine meetings, and summaries of assembly program speakers.

Front page educational items consist largely of attacks by pressure groups on institutions which employ leaders who have liberal political, economic or academic views.

School activities and thought trends are too complex and dynamic to be interpreted by such labels as progressive or conservative. Such catch-alls, however emotional the attitudes they engender, do not promote reader understanding.

Yet the lead of a front page story may point up that a "Left wing teacher is spreading his views at Midstate college."

Discovery of the pseudo progressive, the item continues, was made by a solid local citizen who is steeped in the tradition of the three R's: reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic.

The same article is filled with devitalized generalizations, devoid of reference to concrete beliefs or practices or deeds of the "suspect" educator.

The newspaper may print the article without a sidebar, in which a reporter interviews the teacher and lets him explain his views and actions.

Other summary articles in which pressure group spokesmen are critical of "subversive elements" within the state school system usually are without reference to specific institutions.

By failing to use a precede to point up that the article is filled with opinion rather than fact, the newspaper lets the pressure group win its case by default

In a sidebar, newspapers also could fulfill their interpretative function by backgrounding the significance of the pressure group statement. Why did the group spokesmen issue their statements? Such a question requires digging and generalization on the parts of several qualified reporters; it may even demand guesses.

In addition to an analysis of the pressure group's general expressions and probable attitudes, the newspaper could go further. Reporters could study programs at various state institutions, and report what liberalism and conservatism mean in specific terms at individual schools.

Papers which refuse to interpret the meaning and import of academic liberalism and conservatism let the critics of education win the reading public by default.

Moreover, by focusing attention on a few left-wing teachers as if they are representative of all school leaders, papers undercut public faith in education as a basic democratic tenet. At the very least, reporters could resort to a public opinion poll concerning teachers' beliefs. A large-scale study could be made of teacher practices.

The inquiring education reporter can discover significant interpretative material on many fronts The whole liberal

---

Chaplain Carty was a reporter before he was a minister and served newspapers and churches in Oklahoma, after graduate work in both journalism and theology. He is stationed at San Marcos Air Force Base, Texas.

program remains to be explained: It includes vocational training, guidance in the form of testing and counseling, home visitors, special classes which grade individuals according to age and ability, audio-visuals, conducted tours, school board elections, and research findings.

In a series of education articles, the interpretative studies well could begin with a general discussion of issues. What do the terms liberal and conservative really connote? For explanations, the education reporter might refer to leading exponents of different schools of thought. He might interview a Robert Maynard Hutchins or a Buell Gallagher.

A comprehensive review of a carefully selected book may describe a particular educational approach. Exemplifying this type of interpretative method is the publication, "Antioch College: Its Design for Liberal Education," by Algo D. Henderson and Dorothy Hall.

Explanation of a vocational training program may center around personality portraits In describing the workaday experiences of local high school students, the San Marcos (Tex.) *Record* recently provided insight into its distributive education program.

School groups take field trips, both to local and far-off places, to familiarize themselves with different aspects of American culture. Twelve Indians, members of the student council of Haskell Institute at Lawrence, Kan., visited Quincy, Ill., in 1949. As a reporter for the *Herald-Whig,* I attempted to grasp their reaction to cultural life in and around Quincy.

The driver training program is best illustrated by a picture story. A sidebar, based on research, could show whether the safety lectures and training courses proved effective in making safer drivers of teen-agers.

The scope and effectiveness of audio-visuals need be shown both by articles and photographs. Doubtlessly, many adults conceive of visual aids in terms of movies, radio, chalkboard and pictures. They are not too familiar with extensive school use of models, mock-ups, puppetry and other dramatic participation, demonstrations as in cooking, exhibits, museums, recordings, charts, graphs, maps and cartoons.

A high proportion of students desire professional positions, which constitute a small percent of available work. Some students necessarily are compelled to change job wants. Through lectures, they may discover the existence of more than 30,000 different kinds of occupation.

Matching the right individual with the right job becomes a thrilling adventure, which the student can share with the reading public. The need exists for a sensitive reporter who realizes the dynamic drive of the student for vocational happiness.

The interpretative education reporter can devote a series of articles to the vocational guidance program. He can begin with the assumption that student ambition often outruns ability.

The reporter can follow the student as he takes a battery of tests. The former can differentiate between personality, achievement, aptitude, intelligence and interest tests. From the testing room, the scene can shift to the counseling room. There the student receives guidance from his adviser.

Tax-payers do not always understand the need for increased funds. The inquiring reporter will dig out research concerning birth trends and rising or decreasing student classes. He will explain the need for building expansion in terms of effects both on students and on culture.

Interpretative reporters can utilize research to attack myths. One old wives' tale is the assumption that the more intelligent persons do not adjust socially, economically or physically in the adult world. Statistics show otherwise.

The reporter-photographer can follow the home visitor as she attempts to see and understand the student against the background of his home setting.

Prior to election of school board members, reporters should list the past voting records of incumbents up for re-election. Going further, writers can show the outcome and community significance of measures favored or disfavored by present board members.

An inexperienced candidate for election has no vote record. He may base his campaign on statements of what he plans to do. More important than his words are his past deeds in every phase of his community life.

What kind of persons are teachers? Mousy? Community- spirited? Leftish? How do they live on their budgets? Do they participate in community affairs and read widely? More penetrating personality studies are needed.

Classes contain students who vary considerably in their mental and social ages; grouping persons of the same chronological age makes teaching difficult. If the bright pupil is allowed to skip a grade, he may become a social misfit. Reporters can explain the difficulty of grading according to age and needs.

Stories can consider administrative policies, supreme court decisions, adult educational programs, speeches, music and art work, PTA meetings, and conferences.

There is a dynamic, complex educational world awaiting the interpretative reporter. How he responds to this challenge is important to the continued faith in the value of education.

A Reader Speaks Up About Newspapers

by F. Bourn Hayne

Mr. Hayne was one of three readers asked to criticize newspapers on a panel at the California Editors Conference at Stanford University June 21. An architect of San Francisco, Mr. Hayne prepared his talk by asking 24 questions of 456 professional and business men. He had replies from 156 which are summarized following this article.

"How Newspapers Can Do a Better Job for Their Readers" is the subject which was assigned some two months ago for this panel discussion today, and heavy has been the load which has weighed upon my shoulders.

The more thought put upon the subject the more distant seemed "The Holy Grail," and I say "Holy Grail," because a better job for the readers means a better press for the Nation, and the fate of the world today *rests* upon OUR Nation; so the destiny of the World now rests upon YOUR shoulders.

To attack the problem in a positive fashion, let us consider today as the eve of St. Crispian, the day before the battle of Agincourt, when King Henry V of England, in answer to Westmorland's wish for ten thousand more English soldiers, replied:—

"No my fair cousin,
If we are marked to die, we are enow
To do our country loss; and if to live,
The fewer men, the greater share of honor . . .
He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
Will stand a tip-toe when this day is named,
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
He that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours.
And say 'Tomorrow is Saint Crispian:'
Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
And say 'These wounds I had on Crispian's day.'

And what was the military moral that was proved by the victory of that puny handful of English archers when outnumbered four to one by the heavily armed French Army? The military lesson and moral achieved was that the traditionally heavily armed soldier was no match for the lightly armed, mobile, quick moving archer of the English, especially when the heavily armed men were severely hampered by mud and slime.

And has not this been the condition of the irresponsible elements of the press of America, and have not some of the traditionally powerful, and magnificently armed newspapers been hampered by a vicious mud and slime of sensationalism that has slowed down their movements, given them a slippery footing, undermined their power and influence and exposed them to another defeat at Agincourt?

Do you now understand why you can feel akin to King Henry on the eve of Saint Crispian's day, and say, "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

Have you ever stopped to read *and then re-read* the Statement of Policy that is printed in every issue of your own magazine, *The California Publisher?*

I shall read it over to you slowly in case its frequent appearance has become too commonplace:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

The California Newspaper Publishers Association recognizes the fundamental importance of the implied trust imposed on newspapers in the dissemination of public information.

It stands for truth, fairness, accuracy and decency in the presentation of news, as set forth in the Canons of Journalism.

It advocates strict ethical standards in its advertising columns.

It opposes the publication of propaganda under the guise of news.

It affirms the obligation of a newspaper to frank, honest and fearless editorial expression.

It respects equality of opinion and the right of every individual to participation in the Constitutional guarantee of Freedom of the Press.

It believes in the newspaper as a vital medium for civic, economic, social and cultural community development and progress.

There is your answer to our quest for the Holy Grail, and there is my challenge to this panel discussion. Certain interpretations may be needed for some of the very common words which are used, but perhaps editors, who are being constantly needled by their business managers to keep up or increase their circulation, are inclineed somewhat to dull or blunt the nice definition of some of these very common words. It is the harried editor who must, each day, sift the reported news and place the emphasis according to this code of ethics.

When I was given the honor to appear on this panel I was told that I was to represent the point of view of the professional man. I was selected, I was told, because for about two years, I have been the editor of the bi-monthly *Bulletin* of the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and some of my editorials concerning "The Architect and The Press," and "The Archiect and Advertising" were read by Mr. Jack Craemer of the San Rafael *Independent* and Mr. William A. Townes of the Santa Rosa *Press Democrat,* who is program chairman for this meeting.

Since my first job after graduating from college in 1926 was newspaper work in Arizona, for three years I lived the hectic existence of a newspaper man and relished it. I was thus able to get an insight to the newspaperman's approach to news and I acquired a sort of vague knowledge of the workings of the press. Armed with this past experience, I have been able to edit our *Bulletin* with some success. Having thus done both newspaper work and architecture, I have found that there is a certain great idealistic similarity between the two occupations, but a somewhat different practical application of these ideals.

This different practical application apparently exists, not only between the press and the profession of architecture, but also between the press and the other professions. The press seems constantly to forget that the distinction between the professional approach and the business man's approach can be greatly different. The professional man is forbidden, by his code of ethics, from advertising—he is bound by the oaths and ethics of his profession which are very rigid and binding; he is obliged to prove to the state, through a series of strict examinations, that he is competent to practice his profession, and this is a safeguard for the public.

Teaching is a profession, and teachers must pass examinations before they are allowed, by law, to teach and mold the mind of youth. And if professional people, who have passed these examinations, and have subscribed to certain oaths, fail in their public trust, their certificates can be cancelled by the state and they must cease practicing their profession. Since this control is exercised over teachers, architects, doctors and lawyers in order to protect and safeguard the public, why shouldn't there be some control, by law, exercised over the press to safeguard youth, to safeguard the uneducated, to safeguard the unthinking, and to safeguard the public? State control could be the result; sc the state cannot be allowed to dictate to a free and responsible press. A license cannot be required to express one's opinion. In other words, the press must be above the state; the press must be above the professions, and the press must feel its responsibility for the molding of the thinking of this Nation.

How does that make you feel, Mr. Editors?

"Oh, uneasy lies the head that wears the crown" said Henry V's father, Henry IV, before the battle of Shewsberry; so the responsibility of shaping the public thought is *yours,* and you cannot shrug this off by turning to National presidents or professional men and expect them to ease the crushing weight that is on your shoulders. You can, however, tell business or circulation manager or the owner of your paper to "go plumb to hell" when they demand that you prostitute your supreme responsibility by telling you to lower the standard of the American public by dailing flaunting lurid headlines about the "Jilted Chorus Girl," the "Dissected Bathtub Blonde" and "The Ice-Pick Maniac." The glorification of the gangster may increase circulation, but it is criminal in this tinder box of a world today.

Take this book, *Peoples Speaking to Peoples*—the result of "The Commission on Freedom of the Press" headed by Robert M. Hutchins, the former chancellor of the University of Chicago. It tells of the marvels of modern communication and radio, and television, and lots of words going at great speed over the same wire at the same time. It expresses a great deal of how the peoples of the world can be made to understand each other by communication. Words, words, words. And who is going to write those words that will so hopefully bring understanding to peoples of all nations. Who is going to direct the young reporters who will some day be writing these words. These words must express ideals, hopes and and the golden rule. Turn to your own Statement of Policy and re-read time, time, and time again, till branded deep into your minds—IMPLIED TRUST, TRUTH, FAIRNESS, ACCURACY, DECENCY, ETHICAL STANDARDS, *FRANK, HONEST AND FEARLESS* EDITORIAL EXPRESSION, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROGRESS. And then turn to the Yellow segment of the Press of America and think of the warped training that the young reporters got that had to turn out such filth. . . Think of the training that some of you, yourselves, have had, some of the training which, even next Monday you may be handing out to keen-minded young boy or girl "who wants to learn to write." Is this the training that is required to foster Peoples Speaking to Peoples?

Circulations be damned! Advertisers be damned! Stockholders and Owners be damned! Your responsibility is too great! It has to be great, and because it is so great, from now on you must LIVE UP TO EVERY LETTER OF YOUR OWN STATEMENT OF POLICY, and see to it that every newspaper that does not, is run off the streets of every American city, no matter how powerful or impressive they may seem.

This may seem an absurd statement if newspapers are regarded as a financial investment for the sake of making money, but the time is here when this point of view must be altered and the money invested in newspapers must be regarded as money invested in a sacred trust. Absurd as my

statement may seem to the seasoned business man, it is the point of view of the professional man which I have been asked to represent. Just as professional men must often reduce their *income* for purely ethical reasons, even so the newspapers must regard their responsibility. Basically, the American public is mighty decent and public sympathy would be strongly in your favor.

The last war matured this country in no small manner and we are beginning to see ourselves as others see us. We are pretty gangling and adolescent yet, and it is almost time that, as a nation, we begin to shave. Perhaps the razor of maturity will remove some of the ugly pimples from our face and one of these pimples has been the irresponsible press.

Lots of the romantic fun of news gathering and the press room will have to go. The excitement about a "scoop" lies forever buried in the sepulchres of the old timers. I called on an editor in preparation for this panel, and his appearance and actions were the same old familiar type—the ash tray full of half burned cigarettes, the jumping up and the sitting down. The nervous handling of the sheet of copy, the appointment at 6:00 p.m. after he had already done his eight hours. That glorious drive, rush, competition and excitement that bespeaks the news man of the old school. This is the attitude that must go.

In preparation for this panel, I talked with many people—from grave digger to state assemblyman—and prepared a Questionnaire, which I circulated to 456 college men of San Francisco, to which I received a 35% response. The results to these two approaches convinced me that accuracy and integrity are regarded as far more important than speed. We now have the Radio and Television, so the need for that ulcer-raising rush about speed in newsprint is over. The replies to my 25 questions have helped me greatly in convincing me that what I am saying is true.

So, with a strong feeling of hope we read in the May 26th issue of *Time* that a quiet revolution in the newspaper world is taking place. This means much to the future and for the training of the men who are to link the Peoples of the world together with communication and understanding. Don't let the revolution be too slow for the time is critical and the need is great.

Just as the law of economics says that bad money drives out good money, so one low-principled paper automatically drags down the standard of every paper in the community, for competition is keen, and the advertisers demand a large circulation. A reform cannot well be made by just a few. The reform must be complete throughout and the unwritten, common law in this country, which places the press beyond the control of the professions and the state, can only be enforced by you editors, and must be enforced by all of you.

What Do the Readers Think of the Press?

Following are the returns from a series of 24 questions asked by Mr. F. Bourn Hayne, San Francisco architect, of 456 business and professional men of San Francisco. He received replies from 156, and summarized them by percentage.

1. Have you confidence in the news columns of your daily paper? . . . . . Yes 68.5 No 19.8
2. Have you confidence in the editorial policy of same paper? . . . . . Yes 48 No 42
3. Is your political and moral thinking influenced by the press? . . . . . Yes 53 No 42

*4. What influences you more than the press? ————

5. Has the press moral obligations toward American Society? . . . . . Yes 100 No 0
   If there are obligations, how are they fulfilled?
   Well 9 So-so 55.6 Poorly 28.5
6. In featuring sensational news does a paper fail in moral obligations? . . . . . Yes 73.5 No 21.5
7. Does sensational news poison the mind of youth and others? . . . . . Yes 72 No 16.7
8. Do you think sensational news increases crime? . . . . . Yes 70 No 18.7

†9. Number in order of importance the duties of the press.

(2) To educate	(3) To better Democracy
(1) Accuracy in news	(5) To entertain reader
(4) To influence opinion	(7) To make money re-
(6) To secure advertising	gardless of consequences.

10. Do you have time to read your daily paper carefully? . . . . . Yes 59.8 No 38.8
11. Do you miss your daily paper when you fail to read it? . . . . . Yes 70 No 23.8
12. Are you influenced by commentators more than by editorial policy? . . . . . Yes 43.5 No 50
13. Do you believe in one ownership for all papers in one locality? . . . . . Yes 0 No 97
14. If one ownership prevails ought the "voice of the opposition" be given every courtesy and consideration to be heard? . . . . . Yes 95.5 No 12.8
    Do you think this is ever done? . Yes 32 No 53.5

15. Would you have more trust in your paper if the opinion of all sides were fairly and honestly expressed? . . . . . Yes 84.5 No 6.4
16. Do you think the press of California is fair to the majority? . . . . . Yes 65 No 18.6
17. Do you think the press is greatly influenced by the advertisers? . . . . . Yes 55.5 No 29.4
18. Is accuracy in reporting news more important than speed? . . . . . Yes 95.5 No 1.93
19. Does "Freedom of the Press" still prevail in the United States? . . . . . Yes 75.5 No 14.7
20. Does the press give a clear picture of national and world events? . . . . . Yes 47.5 No 39
21. Ought a better system be employed for keeping track of world events? . . . . . Yes 48 No 23
22. Has the press, by its desire to increase circulation, lessened its influence and lessened the respect of public opinion? . . . . . Yes 70.5 No 21.5
23. Has competition for circulation weakened the strength of democracy? . . . . . Yes 30 No 45.5
24. Whtat would you recommend to better the situation? (Not over 500 words).

---

*On question four, 51 individuals listed other influences, some more than one, chiefly these: magazines, 29; books, 18; radio, 10; television, 1; other people, 14; discussions, 9; education, 5; church, 4; own judgment, 27.

---

†On question nine, 135 answered. The totals put the priority of press duties in this order:

1) news accuracy
2) to educate
3) to better democracy
4) to influence opinion
5) to entertain
6) to secure advertising
7) to make money regardless

124 put news accuracy first; 77 put education second.

To the last question many pages of signed comments were received. A few of these follow:

The handling of the news, both as to writing and featuring, should be independent of the paper's editorial policy or the economic, political, or social views of its owners.

Complete editorial integrity uninfluenced by owners, advertisers, etc., like that of New York *Times,* and for the most part, the *Christian Science Monitor* and Boston *Transcript.*

The accentuation of news of crime is one of the worst influences which the press exercises and undoubtedly increases crime—use of guns, etc.—suicides also. Their policy "of anything for sensationalism—a story" cannot be condemned too severely.

Education of newspaper readers to an understanding of press problems, so that the public will recognize the necessary incompleteness of flash news and the necessary influence of advertising over reporting.

The West Coast needs a newspaper more nearly of the caliber of the New York *Times.*

Note: My comments and answers do not relate to "the press" in general but to "the contemporary press of the State." In my opinion there is not a satisfactory newspaper in the Bay Area.

Present facts and figures—i.e. comparative figures, as would be expected of a Reporter and an Accountant.

Don't treat news as a sensation, give the facts calmly avoiding conjecture and "interpretation." We need wider coverage of national and international news, less local murder and "human interest." Every article should aspire to the dignity of impartiality, not to rabble-rousing.

Less senationalism, more detailed, accurate reporting and particularly on world events, greater effort to follow pattern of New York *Times.*

The power of the advertisers and of pressure groups to keep out any press comments unfavorable to their race or religion, is too evident today.

In a practical world, all papers can't be the New York *Times,* but the Hearst papers could aspire to the level of fairness of the *Chronicle,* the Boston *Herald,* etc.

I can think of no recommendation to better the situation. I am no newspaper man, but am very proud of our press (with much of which I violently disagree). The necessary sales can be procured through the radio, television, public speeches, pulpits, letters to "safety valve," "public pulse," etc., to Congressmen, commentators and by helping shape public opinion through discriminating subscriptions and participating in organized meetings, like your own.

Stick to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth—but they probably would not last long if they did.

Try to use the New York *Times* as an example. If every paper were as fair and impartial with emphasis on factual news rather than sensation, there would be few complaints about the low standard of the daily press.

Although the daily press, as a medium of news and unbiased reporting, often falls short of its mark, it still does a fair job and relative to controlled papers throughout the world our press still remains by comparison "free."

Have never read an article of news on reporting in which I was familiar with the facts when the facts, names, etc. were reported accurately. I marvel that I still think the articles, when I do not know the facts, are true.

Return to having the reporter of top importance—stressing accuracy and comprehensiveness as he once did rather than the "half-baked conclusions" of columnists (Like all Commentators!). Let the reader read accurate reporting

and digest it himself rather than read the "indigestion" of the modern reporter.

We need a means of financing some newspapers of fairly wide circulation like the *Christian Science Monitor* so that they do not depend too heavily on advertising or on special economic or political interests. Some foundation might consider this aim.

I don't think it can be bettered without losing an independent press, which would be worse. We would have public ownership and that would be worse because we would have a controlled or biased press. The order of importance would be different for a quasi public publication, but there we have a greater risk of bias or propaganda to support the views or desires of those in power.

If the good papers do not take steps to control the excesses of the poor ones, some day someone will have to. This movement will be a blow to democracy. However, freedom of the press does not mean complete irresponsibility. I feel that responsible papers should set up, hold to, and maintain some type of newspaper policy which will penalize those papers who abuse their obligations.

How Free Is the Free Press?

by Phil Kerby

How free is the free press?

The answer is that the press is free to do just about anything it pleases, and what it pleases to do is frequently quite extraordinary.

Let's point this up with a few illustrations. A short time ago, General Eisenhower brought his crusade to Los Angeles.

Proceeded by appropriate fanfare, General Eisenhower landed at our International Airport, whence he paraded, with his entourage, to the Coliseum, the scene of a speech, which it was advertised, would be non-political but nevertheless would be a major address of some importance to the nation.

Later that night in listening to a news broadcast, I was rather intrigued to learn that only some 15,000 persons, which included delegates to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention, had heard the talk.

Confessing to a bit of malicious interest, I turned to the papers the next morning, not to read the speech, but to get a look at the spectacle of some 16,000 persons lost in a stadium seating 105,000.

I looked in vain.

There were pictures of Eisenhower, with the crowd looming up behind him, but nary a glimpse of an empty seat. While musing over the kindness of editors, it seemed to me there was a similar event in the news four years ago, but with dissimilar results.

President Truman spoke on that occasion in Omaha before an audience that filled only one-fifth of a large auditorium. That fact, it seemed to me, was recorded in the press across the nation, along with graphic illustrations showing the near empty auditorium.

I checked my recollection with newspaper files, and, sure enough, there was the picture, big as life, and, in fact, in *Life,* and on the front pages of many other publications, including a morning Los Angeles newspaper.

Four years ago, a picture of 8,000 empty seats was news, but today a picture of 87,000 empty seats isn't news. When is a picture a picture? Perhaps newspaper techniques have changed in four years. Or could it be that news values are somewhat flexible, depending on who it is who speaks to empty seats.

How were the two events covered in words?

A newsmagazine which specializes in sharp, timely reports had this to say on Truman's appearance in Omaha:

Quote: "That night he had an evening of pure horror. . . Although his trip had been well advertised and admission was free, he had drawn an audience of only 2000 . . . One of Truman's aides reported 'We had to chop a hole in the ice to get him out.' " A caption on the picture of the almost empty auditorium read "Campaigner's nightmare: 8,000 empty seats in Omaha."

Now let's take a look at the report in the pages of this same newsmagazine after General Eisenhower's Los Angeles speech.

Quote: "Ike's advisers were worried when they found out that the VFW meeting was to take place in Los Angeles' vast 105,000 seat Coliseum, which they knew would not be filled. In the TV age, such huge crowds, unless they are carefully drummed up in advance, have become rare. Since his appearance was non-political, Eisenhower did not allow any interference with the veterans' plans, or any attempts by the Republican Party organization to drum up spectators. Only 14,925 seats were filled."

Then the magazine goes on in the same kindly vein.

"Despite the empty seats, it was perhaps Eisenhower's most effective speech. It seemed to get across not only the man's principles but the man's heart . . ."

This magazine was a little less kind to Truman after Omaha on his western trip four years ago . Quoting a news-

Phil Kerby is editor of the magazine *Frontier,* published in California.

paper editorial, the newsmagazine said: "Then it called the pitch on his western trip: 'It's politics, but not smart politics.' "

One might fairly paraphrase that to read "It's reporting, but not smart reporting."

Nor is it moral reporting.

Speaking of morals, an editorial writer on a Los Angeles afternoon tabloid had something to say on that topic not long ago . He got right down to editorial brass tacks.

"Let's talk plain talk," he wrote.

"There is evidence of moral and ethical disintegration among the average people—not just the crooked cops and crooked politicians and the vice overlords who make the headlines.

"A society can remain healthy only so long as its unethical members remain the exception . . .

"The family as an institution, the churches and the schools must share equal blame for this shocking state of affairs. They are not doing their jobs or this state of affairs would not exist . . .

"The only cure for our rapidly declining ethical health is personal and individual reform . . ." End Quote.

As the editorial writer says, that's plain talk, but not quite plain enough. The home, the churches and the schools (the universal whipping boy for almost everybody) were soundly spanked, but the press was nowhere included. If this indignant editorial writer had wanted to include the press, it would have taken little research.

He merely would have had to look in the pages of his own newspaper in the very issue in which his "plain talk" editorial was printed. The editorial sounding the alarm about our ethics (yours and mine, that is) appeared at the same time the romantic troubles of a male movie star attracted the atention of the police, the courts and, of course, the newspapers.

Another writer on this paper, a female gossip columnist, has been preoccupied for days with a panting blow-by-blow description of the affair. As a climax to her series of dramatic scoops, the columnist, in a burst of candor, confessed in print that she had listened in on telephone conversations between the embattled trio. She admitted she discovered, by canvassing the neighborhood, who shared the party line with the woman involved.

The columnist concluded rather gaily:

"My assistant listened in on some conversations going on over Miss Payton's party line and so did I."

To borrow a phrase from Governor Stevenson, this might be called schizophrenia—editorial schizophrenia.

Here we have an editorial calling for a revival of moral and ethical values, and a columnist's confession of eavesdropping, but no doubt for a highly moral purpose.

The moral tone of this same newspaper is enhanced by another female gossip who specializes in such moralistic items as this:

Quote: "A starlet told Mike Connolly, 'I don't know if I've ever been x-rayed—but I've been ultraviolated.' "

Such items are not of too much importance, perhaps, except that they may indicate (to quote the editorial writer referred to here) the rather significant ethical condition of the press, or, at least, a too large section of the press.

The discharge of General MacArthur was a dramatic event that excited controversy to a fever pitch and deserved the most careful handling by the press. In many newspapers that was exactly the way it was reported, but in others it was a different story.

It is the practice of good newspapers to separate their news and editorial comment, but the MacArthur firing and the subsequent hearings in Washington provided some significant and clear-cut violations of this.

When General MacArthur testified in Washington, the "lead" news story of a Los Angeles chain newspaper published this report.

Quote: "General MacArthur today not only vindicated himself with documentary evidence before the Senate committee probing his removal, but offered a dynamic blueprint for ending the Korean war and keeping Russia from taking over the Pacific."

Other, more confused, minds had to await the completion of testimony before trying to reach a decision on this involved matter, but not the writer of the above dispatch. He settled it in a brief 35-word distorted paragraph that was passed along to his readers in the guise of news.

Several days later, this same correspondent pictured General Marshall more as a culprit brought to dock than as a man who had rendered distinguishing service to his country.

This correspondent wrote of Marshall's then forthcoming appearance before the committee in these words:

Quote: "Defense Secretary Marshall, author of the multibillion dollar give-away plan for Europe and active participant in the Red China appeasement program, will have considerable to explain tomorrow before the Senate committee probing the dismissal of General MacArthur."

Good newspaper practice requires that advertisements meet certain standards, but the rule apparently doesn't apply to ads which, no matter how fantastic, coincide with the prejudices of certain publishers.

One morning I was intrigued over coffee by a full-page advertisement of the Wage Earner's Committee. The top lines, in screaming type, attacked the "labor bosses" and the "labor gestapo" and "its bootlicking political stooges." The text was equally lurid.

It read, in part: "The labor boss . . . is using the $80 million dollar monthly take from wage-earners in dues and fines to buy and sell politicians." The ad attacked "a notorious Socialist Front Organization calling itself Americans for Democratic Action." That organization, according to the ad, "has more money at its disposal than the Re-

publican and Democratic parties combined." ADA leaders were described "riding around in $35,000 bullet-proof cars and spending huge amounts of money on bodyguards." The thought of Judge Francis Biddle, the national chairman of ADA, riding around in a bullet-proof car is something to conjure with.

For a publication to run such wild propaganda, even in advertisements, is an indication of something less than proper responsibility to its readers, but that wasn't all.

After these advertisements appeared, the political editor of a morning newspaper wrote an article praising the Wage Earner's Committee and declaring "that the founders of this unique organization are sincere" and "have created an outlet for the feelings and emotions which millions of Americans share." It might be pertinent to ask this political editor whether he shares the belief of "unique" and "sincere" organization that Judge Biddle is riding around in a bullet-proof car.

Like other Americans, the newspaper publishers of the country like to get together at conventions and talk it over. They held their latest shindig last spring in New York. They pointed out that newspapers must fight the growing tendency on the part of government to censor news about public business. They stressed the importance of full access to all information about the affairs of government on the local, state and national levels. Few could disagree on this point.

But there was a unique feature of their panel on suppression of the news. Reporters were barred from the session. Again, editorial schizophrenia.

In the news which the publishers permitted to be released about their panel on suppression of the news, there was no mention of the responsibility of the press to fulfill its function fairly.

The publishers might have posed a few questions for themselves, to wit: Are newspapers fully and fairly reporting the news? Do they keep editorial comment out of the news columns and confined to the editorial page? In California, Louisiana and Texas, for example, has there been full and unbiased coverage of the tidelands oil controversy? Has the public been informed of both sides of the suit brought by the government against the Fallbrook Public Utility District?

On the latter point, Senator O'Mahoney commented in a recent article in *Frontier*:

"Part and parcel of the fashionable campaign to undermine the social gains of recent years by picturing Uncle Sam as an unscrupulous, power-grabbing bureaucrat, from whom neither private property nor individual liberties are safe, has been the studied attempt in the ultra-conservative press to misrepresent the Fallbrook case."

We have seen that a picture of 87,000 vacants seats really isn't a good picture, while one showing 8,000 vacant seats is a fine picture. When is news news?

An Incident at Saalfelden

And What One Newspaper Did About It

This is the gist of the pamphlet the Toledo Blade has published on its investigation of an incident in Europe which it feels was muffed by the American press.

Quite by chance last summer, the Toledo *Blade* was given an opportunity to perform a necessary service for its fellow newspapers.

The opportunity came about in this way. A member of the *Blade* staff happened to arrive in England late in August to find the press of Great Britain much exercised over an incident that had taken place in Saalfelden, Austria. Large groups of young men and women, most of whom were British subjects, had been held up by American military police at Saalfelden—a checkpoint in the American zone of Austria—and prevented from continuing on to their destination, the Russian-sponsored World Youth Festival in Berlin.

In taking this action the United States authorities charged that the young people did not have the proper passes for travel through Austria. For their part, the British asserted that the Americans were attempting to revive an abandoned technicality in order to score a point in the cold war, and in addition many of the young travelers claimed to have been treated with outrageous brutality by the military police.

Of course, the Communist press in England made a great to-do about the whole business, but this was to be expected.

What was disturbing was the serious manner in which the affair was treated by the British press as a whole: the *Blade* correspondent read a great deal about the Englishman's right to freedom of travel. Inasmuch as he had seen nothing of all this in the American newspapers, his curiosity was aroused. If the charges were true, then the United States was seriously at fault; if they were not true, then the prestige of the United States was being maliciously undermined, and something should be done about it.

Upon thinking it over, the *Blade* decided to make an inquiry. What followed is the result of that inquiry.

The bias of the American reports is worth noting: what could be construed to favor the United States was emphasized, and what reflected unfavorably upon this country was largely omitted.

The absence of flaring headlines in the British press was due more to the severe paper shortage than to any desire to treat the story conservatively.

It is not unfair to say that the press of this country hardly reported the Saalfelden incident at all. The reports it did make emphasized the American point of view, and little mention was made of the furor the affair had aroused in Britain.

In conducting its investigation the *Blade* weighed all the evidence available. The official reports were not released, but the substance thereof was communicated to the *Blade* by the State Department. Following is the *Blade's* story of what happened at Saalfelden and its consequences, insofar as it could be reconstructed from the material on hand.

Saalfelden Incident Aided Communists

by Harvey S. Ford
Blade Editorial Research Director

The Saalfelden incident was a minor and—in America—little known outgrowth of the recent Communist World Youth Festival in east Berlin. Such details of the Saalfelden affair as appeared in the American newspapers were buried in the larger stories of the festival itself, and attracted almost no attention.

Yet, in spite of its comparative insignificance, the Saalfelden incident illustrates the difficulties which beset responsible American officials abroad, and the errors of judgment of which they are sometimes guilty.

The evident purpose of the Berlin festival was to solidify Russia's hold on eastern Germany and to advance its influence in the western zones. However, it was billed as a "world" rally, and in support of this contention the Russians produced delegations which, although insignificant in number compared with the Germans in attendance, nonetheless

represented a good many different countries. The bait used by the Russians was free transportation to Berlin, and this was not without its appeal to certain young citizens of the western European nations.

Just how many of those who came to east Berlin from the west were actually Communists it would be difficult to determine. Some of them certainly came along for the free ride, and others were drawn by their curiosity to see what it was like behind the iron curtain. Nevertheless, it seems safe to assume that the bulk of the western delegates were motivated by their sympathy with Russian aims. Thus the question arose as to whether or not the allied authorities should take any steps to block the young Communists' excursion, and from this came the Saalfelden incident.

It must be concluded at the outset that the Saalfelden affair was so poorly and so scantily reported in the press of this country that most Americans are probably unaware of the existence of the incident. In part this may be due to the fact that the American authorities did not show to very good advantage, but more likely it was just that the Saalfelden business was not nearly as important a story in the United States as it was in Europe, and especially in Britain. The difference in outlook implied here was basic to the whole issue, and it must be kept in mind in order to understand the surprisingly indignant censure heaped upon the United States by the British newspapers after Saalfelden.

Apparently the anti-Communist fire burns somewhat more brightly in the United States than it does in Britain and western Europe. The United States Government has recently taken a firm hand with its native Communists, to the point of sending quite a few of them to jail. Consequently, when the State Department denies passports to American Communists and otherwise restricts their travel, it does not make a newspaper story of any particular importance here.

Not so in Britain, however. The British have always traveled more in Europe than Americans, and traditionally have insisted upon their right to go where they pleased without hindrance. As the Foreign Secretary pointed out afterwards, "it has always been the policy of H. M. Government to facilitate free and unhampered travel throughout the world."

British Communists have been permitted to attend the various Red peace congresses since the war, and when they began to apply for passports to go to the Berlin festival the Foreign Office, though understandably unhappy about the matter, put no obstacles in their way. The British position was well stated by a Conservative journal: "There is such a principle as freedom of travel," remarked the English newspaper, "even for Communists."

The direct route to Berlin for the British, French and other western Communists of course passed through the Allied occupation zones in Germany. However, a military entrance visa was required for west Germany, and the young Communists had good reason to believe that these would not be granted by the army commanders. Therefore, many of the delegates assembled in Paris and made plans to follow a roundabout route, through Switzerland, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, by which they could reach Berlin without entering west Germany.

Austria also was occupied, but conditions there were much different than in Germany. No special visas or passes were demanded except for nationals of the four occupying powers, and in the latter case they had been abandoned in all the zones except the Russian.

Originally a gray pass had been required for interzonal travel, but the French, British and Americans no longer asked for them, and since 1948 the Western powers had been unsuccessfully urging the Russians to take the same action. The road to Berlin thus appeared to be clear.

In running from Switzerland to Czechoslovakia the railroad passes through the French, American and Russian zones of Austria, in that order. The trainloads of young Communists crossed the French zone without incident, but when they stopped at the village of Saalfelden, a checkpoint just inside the American zone, their troubles began. The United States high commissioner in Austria, Walter J. Donnelly, had ordered the American military police to demand the gray pass.

For the Belgians, Italians and nationals of other non-occupying powers this request was no problem, since they did not need the gray pass. Many of the French either had or were able to obtain the necessary gray passes, and eventually were allowed to continue their journey on to the Russian zone. Between Aug. 2 and Aug. 6, 1951, travelers were turned back by the American military police at Saalfelden, and forced to return to Innsbruck in the French zone. Of all nationalities, the British were by far the most troublesome to the Americans.

At Innsbruck the British applied to their consul for the gray passes. At first the consul put them off by saying that he did not have enough passes to go around, and he used the respite thus gained to get in touch with the British high commissioner in Vienna. From this quarter the consul learned that the British were cooperating with the Americans. Thereupon the consul refused to issue any gray passes to British subjects traveling to the Berlin festival.

Most of those turned back at Saalfelden accepted the verdict with good grace, and looked about for other means of getting to Berlin. The principal exception was a trainload of about 330 British whose conduct provided material for three consecutive days of sensational headlines in the European press. Precisely what happened is lost in a maze of charge and countercharge, but it is plain that it began

when the British refused to leave their train at Saalfelden.

This took place on Sunday, Aug. 5, the day on which the two-week festival was beginning in Berlin. Two days before the British had made an unsuccessful attempt to get through, and they were now determined to make things as difficult for the Americans as they possibly could.

They had two objectives in mind: either the Americans would become so exasperated with their nuisance tactics that the military police would let the British go on; failing in this, the British might be able to provoke the Americans to take some action which would be denounced in Europe.

Not only did the British themselves refuse to leave their railroad cars, but they also blocked the doors, thus keeping other travelers from getting on or off at Saalfelden. American military police with bayonetted rifles then boarded the cars and dragged the British out.

Once on the ground, some of the British planted themselves on the tracks, in order to stop the trains from moving. Again physical force had to be used to get the British out of the way. The military police had a crowd of very angry young men and women on their hands, and it must be said to the Americans' credit that they did as well as anyone could have done under such trying circumstance.

The Americans began by trying to persuade the British to return to Innsbruck in the French zone. When this came to nothing, railroad cars were provided for the young Communists to sleep in, army doctors set up an aid station, and army rations were made available for issue. At first these offers were ignored by the British, who remained in the railroad yard hurling bottles and insults at the military police, and chanting the Internationale. As it grew dark it also grew cold, however, and in the end most of the young Communists gave up and retired to the railroad cars for food and shelter. Ultimately they were all forced to go back to Innsbruck.

Meanwhile the press wires of Europe were humming with news from Saalfelden, and none of it depicted the Americans in a very favorable light. Charges of extreme brutality were made against the military police, and questions were put to the British government in the House of Commons. The Communist press of Europe had a field day.

It is, of course, impossible to haul a man off a train gently, and no doubt the military police were as rough as they had to be. On the other hand, they had to put up with a great deal. One soldier reported that he had been struck below the belt by a Communist girl, who probably had hoped to provoke him into retaliating—which he did not do—and thereby furnish the world with an example of an armed American assaulting a helpless girl.

Of the many casualties claimed by the Communists, there was one which the Americans freely acknowledged: an Englishman named Colin Sweet was clouted over the head with a carbine butt by a military police lieutenant. The lieutenant stated that Sweet had tried to grab his weapon. In a report to the British government, the United States high commissioner said that "three, or at the most four, cases of injury took place" at Saalfelden, and that in each instance the injury was the result of resistance to legal authority.

The Foreign Office thereupon concluded "that many stories of rough handling have been exaggerated and no more force was used than was necessary to prevent a serious breach of the law." There seems to be no reason to quarrel with this conclusion.

While the young Communists were rioting in Saalfelden their Soviet mentors were not idle. The Russian High Commissioner in Vienna, Gen. V. P. Sviridov, came forward and graciously offered to waive the gray pass—which up until then he had been alone in insisting upon—in the case of travelers bound for the festival.

According to Reuters, the United States High Commissioner replied as follows: "Believe me, my dear General Sviridov, I dislike the necessity of the gray cards as much as you. I do not, however, see that an exception can be made for this group alone. If you would be prepared to abolish the gray card altogether I would be most happy to agree, and I feel confident we could obtain the speedy consent of our British and French colleagues." Mr. Donnelly concluded this fruitless interview by ironically thanking General Sviridov for his "most kind" intervention in "behalf of allied nationals."

Doubtless Mr. Donnelly looked upon this transaction as a shrewd diplomatic stroke, and in one sense it certainly was, for the release of a few young Communists would have been a cheap price to pay for the elimination of the gray pass. However, there was never any real likelihood that the Russians would consent, as Mr. Donnelly and everyone else was well aware.

What Mr. Donnelly had actually done was this: he had scored a point in one of those typical—and fundamentally meaningless—diplomatic exchanges which consume so much of the time and energy of our representatives abroad. And it was soon apparent that Mr. Donnelly had scored his point at the cost of considerable prestige for the United States in Europe.

The abuse and vilification which the Communist and fellow traveler press of Europe heaped upon the United States expected, and may may be largely discounted. What hurt was the fact that the anti-Communist and pro-American newspapers, especially those in Britain, could find nothing to say in defense of the United States. While it is true that the responsible papers in Britain did not accept the wild tales invented by the Communists, it is

also true that the English press was unmistakable in its disapproval of the American action in stopping the British young men and women at Saalfelden.

A case in point is the *Spectator,* a journal which, in the face of wide-spread British opposition, nonetheless defended the advances made by the United States to the Franco government in Spain. "The verbose and argumentative Foreign Office statement on the alleged mishandling of British youths and girls at Saalfelden by no means disposes of an unfortunate episode," said the *Spectator,* and it added that "the American Commandant in Austria might well feel it his duty to investigate the affair fully."

The Spectator's gibe at the Foreign Office calls attention to still another unhappy aspect of Saalfelden, namely the embarrassing position in which it left the British government. It is, after all, pretty hard to advocate the principle of freedom of travel at the same time that you are trying to explain and condone the action of an ally who has denied that right to your own citizens.

Just how far the British government was responsible for its own woes cannot be determined, for it is not known whether the British High Commissioner's decision to cooperate with Mr. Donnelly was made in advance, or whether the Englishman felt that, once the Americans had commenced to demand the gray pass, he had no alternative left, and must go along and support the United States. Today in Washington it is unofficially admitted that Mr. Donnelly made an error in judgment when he employed what amounted to a trumped up pretext in reviving the gray pass as a device to block the young Communists' journey to Berlin. If the British government was unwilling to deny passports to its youthful Reds when they were leaving home, it was hardly Mr. Donnelly's business to stop them on their way. A few of them ultimately made their way to Berlin anyway, where they were exploited to the full by the Communists as victims of American brutality, and thus they became the heroes and martyrs of the festival.

It does not help the cause of the United States in the cold war to make Americans look like Russians, even if the resemblance is mostly distorted and falsified and the issue debatable.

In distributing its report in pamphlet form the Blade concludes:

What concerned the *Blade* was not so much the incident itself as it was the inexplicable failure of the newspapers of the United States to give the complete story of that incident.

The American press failed most notably in neglecting to give its readers any indication of the way the British reacted to Saalfelden. No American—unless he had happened to be in England at the time, as the *Blade* representative was—could have had any idea of how angry the British really were.

This in turn raised the question as to whether there was, or is, a hesitancy on the part of American newspapers to print anything unfavorable about this country's representatives overseas, or to be critical of their official actions.

The *Blade* has no quarrel with the proud claim to preeminence of the American press, and believes it is more independent and more forthright than that of other nations. But it is convinced that the newspapers of the United States can maintain their present outstanding position only by the exercise of constant vigilance and a wary alertness against pressures from all quarters.

Therefore the *Blade* submits its report on Saalfelden without apology, confident that the effort it required was fully justified by the principles at stake. If it could happen once, it could happen again.

The Presidential Campaign

Stevenson: A One-Party Press

. . . . . .

In my new role in life, I can't help noticing from time to time—I want to put it as delicately as I can—that the overwhelming majority of the newspapers of the country are supporting the opposition candidate. This is something. I find, that even my best friends will tell me! And I certainly don't take it personally.

In fact, I would have been somewhat startled and unhappy if I received much press support after the reception given my Democratic predecessors, Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt. Some people might even have considered such support an ill omen.

It would seem that the overwhelming majority of the press is just against Democrats. And it is against Democrats, so far as I can see, not after a sober and considered review of the alternatives, but automatically, as dogs are against cats.

As soon as a newspaper—I speak of the great majority, not of the enlightened 10 per cent!—sees a Democratic candidate it is filled with an unconquerable yen to chase him up an alley.

I still haven't got over the way some of our nation's greatest papers rushed to commit themselves to a candidate last spring, long before they knew what that candidate stood for, or what his party platform would be, or who his opponent was, or what would be the issues of the campaign.

I know where a young publisher's fancy turns in that season of the year, and I don't blame them for a moment. But I feel that some of them may regret the impetuosity of their wooing now that autumn is here.

I am touched to see in these papers solicitious editorials about the survival of the two-party system. Now I really can't bring myself to believe that the Republican party is about to fade away, even if it loses in 1952. If so, it is staging one of the longest and loudest deathbed scenes in history!

How can the Republican party disappear when about 90 per cent of the press for ten of fifteen years has been telling the American people day in and day out that the Republican party alone can save the Republic? Surely Republican publishers and editors don't honestly believe that they have so little influence!

I am in favor of a two-party system in politics. And I think we have a pretty healthy two-party system at this moment. But I am in favor of a two-party system in our press too. And I am, frankly, considerably concerned when I see the extent to which we are developing a one-party system in the press. I don't say this because of any concern over the coming election. My party has done all right in recent elections in spite of the country's editorial pages, and I have a hunch we will do all right this year too.

But, as an ex-newspaperman and as a citizen, I am gravely concerned about the implications of this one-party system for our American press and our free society.

A free society means a society based on free competition and there is no more important competition than in ideas.

It's not honest convictions honestly stated that concern me. Rather it is the tendency of many papers, and I include columnists, commentators, analysts, feature writers and so on, to argue editorially from the personal objective, rather than from the whole truth.

As the old jury lawyer said: "and these, gentlemen, are the conclusions on which I base my facts."

In short, it seems to me that facts, truth, should be just as sacred in the editorial column as the news column. And, as I have said, happily most papers, but by no means all, do struggle with sincerity for accuracy in the news. Coming from Chicago, of course, I am not unfamiliar with the phenomenon of an editorial in every news column!

What I am saying, in short, is that the press cannot condemn demagoguery, claptrap, distortion and falsehoods in politicians and public life on the one hand and practice the same abuses on the public themselves, on the other. I know the people are smarter than many politicians think and sometimes I suspect that even editors underestimate them.

Let's not forget that the free press is the mother of all our liberties and of our progress under liberty.

—N. Y. *Times,* Sept. 9

Reply to Stevenson

Mr. Stevenson surely would not have publishers and editors who sincerely favor the election of a Republican candidate write instead in favor of the election of a Democratic candidate merely in order to create a diversity of opinion and for the sake of "increasing opposition to uniformity." It is the business of publishers and editors to say what they think. The essential safeguard against what Mr. Stevenson describes as a "one-party press" does not consist of an artificially balanced division of editorial opinion but rather of fair reporting of dissenting news and a free market for the publication of organs of dissenting opinion. We agree, however, with Governor Stevenson that editorial opinion itself should be based on something more than a mere automatic reflex to a party symbol and that it should reflect an independent judgment. We have sought, in our own case, to arrive at such judgments. In three of the last six Presidential elections (counting the present one) we have supported a Republican candidate and in three we have supported a Democrat.

Governor Stevenson's other point of criticism is that some newspapers have been too precipitate in their choice of a candidate in the present case. Some of them, he says, "rushed to commit themselves to a candidate last spring, long before they knew what that candidate stood for, or what his party platform would be, or who his opponent was, or what would be the issues of the campaign."

If this criticism is meant to include our own newspaper, as it may be meant, since we declared our readiness last January to support General Eisenhower in the event of his nomination by the Republican party, let us say that while it is true that we could not then know who his opponent would be we did know what General Eisenhower stood for, including both a firm assertion of American leadership abroad and a middle-of-the-road pol-

icy in domestic matters; we knew that he could neither win nor accept nomination on a platform which repudiated these fundamental beliefs, and we knew that the issues of the campaign would turn, as they are turning now, on the record of the last four years.

Because we believed that only enlightened and responsible leadership could safeguard the American people in the face of the present threat from Russia we urged last January that the Republican party choose General Eisenhower as its candidate for President. At the same time we said that always provided, and only if provided, such leadership was made available we believed that the time was ripe, after twenty years, for a change of party control in Washington.

N. Y. *Times,* Sept. 9

Papers Aid Eisenhower

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is being supported editorially by times as many daily newspapers as are supporting Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, it was reported yesterday by Editor & Publisher, newspaper trade magazine.

Of 918 dailies questioned in a survey, 690, or 75 per cent, are backing the Republican candidate; 142, or 15 per cent, are backing the Democratic choice, and 86, or 9 per cent, have not yet taken a stand. The remaining 1 per cent is represented by fractions in the three categories.

The newspapers supporting General Eisenhower have 81 per cent of the daily circulation of all papers polled. Those supporting Governor Stevenson have 9½ per cent. The remainder is undecided.

In both numbers and circulation the papers supporting the Republican candidate this year represent a higher proportion of the whole than at any time since 1932. Four years ago Governor Dewey, then the Republican choice, had the backing of 65 per cent, with the remainder refraining from taking sides.

—N. Y. *Times,* Sept. 5

Ike's Editing

Gen. Eisenhower in delivery on Monday edited out of his released Legion address its one most telling line—that which described Senator McCarthy and Jenner, without naming them, as "assassin of character and promoters of witch hunts."

—St. Louis *Post Dispatch,* Aug 28

Stevenson's Press Corps

Governor Stevenson is trying to minimize the element of accident in this campaign as much as possible. He will make some whistle-stops and he will have a few press conferences—he has scheduled one Monday—primarily because it would be awkward, and might even become a campaign issue, if he didn't. But his preference is for the prepared and well-rehearsed speech.

He promised when he returned to Springfield after the convention in Chicago to have one press conference a week. He did so for a couple of weeks, then lapsed. He met with the reporters a couple of times during his three-day vacation in Wisconsin, but his conference on Monday will be his first in more than three weeks.

This has enabled him to lay down his labor policy, his civil rights policy, his foreign policy, his natural resources policy among others without being questioned on these things.

In Portland, Ore., last Monday he did agree to answer reporters' questions, but he imposed two conditions: first, that he should select the questions he wanted to answer from among those submitted to him, and second, that only the Portland reporters—and not the reporters traveling with him—should be allowed to ask the questions.

In short, he was nominated without campaigning, and he is now campaigning without answering many questions.

—James B. Reston, N.Y. *Times,* Sept. 14

The Ike Press Corps

. . . . . .

In the re-examination of strategy and facilities that should be under way at the General's headquarters, safeguards should be erected against repetition. And it might be useful to try to find out whether a lingering "five-star psyche" accounts for the fact that, of the thirty-seven reporters traveling with Eisenhower, twenty-four prefer Stevenson, six are undecided and only seven favor the General.

. . . . . .

—Arthur Krock, N. Y. *Times,* Sept. 11

. . . . . .

Gen. Eisenhower has never warmed up to the press which has been discussing frankly his many problems. He will not like them any better when he reads that correspondents traveling with him—most of whose papers strongly favor his election—responded as follows to a poll of their own political references:

Stevenson—24.
Eisenhower—7.
Undecided—6.

—Doris Fleeson, Boston *Globe,* Sept. 12

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 13

Press and Presidency

In today's Mirror of Public Opinion, we reprint in full the editorial of the Baltimore *Sun* through which that noted newspaper announced last Sunday its support of Dwight D. Eisenhower for the presidency.

The gist of the *Sun's* case for Gen. Eisenhower is that the G.O.P. nominee is "a free man," whereas Gov. Stevenson is a captive and that, in any case, a change in parties is needed in Washington.

We reprint this editorial as part of the pros and cons of the presidential campaign. It is our hope that in reprinting comments favorable to Gen. Eisenhower and others favorable to Gov. Stevenson we will contribute to the information of our readers with respect to the important choice which lies ahead of them.

Since the Baltimore *Sun* supported Gov. Dewey in 1944 and again in 1948, its declaration for Gen. Eisenhower is less notable than some of the announcements for the Republican standard bearer. The Norfolk *Ledger-Dispatch,* which declared for Gen. Eisenhower last Monday, backed Franklin Roosevelt four times. The Birmingham *News,* which took its stand for Gen. Eisenhower between the conventions, has never before supported a Republican nominee for the White House. The Richmond *Times-Dispatch,* also for Gen. Eisen-

hower this year, supported F.D.R. four times and sat out the 1948 campaign.

The editorial in the Bloomington *Pantagraph,* of which Gov. Stevenson is a part owner, is of interest chiefly for the personal reason. The *Pantagraph* has long been stanchly Republican. When it criticizes the record of the Truman Administration as a handicap to the Democratic nominee (for whom it has "great admiration and respect"), the Bloomington newspaper runs true to its political colors. It also, of course, expresses a feeling of many people.

Over the country the prospect is that Gen. Eisenhower will have the great majority of editorial pages on his side. In this the press of the country will be following a trend set going at least as far back as Franklin D. Roosevelt's first election. Here is how the daily newspapers have lined up since 1932, as compiled by Editorial Research Reports:

Year	*For Reps.*	*For Dems.*
1932	49%	39%
1936	51%	38%
1940	60%	31%
1944	60%	26%
1948	65%	15%

These percentages relate to numbers of newspapers. If circulation is the basis, then the Republicans have had an even bigger share. In 1948, for example, the 65% of the papers for Gov. Dewey had 78½% of the total circulation. The 15 per cent for President Truman had only 10 per cent in circulation.

Yet in the face of this, President Truman won the election by more than 2,000,000 popular votes and collected 303 electoral votes to 189 for Gov. Dewey and 39 for the Dixiecrat ticket in four Southern States.

The *Post-Dispatch* believes that the voter cannot make an informed choice until both Gen. Eisenhower and Gov. Stevenson have presented their views to the country. When support for Gen. Eisenhower broke out like a rash last January, we said it was too early to decide. We think it still too early—and that it will continue to be too early until the actual campaign gets under way and the people have a chance to size up the nominees and find out for what they stand.

Meanwhile we will reprint from time to time from newspapers which, for one reason or another, feel that it is not necessary to hear the debate—even the debate for the highest office within the grant of the American people.

Milwaukee Journal, July 9

Daily Chicago Tyfoon

The World's Greatest Noisepaper

Journal Staff Correspondence

Chicago, Ill.—Col. Robert R. McCormick and his Chicago *Tribune,* which has been campaigning against the presidential nomination of Gen. Eisenhower, found itself a rival Tuesday.

It was a rollicking, biting, cleverly done imitation of the *Tribune* called the Daily Chicago Tyfoon. It was one newspaper page on both sides. It was put out by the Eisenhower forces and was distributed to delegates to the Republican convention and their alternates.

In imitation *Tribune* type and makeup, it mocked McCormick's frequently expressed hates and dislikes—the British, internationalists, political independents, Rhodes scholars, the British, Wall Street bankers, the Marshall Plan, the British, Pentagon generals, eastern globalists and the British.

The Daily Tyfoon termed itself "the world's greatest noisemaker" published "in the GOP heartland, where Democrats rule," with "an editorial in every column."

One "ear (the boxes in the front page corner) proclaimed the Tyfoon as "an American paper printed with India ink and Canadian pulp." The other flaunted the slogan: "All the news that fits we print."

"St. Lawrence seaway; possible invasion route" screamed one headline. "Assault could hit Chicagoland" and "Rhodes scholars may lead amphibious assault," the headline deck said.

"GOP to ban independent votes," declared another headline. "Plan will keep party sure," the deck said.

Col. McCormick's military views were gently ridiculed as the Tyfoon announced "three mile limit held defensible." It quoted the "director of Re-examinists, Inc.' 'as stating in a speech that "with long range coast artillery and extensive use of floating mines, any enemy invasion can be easily repulsed." The speaker assured his imaginatory audience that the "Pentagon brass encouraged a huge army for the sole purpose of keeping themselves in grade."

Under the heading "News Roundup" were these notes:

"Truman Republican disgraces party. Says independents are American.

"Says alien D. C. cherry trees must come down. 'They look definitely pink to me,' says sleuth.

"MacCarthy finds patriot in state department. Cites exception that proves rule.

"Sees globalism in Gettysburg address. Lincoln said freedom must not 'perish from this earth.'

"Propose liquidation of United States steel industry rather than import foreign molybdenum, manganese and chrome.

"Ike has lost ground since January. Tyfoon reporter finds erosion on Pa. farm."

Editorials, on the second page, were headed "We Dare Not Elect This Man" and "Chicago's Expansion Problems Traced to 19th Century 'Marshall Plan.' "

The first, a parody on the many *Tribune* articles directed against Gen. Eisenhower, ended like this:

"The election of this man to the presidency of the United States would be the destruction of the Republican party. It would blast us away from the solid principles of 1932. It would rocket us 30 years forward to the present, putting us dangerously ahead of our time. We dare not risk this. We dare not elect a forceful optimist, a God calling boulevardier.

"Republicans, Americans, let us unite against this monster, let us rally with this battle cry:

"Though it be for America's worst, let us have America first,

"Let us have isolation, consternation, atomic blasting to damnation,

"Let us elect a political man, for our top Republican."

Chicago Tribune On Its Critics

The pinko New Deal newspapers which were largely responsible for unloading Gen. Eisenhower on the Republican party are unhappy that *The Tribune* has not fallen for their man.

They are beating their breasts over the announcement that this newspaper thinks the candidates of both parties unworthy of votes and suggests the organization of an American party, offering a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

We have just surveyed the lot that deplores this proposal and makes a mock virtue of Republican party regularity. There is not a friend of the Republican party or of the Republican principles among them, although there are certainly a representative assortment of New Deal organs interested in taking over what used to be the Republican party and perverting it to a carbon copy of the party of Roosevelt and Truman.

We observe among this group the New York *Post,* Fort Wayne *Journal-Gazette,* St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* Milwaukee *Journal,* Louisville *Times,* and Illinois *State Register* of Springfield.

When has any of them enunciated Republican principles, or what used to be Republican principles?

If they can transform the party into an echo of the Truman party, they are content, and they have had a succession of candidates willing to do so, none more than the present five-star flop.

—Chicago *Tribune,* Aug. 30

Letters

A Missed Story

Dear Mr. Lyons:

Late last summer a group of young men and women, most of whom were British subjects, were prevented by American police at Saalfelden, Austria, from continuing on their way to the Russian-sponsored World Youth Festival in Berlin.

It was quite by chance that a representative of the *Blade* happened to arrive in England just then to find that country's newspapers tremendously exercised over the incident.

The alarm sounded by the British press was most disturbing. British newspapers gave their readers the impression, and seemed to take the same attitude themselves, that American troops had acted very much like Russians. Yet this incident, which caused such a stir in Britain, was but scantily reported in the American press.

Although this may have been an event of minor proportions, especially when viewed against the vast world struggle we call the "cold war," it unquestionably created ill will for the United States in Britain, and imposed a strain on Anglo-American relations.

The *Blade* became concerned about the incident and particularly about the inexplicable failure of the newspapers in the United States to report the story. The Saalfelden incident raised so many questions that we felt some inquiry should be made. By the time that investigation had been completed, of course, the uproar had long since subsided.

Confident, however, that the effort this long inquiry required was fully justified by the principles at stake, this newspaper has published its report on the Saalfelden incident. Thinking that you would be interested in reading it, I am enclosing a copy. Naturally we will be very much interested in hearing any comments you may care to make.

Sincerely,
Harry R. Roberts,
Toledo *Blade*

(See Toledo *Blade* article under SCRAPBOOK.)

Polling

To the Editor:

I enjoyed very much the article by Bruce Westley in the July *Nieman Reports* on Public Opinion Polling. It appeared to be a very thoughtful and well reasoned article.

Henry Ladd Smith,
Professor of Journalism,
University of Wisconsin

Insurance

To the Editor:

Enclosed find $2.00 for my Nieman Reports subscription renewal.

The expenditure is an annual procedure I started during college. I consider it as worthwhile and as necessary as monies spent for insurances, etc.

Norm Pubek,
Night Editor,
Dubuque *Telegraph-Herald*

I Like —

To the Editor:

I believe my subscription to Nieman Reports expired with the July, 1952, edition.

There is no better way I can think of to tell you how much I like your magazine than to ask you to renew my subscription.

Enclosed please find a check for $2.

Very truly yours,
Joseph D. Schwendeman
455 Abbottsford Avenue
Philadelphia 44, Pa.

Iniquity

To the Editor:

Please discontinue sending me the Nieman Reports. It seems I had a misconception of its purpose.

In the last number I see that Alan Barth of the Washington *Post* issues a moral challenge to his co-workers. Did Mr. Barth write the editorial in his newspaper justifying General Foods when that corporation discharged a radio employee solely on a statement that the employee was a Communist fellow-traveler? Though this was done without any investigation of the facts, the *Post* said it was just because General Foods might lose customers by retaining the employee. Apparently conceptions of newspaper morals depend on whether money is to be lost or not.

I note also a Mr. Wiggin of the same newspaper holding forth on "the right of the people to know." Was Mr. Wiggin concerned about the people knowing the whole truth about the case of the U. S. Government against the A & P; the people getting a correct interpretation of the steel strike?

Or do these gentlemen write for Nieman Reports with cleverly-concealed tongues in cheeks?

Years ago Upton Sinclair wrote about the way newspapers suppressed truth. Commenting on his remarks, a newspaperman, H. L. Mencken, observed that "The American newspaper, even of the better sort, is not only as bad as Sinclair says it is, but ten times worse."

Some of them seemingly are still "ten times worse," but it must be quite an anodyne for one's moral nature to have a publication like Nieman Reports to preach the gospel in and fortify oneself for another plunge into iniquity.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. J. Brett
Washington, D. C.

To the Editor:

Every issue is better. Keep it up.

Edward F. Garrison
Tacoma 6, Washington

Grass Roots Polling

Bruce H. Westley's article in the current Nieman Reports prompted me to send you the enclosed Page-One tear sheets from *The Courier-Journal*. The first one, dated August 1, appeared on Friday before Saturday's primary election. The other was the Sunday following the election, reporting the unofficial result.

"Grass roots" polling is the system I have been using in Kentucky for years on *The C-J*. I have made studies of random sampling methods and Gallup's scientific cross-section methods. I remain unconvinced that a good political reporter, with a thorough knowledge of local politics and politicians, plus some reliable sources who will trust him far enough to tell the reporter the truth, can't come up with as reliable forecasts as the so-called "experts."

The tear sheets don't mean to imply that I always guess right. Not at all. But in 15 years of writing politics on the *C-J* I have *never been caught in print* in a forecasting error. But then, I don't always make a majority prediction.

Hugh Morris
State capital correspondent
Louisville *Courier-Journal*

On Freedom of Information

To the Editor:

On 13 June 1952, following the discontinuance of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations decided to appoint for an experimental period of one year and in a personal capacity a rapporteur on matters relating to freedom of information, and has selected me to fill that post.

My main function, the Council has laid down, will be to prepare, in co-operation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the professional organizations concerned, both national and international, "a substantive report covering major contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information, together with recommendations regarding practical action which might be taken by the Council in order to surmount those obstacles to the fuller enjoyment of freedom of information which can be surmounted at the present time." The Council also decided to include in its agenda for 1953 an item on freedom of information for the purpose of reviewing problems of freedom of information in the light of the Rapporteur's report and of taking appropriate action thereon.

I would particularly draw your attention to the emphasis which the Council has placed on the co-operation of professional organizations in the preparation of the report referred to above. It is my personal conviction that if the report is to be realistic, it must pay particular attention to practical problems in the field of freedom of information, and I feel that I can secure an objective picture of these problems only with the assistance of organizations such as yours. Accordingly, I would appreciate receiving from your Organization:

1. Any views, opinions or suggestions which you may have to offer concerning contemporary problems and developments in this field which I should take into account when preparing the report;
2. any views, opinions or suggestions which you may have to offer concerning the general content of the report; and
3. any other relevant material which you consider might be of assistance to me in the performance of my task, including factual data concerning actual conditions.

I hope to complete the final text of the report and have it circulated well before the opening of the 16th session of the Economic and Social Council, scheduled for 30 June 1953, and I would therefore apprecite receiving your views on the above matters as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,
Salvador P. Lopez
Rapporteur to the Economic and Social Council on
Freedom of Information
United Nations, Lake Success, N .Y.

The First Press Agent?

"Here is, now, some fellow in Wall Street who has a private object in view—the making of a few thousand dollars by speculation; and he asks us to help him to do so, at our own expense. If we refuse, he threatens to say 'you are bought up.' We tell this patriot, and every other patriot, that we have no sort of objection to publish his communication or being paid for them, as for any other advertisements. If 'M.Q.' will transmit $15 (for the article will occupy 30 squares) we shall publish them with as much fearlessness as we do 'Loco Poco Matches,' 'Dancing Parties,' 'Dr. Moffat's Vegetable Life Pills,' or 'Dr. Brandreth's Vegetable Universal Pills.' "

James Gordon Bennett,
quoted in Stewart and Tebbel,
"Makers of Modern Journalism"

Honolulu Newsletter:

On Being a Foreigner Abroad

by Lawrence Nakatsuka

(The writer, a Honolulu newspaperman, recently toured Europe for a month, after studying for a year as a Nieman Fellow in Journalism at Harvard University.)

Honolulu, T.H.

An American who travels abroad for the first time has more than an ocean to cross. He must bridge a mental gap that can, in a way, be as wide as an ocean. The typical American learns that when he is abroad, he is a foreigner. He learns that he is a guest of the country which he is visiting; that a courteous guest ordinarily does not demand that his host change his ways of doing things just to accommodate his overnight guest. Some Americans can and do adjust to this "foreign" role; others never learn.

I remember the time when our tour group made a four-day visit to Rome. My wife and a woman friend were discussing their shopping tour that day.

"Did you notice how these Romans stared at us?" my wife's friend remarked. "You'd think we were foreigners."

"But aren't we foreigners actually?" my wife asked.

After a moment's reflection, her friend replied. "Yes, I guess we are. I've never thought of myself as a foreigner."

It is not always easy for an American to accept the role of a foreigner. Some persist in doing things "the way we do back home." They have not learned (or will not adopt) the maxim that "When you're in Rome, do as the Romans do."

Take the matter of spending dollars abroad. Anyone who has been to Europe, especially to England, will appreciate the initial difficulties of figuring money in terms of francs, liras or pounds. I have seen numerous Americans completely frustrated by the monetary units used by the various countries. It took me several days before I could calculate in English pounds, shillings and pennies.

Quite often, the American, after making a purchase, would reach into his purse or pocket and place a fistful of assorted coins and bills on the counter and tell the sales clerk: "You figure out what I owe you and take it out of here. I don't understand your money."

To an American at home, this incident may appear amusing. But reverse this spectacle and it would not seem so funny. For instance, when my wife and I were waiting for our baggage at Idlewild Airport in New York, after our European tour, we saw a German immigrant trying to pay an airlines employee for meals he had ordered aboard the plane. He had some American coins with which he was not familiar. After wating impatiently while the German fumbled with the coins, the airlines employee muttered to a fellow worker in English: How stupid can these foreigners be? This guy can't count his money; he can't even speak English."

If the ability to count foreign money or to speak a foreign language were the criterion for judging the intelligence of visitors, the average American tourist must appear to Europeans to be far less than intelligent. In our tour group of 36 Americans, who came from all parts of the country, only a handful could read or understand a foreign language; none was a fluent speaker of any of the languages of the non-English countries we toured — France, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium.

Ordering a meal in a Continental hotel or restaurant can be amusing or irritating, depending on your mood and the ability of the waiter to speak English. Because menu cards are printed in a foreign language, one who doesn't read that language must call on the waiter for help. Since this goes on at least three times a day, it can become exasperating to the waiter. Imagine a scene in an American restaurant if a European asked to have the menu translated each time he sat at a table.

First of all, relatively few American waiters speak a foreign tongue. Second, a typical waiter probably would blurt out, "Sorry I don't speak your language," and leave the customer hungry. In Europe, I saw waiters patiently start from the top of a menu card and, in the best English they knew, identify each item. If their English was less than perfect, their patience and courtesy generally were not.

Whether or not the American tourist demands too much during his travels his European host nearly always does his best to please, since Europeans need and want American dollars. Americans being aware of this, tend to strain the hospitality of the Europeans.

On the other hand, it seems that too many Europeans still imagine Americans to be millionaires whose only occupation is to spend their wealth abroad.

The fact is that many more middle and lower-income Americans than plutocrats are traveling in Europe today. Our tour party, for example, was made up mostly of retired couples and single folks who have saved their money for the trip.

Economic hardships being what they are in Europe, it is unfortunate that more Europeans cannot afford to visit the United States. Their notion about "wealthy Americans" would be tempered by the observations that the poor are with the Americans, too. But these visitors also would gain a healthy respect for a comparatively young nation which has outstripped the old countries by virtue of a dynamic and democratic economy and society.

—Pacific Citizen,
July 5.

"A Windy Hillside"

"Better it is that you should set fire to your plant, leave town by the light of it and take to raising speckled peas on a windy hillside with a bob-tailed bull, than to remain a human cash-register editor."

C. L. Knight,
quoted in Stewart and Tebbel,
"Makers of Modern Journalism"

Punch's Viewpoint

Saucer Strategy

by Charles W. Morton

Of all visitors to the United States from outer space, those who were touring around over Washington in July were undoubtedly the most intelligent. Their saucers were much faster than earlier models seen in this country, their lights were more variously and gaily colored, and the ease with which they pulled away from our jet planes bespoke not only a high standard of engineering and design but also a commendable quality of spacemanship. Their repeated appearances on the radar screen were obviously not unintentional; the resulting attempts at interception and pursuit by the Air Force seemed deliberaely courted, possibly for the purpose of establishing comparative speeds. Where previous arrivals from other worlds have contented themselves with outrunning the ordinary transport planes of the commercial airlines, the Washington expedition was willing to pit itself against the best we have, and the outcome was impressive. The demands of an extended cruising radius, a vexing problem in all logistics, seemed to present no difficulty to these visitors, who were able —possibly after several light-years en route—to dawdle over Washington for a week or more, apparently still possessed of ample fuel and stores for the long trip home. Since no forced landings were reported (up to this writing), the inference is inescapable that the entire expedition began its return without mishap, despite atmospheric and gravitational conditions which must have been novel to most of the personnel. (Washington, for example, is listed by the Foreign Office as an unhealthful post, and July there is extremely hot and humid, even at night.)

The occupants of the saucers were evidently still bound by a "no fraternization" policy. None disembarked, and nothing was learned about their appearance or their numbers. The great speed of the saucers militated against detailed observation, but from the closest encounter, in which a traveling salesman driving on a highway in the Middle West was forced to ditch his car to avoid collision with the visitors, one fears that the latest saucer is about 400 feet long and changes its lights, or more properly its effulgence, from yellow to brown—all hands to collision stations? —in time of crisis. It was suggested that the near accident in this case was caused by the salesman's failure to dip his own lights, but his report was necessarily incoherent and needs further inquiry. Few experiences would be more unnerving than being suddenly bathed in brown light from a flying saucer, on a lonely road in the dark.

It was heartening to hear from the Air Force that "so-called flying saucers constitute no menace to the United States." Less easy to evaluate was the behavior of the four flying "cylinders" photographed from the U. S. Coast Guard aid station at Salem, Massachusetts. Noticing "a flash" in the sky at around 10 a.m. in clear weather, a photographer on duty tossed up his camera and made a hasty snapshot in that direction, although he could see nothing in the air. His film proved to have recorded "four dark objects," cylindrical in form, of which three were in a tight formation, with the fourth slightly above and to the rear in the role of Tail End Charlie. These were first reported as "white and egg-shaped," but this may have been a reference to the negative instead of the print. At any rate, the four-cylinder formation was not seen again.

Unfortunately, due to the unilateral aspects of travel from outer space at this time, the Washington expedition trespassed into several restricted flying areas. Radar observers noted their blips in the prohibited zone over the White House, and other critical defence areas were violated—thoughtlessly perhaps, yet without so much as a by-your-leave. There was also the baffling stratagem of the saucer which suddenly established itself as a ground light, in consequence of which the pursuing jet pilot very nearly crashed his plane.

But one must applaud, on the whole, the expedition's wise decision to show itself over the nation's capitol instead of hanging back, as the previous outer space vessels have seen fit to do, in the hinterland or the more suggestible areas of California. The awareness that our seat of government has been singled out, uniquely, for prolonged scrutiny by beings from another world must stir in every bosom a new sense of pride—and humility.

That the Washington expedition was fully informed about life in the United States was evident in its timing. Only sound showmanship and a real understanding of public relations could have brought the visitors to Washington in the dull interval after the Chicago conventions and before the opening of the election campaigns. It would have made little sense to accomplish so notable a voyage only to find the pubilc indoors watching its TV and the newspapers crammed to bursting with politics. As it worked out, late July was just the right time to claim the undivided attention of Americans, although King Farouk proved troublesome for a day or two. —*Punch*, August.

Charles W. Morton, associate editor of the *Atlantic Monthly,* American correspondent of *Punch,* is author of "How to Protect Yourself Against Women and Other Vicissitudes."

IMMIGRATION BILL IS UNDEMOCRATIC

There are no first-class, 2nd-class or 3rd-class citizens in this democracy of ours. You are just as much a citizen as your neighbor, whether you are Protestant, Catholic or Jew; whether your ancestors or yourself came from England, Italy, or any other nation. You are entitled to equal treatment under the laws with other citizens. You are entitled to similiar educational and other opportunities.

Furthermore, scientists have proved that there is no such thing as a "superior race" or an "inferior race."

In the same environment 2 persons with similar brains and character, no matter what their differences in racial background, have the same potential for leadership and success.

The McCarran-Walter immigration bill, which President Truman vetoed, therefore violated not only sacred principles of American democracy; it also ignored established scientific facts.

Ill-considered provisions of this bill would have kept in force what President Truman rightly termed "invidious discrimination" against immigrants from southern Europe, Asiatic and many other nations. They would not be permitted to come to this country in the same numbers as residents of northern European nations.

As Mr. Truman also pointed out, the bill gave "vast discretionary power to deport aliens or to take away citizenship from naturalized Americans"—as if the latter were "2nd-class citizens"; as if a person had to be born in the United States to be a "first-class citizen."

President Truman acted wisely, and in the interests of democracy, in vetoing the bill. It is unfortunate indeed that Congress, following Sen. Pat McCarran's short-sighted and bigoted leadership, voted to override the veto.

—Santa Rosa (Calif.) *Press-Democrat,* June 27.

Talk With James Thurber

by Harvey Breit

Being an old hand at reporting, Mr. Thurber decided to help along. "About the book," he began, "you can say it's about Taft country but it's by an Eisenhower man." Mr. Thurber, thinking on politics and the state of the Union, took a jump or two "If we don't stop suspecting all writers," he said, "it will be a severe blow to our culture. I think all writers, even the innocent ones, are scared. There's guilt by association, guilt by excoriation, there's guilt by everything the politicians invent. And it's rather foolish to hold the respect we do for ex-Communists, that is, people who once tried to overthrow the Government. Pretty soon some new Budenz will drop out of the Party deliberately, and we will go ahead and make him a hero."

Just about that time Elliot Nugent visited briefly and when he left, Mr. Thurber picked up the thread of the discussion. "People ask why there isn't a comedy like "The Male Animal' any more—something that's free and exuberant. It isn't possible to write a comedy like that any more because we're living in the most frightened country in the world. How confusing my dossier must be. I would not join a Communist organization, obviously. But I won't be scared off those organizations I did sign up for. They say now—it's gotten so abject— don't join anything. Don't even join a garden club."

* * *

—N. Y. *Times* Book Review June 29.

Junior College Students Answer Up For Democracy

by Keith Allan

Answers to a questionnaire by Santa Rosa Junior College students disclosed today that the future citizens have a sturdy conviction that the basic principles of Democracy still are the best guidepost to the full life.

The questionnaire, drafted by the Purdue University Public Opinion Panel, earlier had been submitted to a cross-section of high school students in a selected area not including California.

From the answers, LOOK Magazine had drawn alarming conclusions that the nation's youth had developed tendencies toward Fascistic and Communistic thinking.

The same questionnaire, submitted on a voluntary basis at the Junior College, indicates that the youth of this area are considerably more Democratic in their thinking.

The Junior College students were told by college officials that filling out the questionnaire was optional.

The boy or girl was asked NOT to put his or her name on the questionnaire or otherwise mark it so that the individual might be identified.

On this basis 269 students filled out and turned in copies of the questionnaire. Of these, 111 were boys and 158 were girls.

In answer to the proposition designed to find out if the students believed in freedom of the press, the Santa Rosa students answered 120 in favor, 105 against and 34 uncertain. The proposition calling for a "yes" or "no" or "uncertain" reply, was:

"Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to print anything they want except military secrets." This was considered to contain a certain ambiguity which may have confused some, who might take "anything" to include libelous statements and obscene literature.

Such was not the intent of the question, but it was felt that, although the question was poorly worded, the Santa Rosa group should be under the same handicap as the Purdue area group.

Santa Rosa students were in no doubt when it came to the question of religious freedom. To the statement—"Religious belief and worship should not be restricted by laws," the vote was 228 agreeing, 25 disagreeing and 16 uncertain.

They were even more emphatically against the tenet that the "The government should abolish all rights of inheritance to insure equality of opportunity." The vote was 21 agree, 230 disagree, 18 uncertain.

The question of government ownership and control was covered in 2 statements—"the government should have control of the railroads and airlines" and "most basic industries, like mining and manufacturing, should be owned by the government."

The vote on the first was 25 agree, 205 disagree and 39 uncertain. On the 2nd the vote was 25 agree, 218 disagree and 26 uncertain.

The Santa Rosa students were equally emphatic in their feelings on certain rights of the individual. On the statement—"In some cases, the police should be allowed to search a person or his home even though they do not have a warrant."—the vote was 62 agree, 190 disagree and 17 uncertain.

On the statement—"Some criminals are so bad that they shouldn't be allowed to have a lawyer."—the vote was 17 agree, 241 disagree and 9 uncertain.

On the statement covering one of our constitutional rights—"Persons who refuse to testify against themselves (that is, give evidence that would show that they are guilty of criminal acts) should either be made to talk or severely punished."—the vote was 24 agree, 203 disagree and 42 uncertain.

On a statement based on another ideological tenet—"Large estates, on which the land lies idle and unused, should be divided up among the poor for farming." —the vote was closer—97 agreed, 117 disagreed and 55 were uncertain.

Right of the worker to strike was strongly upheld. On the statement—"The right of some working groups to call a strike should be abolished, as it is a threat to democracy and not in the general interest of society."—the vote was 64 agree, 165 disagree and 40 uncertain.

In the mattter of Sen. McCarthy, 191 students answered yes to the question—"Have you heard about Sen. McCarthy's efforts to discover and remove Communist influence in our government?" Fifty-two answered no, and, strangley enough, 26 were uncertain.

Of the 191 who answered yes, 40 approved of his methods, 104 did not and 37 were uncertain.

The Santa Rosa students were against Congressional immunity. To the statement and question—"If ordinary citizens make accusing statements about others, without evidence or proof, they can be sued for slander or libel. Do you think that members of Congress trying to uncover dangerous influences in the government should have to obey the same laws or not."—138 said they should, 97 that they should not and 34 were uncertain.

On the much disputed matter of loyalty oaths—127 thought they should be required of all government employees, 75 that they should be required of only those in positions involving security, 43 that they should not be required of any, and 24 were uncertain.

On non-Communist oaths for teachers the vote was 112 that they should be required; 132, that they should not. Twenty-five were uncertain.

In this case it was the girls' vote that threw the balance over against requiring the oaths. The boys' vote was 52 in favor of requiring the oath, 49 against and 10 uncertain.

Sixty-seven girls indicated a preference for the Republican party, as compared to 46 for the Democratic party and 3 for some other party. Forty-two said they had no party preference.

Among the boys the Democrats were in the lead, with 39 indicating a preference for that party as compared to 33 for the Republican. Four preferred some other party and 35 had no party preference.

All but 8 of the students said they had had, or were now taking, a course in civics or U. S. government.

—Santa Rosa (Calif.)
Press-Democrat, June 27.

"The Best Advertisement Any Charlatan Ever Had"

E. L. Godkin on Jim Fisk:

This man came to New York a few years ago, a smart, impudent and ignorant peddlar, without morals or manners, and with a good deal of animal spirits, and in search of two things—physical enjoyment he might have had with a little money, but notoriety he could get only with the help of the newspapers, and this help they gave him to his heart's content.

He went inconsistently to work to do strange, indecent, and outrageous things, and they went to work to chronicle them and then denounce him for them. This was natural enough when he first showed himself on the scene as a swindler and blackguard, but when it was discovered that he was really indifferent to public opinion, that he had no shame and no sensibility, and really enjoyed his bad reputation, liked to be thought lewd and smart and knavish, the press at once began to treat him as a curious phenomenon, and laugh over him, chronicle his movements, record his jokes, give him pet names, and devoted an amount of time to the consideration of him as an entertainment simply, which proved the best advertisement any charlatan ever had, and gratified his dearest ambition. To be 'in the papers' every day, to be thought smart by brokers and drygoodsmen and railroad men, are what he of all things most desires . . .

We cannot make Fisk a person of importance, and fill everybody's mind every morning with his doings and sayings, without making Fisk's career an object of secret admiration to thousands, and making thousands in their inmost hearts determine to imitate him. The newspapers ought to remember that, while for some offenders against public decency and security denunciation may be a proper and effective punishment, the only way of reaching others is not to mention them.

E. L. Godkin in *The Nation*
quoted in Stewart and Tebbel:
"Makers of Modern Journalism."

Our Reviewers in this Issue

(Pages 43-47)

Robert W. Brown, editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger,* and **A. G. Ivey,** associate editor of the Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel,* were Nieman Fellows last year; **William M. Pinkerton,** director of the Harvard News Office, was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

Nieman Notes

will be resumed in the next issue of *Nieman Reports.*

The New South for May

Changing Patterns in a Border State

by Priscilla Robertson

Last year, the Northern Kentucky Education Association (consisting of teachers from the area near Covington) arranged a day-long conference on moral and spiritual values in education. Kentucky's Department of Education has been the first to set up a separate Commission on Moral and Spiritual Values, in order to meet the need for such values while preserving the separation of church and state.

When the Negro teachers of Northern Kentucky heard of the conference, they wanted to take part and gain some of the benefits. Accordingly, they mailed in their dues to the association, with a request that they be allowed to attend. The white leaders of the meeting said to each other that the only way to implement the moral and spiritual values they were trying to discuss would be to welcome the Negro members. They did so, and the Negro teachers attended both sessions of the conference and the reception afterwards. This is only one of many incidents that show how the pattern of racial segregation is breaking down in Kentucky. Perhaps the most far-reaching step that has been taken in the last two years is the admission of Negro students to five previously white colleges. In each case, student bodies have taken the attitude that nothing extraordinary is happening. They have treated the situation as perfectly normal. The Dean of Women at the University of Louisville (much the largest of the undergraduate bodies involved) says that she has been pleased to notice that there has been very little of a "let's put Mary on because she's a Negro" attitude, and much more of a "Mary would do that job well, let's put her on" response.

The completeness of their acceptance has been something of a surprise to the students who transferred from Louisville Municipal College for Negroes, which closed a year ago, to the main campus of the University. Apparently they, like many others, had been prepared to believe the myth that the white students would object.

At first there was talk of reserving special tables for colored students in the cafeteria, but these were never used because they did not suit the wishes or convenience of either race. In general, all students participate in *everything* on campus—not only facilities such as dining room and library, but all the recreational clubs, and glee club, the home economics club and all college functions, including University sponsored dances, which are held only in ballrooms that will welcome all members. (There has been no interracial dancing, except square dancing.) Negro students brought their own fraternities and sororities with them. This spring one Negro has gone out for football practice, which should do a lot to make the other colored students feel that the athletic teams belong to them as well as to the whites.

Negro Faculty Member

With some hesitation, the Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville decided to employ one of the professors from Municipal College to serve as "adviser" to Negro students on the new campus and to teach a single course on the graduate level. Dr. Charles Parrish, distinguished sociologist, was the fortunate choice for this position. But when he got to his new office, the needs of the college life proved to be different from what the trustees had imagined. The need for a special adviser for colored transfers evaporated, and he is now teaching a full load in the sociology department with many more whites than Negroes in his classes.

In theory, although the courses Dr. Parrish teaches are themselves required, any dissatisfied student could ask to be changed to another section. If this has happened at all, it has been infrequent and unnoticed. Actually, Dr. Parish's section of one freshman course, Problems of Modern Society, happens to be larger than the alternate section.

Teaching Fellow

Possibly an even more significant development occurred without any public attention. While the trustees were debating whether to install a Negro full professor, the physics department liked so well the work of one of the students who came from the Louisville Municipal College to do graduate work, that without any fanfare they made him a teaching fellow. Robert Maupin has been a graduate assistant since September 1950, handling one of three sections in laboratory work for freshmen in physics. His department is delighted with him, and so far as is known no white student has asked to be transferred to another section.

Since there is no longer any designation of race on registration cards, it is almost impossible to tell how many colored students have registered. But it is known that in the fall of 1951, when the undergraduate colleges were integrated, 54 students out of a possible 123 transferred to Belknap Campus (the main arts and science campus) from Louisville Municipal College. Some of the others may have been discouraged by the higher tuition rates at Belknap Campus; a few went to Catholic colleges; and some who did not wish to face white competition may have gone to the Kentucky State College at Frankfort. However, 17 students who had been at Frankfort last year have transferred to Louisville this year.

Besides the University of Louisville, Berea and three Catholic colleges are now taking Negro students. The University of Kentucky at Lexington admits them to graduate school, but the state-supported teachers' colleges have not yet accepted them, partly because these institutions lie in less progressive areas of the state. Nor are Negroes admitted by Presbyterian Centre College of Kentucky or Baptist Georgetown College. However, Negro students are welcome at both Protestant seminaries in Louisville. At the Southern Baptist Seminary a Nigerian student is living in the dormitory. Before the law was changed to permit integration, ninety-six per cent of the student body of that institution

voted in favor of admitting colored students both to classrooms and dormitories. Now they are living up to their principles.

Representation

Dr. R. B. Atwood, president of the Kentucky State College at Frankfort, now sits with his fellow presidents on the Council of Public Higher Education. Until 1952 he was debarred by reason of the fact that his college was run directly by the board of education and had no regents of its own. This year the college was given its own board and full equality on the Council with its sister colleges. Negroes also are members of the State Board of Education and the State Textbook Commission.

As for the other professions, members of the state Negro Medical Association can now become members of the Kentucky Medical Association. Their previous difficulty grew out of the refusal of various county medical societies to accept them. This problem was met by the creation of a Negro branch on a statewide level — not an entirely satisfactory solution, but a step forward. Lawyers seem less willing to accept colored members, for the stated reason that they fear social intermingling at Bar Association parties. In Louisville the Council of Churches is integrated. There have been occasional examples of exchange of pulpits between Negro and white ministers and a good many examples of interracial activity among young people's groups.

Hospital Facilities

One of the triumphs of recent years has been the admission of Negro girls as students in nursing at the Louisville General Hospital, where they are assigned, as are white students, to patients of either race. In 1948 for the first time Negro patients were accommodated by one of the city's private hospitals — St. Joseph's, a Catholic institution. Before this, colored patients had only Louisville General or their own little Red Cross Hospital — which, however, has been vastly improved in recent years.

Out in the state, the possibility of Negroes finding hospital beds has increased, since the use of federal funds for hospital construction makes it mandatory that patients of all races be accepted. Also, a state licensing provision prohibits all hospitals from refusing any emergency case.

Louisville's main public library has been open to and widely used by both races since 1948. This April all the suburban branches were also opened to Negroes. The city parks, however, with the exception of one small park for Negroes only, have been closed to them since 1927, though last fall the courts said that Negroes must be allowed to play on city golf courses unless and until equally attractive courses were provided for them.

Louisville is the first Southern city to give some training in race relations to all its rookie policemen, and it employs 34 Negroes on its force, more than any other Southern city except Miami. At the Southern Police Institute, on the campus of the University of Louisville, police officers from all over the South receive training in how to handle minority group disputes as part of their comprehensive course in police science.

Next Steps

If segregation as a policy is indeed "curling up at its edges" in Kentucky, and especially in Louisville, what will be the next steps? What remains to be done?

In the 1952 legislature, the Catholic School Board urged the repeal of what is left of the Day Law. Though the Board's hopes were not realized, it intends to call for repeal again in 1954, unless the courts declare the whole business of segregation unconstitutional before then. The Day Law is the statute which, until two years ago, completely forbade education of the two races in the same classroom at the same time. When it was amended, the change applied only to higher education; it is still a severely punished crime for members of the two races to share a common classroom in grade or high schools. At such time as the law is repealed, the Catholics are prepared to start integrating all their parochial schools. In some country districts, they feel they could go ahead immediately. In a few city schools, they believe it would take a few months to educate and prepare the parents. The children evidently favor the change immediately, but not all the parents are so liberal.

The repeal of the Day Law would make no difference in Kentucky's public schools, where separate but equal use of school funds is required by the state constitution. Though a constitutional amendment is hard to put through, financial pressure may bring a quicker change than might be expected, even if the courts do not rule that segregation is in itself discrimination. Between fifty and sixty counties in the state have no high schools for Negroes, but have been sending them to Lincoln Institute as boarding students. Judging by recent court decisions, it seems likely that a suit challenging this arrangement would be successful. A bill that might have eased the counties' dilemma, by permitting several counties to join in establishing a single common Negro high school, was defeated in the recent legislature. Lack of money and the expense of dual education will weigh increasingly hard on the budgets of these counties.

Off-Campus Custom

There are other ways in which the present situation is anomalous. For instance, when University policy clashes with off-campus custom, what then?

Many banquets and parties have been given by university fraternities at big hotels down town which do not accept Negro guests. This policy has had to be amended already for Community Chest luncheons, and now perhaps will evoke new pressures.

Significantly, contacts made at the newly integrated colleges have already enabled several Negro students to secure jobs which before would almost certainly have been closed to them. Kentucky Negroes themselves feel that their greatest need is equal opportunity in employment—chances for apprentice training, for upgrading, and of course for the opening up of certain positions which have never been filled by Negroes in this state.

In this, as in the freer use of public accommodations, administrative officials are bound to find out sooner or later that a policy of partial segregation is extremely difficult to maintain. Perhaps they will also take courage from the fact that the change-over so far has been much easier than people predicted.

Mrs. Cary Robertson is the wife of the Sunday editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and author of *The Revolutions of 1848*, just published by Princeton University Press.

Denver Post, Sunday, April 6, 1952

The Last Outpost of Feudal Journalism

Copper Controls the Press of Montana

by Thor Severson
Denver Post Reporter

This is from the first of six articles in the Denver Post on the influence of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company on the public in Montana through its chain of newspapers.

BUTTE, Mont.—Montana lives under the captive shadow of one of the world's most fabulous corporation giants—a giant so powerful it virtually ghostwrites this state's legislative program and wields enough dictatorial power to all but still the voice of the state's free press.

King copper ruled in the yesteryear, he rules today. The only difference: The method.

But whether by bared fist or gloved hand, the result is the same. King Copper has Montana in his pocket. His hold is still strong, his grip unshakable.

Of Fabulous Wealth

The corporation behind this control? Actually, there are two—Anaconda Copper Mining company, the world's largest nonferrous mining industry, and its copperdust twin, Montana Power.

Both are fabulously wealthy, both powerfully influential. Their Montana interests are so closely interrelated they are almost identical. It is a sort of Damon-Pythias relationship. So close are the ties, in fact, they are known from the grasslands in eastern Montana to the state's mountainous west as "the company."

Anaconda, the fatter of the twins, has subsidiary holdings in fifteen states and large holdings in Chile, Mexico and Canada. It has assets totaling more than $700 million. It virtually owns the city of Butte, holds vast properties in Montana lumber, and owns three domestic railroads and a foreign railroad, as well as a steamship line—to serve its far-flung operations.

And more than an incidental fact—Anaconda owns virtually all the fabulously-rich mining properties in Butte, and five of Montana's six most influential newspapers.

Montana Power, the leaner of the twins, but fat in its own right, is a company which grew out of the clever buy-and-sell stock manipulations of John D. Ryan, company founder and onetime president of both Anaconda and Montana Power.

The liason between these two agglutinative corporations, it becomes obvious, goes a long way back. Wherever you find Anaconda, you find Montana Power walking a step behind in the shadows.

It has a virtual monopoly on power and gas distribution in Montana, boasts more than 10,000 miles of transmission lines, almost 1,000 miles of gas mains.

Study of Influence

But this is no indictment against powerful holdings, no argument with free enterprise—no simpering wolf cry against accumulative corporation wealth.

It is a study, rather, of "company" influence upon Montana life.

The revealing significance of this A. C. M-M. P. liason of control over the destiny of the Treasure state lies in the company ownership by Anaconda of five powerful Montana newspapers, three of which publish on both sides of the clock.

And it is found, also, in the influential hand Anaconda and Montana Power exercise over the state's legislature, directly and indirectly, on Helena's capitol hill.

The chain of company newspapers, for purposes of geographical study, extend from Missoula in the far west to Billings in the east. Their circulation territories are so interlocking they sometimes spill over into each other's territory of operation—giving the company domination over the news border to border.

The papers: The Billings *Gazette, the* Helena *Independent-Record,* the Livingston *Enterprise,* the Montana *Standard* and Butte *Post* in Butte, the Missoula *Sentinel* and the *Missoulian* in Missoula.

There is criticism against this "company" ownership of the press, of course. Some is based on fact, some on imagination. Much of it is bald. Some is unsupported. Much of it can be supported.

The "company" press, itself, is known by many names. It has been called the "captive press," the "feudal press," a "slave press," an "apologist press . . ."

And the product of the "company press" is read in many ways. Some read it with a screening eye, others with suspicion. Some with complete belief, others with indifference.

Not New in Montana

Actually company ownership of newspapers is not new in Montana. It was born in the buy-votes, buy-power era which mushroomed in Butte's battle of the copper kings. It was accepted in that day. But like a hangnail, it is irritating to modern-day Montanans.

And it represents something darker . . .

The ownership and control of a "company press" the like of Anaconda's—disregarding the fair or unfair treatment of news for the moment—makes Montana the last outpost of a captive press in America.

The company, at will, has in its power to "kill" any story it wishes, to impose a dangerous censorship. Independents may print the story. Yes. But so far as the chain papers of a corporation press are concerned, the story could die in the wastebasket, a casualty of the shears, at the whim of the company.

Or the company press can "ignore" a major "policy" story by either underwriting it or giving it a "policy" slant, or by burying the story on a "catch-all" page.

Or by failing to print the story at all.

Or it can, as well, throw a screening blanket of darkness over public issues by ignoring them editorially, by writing around them, by dealing in calculated scattergun bursts. The result: Control, or attempt at control, of public thought.

That is the power, the latent backroom power, of a "company" press.

Sin of 'Omission'

But what of the A. C. M. chain? Its history is rife with so-called "company" journalism. The sin is more of "omission" than "commission" today, however. You see very few "policy" stories planted in today's A. C. M. press, but you can search in vain for a story that may be carried in, say, the independent press.

And its editorial policy?

You hear it echoed in casual interviews with businessmen, educators, men of the professions—that Montana's company papers deal in a sort of editorial Afghanistanism.

Montana's few independent publishers in the daily field, and they are few, very few indeed, delight in A. C. M.'s peevish and selective type of editorial policy, however.

It gives the few independents an open field to till editorially. And it makes their editorial voice even stronger, for the reading public likes a bold editorial—whether it agrees with the conclusions, or not.

The A. C. M. papers deal often in international and, yes, national issues. But seldom is a state issue of controversy explored editorially, especially issues on taxation or corporate law.

The policy seems to be a policy of escapism. As one professional man put it: "They write editorially about everything except what you want explored . . ." It is, very often, an editorial routine of flowers-in-spring, havoc-in-China, life-among-the-Eskimos. The menu served up editorially, normally, is meatless. It is prepared for the vegetarian palate.

Take a few examples of so-called "policy" handling of the news by the Anaconda press. There is, for example, a major political battle being waged in Montana over whether silicosis, the racking lung disease so common among miners, should be brought under coverage of the Treasure state's workmen's compensation law.

It is not a new issue. It has been fought in virtually every session of the Montana legislature for decades—with, of course, the Anaconda Copper Mining company lined strongly in the ranks of the opposition.

But this time, instead of beginning anew the battle in the assembly, supporters of the measure have taken the proposal to the voters in the form of an initiative for vote next November.

Basically, supporters seek to remove industrial diseases, the like of silicosis, from the welfare rolls, arguing counties are being forced under the present law to shoulder an unjust burden.

In turn, they seek to charge compensation for silicotics against the "industry responsible"—which, quite plainly, means the mining industry.

A Major Story

The Helena Independent-Record, one of the five Montana newspapers owned by the A. C. M., broke the story in its Feb. 28 edition. It was a major story from the Montana viewpoint. For it affected vitally the state and county tax programs, and every victim of an industrial health disease in Montana.

Yet it was buried in the Independent-Record's financial page, a five paragraph story with the feeble headline: "Initiative Planned to Change Parts of Present Statute . . ."

No mention of silicosis was made. Three of the paragraphs were given to reporting the initiative was primarily a union-sponsored measure and to an explanation of the legal machinery for placing the initiative on the November ballot.

The last two paragraphs quoted an industry spokesman as labeling the initiative "patently socialistic" and traced the sponsorship of the initiative to former Representative Jerry J. O'Connel, long a target of "fellow-traveler" charges. It ended there—abruptly.

No voice was given to the measure's supporters. It was, in all, an underwritten, underplayed report on a major Montana issue, one which every voter may have to cast a ballot on in the fall.

The next morning, however, the Great Falls Tribune, Montana's major independent, considered the Associated Press wire story important enough to give it a three-column prominent play, and to carry a "follow" story giving spokesmen for and against the initiative a full, balanced exchange.

Available to All

The stories, written and dispatched by the A. P.'s Helena bureau and available to all Montana members, carefully explained the initiative, then gave opponents and proponents an equal exchange of opinion.

Moreover, the wire stories printed by the Tribune were ignored by A. C. M.'s morning publications. And the following Sunday, the Independent-Record and Montana Standard—both A. C. M. papers, ignored another A. P. story on the same issue.

The story reported an invitation, under a Butte dateline, of the Butte Miners union to an industries attorney to appear before the Butte union, and explain his criticism of the initiative.

The invitation, as carrried by the A. P., read in part:

"We resent any inference that we are circulating the petition under pressure or under guidance of any political party. We are working for the interest of the workers suffering from silicosis, and we resent statements such as the one attributed to you. . .

"By no stretch of the imagination can we imagine an attorney making such a charge as 'patently socialistic' against a plan that would take the burden of cost of silicosis from the backs of the people and put it on the backs of corporations. . .

Again, where the story was ignored by the A. C. M., it was carried by the Great Falls Tribune, an independent, although Great Falls was far from the scene of action.

Not 'Dated' Example

The comparison is singled out merely because of the time element. It is not a "dated" example. It, therefore, could reflect today's editorial policy of the A. C. M. press where a common state issue conflicts with a company issue. If not, it is at the least, an isolated example of "suppression."

But to another case. . . .

Last February, the Montana safety conference met in Helena. Its meetings were staffed by a Helena Independent-Record reporter; his running stories were carried by the Independent-Record.

However, there was one "omission" in the Independent-Record report on conference actions—at least in detail. This was a resolution which:

1—Recognized occupational diseases and infections were continuing to take "far too great a toll in terms of health, earning ability and in some cases life itself from the workers in Montana."

2—Resolved to press for legislation and greater funds to carry out work to combat occupational diseases and infections.

The obvious reference, again, was to silicosis. The report, as was said, was not carried by the Independent-Record, and inasmuch as the conference was not staffed by the Associated Press, it did not reach any of the Montana dailies—A. C. M. or independents.

A Key Issue

Going back a bit further, to the 1947 state legislature, there was still another action on silicosis—a key issue at A. C. M. mining and legislative programs.

On Feb. 6, Representative John Emmons, a Deer Lodge Democrat, announced he would introduce a bill in the assembly declaring silicosis an "industrial accident" and which would bring it under the workmen's compensation act.

His announcement was used by the Associated Press for one of its legislative "leads" that day. The Great Falls Tribune carried the story on page one the following morning, next to its top story. It was ignored by the A .C. M.'s corresponding morning paper in Butte. Yet, both had the same A. P. file. And the Helena Independent-Record, which covers the assembly with staff writers, ignored the story, too.

In a wide swing through Montana, one of the A. C. M. editors was asked about A. C. M. policy on legislative coverage. He told this reporter: "You'll notice all of our papers, except Helena, carry wire service reports on the legislature."

That is true. The A. C. M. press does carry wire reports on the legislature. All five of the company papers, in both morning and evening-side publications, carry a lot of "copy."

"That should make it pretty obvious we're not trying to slant news out of the legislature shouldn't it?" he asked. But let a veteran Montana law-maker, Representative Leo Graybill of Great Falls, answed:

"The A. C. M. follows a rather obvious program of legislative coverage. It prints fully the report on the cat and dog bills, and on most of the routine legislation. But where a tax or labor or compensation bill is involved, the report is screened.

"The story might be buried deep in the paper. It might not be carried at all. Or the facts may be cut to the bone. That happens most often. It seems to me that news page position—(whether it appears on page one, or deep inside)—counts for something in an objective newspaper.

"No. The company doesn't give an objective report on the legislature. And we all recognize the fact. They have one man at the press table with full credentials of a press man. But he doesn't write a word. All he does is keep track of the roll call votes, and telephone Butte the results.

"We all kind of laugh about it—the way the A. C. M. press covers the legislature. Especially the way the legislature is covered by the Helena Independent."

Charge it up to an editor's individual judgment of news. Accept the company's position it is publishing a totally objective chain of newspapers.

Suspicion Invited

One fact is inescapable, however: The mere ownership of the press by an industry invites suspicion. A company inherits this suspicion the moment it wields both the tools of industry and the pen.

A Good Investment

Why is A. C. M. in the publishing business?

T. B. Weir, a director of the subsidiary Fairmont corporation which has direct control over the A. C. M. press, said, "We're in the business because it's a good investment. That's our only interest."

Many doubt that. They say the ownership is an instrument—actual or potential, and both—of suppression.

Some years ago, one of Montana's independent editors became irritated with the company's obvious policy at that time of invoking a "news blackout" on anything Senator James Murray did in the U. S. senate.

That was in 1943. But the observation still is recalled in Montana.

The editor, Miles Romney of the Western News, referred to a statement circulated by Murray that the corporation press was kept to serve special vested interests—specifically, A. C. M.'s and Montana Power's.

Editorially, he agreed with Murray that the company press had treated Murray "shabbily" and argued that the activities of a U. S. Senator from the state in which a newspaper is published are "bound to be news whether the management of the paper is in accord with the senator's viewpoints or not. . ."

Then, in a blistering indictment of a corporate press in general, the Western News said: "Certainly the control of the press by any special privilege-seeking group is not in the best interest of the public.

"I doubt if anyone will argue that point.

"But it seems to me that it is at least questionable if such control in the long run is to the best of the corporation itself. Gradually a suspicion is bound to seep into the public mind that such control must be exercised for a purpose of dubious worth to the public. . .

"What the corporation might conceivably gain through control of news, which is likely to result in control of public opinion, could easily cost the corporation more in loss of public esteem. . ."

Many Indifferent

That's one man's opinion on a company press. But in words perhaps not so well chosen, so scholarly spoken, other Montanans mirror the same reaction. There are many who are indifferent. Of course. But the searching reader chafes under the scissor blades of a company press. If he can find no wrong, the theory, itself, is irritating, for the reputation of a captive industrial press in America is short of goodness and light.

Another question . . .

Just how big is Anaconda?

Actually, the full scope and sweep of Anaconda's holdings is staggering. It is both one of the world's major producers and consumers of copper.

But is is also a major producer of other ores: Silver, zinc, gold, lead. It produces 95 per cent of this nation's output in manganese, the defense-critical ore in such short supply.

Nor do its interests stop there. It owns more than 500,000 acres of Montana lumber lands, consumes approximately 40 million board feet of lumber in its operations alone. And on the retail end, it sells other additional millions of board feet through its controlled lumber yards throughout the state.

It operates three domestic railroads, all to service its own holdings. It owns all or the majority of stock in about fifteen domestic companies, and has major copper, molybdenite, gold and silver properties in a half-dozen foreign countries.

That's only a thumbnail sketch of its size.

Story Not Printed

The full story of A. C. M. operation was carried last Nov. 17 over the Associated Press wires throughout Montana and elsewhere in the nation, but it was not printed in Montana's key A. C. M. papers.

One A. C. M. editor said it was not published because it was a "rehash" of facts he believed to be common knowledge in Montana. Montanans generally know about A. C. M. operations, he said.

Regardless of whether his analysis of Montana's familiarity with A. C. M.'s operations is correct or incorrect—the opportunity was there, in concentrated capsule form, to produce a printed sketch of the state's largest and most influential industry.

It is not information which should carry a do-not-print tag. You can find it in the Encyclopedia Britannica, in financial papers, in engine ring journals.

But as one Montana attorney put it: ". . . It wasn't published in the A. C. M. papers I read."

Five articles, exploring A. C. M. as an editor and as an industrialist, will follow. They are: (1) An appraisal by a supreme court justice of the A. C. M. press; (2) Is the Montana legislature a vassal state of A. C. M.?; (3) The "Copper Curtain" and politics; (4) A. C. M. answers, the Kelley shaft project, and A. C. M.'s new public relations policy; (5) Butte, the city.

Chapel Hill Weekly (N.C.), April 25

Policy of a Village Newspaper

Sam Ragan comments, in his column in the *News and Observer,* on the fact that in reporting the illness of Kenneth Royall I described him not as the former secretary of war but as the nephew of Miss Alice Jones and Mrs. Isaac Manning. This touches upon a question that I often think about and that some times comes up in a conversation—the question of the basis of selection of news for a village newspaper. What and, if anything, how much shall such a paper publish about persons and happenings that have no special connection with its own community?

I have no absolute rule about it, but in general I do not print news of the outside world unless it has some local angle, because it is fully reported in the daily papers and is old stuff by the time my paper comes out.

For example: I am writing this article on a Sunday morning. I have just been reading in the morning paper about an important happening in Washington. In my paper, which will come out Friday, I may or may not have some comment to make on this matter, but I will not publish it as news. There would be no sense in doing so. It would just be repeating what everybody knows already. There was a time when many people in small towns and out in the country depended on the local paper to give them news of the nation and the world, but that condition has been ended by the greater circulation and better distribution of daily papers and by the radio. What a change has come about, in news service, since my young days in Chapel Hill, a quarter of a century before the radio was ever dreamed of and when the morning paper was not seen in Chapel Hill until the first mail of the day arrived on the train about noon! In those days relatively few of the country people took daily papers. Now many get the papers by mail in the morning, and for a still larger number even the daily paper's news, or anyway a good part of it, is made stale by the radio.

President Roosevelt's death, seven years ago this month, occurred on a Thursday. The news of it had spread all over the country in a few minutes. It reached us in the *Weekly* office after the paper had gone to press. We had not run many copies and could have stopped the press and put in a flash bulletin. The printers asked me if we should, and I said no. The appearance of this news in the *Weekly* could not have given to any reader the slightest bit of information that he did not already have. Nobody said anything to me about its not appearing in the paper. I doubt if anybody even noticed it, since the people who read the *Weekly* certainly do not read it in order to get stale news of the world outside.

Eminent persons and formerly eminent persons are falling ill and dying every day, but I do not chronicle these illnesses and deaths in the *Weekly* unless the persons are associated in some way with Chapel Hill. If I did, there would be little space in the paper for anything else. If Kenneth Royall's aunts had not been residents of Chapel Hill, I might have printed the news of his illness because of his being a University of North Carolina alumnus, but since there are thousands of University alumni and only half a dozen nephews of Miss Alice Jones and Mrs. Isaac Manning, you can easily see which connection is the greater distinction for Mr. Royall.

The Chapel Hillians who are friends of Mr. Royall's, and those who are not friends of his but know about him, are proud of his having attained eminence. But, as far as any local connection is concerned, they are far more interested in him because of his kin here than they are because he was once a student in the University. The plain truth is that while people in Chapel Hill recognize Mr. Royall's ability and honor him for his achievements they don't really care a hang about his being an ex-secretary of war, but they care a great deal about his being a nephew of Miss Alice Jones and Mrs. Isaac Manning.

Book Reviews

The Great Individualists of the Press

by William M. Pinkerton

MAKERS OF MODERN JOURNALISM. Kenneth Stewart and John Tebbel. Prentice-Hall, New York, 1952, 486 pp. with 10-page Reading Bibliography. $6.65.

Eating lunch at that long table in the Faculty Club, a sociologist remarked the other day that newspapermen tend to see events in personal terms. Even in the classroom, he said, they talk of the individual man as the mover in historical developments. Ken Stewart and John Tebbel offer an example of this approach in their "personalized, biographical history of the American press told in terms of the lives of such newspaper giants as Greeley, Pulitzer, Hearst, Ochs, Scripps and Luce." It is easier, livelier reading than sociology or history. It leaves a lot of questions lying around unanswered, but it still gives you a vivid picture of some highlights of history.

Having set their formula, and admitted its limitations in a brief foreword, the authors apply it briskly. There is a minimum of generalizing, and the stage sets are meagre. As a result, the actors look somewhat bigger than life. The authors are fully aware of the bias in selecting a few "giants" to represent the history of the American press. Most of their stories are success stories. The failures are the dull failures that followed success—the decline of the *Post* after Godkin, the deline of the *World* after Pulitzer, the decline of the *Herald* after Bennett the Younger—and not the heartbreak failures of the dedicated man with a good idea. The bias of the concentration of "giants" in New York is offset somewhat by chapters on some of the great regional newspaper families of our times—especially a lively account of Cox and the Knights of Ohio. The bias is an honest bias, without any axe to grind.

Watching the show, you see the Makers of Modern Journalism change from the eccentric, sometimes egocentric, hot-heads of the Nineteenth Century — Bennett with his showmanship and his disrespect for stuffed shirts, Greeley with his radical social and political notions, Bonfils' and Tammen's circus, Scripps' and Pulitzer's adamant isolation from the owning class, Ed Howe's acid comments on women and organized religion—to the more moderate managers of the present. But if you look back, you notice two things: First, the eccentrics of personal journalism were men who knew news, who knew what the people would read, who could write with zest and power. People tolerated their fads and fancies and bought them for their news, their human interest and their editorial force. Second, people like Raymond and Reid in New York and Nelson and Lawson in the middlewest were laying the foundations for a more impersonal, less erratic kind of journalism long before the 20th century dawned.

Another thing you notice is that the parade of "Makers" starts to repeat itself along toward the middle of the book. In the Twentieth Century, the Heirs take over. The distinguished and important names of contemporary journalism are largely second or third generation names: Reid, McCormick, McLean, Taylor, Cowles, Knight, Bingham, Daniels, Pulitzer, and more recently Annenberg and Hearst, to name a few. The heirs who failed pass quickly from the stage; those who remain make, as a group, an impressive body of responsible leaders in modern journalism. It seems likely that those two lively fellows, C. L. Knight of the Akron *Beacon-Journal* and Gardner Cowles Sr. of the Des Moines *Register-Tribune,* would have been lost to this book except for their sons' dramatic success in pushing out the horizons of the family interests. The heirs are not mere trustees, preserving the property; many are creators and developers. They inherited "the newspaper urge" as well as the newspaper. But the new names of contemporary journalism—with the rare exception of a Field—appear in the final chapters of this book, where the authors turn to a quick look at magazines (Ross, Luce, Wallace), at Washington columnists (Lawrence, Lippman, Pearson) and at radio (Kaltenborn, Murrow, Davis). It is interesting, in passing, that the authors consider commentators the "makers" in radio, but publishers the "makers" of the contemporary press.

Does the dominance of the Heirs signal the end of the age of new enterprises in the newspaper world? Before we say so, we might recall that several of the most successful enterprisers of the past were amateurs who brought new life to journalism in an expanding local economy—Nelson the contractor, who made his newspaper an instrument of community service; Cowles the banker, who knew the star routes by heart and got his paper to the farmers first; Hearst the man of wealth, who knew talent and bought it by outbidding the field. Whether new newspapers will come from such enterprising amateurs, or from men who can grow up on newspapers without getting stereotyped, or not at all, remains to be seen.

We wind up talking about individual men, and not about economic trends and social forces. Newspapermen can hardly be blamed for thinking in personal terms, for, as this book shows, their livelihood depends, in large part, on the competence of the "makers" and the imagination of the future "giants."

Not Embittered Nor a Bland Glossing-Over

by Robert R. Brunn

SOUTH OF FREEDOM, by Carl T. Rowan. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 270 pp. $3.50.)

Carl T. Rowan, writing this book, is a journalist first and a Negro second. His desire was to report "what it means to be a Negro in America." Only a Negro can do this with sensitivity and accuracy, but to do it he must achieve a certain sense of detachment that is most difficult to attain under the circumstances. This Carl Rowan does.

He traveled 6,000 miles through his native American South to make this study of discrimination and segregation between Negroes and whites. What he found was not a "New South," but this:

"Only among a courageous few of a

passing generation, and among wisdom-seeking youth who stand to control a coming generation, had I found an admission that racism has been the Southland's mental illness, her epidemic. I had begun to have a glimmering of hope that an increasing number of the people were quietly desirous of a cure."

Carefully thus, he reports the state in the South of what is known in every living room in America as "the Negro problem." And before he is through he does not excuse the rest of America its more subtle discriminatory practices. Knowing the problem as only a Negro can, he concludes that all over the United States what the Negro wants and needs is simply put: Dignity.

* * *

What Carl Rowan sought to do, first as a reporter for the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, and later in this book, was not to advance on the South with crusading zeal to write a series of "revelations." Rather, he reported one man's day-to-day travel through the South from Georgia to Oklahoma with constant reference to his life as a boy in McMinnville, Tenn., and his unusual experience as a naval officer in World War II.

What happened to Carl Rowan? First, he sought out many of the "big" race stories in the South—Columbia, Tenn., scene of a race riot in 1946; the state of Georgia and the Herman Talmadge machine ;Judge J. Waites Waring, enemy of "white supremacy" in Charleston, S. C.; Laurel, Miss., where Willie McGee was still waiting to know if his life would be spared; the University of Oklahoma where an exciting and successful fight against segregation was being made.

He writes about these with intensity—impatient eyes, but not bitter. The same can be said of his accounts of what happened to him in his home town, before hotel room clerks, in railroad Pullmans and dining cars, on busses and in restaurants.

There were:

His conversation with a white boyhood friend in McMinnville who said he would "laugh inside" if Rowan wrote the facts about Negro treatment in the South.

His visit with another white friend as they rode in the Negro section of a bus between Nashville and Knoxville; and how his friend passed as a Negro to avoid being moved to the white section when a passenger complained.

Miami: "A peacetime city in which I now rated as nothing," turned away from the hotel where he had lived an unsegregated life as a Navy trainee.

* * *

Birmingham: Where both races enter by the front door of the city busses, but "Nigras step up on the left side, white people on the right side" of the steps; and where only whites are permitted to leave by the front door. And where a laundry posted this sign high on its walls: "We wash for white people only." Rowan had a revealing conversation with a Negro laundress there who told him with amusement that her clothes were "in one of them tubs there."

The time in Georgia when he hid his necktie, camera, and typewriter for fear of being thought "biggety" and getting in trouble with the authorities.

Mr. Rowan has no sympathy with the gradualist doctrine which he describes as "Be patient, democracy will come to you later.' ' He believes that segregation and other forms of discrimination against Negroes in employment, education, and community lift must be met head-on with the force of the federal law whenever possible. Of all people, he is hardest on those Negroes in the South and elsewhere who have profited from segregation and its freedom whom white competition and so defend it.

Carl Rowan has known that this problem existed from the time he was a humiliated small country boy in a big city who was sent to the kitchen of a large restaurant to eat while his fellow (white) winners of a newspaper contest ate in the dining room . It is due to his humility and balance that this is not an embittered tract nor a bland glossing-over but an intimate and convincing view of America's most deplorable social problem.

—Christian Science Monitor.

Robert R. Brunn, a Nieman Fellow in 1949, is assistant American editor of the *Monitor.*

When Revolt Broke Out All Over

REVOLUTIONS OF 1848: A Social History. By Priscilla Robertson. 464 pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press. $6.

by Crane Brinton

The author is the daughter of the late Preserved Smith, who was Professor of History at Cornell, and the wife of Cary Robertson, newspaper man in Louisville and former Nieman Fellow at Harvard. It is tempting to suggest, though no doubt unfair to her own individuality, that this admirable account of the revolutions of 1848 is a happy blending of the best of two worlds, the academic and the journalistic, not as often so blended in fact as they should be. The obvious ingredients are on the academic side the patient and accurate assembling of fact and on the journalistic side the skillful narration, the appeal to the general reading public. Both are indeed present in this book, which is one of the very best of the crop that has come from the recent centenary of that remarkable year of 1848.

Mrs. Robertson's great advantage over the narrowly academic historian is not quite so simple a matter as mere skill of presentation. The really serious weakness of the modern academic and professional historian is not that he is too careful about facts, too specialized in his research, too unwilling to generalize, not even that he is unreadable. It is that, unless he is writing a textbook or a newspaper article, he feels he has to say something no one has ever said before and avoid saying anything that has been said before. He must dig up new facts, yes, but even more, new interpretations. Hence the drive to revisionism, debunking, and undebunking; hence the effort to attain from history laws or uniformities that will satisfy the latest standards of the social scientist.

From this difficulty Mrs. Robertson is happily spared. She knows that some of the things that need to be said about 1848 were said long ago, said even by the first of the ladies to write about the revolution in France—Cosima Wagner's mother, the Countess d'Agoult. She is not ashamed to tell the old stories, if they are true and good. She does not strain for novelty. The result is a well-balanced, always readable account, which does achieve the new in no mean sense, the new of the really skillful teller of old tales. No one else has

seen 1848 quite as Mrs. Robertson sees it, with an ample perspective of time and a tempered but not disillusioned belief in the democratic ideals which inspired the revolutionists.

She is understandably a bit superior to these excited and imperfect idealists like Mazzini or academic stereotypes made flesh like Dahlmann and Kinkel. She is occasionally tempted to the kind of patronizing which bright people fall into so readily, as when she says of Metternich, by no means without truth, that "his real faults were great, for he lacked compassion, but his sense of irony kept him from seeming nasty and often made him appear quite as clever as his twentieth-century judges." But just as she avoids the academic pitfall of straining for the hitherto unsaid; so she avoids the contemporary journalistic pitfall of straining for hard-boiled brightness. She has written a book in the best tradition of what, in a word now perhaps significantly beginning to be overworked, we must call humanism.

N. Y. *Times,* July 13.

Mr. Brinton, Professor of History at Harvard, is the author of *The Anatomy of Revoluion.*

Watterson and Politics

by Robert W. Brown

"MARSE HENRY," A BIOGRAPHY OF HENRY WATTERSON, Isaac F. Marcosson. Dodd Mead & Co., New York, 259 pp. $4.

Those great twin builders of myth and misrepresentation—Time and Repetition—have been misconstructing biographical characterizations since Adam and Eve were evicted for breaking a clause in their lease on Eden. Maybe before. And their handiwork is seen in the case of Mr. Watterson, one infers from Mr. Marcosson's stout contention, specifically in the alleged instance of the famous Kentucky editor's attempt to incite a "march on Washington."

Time has worked against Mr. Watterson's own protestations, and repetition has done the rest. The result is the picturization against which Mr. Marcosson argues convincingly—a fire-spitting, rabble-rouser who urged a 100,000-man armed march on the capital during the Hayes-Tilden election dispute. To name but one instance, we recall an otherwise scholarly and seemingly objective history of the period published and widely read a decade or so ago which attributed such violent sentiments to "long-haired journalists such as Marse Henry Watterson."

Most of the country and all of Marse Henry, from his feet to his shaggy name, his pungent pen and torrid tongue, did, indeed, seethe with resentment against the arrogant and obvious skulduggery in which Tilden was counted out. But, Mr. Marcosson emphasizes, Marse Henry suggested in his Washington speech in question merely that "at least 100,000 peaceful citizens" demonstrate their "freeman's right of petition."

The speech had been approved by the conservative Tilden and was delivered Jan. 8, 1877, in Ford's Opera House. "It was on this occasion that Watterson issued the famous call for 100,000 peaceful citizens to mobilize in Washington in the interest of Tilden," Mr. Marcosson writes. "Watterson was followed by Joseph Pulitzer, an ardent Tilden partisan, who just then was cutting his journalistic eye teeth. Pulitzer, greatly incensed over the turn of post-election events, excitedly demanded that the 100,000 men be armed and ready for action. It was an unlucky utterance so far as Watterson was concerned. Pulitzer's firebrand declaration was confused with Watterson's for a peaceful army demanding only the right of petition. Pulitzer was unknown; Watterson was in the forefront of the battle for Tilden. Hence it was easy for the Republicans to tag him with the label of belligerency."

Republicans and others who applied the label, including some historians and period writers, overlooked the fact that Mr. Watterson's proposal for a peaceful petition was available for inspection in the black-and-white of his own newspaper, the *Courier-Journal.* He had outlined this part of his speech in a dispatch to the Louisville newspaper the day before. In this he proposed that the people exercise "the peaceful right of petition . . . memorialize the Senate to do its duty . . . (and) send a hundred thousand petitioners to Washington on the 14th of February to present the memorial in person . . ."

This is only one of the many high points in Marse Henry's political career, detailed and inspected by Mr. Marcosson, who, by the way, was a protege of the editor's before leaving Louisville to win the title of "the world's foremost interviewer." Accounts of Mr. Watterson's political activities, as a matter of fact, are piled one on another almost to the point of surfeit. The uninitiated reader could be forgiven, if he concluded that Marse Henry was a politician by both preference and profession, and a journalist only in spare-time and by whim.

This would be our only argument with Mr. Marcosson's book. It is hailed as the "first biography" of the famed journalist. But it fails to be a biography in the accepted sense. Surely Mr. Watterson must have tangled with local authorities over affairs which, if not as glamorous and earth-shaking, would have uncurtained a more down-to-earth facet of his personality. Yet here we find him only in the smoke-filled rooms contriving "spontaneous" presidential nominations, or dining with, twitting, praising, agreeing or arguing with the political greats from Lincoln to Wilson. Shucks, wasn't he ever threatened with the horsewhip by an irate "constant reader," or didn't he ever editorialize against local laxities and delayed garbage collections? There's all this meat of politics and no potatoes of human personality.

This is not to find fault with what the book is—a detailed, absorbing account of a great man carrying out an important semi-political role during vital times—the post Civil War period of disunity; the excitements and dislocations of the Industrial Revolution and the age of maturation as the 19th became the 20th century and America took her destined position in the world. This evolution required the services of strong, articulate, imaginative and progressive thinking men and editors, and that Mr. Watterson was among these is brought out informatively and entertainingly by Mr. Marcosson. This would boil the argument down to that of definition and use of the word "biography."

Another incidental attraction of the "Marse Henry" volume is a foreword by Arthur Krock, another student of Wattersoniana and former colleague of the Kentucky editor.

A British Look at News Work

by A. G. Ivey

KEMSLEY MANUAL OF JOURNALISM. By Staff Specialists (Introduction by Viscount Kemsley) 424 pp. Cassell & Co., London (The British Book Center, New York) $5.50.

"The ideal news editor would be a monster who would almost certainly be slain by his staff within a month," writes James McDowell. "He would have the constitutions of a carthorse, the tenacity of a limpet, the enquiring intelligence, bright and sharp as a needle, of a performing terrier. His omniscience would never need encyclopedia, almanack or files . . . Above all, and beyond everything, he must have, developed to its highest pitch, that mysterious detecting device in the newspaperman's brain, which, when it receives the right signal, no matter how faint, how improbable, how difficult to decipher, rings the alarm bell which says: 'There's a story here.' "

That quotation is not a sample of British understatement. It is a specimen of occasional picturesque expression by the newspaper craftsmen who wrote this book. Forty-one—count 'em—41 authors wrote the *Kemsley Manual,* a handy guide for budding Briish newspapermen. Despite the accent, the book can easily be understood by Americans.

Each phase of the newspaper process is treated by a specialist; the two score authorships illustrate the collaborative, cross-check assembly-line technique of journalism of large newspaper chains, such as the Kemsley group of publications.

The Kemsley chain, apparently scorning journalism schools (as is the custom in Britain), trains its own cub reporters, or cadets, in the way they should go. In prescribing books for trainees under the Kemsley Editorial Plan, established in 1947, a writer recommends The Bible, Shakespeare and Macauley's *Essays.* Subjects of most help to journalists are hisory, biography, politics, economics, hisory of science and poetry.

American journalists will remember the counsel of Joseph Pulitzer that the first requirement of a writer of editorials should be "knowledge of history, especially American history," a requirement amply met by the great editor, Frank I. Cobb of the New York *World.*

The Kemsley plug for poetry is especially apt. In a "plea for poetry," R. C. K. Ensor writes: "It is unfashionable just now, but men cannot really do without it. And besides the uses which it has for everyone—to enrich the imagination, deepen the feelings, and exalt the soul—it has for the journalist a peculiar value to him. For the poet is in some sort his antithesis. He writes for the moment—for today's newspaper; whereas the poet writes for posterity, and the final test of his success or failure is, not whether he is read now, but a hundred years hence. To survive that test a poet must perfect and concentrate his expression in the highest degree . . . The journalist cannot rival (the best poetry); but it is of immense value to him to be aware of it, and to have it as a sort of background while he writes."

The manual covers all newspaper assignments, from the job of the reporters, editors, sub-editors (desk men) on and on to specialized departments such as sports, picture editing, typography, dramatic criticism, cartooning, women's news, advertising, and including the mechanical departments, circulation.

Viscount Kemsley in the introduction takes a swipe at the Royal Commission of the Press (perhaps the closest British equivalent to the American "Hutchins Commission"). The Royal Commission "seemed to be inspired by political animus against newspapers," declared Viscount Kemsley. The Press can best "conduct itself," declared the publisher, by adhering to one chief principle: "The key to this problem of raising the levels of the Press is found in the intellectual and professional standards of working journalists. Education and training within the industry have to go hand in hand with high and rising standards of recruitment."

Perhaps these standards of training suggest to American newspaper editors and publishers desirablity of more on-the-job training of beginner reporters. Experience in the sink or swim fashion is a good teacher sometimes, but it's wasteful—and sometimes the end product suffers from built-in flaws and imperfect workmanship.

W. W. Hadley, editor of the London *Sunday Times* for many years, wrote several chapters in the book, one of them "The Editor." He cites three "loyalties" of an editor: 1) to the proprietor who hires him; 2) to his staff; 3) to his readers. In winning public trust an editor must deserve the confidence of the public by his own integrity. "The honest newspaper, like the honest man, is reluctant to declare its rectitude," writes Hadley. "It will be judged by its conduct."

H. V. Hodgson says the leader (editorial) writer should not necessarily express his own opinion, but the opinion of his newspaper. "He should write as editor, not as a person of private views which he would like to air in public."

That is a view which naturally brings up arguments. But Hodgson answers rather well by saying opinion of an individual writing for a newspaper is a matter of "conscience," that it is immoral to write what one does not believe, yet it is foolish for a writer to refuse to vary or moderate his expression on points which raise no moral issue. "Suffice it to say that a leader-writer who finds himself constantly out of sympathy with the line pursued by his newspaper on subjects on which he has to write, and cannot persuade his editor to the views he would fain persuade his readers, ought to get another job." Hard words, but true, on both sides of the Atlantic.

Here are a few quotes, typical of the *Kemsley Manual of Journalism*:

"There are immensely more intelligent readers than newspapermen are in the habit of believing."

* * *

"It should be an inescapable condition that (feature articles) be readable by all readers, whether they happen to know the subject or not."

* * *

"Dullness in a newspaper is the unforgiveable crime: men who find life dull should not enter the profession of journalism."

"Men of a sceptical turn of mind are well suited to the business, and I would employ them in preference to the sanguine."

* * *

"Newspapers must reflect the varied character of the reading public."

* * *

"It is in the nature of things that near certainties fall down and completely unanticipated news turns up."

"As the evening advances time becomes everyone's enemy."

* * *

"As he reads each item, the copy-taster subconsciously asks himself: 'Is it *news?*' 'Is it *interesting?*' 'Is it *important?*' "

"Never take anything for granted. Never take it for granted that it's an old story or a new one; true or false; not worth while chasing or too late to chase, too fantastic or too simple-minded to be believed. Go and see; find out; make sure. This principle you disregard at your peril."

* * *

"The object of the headline is to persuade the reader to read the story underneath it. Every word in the headline should pay its way. It must be made to work hard."

"(The business of the leader-writer) is not just to record for readers the conclusions that the newspaper has reached and that they ought to swallow, but to persuade them by teling them why and how those conclusions have been arrived at."

"One of the main functions of the law of libel is to preserve freedom of speech by defining its limits."

* * *

The *Kemsley Manual* makes a good case for recruiting bright young men with aptitudes for journalism and then providing them with intensive education so that they "earn while they learn" as we vulgarly say in the United States. Any new employee of a Kemsley paper certainly knows what is expected of him. As an informative picture of pragmatic journalism in the English-speaking world, the manual will reward the interested journalist who is eager to know how things are done and what the score is, Kemsleyly speaking.

Improvement of Information

First Report of International Press Institute Finds This Top Problem.

What is the most important step that can be taken to promote world understanding through the free dissemination of information?

For the answer to this question, the International Press Institute, in its first IPI SURVEY, turned to the men who have the daily responsibility for the gathering and publication of news. Two hundred and forty-eight editors in forty-one countries have reported their views in answer to an IPI questionnaire.

The news of today's world, the editors agree, is "the biggest continued story in history," but it is not getting the coverage it deserves. By a 2-1 majority the editors believe that the average newspaper reader has an interest in world affairs. But they are in almost unanimous agreement that there are ways by which this interest could be more thoroughly cultivated by the press.

The Real Problem

The consciousness that every area of the world, given proper interpretation, is vital news in every community, has forced editors to discard time-honored conceptions of the news budget. A cardinal assumption underlying most of the 248 answers to the Institute's questionnaire is that the real problem is to make the news interesting.

A great obstacle to improving information on world affairs, say the editors, has its base in a growing tendency toward restriction on newsgathering even in countries where censorship does not exist. The editors want to organize a continuous campaign to clear away government restrictions, in both democratic and totalitarian countries, which are hindering the free flow of information. They are not generally optimistic about what success such a campaign will have in removing the totalitarian restrictions.

Finally, many editors have become increasingly anxious about economic problems—particularly the shortage and high cost of newsprint—which are forcing large numbers of newspapers to cut their foreign news coverage below the barest minimum.

Purpose of Survey

Purpose of the first IPI SURVEY has been to get editors' estimates of the value and extent of present-day reporting of world news and to obtain suggestions as to what steps can be taken to facilitate the flow of news among nations. The editors' discussions of these topic have been analyzed in a 9,000-word report published this month by the IPI and now being distributed.

Despite many variations in approach and emphasis, the responses show a striking agreement on the major problems editors face in trying to print full, balanced and reliable foreign news reports in a world split by international tensions and complicated by delicate political and economic crises. These problems, as seen by the editors, fall into three broad classifications: (a) the professional, (b) the political and (c) the economic.

Professional shortcomings, the editors feel, are responsible for many of the most serious flaws in the foreign news picture. While the editors admit that they themselves have contributed to the problem by frequently underestimating the reader, they also criticize the correspondents. They agree that world conditions require a brand of reporting distinctly superior to much of the current product and that it is time for newspapermen to revise traditional conceptions of what makes a good and significant news piece. A considerable proportion of the editors' criticism is directed at the large international news agencies, which supply the bulk of most newspapers' foreign material. The editors rate the news agencies first in value among their sources of foreign news because of the agencies' general world coverage, which cannot be duplicated.

Own Staffers Preferred

At the same time, the editors prefer the style and content of their own correspondents' material, wherever it is available, because of its special appeal to their particular audience and its greater use of background and interpretation. The material provided by the special newspaper syndicates is also rated highly by American editors for its interpretative value. In general, the editors consider all three

sources of news (agency, special correspondence, syndicate material) extremely important, but consider only the news agencies indispensable.

In their criticism of agency over-emphasis on "spot" news, a number of editors say the wire services fail to give their readers a comprehensive and properly evaluated picture of assorted world happenings, and that the readers are often left in the dark about important foreign trends taking place below the surface of current events.

The responses also emphasize the need for considerable improvement in the professional training of both editors and correspondents. "Today a first-class foreign correspondent needs a degree of training far transcending anything he ever had before," observes the editor of the *Christian Science Monitor.* Such improvement, according to the editors, depends on newspapermen taking more advanced study in economics, social science, language and history at advanced educational institutions; on more extensive travel by both editors and reporters and on such programs as international exchanges of journalists.

Political Dilemma

The foremost political problem, as gauged by the editors, is the disintegration of lines of communication between segments of a divided world. The editors unanimously recognize that it is now almost impossible to obtain trustworthy news direct from countries under Soviet control, and that this fact is seriously undermining the reliability of every newspaper's foreign news regardless of what steps individual editors may take. Most of the respondents believe the only answer to this problem lies in a resolution of the political differences between Soviet Russia and the West. A few newspapermen, however, like the foreign editor of a large American daily, suggest "a more determined effort on the part of newsgathering agencies and newspapers to penetrate the Iron Curtain, even at the risk exposed by the Oatis case."

A second kind of political interference with the press, alleged by a large number of editors, is a growing tendency towards restriction of information even in democratic countries with a strong tradition of a free press. Responses from almost every area of the world are critical of secretive officials who seek to suppress or censor news on such grounds as "national security" or "public interest." The government public relations officer is a frequent subject of unfavorable comment. A Welsh editor declares that "insofar as he is an obstacle to direct access by the journalist to the people he wants to see, the PRO is a hindrance to world understanding."

The editors recommend continual vigilance and organization to combat these tendencies, together with hard-hitting publicity campaigns to expose government officials who attempt to restrict access to, or publication of, legitimate news. Some of the questionnaires, from such widely scattered areas as Sardinia, Viet Nam and Union of South Africa, recommend an international press organization to fight against restrictions on information wherever they might occur.

If editors take active steps to use their collective efforts to beat down restrictions on newsgathering they will have to be provided with detailed information on the nature and location of any government-sponsored abuses of free press privileges, says the editor of the Washington *Post,* who suggests that the International Press Institute:

> Provide the press of the world with a periodic survey of the state of press rights in the world, including accurate reports on measures or actions that infringe upon the right to get the news . . . so that the moral opinion of mankind may be focused upon the gains and losses in the struggle to achieve free access to the news, free transmission of news and free expression of views.

Economic difficulties preoccupy many editors in Britain, Europe, the Pacific area and South America, at times almost to the exclusion of other problems. Their main worries in this category are over the shortage and high price of newsprint, and excessive telecommunication rates. These two problems have forced many editors to sacrifice much of their foreign coverage.

Newsprint Shortage

The newsprint crisis is the more serious. Britain's mass circulation newspapers suffer most severely, and almost all British replies to the questionnaire rate the pulp shortage as the greatest obstacle to giving newspaper readers an adequate foreign news report. The editor of the London *News Chronicle* writes that the newsprint famine "is a more serious barrier to the maintenance of informed public opinion than the censorship which exists in too many countries." An Austrian editor points out that the "best news report in the world goes into the wastebasket when there isn't any paper to print it on." The pulp shortage has created much bitterness among Western European editors, who frequently accompany a description of their plight by remarking on the favorable position of American and Canadian newspapers.

The most commonly advanced solution to the newsprint problem is creation of an international pool of newsprint and allocation from the pool on an equitable basis. Another suggestion is that research be speeded up to develop a synthetic newsprint which could be made available in unrestricted quantities to all newspapers at reasonable prices. One British editor, however, declares that the wide gaps between debtor and creditor countries must be lessened before any solution is possible.

High cable rates draw comment in many areas, particularly Europe and South Africa. Editors say it is useless for them to worry about qualitative improvements in world news reports until they can afford cable costs from such news centers as London, Tokyo, Paris and Washington. The editor of the *Soro Amstidende* (Slagelse, Denmark) declares that world understanding would be helped by fuller reporting of United Nations proceedings, but that his own paper, which hoped to maintain a full-time correspondent at U. N. headquarters, could not do so because of prohibitive telecommunications rates.

—Bulletin No. 1
of Int. Press. Inst.