

NiemanReports

July, 1952

NEWS CENSORSHIP IN KOREA

Robert C. Miller

The Muckrakers Revisited

Whitney R. Cross

The Right to Know

J. R. Wiggins

Predicting Elections

Bruce H. Westley

Assignment in Milwaukee

Robert H. Fleming

A Moral Challenge to the Press

Alan Barth

Can Your Readers Keep Up With the News?

Louis M. Lyons

Nieman Notes — Reviews — Nieman Scrapbook: "Press and Police" by Malcolm C. Bauer; "If We Were Governor" by Dwight Sargent; "The Independence of the Washington Star" by Samuel Kauffmann

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. VII NO. 3

JULY, 1952

A Future For Reformers

by James Bryant Conant

(This is a part of the baccalaureate address of President Conant to the Harvard Class of 1952.)

Horace Mann, the rebuilder of the schools of Massachusetts, expressed the spirit of private initiative in good works when he declared in Victorian language: "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity." Translated into the twentieth century idiom of understatement, I suggest this doctrine is as relevant to your future, gentlemen, as it was to the America of your great-grandfathers. For the significance of public-spirited citizens has not diminished with the years. Quite the contrary. There is need to reassert more vigorously than ever the importance to our democracy of citizen participation in civic undertakings.

President Eliot and President Lowell used to emphasize the Harvard tradition of public service which I am glad to say still continues strong. They had in mind not a career as a politician or government official, admirable and important as such careers may be; they referred to a man's feeling of personal responsibility for the welfare of his city or town, of his state, and even of the nation. Forty years ago it was customary to speak of the special duty to be civic leaders of men who had enjoyed the privilege of a college education. On those individuals there rested a special obligation to forward good government, to be vigilant guardians of the body politic, to fight corruption and inertia, to be reformers. The long period of peace from the late '60's to 1917 was the pioneer era of philanthropy, of reform groups, of individuals pressing their solution of the nation's ills upon their neighbors.

To keep alive the spirit of individual effort on behalf of the welfare of one's neighbors in the days ahead, it will be necessary not only to recognize the adverse effects of mobilization but also the benumbing influence of certain events of the last few years. I refer to the successful attempts by certain groups and individuals to undermine the status of all reformers. How well the reactionaries have been aided by the Communists in this endeavor requires no comment. The conviction of Alger Hiss and the confession of Klaus Fuchs have been heavy blows to the tradition of those who "would win more victories for humanity." For the time being, the reformer must struggle against a dark blanket of public suspicion woven by the same types of persons who have always fought him but now are aided by the revelations of the traitorous actions of a few fanatics.

It is an old story, this phenomenon of a tide of reaction swelled by public resentment against the evil deeds of a handful of extremists. The Restoration following the Cromwellian Commonwealth is the classic example of the swing of the pendulum. But closer analogies are to be found in the history of both England and this country at the time of the French Revolution. Unless all Western civilization is wrecked by the whirlwind of a third World War, it seems certain that there will be in your lifetime a reaction against the present reaction. And when this occurs, some of you will wish to take up the work of the American reformer. You will be in a position to do so without any possibility of the taint of a foreign ideology. For the infiltration of European Communist notions that confused some of my contemporaries twenty years ago is not part of your cultural inheritance. While you were still in school the issue was clearly drawn between the ideology of the Soviet and its satellites on the one hand and the free nations on the other.

To your college generation and succeeding classes will be given, I feel sure, the privilege of making of the reformer once again a highly respected though bitterly controversial figure. He will once again take his place alongside the conservative in the front rank of public-spirited Americans. Together the radical and conservative (as distinguished from the reactionary) will forge new tools with which to reshape our American democracy to meet a continuously changing technological civilization.

In spite of a divided world, armaments, and the call of military duty, I believe the challenge of Horace Mann will still have meaning, gentlemen, when you return here to celebrate your twenty-fifth reunion. For surely individual enterprise on behalf of the well-being of others must be held in high esteem so long as this republic is a society of free men.

NEWS CENSORSHIP IN KOREA

by Robert C. Miller

The American reading public frequently has accused its newspapers of not "printing the truth" about Korea. The denials have been loud and usually accompanied by violent gestures.

Every newsman has made repeated explanations that he prints just about every line of Korean war news furnished him by the press associations and feature syndicates. And they have emphasized time and again that they are relaying every important bit of news gathered by reporters in the field.

Despite this, our critics are right; we are not giving them the true facts about Korea, we haven't been for the past sixteen months and there will be little improvement in the war coverage unless radical changes are made in the military censorship policy.

During the first six months of the Korean war the coverage was excellent—from a civilian and newsman's point of view. The Military considered the coverage tragic and inefficient as censorship was on a voluntary basis with the final judgment left in the hands of the newsman as to whether the story violated security.

Since the enforcement of censorship by the Press Advisory Division of the Far East Command early last year, much of the truth about the Korean War and Peace Talks has been red pencilled.

In fact it has taken a tough fight, led by Frank Bartholomew of the United Press and other newspaper executives, to obtain the concessions we now enjoy at the Peace Talks. Had it not been for this pressure on the Military, plans would have been carried out for limiting coverage of the talks at Kaesong and Panmunjom to mere communiques and restricted eye witness accounts.

Unfortunately the press still is regarded with suspicion by most military minds, who consider us a necessary evil, and it would be difficult to convince many of them that the evil is really necessary.

One senior officer put it quite bluntly. He said that if he had his way there would be two communiques issued about the Korean war; one would announce the beginning and the other our victory.

General Ridgway even rebuked the press in Korea for allegedly "fraternizing" with Communist newsmen at the Peace Talks and relaying Red propaganda.

The General forgot that we are forced to depend upon

these Communist newsmen for the details of the negotiations at Kaesong and Panmunjom. Our own officers would tell us nothing, and unfortunately the Reds, using their old trick of mixing truth with propaganda, were more accurate and better sources of information. United Nations sources either denied or withheld comment on Communist-supplied information, then belatedly acknowledged its truth weeks afterwards.

General Ridgway, in spanking us verbally, also forgot that officially the Communists are not considered our enemies, nor are we at war with them. They receive and accept invitations to our diplomatic functions, they too are members of the United Nations and are accepted as equals by both American and United Nations dignitaries. It seemed odd to us at Panmunjom that the Washington press and diplomatic corps was not included in the General's reprimand.

Fortunately there has been an improvement at the Peace Talks so that now we know things about the same time as the Communists. Air Force Brigadier General William Nuckols deserves the credit for this and other improvements which have been effected since he was given a free hand as United Nations spokesman at the negotiations.

The Military censors and the rules under which they operate are the source of our troubles in Korea. Personally they are fine people attempting to do a job which every reporter realizes is necessary—to maintain military security and prevent valuable information from being given the enemy.

Every member of the press—and that includes reporters, cameramen, radio men and television personnel—appreciates the necessity of military censorship in times of conflict. It's just as possible for a person like myself, who has about eight wars under his belt, to make a slip as it is for a man on his first war assignment.

We fielded a team in Europe and the latter stages of the Pacific War that produced an efficient, fair and well organized censorship. Unfortunately, I cannot honestly pay the same tribute to the censorship organization of the Far East Command.

The basic fault is that no man with any previous newspaper experience is allowed to hold a censor's job. The first requisite of the Far East Command is that no censor can have the slightest taint of newspapering in his record. Were you to adopt such a policy here on a newspaper you'd be forced to hire a back shop foreman who didn't know the difference between a Ludlow and a Linotype, or a reporter who couldn't write.

Robert C. Miller, UP roving correspondent, has covered the Korean War. On home leave, he gave this talk to the Nevada Editors Conference. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1947.

There wasn't a censor at Eighth Army Headquarters in Seoul who had the slightest conception of newspapering. If he had, he wouldn't be allowed to wield a red pencil.

The censors also are kept under a check rein by the censorship code imposed by the FEC. This code is a riveted set of rules and no interpretation or deviation is allowed. Its authors undoubtedly were theorists who had no conception of the actual problems faced in the field.

No members of the press were consulted when the censorship code was drafted, nor were any comments or reaction to the code sought by the Army before it was put into effect.

In addition the code contains two sections which we believe to be exceedingly dangerous. One prohibits publication of anything which might "give aid and comfort" to the enemy, and the other stops any stories which criticize or bring discredit upon any branch of the armed services.

These are the two jokers in the deck which have killed numerous stories that frontline reporters believed newsworthy without violating military security or jeopardizing the life of one United Nations soldier.

Stories of enemy guerrilla activity were considered comforting to the Reds and banned, despite the fact that they were printed prominently in the South Korean press and broadcast by the Seoul and Pusan radio stations which were beyond the jurisdiction of the Far East Command censors. This repeatedly was called to the attention of the censors, but guerrilla stories still were prohibited. This explains why you never were told of the uprisings in the provinces of North and South Cholla where crops were 40 per cent below normal because of guerrilla activity, or of the appeal by the South Korean Government to General Van Fleet to release a South Korean division from front line duty to fight the guerrillas. Nor were we allowed to mention the actions of the South Korean police who blackmailed innocent farmers, threatening to arrest them as Reds unless they paid off. Hundreds fled into the mountains and joined guerrilla units because of police blackmailing tactics, but stories concerning this were killed.

Stories even hinting at incompetency of command or bungling in high places were stopped because they brought "discredit" upon that branch of the service. We were not allowed to write of the American colonel so bitterly hated by his men that they collectively offered a \$700.00 reward to the man who shot him. Nor was anything ever passed about the thousands of words of testimony given the Inspector General's office by his junior officers who claimed him incompetent.

The censors refused to pass what I thought was a cute little box about this colonel who came under fire while touring the front and reported it to his headquarters by radio Jeep. The headquarters voice receiving the message

politely inquired as to whether it was "friendly or enemy fire, Sir?"

Censorship also stopped publication of a Defense Department report on close air support in Korea.

The findings of this report, made by a Johns Hopkins team, were of extreme importance to Americans who are paying for the building of the most efficient military machine possible. Included in it were statements that the Air Force had exaggerated its claims of effectiveness, was improperly trained to carry out close air support assignments and was doing a far poorer job than the Marine Corps which developed close air support.

To date, all stories of this report have been killed because they bring "discredit" upon one branch of the service. For the same reason it was impossible to mention the two brand new, baby blue Buicks used by the Fifth Air Force to haul its brass over Korea's 30 miles of paved road at a time when shipping was at a premium and the Eighth Army commander had to be satisfied with a nine year old Plymouth.

As a newsman in Korea you soon learn that the Military will tolerate no criticism, however constructive, from civilian newsmen.

This censorship policy is not limited to the Press Advisory Division, but contaminates practically the entire Army. Information that often is of vital importance to the American people has been withheld as well as facts which we need as ammunition in our Cold War against Communism.

The Eighth Army received reliable reports last fall of heavy rioting in three North Korean cities, including the capital, Pyongyang. Intelligence reports also told of increasing dissension between North Korean and Chinese officers. G-2 of the Eighth Army gave the reports a very high evaluation, yet the news was withheld from the press because of "security reasons."

Even after a junior officer made copies of the report available to the United Press, Eighth Army intelligence heads repeatedly denied any knowledge of its existence. Nor could any of these officers see the slightest value of this news as a morale booster for the United Nations, or propaganda against the Reds. Can you imagine what the Communists would have done with the reports of anti-war riots in Washington, even if dubiously factual?

It took pressure by the entire United Press organization in Tokyo to get these stories passed by censorship which killed them for "security reasons" when first submitted. And great care had to be taken to protect the junior officer who gave me the information to prevent him from being court martialed instead of decorated.

The Defense Department in Washington severely criticized the Eighth Army for not making this information public in the form of a press release, and urged that any similar reports be given the press immediately. However,

to my knowledge, none of these reports ever has been made available to the press.

It may be that I'm making a range of mountains out of a molehill by criticizing our Military censorship policy. However, there are two things we must never forget: Public opinion is one of the most powerful weapons in America today and the fear of exposure to it has remedied many an evil situation and prevented others from occurring. If any section of our government, civilian or military, finds it can operate without fear of public scrutiny it may be tempted to take measures which would not be in the best interests of the people and the Nation.

Secondly, we are fighting a desperate, costly battle against Communism which we call the Cold War. Our most devastating weapon in this fight is truth. With it we can build the strength of the Democracies, and undermine that of our enemies. We, the press, are the big guns in this fight, and when censorship prevents us from obtaining and broadcasting the truth, we are being denied our most explosive ammunition.

Many of our military minds seem to forget that the United Nations forces in Korea—which are largely American—are a corporation being financed by the blood and money of the American people. Every citizen is a stockholder in this company and deserves to know how his funds and the blood of his loved ones are being invested. The only impartial, objective report can come from the press which, within the bounds of security, should be just as free to criticize as it is to praise, and as unfettered to expose as it is to commend.

There is a peculiar animal in our military organization known as the PIO—Public Information Officer—and PRO—Public Relations Officer. A knowledge of his job is important to the American people as more than three-fourths of all the Korean news originates either directly or indirectly from these Army, Navy, Marine and Air Force offices.

The main trouble with PIOs is that they are such nice, accommodating people. You can cuss out a censor and the PIO officer will be right there helping you find the right adjective. He offers suggestions for stories, good food, liquor and usually a nice, safe bed—something never to be underestimated in a war zone. In addition, they are nearly all former newsmen of one sort or another. The result is that reporters rely more and more upon the PIOs and their handouts for news instead of going out and digging up their own yarns and checking their own facts.

This is one subject upon which Bob Miller is an authority. I have accepted and compared the hospitality and handouts of every division PIO in Korea, and confess I thoroughly enjoy their pampering, which, I must also admit, often hindered my reporting, for if any criticism is to be leveled at Public Information Officers, it must be

shared by the newsmen who rely too much upon their services.

The job of the PIO office is to handle public relations, which means the press. It didn't take the wiser heads in uniform long to discover that an officer who got his name and picture in the paper seemed to get the best jobs and speedier promotions, providing, of course, his name was spelled correctly, the articles were written from a complimentary viewpoint, and the best profile of the officer presented. There is little difference today between a PIO officer and a Hollywood publicity agent. They compete with each other for newspaper space and radio time—favorable, of course—and attempt to tone down or cover up unsavory incidents which might jeopardize the commanding officer's career or make his outfit look bad.

You certainly would not expect the true appraisal of a Hollywood "epic" from the publicists hired by the studio to promote the picture; nor can you expect an objective report of any army from the men paid to publicize it. No public information officer worth his colonel's silver leaves is going to put you on the scent of a story that exposes his division, and he'd be a helluva PIO if he didn't attempt to detour newsmen away from such yarns. Yet it would be difficult to convince these men that by hiding facts which weaken our military organization and by protecting incompetency, they are a subversive influence every bit as dangerous as any Communist agent.

The fault here lies entirely with the reporter for being a human being.

Sitting in a comfortable headquarters and covering the war with the help of the PIO is the nice, safe way of doing the job. And what human can refuse excellent food, good companionship and good liquor, freely poured—particularly in Korea? Nor can you expect a reporter to bite the hand that has wine and dined him by digging up stories which probably would ruin the PIO's career.

Another barrier to good reporting is the susceptibility of the newsmen to the grandeur of high military rank. There is something about a uniform that impresses men—especially young men—and its dignity increases with each promotion in rank. Too often the majestic figure of a senior officer hovering in the reporter's mind has a considerable influence on his treatment of a story, or whether he even handles it at all.

There are certain facts and stories from Korea that editors and publishers have printed which were pure fabrication.

You didn't know that when you printed them. Many of us who sent the stories knew they were false, but we had to write them for they were official releases from responsible military headquarters, and were released for publication even though the people responsible knew they were untrue.

Late in 1950 front line reporters in Korea sent several eyewitness stories telling of the capture of Chinese soldiers as POWs. Yet you all printed denials from Tokyo headquarters which insisted that there were no Chinese fighting in North Korea. Then when the disaster hit and the United Nations Armies were driven south, you also received and printed officially released stories from the Tokyo headquarters estimating the Communist "hordes" at more than a million. The headquarters which could publicly find no Chinese on Monday suddenly located 1,358,236 Chinese and three boys by Friday at a time when our armies had broken contact with the enemy and were fleeing southward miles in front of the advancing Communists. The truth was that no one had the slightest conception of the Chinese strength, but concealed that fact with official news releases that were untrue.

I urge you to be particularly suspicious of casualty estimates from Korea, both those suffered by us and inflicted by us.

General Van Fleet brought up the subject of casualty estimates last fall at a conference of his corps commanders. He put it bluntly, explaining that if he had believed the casualty estimates made by the corps commanders "there wouldn't be a live Chinese or North Korean opposing us."

The General explained that he had released a weekly casualty figure of 12,500 enemy dead, wounded or captured. "That figure was an exaggeration," he told his commanders, "but this estimate for the entire Eighth Army was less than any made for the same period by any one Corps commander of the enemy casualties suffered in his area."

Were you to tabulate the number of enemy trucks allegedly destroyed or damaged by our night intruder planes during the past year, you would find it far in excess of the number of vehicles known to be in all of the Orient.

I flew with a Marine night fighter on one of these missions last fall. This squadron, the only one operating at low altitude beneath Navy and Air Force flare planes, has more positive identified kills than any other squadron in Korea. It also has the highest proportionate losses. Our plane was high scorer for the night with three trucks burned and eight damaged. The squadron accounted for 54 destroyed or damaged trucks that night, yet the Fifth Air Force communique claimed 673 enemy vehicles destroyed or damaged that night by our intruder planes. The other 619 Communist trucks were allegedly hit by high flying medium bombers operating alone and without the aid of flare planes.

If these nightly claims of between six and seven hundred trucks were accurate, there would have been a complete throttling of enemy transport with decreasing artillery and mortar fire. However, enemy artillery and mortar fire was ten times greater last fall than it was during the early summer along the Korean front, and there were no indications anywhere of an acute shortage of either ammunition or supplies by the Reds.

Even pictures can be misleading. An aerial photograph on exhibit at the Fifth Air Force Headquarters in Tokyo showed a destroyed Korean bridge, cut cleanly in half by "pin point bombing." The bridge looked familiar, and upon a closer study, I found it to be the highway bridge north of Taejon which had been blown up by Army Engineers during our retreat south. That photo was distributed and used by all the major picture syndicates as an official Air Force photo.

Next time you read of an Allied defeat by "overwhelming and numerically superior enemy forces" check back on your own childhood fights. Were you ever licked by a fellow smaller than you? Wasn't the fellow who bloodied your nose always twice as big and pounds heavier? It just isn't human nature to admit that we were beaten by a smaller, tougher opponent even though it's true in many cases. And the Commies are no different. I haven't the slightest doubt that when they were sent reeling back to the North last year their defeat was caused by the "overwhelming and numerically superior enemy forces," and they claimed we outnumbered them at least by twenty to one.

Previous criticism of the Army brought the charge that I had an "unfriendly" attitude toward the Military. Unfriendliness and distaste are sort of luxurious emotions which a good wire service reporter never can enjoy. I confess to a critical attitude toward the Army, Navy, fire department, State Department, school board or any other department of Government I am assigned to cover. That's part of my job, and no reporter would ever work for me who didn't incorporate it in his personality. To do the reporting job expected of him, every newsman should approach his assignment with a "prove it" attitude and accept nothing at its face value.

It's my firm belief that the strongest girder in the structure of American democracy is that of its free and unshackled press which exposes and reveals so that the people may know and remedy.

On Predicting Elections

by Bruce H. Westley

Ever since the 1948 elections, political reporters have been on the spot. That was the year, lest we forget, that everyone put his money on the wrong horse. But more than that, it was the year the mighty poll went sprawling.

Four years later political experts are still unable to pick winners. What is worse, *this continues to surprise them.*

"The people continue to respond to facts and emotions in a way to confound the prophets, including those whose livelihood depends on not being confounded." These words, from Prophet Arthur Krock to the People (at least those who read the *New York Times*) make a very nice text: for Mr. Krock would seem to be every bit as confused as the situation this article will attempt to deal with. He first of all confuses prophets with emancipators, but that's beside the point, which is that he confuses reporters with prophets. Let's try this quote on backwards:

"The prophets continue to confound the people." The people continue to ignore the prophets. *Who says journalism's livelihood depends on our being successful prophets?*

This is not a castigation of the excellent Mr. Krock, whose record as a reporter is far better than his record as a prophet. It is not, in fact, a castigation of anyone, including the Associated Press. Nevertheless, I would like to examine the AP solution to the dilemma.

Early in January, the AP, very properly, set up its plans for election year coverage. It was keenly conscious of its "failures" of the past. Staffers were regaled as follows: "From a strictly professional newsman's viewpoint, little or no fragrance is attached to our memories of 1948, when President Truman upset all major poll and journalistic predictions by beating Thomas E. Dewey. Seldom, if ever, in our time have American news media undergone heavier critical fire, or subjected themselves to such self-examination."

Agreed. And what is the solution? No predictions? Less emphasis on the prediction of outcomes, more on reporting the personalities and issues involved? No. AP's answer appears to be: LESS SCIENTIFIC PREDICTIONS. It is "grass roots" polling. ("To an ace reporter from one of the wire services, a grass root usually consists of a local political writer," according to Melvin S. Wax, one of the latter for the Claremont, (N. H.) *Daily Eagle*, writing in *The Reporter*.)

It is time to try to find answers to two urgent questions: (1) *Are reportorial techniques equal to the task of pre-*

dicting human behavior? (2) *Why all this emphasis on prediction anyway?*

The prediction of human behavior has been confounding psychology and sociology for generations. Neither has any ready solutions at this moment, although scientific sampling methods are capable of rather accurate measures of attitudes and intentions. Voting is an extremely complex act which puts unusual strain upon the techniques of social science.

A brief summary of polling developments will help clarify the issues at this point. Nearly everyone remembers the *Literary Digest* "straw vote," which managed to pick winners for a number of elections before it finally cracked up in 1936. To anyone interested in the statistics of sampling, the surprise is that it had any success at all, not that it finally missed. For the editors of the *Digest* pulled an unbelievable boner. The "sample" they drew from the total voting population was a very elite sample indeed. The names were obtained from telephone listings and auto registrations. When voting behavior was based on other than economic considerations, this lapse had little effect. In the dark days of 1936, those who had phones and cars tended to vote one way, those who did not tended to vote another—and there went the "straw vote."

There was nothing remotely scientific about the *Digest* operation. There was and is a great deal of scientific care in the methods first employed by George Gallup in 1936 and later used by him and others in another run of successful predictions. When these methods failed to pick a winner in 1948, there was general consternation; only a few were not surprised that it should happen at all, and even they were undoubtedly surprised to see it happen when it did. But fail they did. Hence the attempt by the wire services and newspapers to substitute other measures.

Nevertheless, the "purposive" methods of Gallup, et al, are probably essentially sound. Any reporter who thinks he can pay a call at the local general store and pick up a "grass roots" "sampling" of local opinion would do well to find out how careful these methods are. Basically, the method is this: The sample is drawn to include in it every human difference that is believed to be related to voting behavior—in the same proportion in the sample as it occurs in the population. The basic variables in this category are age, sex, and "socio-economic status." To the extent that the variables "controlled" in the sample are the ones most closely related to voting behavior, to that extent will the poll be representative.

There is one major drawback to this method. The trouble is that we don't really know what variables should be included.

Bruce H. Westley is visiting lecturer at the University of Michigan, on leave from the University of Wisconsin. He was formerly on the staff of the *Providence Journal* and the *Wisconsin State Journal*.

There is a way around this, unfortunately an expensive one. This is "probability" sampling. In a probability sample, pure chance and pure chance only operates in deciding who is included in a sample. As long as our sample is not too small, we can predict with a *known degree of certainty* that absolutely any variability that occurs in our (carefully defined) population will occur in the same proportion in the sample. This way, we don't have to know in advance what the important variables are. And the important thing is that we have statistical techniques that will tell us the size of our sampling error. A clear statement of error in these terms is impossible when purposive methods are used.

Purposive samples as customarily drawn consistently err on the conservative side. The reason seems to be that when interviewers are filling their low income quotas they tend to find people to fill it toward its upper end. They are easier to find, perhaps nicer to talk to.

It is not possible to review here the entire controversy between purposive and probability sampling. The point is that purposive methods, even though they may not be the best available, are far more careful than reportorial methods could possibly be under the best circumstances. (If the reporter really asks voters, then he is subject to all the faults of purposive sampling and can match none of its care. If the reporter asks "experts" or local "opinion leaders," he should realize upon a moment's reflection that these people are subject to both error and bias in *their own* observation. Since the experts may be more like each other than they are like the people they speak for, *this means that the errors are compounded, not cancelled out*, as he might hopefully expect.)

But the problem of sampling is not the only problem in predicting election behavior. It is quite possible that the American Institute of Public Opinion *had* an accurate measure of the political attitudes of the voting age public in August, 1948.

The fault may lie in any or a combination of these factors: (1) A very high percentage of the "don't knows" may have swung to Truman. (2) The population which actually went to the polls may be a very different population from that drawn on by the Gallup interviewers (eligible voters). (3) There may have been a strong swing from the Dewey column between the last poll and election day.

The question is: what can reporters and editors do about it? That there has been a great deal of soul searching since 1948 there can be no doubt. This year AP has sent out several advices to its members and staff. When its 1952 plans were first laid out, it seemed likely that the lesson had been learned. "Let there be no misunderstandings," it said, "we are not going into the crystal-ball business." But a later advice went like this: "We made a thorough check on usage of the New Hampshire "grass roots" survey. . . .

Fifty of 119 papers checked used [it]. . . . That's a highly satisfactory showing. It proves that there is a definite field for this type of enterprise reporting." Then came the result in New Hampshire. The AP was satisfied, apparently, with its indication that Eisenhower had a "slight lead." (The vote: Eisenhower 50%, Taft 38%). Later, talking about a somewhat better showing in Wisconsin, the "log" was jubilant; on the Nebraska predictions, less so. Then: "*Regardless of how they turn out*, there's no doubt the surveys are proving to be a worth while enterprise. They're getting increasingly wider usage (!). . . . (Italics and exclamation point this author's.)

This brings us to the second point raised at the start. Where has this confusion between reporting and prognostication arisen and where is it taking us? The present news product would seem to indicate that pre-vote reporting is nothing else. The headlines read "Taft Seen Gaining in . . .," "Kefauver Holds Slight Edge in . . ." There is so much solid news and background that could go into these reports. Sometimes it does get in, but more often not. And when it does, the prediction always seems to take the play.

I am not one of those who deplore opinion measurement in its entirety. In fact, I'm in favor of it. *I'm in favor of its being done by those who know how.* As to election forecasting, that's another matter. If a sound polling organization could rattle off a last-minute poll a day or so before the election, then it might have an excellent chance of success. The trouble is, we might be reading the result before we read of the prediction.

The "bandwagon effect" as a factor in election outcomes is often cited against the polls, but I think we need not fear it. The bandwagon certainly did not roll for Landon in 1936, nor for Dewey in 1948, despite predictions. Other objections to careful opinion sampling seem no more convincing. Perhaps the worst thing that can be said of them is their journalistic treatment. First, that it is often superficial and inadequately qualified; second, that it takes over space that might have been devoted to reporting the issues and the personalities—and gives us a sense of comfort that, having put down our \$2, we can head back to the stands and wait for the race.

Finally, the polls can give the profession of journalism a valuable picture of its own effectiveness in "getting through" to readers the significant issues of our time. The scant evidence turned up so far indicates that we are not even approaching a level of effectiveness commensurate either with our own aspirations or what a democratic society has every reason to expect in return for the privileges and immunities it grants us.

Who are the candidates? Who is supporting them? What is the source of their power? What kind of cam-

paigned is being run? What are the candidates saying? How many people are listening to them? How has the candidate fared here in the past? How has the state voted in the past? What kind of primary is this: binding, or a popularity contest? How much money is being spent? How is it being spent? Where is it coming from? These are a merest start on the questions that good pre-election reporting might answer.

If newspapers are going to predict outcomes, they have these choices: They can be completely venal about it and predict the success of their own favorite, with or without benefit of a sampling of opinion, in the belief it will help

shoo him in. (Let's not pretend this doesn't happen.) Or they can be completely honest about it and do either of two things: get into the prediction racket with both feet or get out of it altogether. By getting in with both feet, I mean jointly, through wire services or not, employ the best available national survey and publish its results with all the care necessary to tell the story fully, and with appropriate qualifications.

By getting out, I mean by removing the prediction emphasis that currently, by failing to predict correctly, is making us look like boobs and widening the gulf between the press and its readers.

Press and Police

by Malcolm C. Bauer

Now we come to the sins of the press. They are not to be taken lightly. They are not so serious as the sin of the suppression of the news. But, if they are not corrected they lead to the very situations which cause suppression. They lead to ill-will between police and press. And they give the police what in some cases they consider an adequate excuse to deal reluctantly or not at all with the press.

I shall list only a few of the newsman's faults. Lord knows—and you know—he has them aplenty. He is subject to the human failings of policemen and others; he is selfish, vain, usually in a hurry, maybe lazy and seldom given to ranking the concerns of others as high as his own.

But the reporter's job is not the policeman's job. Many reporters, particularly the young ones who have not yet undergone the maturing experiences of the night police beat, fancy themselves amateur detectives. Somehow, perhaps from the movies, or television, they have acquired the idea that the only police reporting job is a good detective job. They forget that their job—getting the news and getting it straight—may be even more important than the police job of getting a fugitive or solving a crime.

Another misconception of the newspaperman, not by any means confined to the young, is that he is above the law. I am glad to note the day is passing—it has long since passed in Portland—when a newspaper police pass provided immunity to a newspaperman. Certainly a policeman or a police judge is entitled to a sardonic laugh when he reads an editorial demanding honesty in government written by an editor who makes a practice of passing his traffic tags down through press room channels "to be taken care of."

Malcolm C. Bauer, associate editor of the *Portland Oregonian*, was a Nieman Fellow in 1951. This is part of a talk to the Oregon Association of City Police Officers at Portland.

Some sports columnists who for years have thought it quite proper to put the "fix" on a traffic ticket have been roaring with rage over the "fix" put on basketball games.

Nor can the press sincerely profess a high moral purpose and at the same time fail to exercise moral restraint in publishing the news.

Many of us have been unhappy about the publication in Portland newspapers of the names of some of the witnesses who testified in the abortion trials. The Portland dailies consider it a social obligation to omit names of boys and girls under 18 arrested or convicted of minor crime. Why should they publish the name of an unfortunate girl, raped by a first cousin, and then forced to take the witness stand to testify to the details of her abortion?

As newspapermen we are often so eager to pursue our responsibility to tell all of the news that we lose sight of that moral responsibility to which we are as sensitive as any husbands and fathers in our homes or in our parent-teacher association or in our churches.

Nor should we forget that there are rights and freedoms other than freedom of the press. The right of fair trial is one. The right to be confronted by one's accusers is another. The press should never take over the functions of the judge or the jury—or, for that matter, the prosecutor or the police. Nor should it permit its columns to be so used without qualification, even when the news is a United States Senator.

Self restraint is the cure for these ills. The press should perform its work honorably as it believes public officials—including the police—should perform theirs. It should ask no quarter from the police, and it should give none.

If both police and press do their jobs well, they will experience a minimum of conflict. If both perform their duties honestly, thoroughly and intelligently, the community—to be a model community, indeed—need ask little more.

THE MUCKRAKERS REVISITED

Purposeful Objectivity in Progressive Journalism

by Whitney R. Cross

Exactly fifty years ago, three pioneer articles of a new type of journalism came out in a single issue of *McClure's Magazine*. The three stories by Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens and Ray Stannard Baker represented scholarly research, as well as "exposure," of the corruption in organized labor, big business, and city government. This issue enjoyed unprecedented sales, and brought more of the same from McClure's staff, as well as a very rapid deluge from most of McClure's competitors. It was after five years of this vigorous journalism that Theodore Roosevelt labeled the probing writers "muckrakers." Steffens and Baker were close friends of the President, and protested this aspersion. He answered that he did not mean them but only their less responsible imitators, and that he would make the distinction clear in a public statement. But Roosevelt never made good his promise, and the whole group of crusading writers, good, bad, and indifferent, have been called muckrakers ever since.

The group's reputation has suffered more damage than this uncomplimentary name. Progressive-minded people were grievously disappointed when the reforming spirit fled from the magazine about 1910, and from American politics after 1915. Looking back from, say 1925, it seemed that these writers had bungled the main chance to found a solid, permanent progressive movement. Their ideas looked inconsequential and opportunistic; their attack on evils, either mistakenly aimed, or not directed at the roots. By comparison with some thinkers before 1900, and also in contrast to the disillusioned, left-ward-tending intellectuals of the 1920's, these people seemed unsystematic, temporizing reformers, weakly compromising with the status quo.

So the muckrakers became doubly damned. On one hand, they were reviled as cheap, sensational, grubbers of dirt with a bias against the good things in American life; and on the other, they were written down as "bogus" progressives.¹ No one has denied their unique impact on their society. They are credited with the major responsibility for all the multitudinous political and social reforms in the United States between 1902 and 1915. But even full credit for this achievement, coupled as it is with a low estimate of their mentalities and a deep suspicion of their journalism, has not gained them much prestige.

Professor Whitney R. Cross is in the history department at West Virginia University. This paper was the annual address to the Morgantown chapter of Kappa Tau Alpha.

My research in another field has given me occasion recently to read some of the muckrakers, and I have gradually come to several favorable conclusions about them. First, they varied greatly in caliber and reputability, and the ones historically most influential prove to be the best ones qualitatively. The five I am discussing here, Lincoln Steffens, Ray Baker, Ida Tarbell, Charles Edward Russell, and Finley Peter Dunne, seem to represent the cream of the crop. These people do not deserve to be saddled with the reputation for sensational propaganda created by their less able imitators.

Nor does their supposed "bogus" quality seem any longer to be a valid complaint against them. No one seems to have considered these people very seriously since the early 1930's, when several of their autobiographies appeared. Back in the twenties, some American intellectuals thought the Russian revolution was the hope of the future. Others, more numerous, never accepted Marxian communism, but hoped to find some other comprehensively radical theory to eradicate what they took to be fundamental flaws in American society. Most of these people have now realized their mistake. Communist Russia has proved to be not Utopia, but the enemy of all liberties—both of property and of mind. And in other cases than the Russian one, doctrinaire positions with comprehensive, systematic ideologies, have either proved dangerous or have come to seem potentially dangerous. In the context of our experience since 1930, it has perhaps become a virtue instead of a sin to be an opportunistic compromiser; and conversely, a doubtful business to be an uncompromising ideological purist. Persons like the muckrakers, who devised limited, expedient, repairing operations upon the old structure of American democracy, should accordingly rise in our esteem.

Again, it now seems that the strictly limited purpose of the muckrakers, to cleanse American politics of abuse by special interest groups, was entirely worthy. They can hardly be blamed for the impermanence of their accomplishments; for the fact that we have the same job to do over again, right now. Rather, we might learn something from their methods, which were temporarily reasonably successful. Had muckraking done itself in by its excesses and superficialities, our conclusion would be difficult. But it is now adequately established fact, built on more thorough study than mine, that the opponents of muckraking were

able to exert the strength to destroy it.² What was needed for more permanent success was not less, or different, but more muckraking! I believe that the five writers I have mentioned had as much influence to lead mass opinion toward effective, constructive, political action, as any five persons in the history of American journalism. What was the secret of this extraordinary effectiveness?

They were gifted writers, to be sure, but others of equal merit have failed to achieve their results. They had an extraordinary boss in S. S. McClure, but they left him *en masse* to found their own journal when he planned to exploit their success for unworthy ends; and they succeeded quite as well on their own. I believe the secret is that they discovered what I have called in my title "purposeful objectivity;" that is, they found a middle line between arid factuality on one side, and pure propaganda on the other. This purposeful objectivity can, I think, be demonstrated most clearly by tracing it through their experience.

First, how fairly did they deal with facts? how well did they restrain any wish to warp data to doctrine? Charles Russell was a Socialist during part of the period. He had been a single-taxer before, and would be a non-partisan leaguer, afterwards. But while it seemed to lend him needed security to adopt various dogmatisms, temporarily, he remained uncomfortably tentative about all of them. His ever-ranging curiosity would never completely settle down to let him accept the answers as final, and his reporting articles are nearly totally free from twistification of fact into doctrine. Steffens accused Russell, when he joined the Socialists, of "playing" at being a man of action instead of an inquirer. This never lasted. As Steffens put it, "Russell soon was writing again and thinking; he was doubting too and suffering. He had got out of his job when he got into action."³

Steffens was more constantly tempted than the rest to let a theory ride him, but his articles written before 1910, when he was most effective, demonstrate a high degree of factual objectivity. He trod constantly on dangerous ground, and probably made more people wish to sue for libel than any of the other four, but one case, attempted as a bluff, helped him gain such a reputation for judicious accuracy that he was immune to attack thereafter.

It was Ray Baker, the most utterly circumspect reporter of the lot, who was involved in the only libel suit *McClure's* lost on these authors. He had used most scrupulously certain records of a Wisconsin state commission, but the state's records were proved erroneous in court. Baker believed most religiously that his job was to present the true facts without pet remedy or final solution. Indeed, the further he went, the less sure he became that he had any remedies. He discovered that straight facts were the most arresting material, that "Truth is always sensational, cut-

ting like a keen fresh wind through the fog of pretense and secrecy, and the slime of corruption."⁴

As for Ida Tarbell, Baker testified that in objective use of fact she "was the best of us."⁵

A humorist's objectivity cannot be judged in the same terms. Exaggeration is a tool of his trade, and nobody would demand that he weigh pro and con with equal justice in every subject he elects to ridicule. Still, humor at its best seems to involve a sane sense of proportion, a sound taste for earthy realities, and an ability to penetrate superficial appearances—and all of these pertain to essential objectivity. F. P. Dunne, the creator of Mr. Dooley, was a humorist of philosophic dimensions, sane, realistic, and deeply wise. Scarcely a passage in all of Mr. Dooley's sayings fails to illustrate these characteristics of superior objectivity.

All five of these journalists, however much they varied in detail among themselves, thus appear successful in objectivity. Indeed, it would be difficult to exceed their performance in any age or vehicle of expression. Not a one of the five, however, would have been so naive as to claim that they always "let the facts speak for themselves." None supposed, as all historians once did, and as some still do (are journalists subject to the same failing?) that any such quality as absolute objectivity could even exist. We really all know, when we are honest with ourselves, that facts never do accumulate themselves, sort themselves, emphasize themselves, censor themselves, or make any kind of meaning of their own accord. They are the tools of functioning men, rendered meaningful only as they are assembled and presented. The muckrakers knew that pure factualism was impossible, that any effort of theirs to withdraw themselves wholly from their facts would make for bad journalism.

For one thing, they wanted to be read. Their sense of the audience's limitations automatically shaped presentation, somewhat. Ray Baker learned one lesson of this sort as a cub reporter in Chicago. A big story he had written at white heat was edited down to two colorless paragraphs. He argued to the editor, "It was all true, every line of it." "But Baker," replied the editor, "we don't want to publish all the truth on one day. What should we do for next Monday and Tuesday?"⁷ Lincoln Steffens remarked that people would "not read anything that is longer than a meal,"⁸ and that "the public won't read figures."⁹ He gathered details assiduously, but held most of them back for his own use. It was a superb defense against the threat of libel suits, for instance, to know much more damaging evidence than had been printed. The complainant could ill afford a trial that would merely give him far worse publicity! And a little information of confidential nature, cautiously released at the proper moment, served as powerful blackmail to pry even more data out

of the political gangs. Steffens, in fact, soon had crooks, grafters and bosses, as well as reformers, thinking that he knew everything.

So readability dictated amount of detail and length in a story. Often it also dictated the level of difficulty or novelty, and the direction of emphasis.

"Th' newspapers have got to print what happens," said Mr. Hennessy.

"No," said Mr. Dooley, "they've got to print what's different. Whenever they begin to put headlines on happiness, content, varchoo, an' charity, I'll know things is goin' as wrong with this country as I think they ar're ivry national campaign."¹⁰

Steffens advised a friend dealing with the public, "Don't go too fast at first, give them a little, as much as they can take in, then go on and give more."¹¹

But the desire to be read, and its influence on presentation, touch only the superficiality of the muckrakers' urge to exceed simple factual objectivity. They wanted to be read for a purpose, and their purpose itself very largely dictated both material and method. Steffens said he would quit if he were not read, "Not for fear of the loss, but because I should feel I wasn't doing good."¹² He accused the majority of newspaper reporters of failing to learn from their own stories. He said, "there is typically no continuity in their lives, no accumulation of knowledge into wisdom."¹³ Something was needed beyond undigested information, to be of any use in the world.

Steffens and Baker most clearly defined the common need, felt by all the crowd. As early as the Pullman strike in 1894, Baker had felt the rush of events and facts about him and past him. He knew these things were worth thinking about, that they should be meaningful, but the facts "would not stand still and wait" for a busy reporter. In agony he asked, "What was a man to do?"¹⁴ By 1900, before he began muckraking, Baker had a breakdown and spent a year in the Arizona desert, catching up to himself. He admitted he had no grasp on "Primary things." "I know how to work: I do not yet know how to live. I have no central guide. I have no dominating purpose."¹⁵ He came back from the desert with purposeful direction to his thought. He now had to be a "maker of understandings," to help people live with each other, democratically, in a complex world.

Steffens' experience was similar. He found that "we don't know what we know. . . You can't put the facts of experience in order while you are getting them, especially if you get them in the neck."¹⁶ He searched constantly for new understandings, new questions to ask, for more intensively genuine meanings. He considered himself less a muckraker than a "graft philosopher,"¹⁷ always trying to generalize his knowledge into a meaningful and usable formula.

Clearly then, the muckrakers either saw from the start or quickly learned, that any rigid kind of objectivity that made them merely mechanical purveyors of facts without generalization, would not do at all. Their writing would be sterile. No one would read it. It would mean nothing even if it were read. And they would be dodging their fair responsibility, and making their own lives unsatisfactorily barren, unless they became purposeful.

What kind of purposeful meanings could they form, without departing from respect for facts and reasonable impartiality with them? Ida Tarbell had the most naive mind of the group. She said most often that she was only setting down facts without personal bias, and only rarely admitted any effort to cast them into a pattern of her own. But just as the most immaculately dressed woman on occasion appears with her slip showing, so once in a great while the edges of Miss Tarbell's underlying assumptions can be perceived. Before 1890 she had concluded that three curable evils explained much of the trouble and misery in American life: discriminatory transportation rates, protective tariffs, and private ownership of natural resources.¹⁸ Yet she claimed that it was pure coincidence that led her as a muckraker first to study Standard Oil, a monopoly built on railroad rebates; second, the operations of the protective tariff; and finally, though not in the muckraking spirit or period, the United States Steel Corporation, probably the largest private owner of basic resources in her lifetime.

Again, she had started her alternate career as a biographer with a study of Madame Roland in the French Revolution. It was to be based on two suppositions. One was that women had a constructive influence in politics, and the other that revolution "was a divine weapon" for progress. She punctured both beliefs while studying in France in 1893, and remained rather firmly convinced to the contrary thereafter. Women, she found, would always sell out their own independent principles to support the man they loved. And revolutions, upon investigation, "seemed to me not something that men used, but something that used men."¹⁹ Ray Baker handed on a list of Miss Tarbell's "chief essentials for promoting the general welfare." They are: health protection for all; food, shelter, clothes, and a little fun for everybody; freedom to find work and to express opinions; and an end to force.²⁰

Observe the nature of these purposive sentiments. They could by no stretch of the imagination be called in total a systematic, comprehensive political theory. They were smaller scale principles, each of somewhat limited application. They constituted only a sort of liberal orientation, allowing a good deal of flexibility. Indeed, after 1912, Miss Tarbell wrote a series of articles on all the good practices of big business;²¹ and she admired the United States Steel Corporation as much as she disliked the Standard Oil Company. In 1919 she wrote a little-noticed novel, show-

ing how war changed life in a typical Monongahela Valley mining and milling town.²² Here she endorsed the war heartily, despite her earlier pacifism. It has been uncharitably suggested that Miss Tarbell was charmed by Judge Gary and repulsed by John D. Rodgers and John D. Rockefeller—exemplifying her own theory of woman's lack of independent judgment. But the other cases of reversed view seem above any possible suspicion, and doubtless this one was, too.

The point is not that she was shifty of principle. She was no more so than most of us are. She held quite firmly to some beliefs, qualifying others in the light of new experience. And when she was beyond eighty, she was still searching "the still unanswered questions of the most fruitful life for women in civilization, the true nature of revolution, even the mystery of God."²³

Ray Stannard Baker also constantly bespoke the necessity to stick to facts and forego undue interpretation. But he was far more conscious than Miss Tarbell of the fact that interpretation occurred in any case, even if one were not aware of it. Indeed, on account of this realization, and his consequent superior watchfulness of himself, Baker accomplished finer objectivity than Ida Tarbell did. One does not have to pick up slips of the lip or pen, to find his presuppositions. They are frankly stated and cautiously discounted in advance. In his labor and railroad articles he wanted to cure the disease he called, "The American Contempt of Law."²⁴ His articles on the *Color Line* were framed upon his theory that white Americans could advance only as they helped Negroes advance also. When he explored the failings of the churches, he admitted several possible solutions but for himself clearly accepted the social gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch.²⁵ His code of variegated principles does hang together consistently, and he often stated their summary: that the Golden Rule, "is the least sentimental, the most profoundly practical teaching known to man."²⁶

Baker never switched from his hostility toward over-powerful business interests as Ida Tarbell did; nor did he move left in time with Lincoln Steffens; nor did he join the many other progressives who became disillusioned in the 1920's. He spent the decade writing the official history of the Wilson administration. He never came to believe in any other recipe for saving democracy, than the alleviation of ignorance through more and better teaching and reporting.²⁷ Had he been less stable emotionally, he might well have taken some other course. It is worth noticing that he consciously labored to preserve this emotional stability. He wrote essays under the pseudonym, David Grayson, expressing all the beauty and goodness he found in the American character, giving voice to all the appreciative, artistic yearnings his analytical reporting denied him. Baker's viewpoints were constant, but his flexibility and

search for new insights were among his basic convictions.

Peter Dunne, of all the crowd the most beloved to his own generation, had obvious viewpoints to propagate. No one could with a clear conscience summarize, and spoil them. He can only be selectively quoted to show that his mind ran in the same channels as the rest.

Is it a "Robber Baron" you would like to see dissected? How about Rockefeller? "He niver done annythin' wrong save in th' way iv business."²⁸ Or George Baer, who in the midst of a bitter coal strike announced that the Lord had placed labor's welfare in the hands of the Christian property owners of the country?

"What d'ye think iv th' man down in Pennsylvanya who says th' Lord an' him is partners in a coal mine?"

"Has he divided th' profits?" asked Mr. Dooley.²⁹

Or do you want to understand business ethics in the Chicago of the 1890's?

"Jawn, niver steal a dure mat," said Mr. Dooley. "If ye do ye'll be invistigated, hanged, an' maybe rayformed. Steal a bank, me boy, steal a bank."³⁰

Or do Lincoln Steffens' theories of municipal corruption need confirmation from Mr. Dooley? In the city council, "Jawnny Powers didn't meet so manny that'd steal a ham an' thin shoot a poliseman over it. But he met a lot that'd steal th' whole West Side iv Chicago an' thin fix a grand jury get away with it."³¹

Dunne had begun before muckraking started, but he outlasted all the rest at the attack. He was always less strenuous than the others, and by the twenties too lazy to take up a pen very often. But no one excelled his constancy in ever-flexible adherence to the miscellaneous principles of an unsystematic, liberal democratic faith.

Charles Russell's basic slants have already been indicated. He was the only one of this group to adopt in the muckraking period what can fairly be called a doctrinal system. Even this, he kept reasonably flexible, and permanently so. As a semi-convicted Marxist, he went to Russia in the middle twenties. There he immediately perceived what it took some of his fellows twenty years to see, that where force underlay the system, liberty must die.³² When he summed up his career in 1936, the only requirement he could postulate for the would-be reformer was "a mental loyalty to good."³³

It is difficult in our present ideological mood to do full justice to the Lincoln Steffens of the period 1902 to 1910. The fact that he later became a believing Communist makes it easy to dismiss him as a completely unworthy subject. Such an attitude, however, would merely deprive ourselves. Before 1910, Steffens was in many ways the deepest and clearest thinker of the whole crowd. How he happened to become converted to a dogmatic position, we will soon see. But let's discover first what kind of thinking he did in the muckraking period. He had as basic

presuppositions, first, a sort of evolutionary pragmatism, and second, a profound reverence for the inner core of traditional Christian beliefs. He wrote to a philosopher friend, "Life is to evolve from plant to beast, from beast to man, from man to more the man. The means are all activities. The thing is to grow more faculties, and, if I observe aright, business serves as well as chemistry. I seek, therefore, what you would escape, the striving, struggling, battling, practical world, which far outranks the philosophic heaven."³⁴ Even more constantly recurring in his speculations, was the Christian theme. He said, for instance, "I want to tell Christians what their Christ said they should do. I shan't pretend to accept it all myself. But I will show how that would solve the problem. I cannot expect to convert the Christian Church to Christianity, but I can show what would happen if they would but believe, which they don't, now."³⁵

The third basic principle of the pre-Comunist Steffens was the very flexibility that I have been talking about in the case of the other muckrakers. He always realized that there was a risk in theorizing. He said that "Ideas harden like arteries."³⁶ Baker tells a story Steffens once told him. Steffens and Satan were walking down Fifth Avenue one day when they saw a stranger stop and "pick a piece of truth out of the air." Steffens asked Satan if this did not worry him.

"Don't you know that it is enough to destroy you?"

The Devil answered, "Yes, but I am not worried. I'll tell you why. It is a beautiful, living thing now, but the man will first name it, then he will organize it, and by that time it will be dead. If he would let it live, and live it, it would destroy me."³⁷

Baker, who knew him best of all, thought of Steffens in his earlier years, as a "kind of Socratic Skeptic, asking deceptively simple questions. . . I always thought he was at his best, doing his greatest work, in the days when he was still the eager, observant, thirsty reporter, striving first of all to understand."³⁸

It was upon this kind of foundation that Steffens built his more particular, limited hypotheses about the corruption of American government. These theories became reasonably well established in his mind as the years went by, but they were ever growing, slightly changing from experience to experience, and always open to revision on the appearance of new evidence. His theory of corruption has become a fairly standard analysis, and so far as I can personally see, is just as relevant today as it was in his own time. The evil, said Steffens, "is privilege. Trace every case of corruption to its source and you will see, I believe, that somebody was trying to get out of government some special right; to keep a saloon open after hours; a protective tariff; a ship subsidy; a public service franchise."³⁸ In each of these respects, special interests, he thought mainly business

men, were finding it necessary to their success to corrupt politics, government, and the people of the United States. He concluded, "Political corruption is, then, a process. It is not a temporary evil, not an accidental wickedness, not a passing symptom of the youth of the people. It is a natural process, by which a democracy is made gradually over into a plutocracy."⁴⁰

Subsidiary to the main theory were two corollaries. First, he insisted that the ethics and morals of politics were higher than those of business. And second, he supposed through this whole period that the people were wise enough, ultimately to triumph. He said, "The people are suspicious, weary, and very, very busy. But they are none the less the first, last, and best appeal in all great human cases. It is not that the people are better than their betters, but that they are more disinterested. They are not possessed by possessions."⁴¹ As long as he stood in the muckraking camp, Steffens exceeded the others only in the fertility of his hypothesis—making process. He eagerly sought new truth and never supposed that he knew the final answers to anything. Thus far he was safe, responsible, and influential.

Every one of these five, then, had principles and purposes as they wrote. They formed theories through the use of hypothesis to explain observed facts. They formed generalizations of limited scope and application, not grand scale systems of political theory. And all their theories maintained some degree of tentativeness which allowed them to be modified by the appearance of new facts.

Picture the muckrakers, or yourself as a practicing journalist if you prefer, standing over the middle of a see-saw. Lean out on the one side, toward a rigid factualness, and you become sterile—one end hits the ground. Lean over too hard to purposeful campaigning on the other side, and the other end bumps.

I cannot tell you why Steffens lost his balance on the see-saw,—only how. By 1910 he had become so sure of his theories of corruption that he came to call them laws, and talk about his science of politics. The next step was to test them. So he built his laboratory and constructed the experiment. Five years of hard, sincere work went into the "Boston—1915" project. He wanted to get all the big influential men—both bosses and businessmen—all the natural leaders of society. He would train them to serve the public good instead of their pockets, and convince them of the superior personal satisfaction to be gained thereby. They would purge the city of the special privileges which manufactured corruption.

Peter Dunne could have foretold the outcome. Mr. Dooley said, "A man that'd expect to thrain lobsters to fly in a year is called a loonytic; but a man that thinks men can be turned into angels be an iliction is called a rayformer an' remains at large."⁴² But Steffens had become so con-

vinced his experiment was foolproof, that its failure only convinced him that "Nothing but revolution could change the system."⁴³

This is the substance of the change in his consciously expressed ideas. Yet I doubt that the logic of the progression in his thought is a really adequate explanation of the transformation. Steffens, I believe, had been one of those highly sensitive men who function at full efficiency only as their emotional stability is sustained by certain intimate associates, usually a highly sympathetic and self-effacing woman. Steffens had two very close personal associates, his wife and his mother-in-law. Both within a year died of lingering illnesses, just after 1910. He found himself lonesome and at loose ends; his freedom was nothing but an intolerable burden. In such a mood, he decided to go the rounds of the various radicals of Greenwich Village—not to take any of their creeds on faith—but to get some variegated new slants to stimulate his independent thinking. He first heard of Freudian psychology among some of his new acquaintances. The essential irrationality of man hit him like a ton of bricks.⁴⁴ It reinforced his conclusion from Boston. To know and preach the causes of evil was not enough. Then came the Russian Revolution, and a visit to Russia, and finally marriage to Ella Winter.

Purposefulness, it seems, can grow on one. It is just as Mr. Dooley said about liquor: "Whin ye take it ye want more. But that's th' trouble with ivrything ye take. If we get power we want more power; if we get money we want more money. Our vices run on friver. Our varchues, Hinnisy, is what me friend Doc Casey calls self-limitin'."⁴⁵

How can the practicing journalist make his purposefulness self-limiting? All the muckrakers agreed that life was not worth living, personally, to say nothing of the profession, without high and noble purpose. Lincoln Steffens thought one could not write effectively without deep emotional concern. He advised reporters to "Care like Hell!" but not to let anyone find it out. Perhaps Steffens cared too much!

If so, a healthy, calculated indifference in counter-balance should be useful. Peter Dunne's laziness is usually explained as the concomitant quality of his perfectionism. He made writing so difficult that he often could not drive himself to work. But may it not also have been his counterweight, telling him lest he get overenthusiastic. "Why so hot, little man?"⁴⁶

Purpose, may we conclude, one has to have. But some kind of emotional counterbalance against too much of it seems equally important. It may be well to understand also just what it is that one loses when he goes too far with hypotheses. When ideas harden into dogmas, it is humility which disappears.

"Oh, well," said Mr. Hennessy, "we ar're as th' Lord made us."

"No," said Mr. Dooley, "lave us be fair. Lave us take some iv th' blame oursilves."⁴⁸

NOTES

1. The phrase is suggested by a chapter title in Daniel Aaron, *Men of Good Hope: A Story of American Progressives* (New York, 1951).
2. This is the verdict of Louis Filler, *Crusaders for American Liberalism* (New York, 1939).
3. J. Lincoln Steffens, *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens* (New York, 1931), 633-634.
4. Ray Stannard Baker, *American Chronicle: the Autobiography of Ray Stannard Baker* (New York, 1945), 220-221.
5. *Ibid.*, 220-221.
6. Ida Tarbell, *All in the Day's Work: An Autobiography* (New York, 1939), 399.
7. Baker, *Chronicle*, 27-28.
8. Steffens to Brand Whitlock, April 25, 1910, *The Letters of Lincoln Steffens* (Ella Winter and Greenville Hicks, eds., 2 v., New York, 1938), I, 245.
9. Steffens, *Autobiography*, 405.
10. Finley Peter Dunne, *Mr. Dooley at His Best* (Elmer Ellis, ed., New York, 1938), 225.
11. Steffens to Harlow Gale, Jan. 1904, *Letters*, I, 165.
12. *Ibid.*, I, 165.
13. J. Lincoln Steffens, *Lincoln Steffens Speaking* (New York, 1936), 203.
14. Baker, *Chronicle*, 44.
15. *Ibid.*, 115, 133.
16. Steffens to Allen Suggett, June 30, 1910, *Letters*, I, 247.
17. Steffens, *Autobiography*, 373.
18. Tarbell, *Autobiography*, 268.
19. *Ibid.*, 143-144.
20. Baker, *Chronicle*, 221.
21. Ida Tarbell, *New Ideals in Business*, etc. (New York, 1916).
22. Ida M. Tarbell, *The Rising of the Tide: the Story of Sabinsport* (New York, 1919).
23. Tarbell, *Autobiography*, 407.
24. Baker, *Chronicle*, 168.
25. Ray S. Baker, *Following the Color Line*, etc. (New York, 1908); *The Spiritual Unrest* (New York, 1909), 263 and *passim*.
26. Baker, *Color Line*, 307.
27. Baker, *Chronicle*, 475.
28. Elmer Ellis, *Mr. Dooley's America: A Life of Finley Peter Dunne* (New York, 1951), 306.
29. *Ibid.*, 176.
30. *Ibid.*, 95.
31. *Ibid.*, 90.
32. Steffens' Review of Russell's book on Russia, originally in the *Nation*, is reprinted in *Steffens Speaking*, 160-161. It is highly illuminating on both men.
33. Charles E. Russell, *Bare Hands and Stone Walls*, etc. (N. Y., 1933), 424.
34. Steffens to Frederick M. Willis, April 1, 1893, *Letters*, I, 95.
35. Steffens to Mrs. Joseph Steffens, Dec. 21, 1909, *Letters*, I, 235.
36. Steffens, *Autobiography*, 407.
37. Baker, *Chronicle*, 222.
38. *Ibid.*, 223.
39. Steffens to Theodore Roosevelt, June 9, 1908, *Letters*, I, 195.
40. Steffens, *Autobiography*, 413.
41. Lincoln Steffens, *Upbuilders* (New York, 1908), x-xi.
42. Ellis, *Dooley's America*, 299.
43. Steffens, *Autobiography*, 631.
44. *Ibid.*, 634-655, *passim*.
45. [F. P. Dunne], *Dissertations by Mr. Dooley* (New York, 1906), 312.
46. Suggestions toward this appear in *Mr. Dooley at His Best*, 233; and Baker, *Chronicle*, 225.
47. *Mr. Dooley at His Best*, 107.

A Moral Challenge to the Press

by Alan Barth

Walt Whitman, you remember, said that "the American compact is altogether with individuals."

And the Americans who wrote the Declaration of Independence regarded it as self-evident that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that it is in order to secure these rights that governments are instituted among men.

Now, it is precisely this traditional regard for the dignity of the individual which, in my view, is undergoing a dangerous corruption today. And the press has been to some extent, I fear, an agent—perhaps an unwitting and unwilling agent, but nonetheless an agent—of that corruption.

One measure of the decline of respect for the individual is to be found in our abandonment of the presumption of innocence which has traditionally protected any American accused of an offense against the government. That presumption no longer operates so far as the whole category of offenses called disloyalty is concerned.

You have only to look at the perversion of this presumption in the Federal Government's employee loyalty program to see how far the corruption has gone. From the earliest days of the Republic—and long before that, of course, among civilized men—the burden of proof of an offense has been held to rest not upon an accused individual but upon the government seeking to punish him. Judges have always, therefore, forbidden juries to convict unless convinced of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

But today, as you know, the reasonable doubt standard has been completely turned around—at least so far as the government's loyalty program is concerned. In so-called loyalty program, "reasonable doubt" may be conjured up entirely on the individual employee. He is judged disloyal unless he can prove his *innocence* beyond a reasonable doubt.

This is, incidentally, an impossible burden. It would be difficult enough to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that one had not committed a specific overt act. But to prove oneself innocent of an undesirable state of mind is a task beyond the reach of logic running into the realm of faith.

Add to this the consideration that, in the government loyalty program, "reasonable doubt" may be conjured up on the basis of information whispered by anonymous

sources and you can see how far we have departed from our vaunted respect for an individual.

It was less than a decade ago that the Supreme Court of the United States declared: "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

Yet congressional committees think very little today of forcing citizens to confess their political faith. And a rigid political orthodoxy is prescribed for those who would hold public office or teach in public schools.

The breakdown in respect for individual rights is revealed most strikingly in the conduct of certain congressional investigating committees and in the abuse by certain members of Congress of the privilege of congressional immunity. And it is precisely in this connection, I think, that the problem affects the press most intimately. For the inescapable fact of the matter is that all of us in the field of journalism are being used, unwittingly and involuntarily, as instruments for the execution of punishment by publicity—as instruments of punishment—for offenses which Congress has no constitutional power to declare criminal or to make punishable by law.

Moreover, we are being used to inflict this kind of punishment without any semblance of a trial, without any determination as to whether the victims are guilty or innocent. We are used sometimes, indeed, when we know that the punishment is altogether unjust.

When we publish in headlines that Senator McCarthy has spewed out wild charges of treason or espionage against a career foreign service officer or an economic adviser to the President or a university professor having no connection whatever with the Government—we do the Senator's dirty work for him and we inflict on his victim an irreparable injury. The fact is that we do this often when there is not the slightest corroboration of the Senator's charges—often, indeed, when we know them to be altogether absurd.

This comes, I think, very close to irresponsibility. And the injury resulting to innocent individuals is perhaps the least serious cost involved. This kind of journalism makes the press a partner in a corruption of the democratic process. It imposes on the whole society a kind of intellectual reign of terror, suppressing speech quite as effectively as any formal censorship. As Senator Margaret Chase Smith observed a couple of years ago in a protest against Senator McCarthy's name-calling tactics, "Freedom of speech is not

Alan Barth, author of *The Loyalty of Free Men*, is an editorial writer on the *Washington Post*, was a *Nieman Fellow* in 1949. This is from an address at Colorado Newspaper Week at Boulder.

what it used to be in America. It has been so abused by some that it is not exercised by others."

American newspapers pride themselves on being impervious to the tricks of press agency. They have learned to detect the contrived handout, the planted story, the trial balloon. Yet they have found themselves in recent years sucked in as the purveyors of gossip, and in some cases of malicious falsehood, put out in the guise of news—simply because it has been uttered on the floor of Congress or under the auspices, and the protection, of a congressional committee.

I am not talking now about those newspapers that seek to do no more than circulate scandal. I am talking about newspapers that are trying conscientiously to give their readers a proportioned and honest view of the world around them. These newspapers—the best elements of American journalism—are being cynically manipulated and exploited to advance purposes which they abhor.

They are being hoist, it seems to me, by their own tradition of objectivity. That tradition is responsible, of course, for making the American press the most accurate and reliable in the world. But it is also responsible, I am afraid, for imposing serious handicaps on the press in dealing with some of the realities of contemporary politics.

The tradition of objectivity has kept us in particular, I think, from conveying to our readers any full awareness of the degree to which the vital investigating function of Congress has been warped and twisted into a system for punishing individuals for holding opinions which the investigators happen to dislike. It has kept us, for example, from giving the American public anything like a fair and focused picture of the procedures of the McCarran Internal Security Subcommittee—the most flagrant contemporary form of the auto da fe.

The McCarran Subcommittee has made a practice of throwing the protective arm of congressional immunity round the shoulders of any ex-communist who wants to point an accusing finger at someone he dislikes. Yet distinguished scholars like Owen Lattimore and John Fairbank are treated like common criminals when they come before this group and dare to defend themselves.

The tradition of objectivity has led the press to treat with perfectly straight faces, as though they were entitled to equal weight and credibility, on the one hand the dredged up reminiscences of professional witnesses—of the ex-Communists gifted with what someone has aptly called "recuperative memory"—and, on the other hand, the denials of their victims who have been guilty in most instances of nothing worse than having expressed doubts as to the divinity of Chiang Kia-shek.

I listened for some days to the proceedings of the McCarran Subcommittee in connection with Owen Lattimore. They seemed to me to resemble a Medieval inquisition into

heresy—or a variation on the bear-baiting which used to be considered such great sport a few centuries ago. It was as though the counsel and members of the subcommittee had succeeded in chaining some helpless creature to a stake and were deliberately goading and tormenting it. It seemed to me an ugly performance, a sadistic performance. And I was not alone in this impression among the newspapermen who were there. But there was no way, within the techniques of detached and objective reporting, to make news stories about the hearings convey to readers this sense of what was going on. I was able, I hope, to do it in some degree in editorials. But the news reports, in my judgment, missed the essence of the story.

You may defend or excuse this or that item in my bill of particulars as being made necessary by the circumstances of our times. Taken together, however, it cannot be denied, I think, that they demonstrate a monstrous corruption of the fundamental premise of our society.

Why is this corruption tolerated? It is tolerated because it is supposed by many sincere and patriotic people that the sacrifice of individual rights will make the nation more secure. Here, I believe, is the most tragic fallacy of our time. Here is the most mischievous concoction of political patent medicine ever swallowed by the American people.

The thesis that I want to put before you is a direct contradiction of this notion that there is some essential incompatibility between national security and individual rights. The contrary, I am convinced, is the case. National security and individual rights, so far from being in conflict, in point of view, are indispensable to each other.

There is very little need, I presume, to elaborate the point that military strength and a formidable defense system are needed in these times to protect the institutions of freedom from the threat of outside aggression. It is equally plain that an alert counter-intelligence system is needed to frustrate the activities of Soviet agents and of the Communist Party, Russia's fifth column in free countries.

You know, there is a prevalent myth that totalitarian governments are somehow much more efficient than governments that depend upon the voluntary consent of the governed. It is true enough, of course, that a dictatorship can move more swiftly in certain situations than a democracy. But this may mean only that it can more swiftly translate into disaster the errors of the dictator.

Free speech and a free press provide an antidote for error. They give a free people the means of correcting their mistakes and replacing incompetent officials. The totalitarians lack any such self-regulating mechanism. And the lack is likely, in the end, to be a fatal one—as it proved to be in the case of Adolf Hitler's thousand-year Reich.

Freedom of speech is, in addition, a stabilizing influence. It makes for enduring government because it provides an orderly outlet for discontent. Thought that is silenced is

always rebellious. Like any force that is confined, it tends to become explosive. But exposed to reason and counter-argument, it can go only as far as its merits will carry it.

The men who wrote the Constitution understood another basic point which we are tending to forget today—that tolerance of diversity is the only way to gain real and lasting national unity. National unity grows not out of uniformity but out of resolved conflict. It grows out of general participation in the shaping of public policy, out of granting to everyone a chance to be heard and to win acceptance if he can for his opinion. And this means, obviously, tolerance of opinions which the majority may consider distasteful, even of opinions which the majority may consider disloyal.

A nation is, you know, in some respects like a family. It is held together by the cement of mutual trust and by a broad tolerance of diversity. That cement is being eaten away by a corruption of confidence. Nothing could be more destructive of national unity.

Doubt seems to have become the prevailing characteristic of our time—doubt of our own institutions, doubt of the processes by which we have lived and grown to greatness as a nation, and doubt, finally, of each other—the most morbid and enervating form of corruption in national life.

All that I am trying to tell you—the essential point of my whole monologue—was expressed not long ago, and better by a good deal than I know how to express it, by one of the great Americans of our time, Judge Learned Hand. He was speaking extemporaneously at a reception, just after he had announced his retirement from the Federal bench, and this is what he had to say:

My friends, our future is precarious. . . . I like to hope—although I agree that we can have no certainty, still I like to hope—that we have a good chance, a splendid fighting chance and much assurance of victory; but on one condition: that we do not go to pieces internally. It is there, I think, that you and I may be able to help. Because, my friends, will you not agree that any society which begins to be doubtful of itself; in which one man looks at another and says: "He may be a traitor,"—in which that spirit has disappeared which says: "I will not accept that, I will not believe that—I will demand proof. I will not say of my brother that he may be a traitor, but I will say, "Produce what you have. I will judge it fairly, and if he is, he shall pay the penalty; but I will not take it on rumor; I will not take it on hearsay. I will remember that what has brought us up from savagery is a loyalty to truth, and truth cannot emerge unless it is subjected to the utmost scrutiny,"—will you not agree that a society which has lost sight of that cannot survive?

Here, I think, is the great moral challenge to the American press—and, indeed, to all free men: to maintain loyalty to the truth, to maintain loyalty to free institutions, to maintain loyalty to freedom as a basic human value, and, above all, to keep alive in our minds and hearts the tolerance of diversity and the mutual trust that have been the genius of American life. These are what have created in America a genuine and enduring Union; they are what have kept that Union, until now, secure and free.

Assignment in Milwaukee

by Robert H. Fleming

The American Society of Newspaper Editors, in its annual spring convention, heard James B. Reston and Basil L. Walters discuss the need for improved political reporting. Reston called for providing political reporters more time to gather their facts. Walters urged "more head-work and more leg work and less guesswork."

At the Milwaukee *Journal*, we've taken a careful look at the problem and come up with a successful answer. We've done it by providing perspective, by keeping at a reasonable distance from the candidates.

First, however, some background. Wisconsin's presidential primary is one of the first in the nation. In past years, Wisconsin has had special importance, too. In 1944, Wendell Willkie came in for three weeks of hard campaigning, didn't win a single delegate, and promptly abandoned his bid for renomination.

In 1948, Thomas E. Dewey hoped to repeat his 1944 triumph, but he was shut out by Harold Stassen and Douglas MacArthur. Dewey took heed, went to Oregon to recoup, and pushed on to the nomination.

This year, Wisconsin forgot its friendship for Stassen. A strong organization worked hard for Robert A. Taft. He won 24 of the state's 30 delegates. The other six went to Earl Warren, who won in the Milwaukee and Madison districts where important newspapers helped him overcome the handicap of a badly organized campaign.

We in Wisconsin newsrooms are accustomed to an influx of visitors in March of each presidential year. The Washington reporters come in for a couple of days or a couple of weeks. It's easy to say how they should do their work, but the problem of a daily story—with the first one within hours after arrival—is a large order. When is one

man supposed to find time to locate a trend, let alone analyze it carefully, when there are four presidential candidates making 10 speeches a day apiece?

Reston has the answer—more time to gather facts. There are few editors who are satisfied with a good story every three days, however. Many of the reporters here last March were expected to “look in on Nebraska, and also swing down to have a talk with Adlai Stevenson,” as one leading paper directed. We chuckled over the cursing of a man who skipped dinner three nights running, while he wrote a Wisconsin story from his legwork and then contrived a Nebraska “situationer” via long distance calls. But that wasn’t his fault; he was following orders.

We had different orders on the *Milwaukee Journal*, which comes back to the main point. Two of us spend full time on politics, but when the campaign was hottest here, we weren’t hearing Taft repeat the same charges or counting Kefauver’s sidewalk handshakes. Other reporters, men and women who’d shown interest in political reporting, maintained our watch on the candidates and even their wives as they toured Wisconsin. The *Journal’s* two men with the most political background changed their routine. While one stayed with a major candidate—and changed from one to another every two days—the other reporter stood aside for a look at the big picture. By being in the office, he could see the interplay of political forces. He could put aside the blinders of a campaign trip.

The blinders are provided by the physical nature of modern campaigning and the mental habits of editors. A typical day following Taft, Stassen, Kefauver or Warren in Wisconsin started at 7 a.m., when the candidate left his hotel en route to a breakfast some 40 miles away. A morning stop at a college or a tour of a factory was followed by a luncheon, three or four afternoon stops in smaller towns, a dinner meeting and finally a night rally.

Advances or handouts were rare. Reporters writing for eastern morning papers, with early deadlines, could seldom wait for the night speeches. Yet the schedules gave them little time to write, let alone think.

When a candidate stopped in town, the reporter had to

Robert H. Fleming, political writer on the *Milwaukee Journal*, was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

watch and listen for something new, something that hadn’t been said a dozen times the day before. When the stop ended and the party piled back on a chartered bus, there were sometimes a few local politicians aboard. But they were busy talking to the candidate, up in the front of the bus. The reporters, in the rear seats, were forced to interview each other. And that, as 1948 showed, can be nearly fatal.

But a reporter, freed of the responsibility to make sure that no factory worker swore at Senator Taft or refused a Kefauver handshake, had time for other things. He could talk to labor sources, to farm leaders, to judges or lawyers who were good political observers. He could talk to the Stassen men on how Taft was doing, or ask Kefauver backers if Warren could get much Democratic support. Those questions are a waste of breath when a candidate is nearby; nearly every available source is backing that candidate and propagandizing for him.

I can hear an answer to the proposal of giving reporters some perspective. It’s the common retort: “You may be able to do that on your paper, but we don’t have the manpower for it.” I say that’s a poor alibi. I claim that manpower can be used as editors want to use it. If they’ll realize that perspective is important, they’ll get it. They don’t worry about what route a reporter travels getting to work each morning, as long as he gets there. The same attitude might well involve political trends.

But we have another practice that’s worth sharing, too. We don’t predict the outcome of elections. Our editor, J. D. Ferguson, says “We don’t feel called upon to forecast how a jury will vote in a court case; why do it on an election?” It makes sense. Yet I’ve seen eastern reporters struggle for hours with calculations of factors they scarcely understand, in order that they may prepare pre-election predictions.

We let the politicians predict, and try to protect the reader by careful questions that often reveal the emptiness of their optimism. We don’t print polls, either. We simply doubt their validity.

Our omission of polls, along with emphasis on perspective, serves as a preventive for political apologies.

So when “Stuffy” Walters calls for more headwork and more leg work and less guesswork,” he is not referring to political reporters alone. More headwork by editors can produce better leg work by reporters and less guesswork for readers.

Can Your Readers Keep Up With the News?

by Louis M. Lyons

*A Talk to the California Editors' Conference
Stanford University, June 21, 1952*

This is a bright season of year for me—this commencement time. For it is the season when we select Nieman Fellows at Harvard. This brings us applications—perhaps 100 or more for our dozen fellowships—and so I get to know, at least on paper—and through interviews some more intimately than that—100 or so able, eager, young journalists just well started on their careers. They expect to stay at it. They have discovered about what they want to do, what they hope to do. They have put themselves into it. They have discovered their own deficiencies and are prepared to take time out to fill in the gaps—perhaps in economics, which they discover to be at the root of political issues; perhaps in science, a new assignment on many papers; perhaps in labor-management problems, an assignment that depends so greatly on the capacity and attitude of the reporter; perhaps in local government. Whatever it is, they are seeking to strengthen their background for dealing with public affairs. So Nieman Fellows are most apt to study history, government, economics, the subjects that are the background of public affairs.

Whatever they want, these newspapermen applying for further study spell out their own newspaper experience and their intentions. Inevitably they disclose their attitudes. So you read of their aspirations and of their ideals about journalism. And I can say that they are as high as of any generation of newspapermen, and as high as those of the men serving any institution in American life.

It is a most heartening experience every year to meet this strong aspiration and idealism in so many of the men of our craft.

Let me read you a paragraph from a letter from a newspaper publisher who served on our Selecting Committee this month. It came in as I was preparing this. He says what I mean:

In the rush of our departures I did not tell you how thoroughly I enjoyed the Nieman work. Nothing I have done in a long while has given me equal pleasure or satisfaction. The applicants and their applications were always interesting and the best of them were a delight and an inspiration.

I find myself still thinking of some of the unsuccessful applicants, particularly those who explained their problems well, and wishing to help them. If I had the time, I would like to visit two or three of them on their home grounds.

That's what I'm talking about. We shared the same

experience. But he has it once. I've had it every year for more than a dozen years now—a great experience.

It evokes a confidence, a feeling of buoyancy, of security, in the future of the institution of journalism in the U.S. that it is very reassuring to have.

At other seasons I am often dourly critical of the lapses of the press and concerned for the chance of the reader to keep up with the score and really to learn the facts of life in the world he has to live in. But in June the world looks bright and the future of American journalism secure, for I can see the affirmation in the young men who are going to be writing and editing our news and running our newspapers when the present managers have gone to their reward, whatever that may be.

Now, I know many of these young men will change. It is the way of the world. I know the impact of the world and the practical pressures. I know how the arteries harden and the mind narrows into grooves of routine and necessity. Nevertheless, we measure the chances of the future in terms of those who see a vision—especially when they are eager to work to arm themselves with the knowledge and wisdom to bring it off.

To be sure, the operation of the Nieman Fellowships is a very small thing—a dozen Fellows a year. Even so, in our 14 years we have now 160 former Fellows spread around, and 120 of them still in journalism—including Bill Townes, able general manager of the Santa Rosa, California, paper; Irving Dilliard, brilliant editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*; Bill German, who steers the copy desk of the San Francisco *Chronicle*; Mary Ellen Leary, State political editor of the San Francisco *News*; Malcolm Bauer, associate editor of the Portland *Oregonian*; George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans *Item*; Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville, Miss., *Delta Democrat Times*; Harry Ashmore, executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*; Houstoun Waring, Littleton, Colorado, editor of one of the most famous weeklies in America; Ernest Linford, writing enlightened editorials on the Salt Lake *Tribune*. And a lot of able reporters from Denver to San Francisco, besides such Californians who have gone into foreign news service as Bob Miller, UP roving correspondent, and Christopher Rand, whose China articles in the *New Yorker* magazine are a liberal education. I mention only the Western part of the country, and only an outstanding few.

But it is not these newspapermen who aspire to a Nieman Fellowship that I mean. It is the spark and the spirit

of a whole great group. And whether they are ever Nieman Fellows or not, they grow on the job, they have to find their own ways to supply the background they need, to make themselves adequate to their great responsibility to inform the reader. And when I speak of the later impact of the practical world on them, I do not mean to be cynical about journalism. It has its quota of cynics, and the mere fact of seeing behind the scenes at the inside, as the journalist does, can make some men cynical.

But of course it is true of all institutions, and especially of commercial and political institutions, that their veterans have to compromise many times and in the process lose much of their early idealism and the vigor of their forward drive. I would not put journalism behind other institutions in the proportion of idealism, of intelligence, of vigor and wisdom in the best men who serve it, nor in the proportion of men of high caliber. I never yet saw a newspaper staff that did not have within itself the talent and capacity and desire to do a better job than management is asking of it—to do, in fact, all a reasonable reader can ask.

One of our shortcomings we share with all institutions of men. It is the one that Maitland long ago pointed out—that is, the time lag between the formative years of education and inspiration and the years of possible leadership. He was thinking of politics. But it applies right across the board. Maitland saw the political leader of 50 or 60 applying as well as he could to public issues the ideas of his youth that he learned in school and university. And the tragedy was, often, that the times had changed, and the leader had not kept up with the change. The new ideas had never taken hold of him, never got into him, as had the ideas that were current when his mind was open and his whole being athirst to learn. So, he said, politics inevitably lags a generation or so behind the times, in terms of thought, of the application of knowledge to human affairs.

In journalism we have to convey all we know or understand about the new fact for the next edition. This enormously telescopes our task to inform and interpret. It is hit and run, take it off the surface and whip it into the space we have, and on to the next event. Or, if we know how and know enough, it is a chance to give meaning to an event, to make it tie into what the reader knows or needs to know.

The time factor that limits all our work heightens and sharpens our role. It gives us, to be sure, a constant alibi. But it is a constant challenge. If we muff a story we muff it perhaps for a whole community. If we serve up all there is in it, we may be giving the reader the best chance he is going to have to grasp the significance of a situation that may be more important to him than he realizes.

It is always possible to describe the newspaper job in terms of deadlines and space limits, so that it is an impossible job. But we know it isn't. We know it can be

done and is being done. The best people—the best equipped people—are doing it. No others are good enough for the job. Every assignment is an acid test of the reporter's capacity to grasp the full significance of the event and to spell it out so that it has meaning. Every story is a test of the capacity of the desk to judge the importance of the story and to get across to the reader, by its position and its headline and the space given it, its value as a piece of information.

Here is a statement by Andru H. Berding, as he left a dozen years' work with the Associated Press to take charge of public information for the Department of Defense:

Giving out information, however, is not enough. Government information must include adequate background. The functions and actions of government have become so complex that the issuance of bare facts concerning them is often confusing rather than informative. An explanation is required of the reason for the action, of its purpose, its expected effect, its relationship to other government actions.

Now, just substitute "modern life" for "government" and his statement would apply to the role of the newspaperman just as aptly as to the government information service director. Berding comes by this attitude from his news experience, and it applies to all our jobs.

The dimensions of the news and so of the newspaper cover the whole range of human nature and human activity. As met from day to day, the events which will emerge as news are unpredictable. The one certainty is that the demands upon our attention will change every day in the infinite kaleidoscope of moving events.

In such a chaos for our pattern, how can any one qualify as sufficiently expert to deal with the news? We can have specialists. We must have a few—the larger paper can have many. But none can have enough for every possible development.

I venture to suggest that the tendency is too much toward specialization rather than too little. True, any one must specialize in some degree if he sits down to study any issue. A Nieman Fellow, after selecting his studies, is a specialist in those fields while he works at them. But I don't rate him a specialist if he is studying to qualify himself for better understanding of the daily run of events he will encounter in the news file.

Of course, we have to staff those special areas that make a consistently large part of the news—sports, business, police, courts, city government, state politics, and maybe a few more. We want a book editor, but here is no specialty. Books range as widely as the news. The book editor is only an assignment editor for the reviews. We'd like to have a dramatic editor, but unless it is a metropolitan paper, we call him entertainment editor and add movies, music and miscellany to his beat—and do pretty well too. Or we pass

both books and theatre tickets around the staff according to their interests and aptitudes—and with luck get a rich variety of talent, style and interest.

Science is a specialty forced on us and growing. But the range has become so wide that all we can hope for is a man of science bent and curiosity who will learn to develop a productive acquaintance among scientists and keep up with their literature. When we come to sub-divide into a specialist in public health, one in mental health, one in medicine, I have my doubts of the gain—unless a given field in a given community at a given time is inevitably a full time job.

Any good staff reporter at a given time on a given assignment has to become a specialist pro tem on the steel issue, on the bus strike, on the city budget, on the traffic problem, on the park plan, on the crime investigation, on the political reform committee's program.

He has to know more about that subject than anybody else in town. Keep up with it, report it, explain it, catch every new turn in it, and see where it leads and how it relates to the basic pattern of the community even before the experts who are wholly immersed in it.

But he has to be a specialist in one issue this month and in another next month. He has to be a versatile specialist—capable of absorbing all the facts fast, of understanding and relating all the facts, fast—but still he has an outside look at them all. He is a specialist perforce, for the time, but without the specialist's single-track view of it all. He keeps his amateur standing. Next week he will have to be a specialist on something else—just as important to him and his paper and his readers.

This I think is the crux of it. The reporter keeps his non-specialist attitude even while specializing up to his neck. He has the detachment of the outsider examining the case. He keeps his amateur standing. He is equally capable of becoming as intensely preoccupied with the next issue. That, by my definition, makes him something besides a specialist—both more and less. But for journalism more rather than less. For research or teaching it is something else. But from the view of the reader, the full-time all-the-time specialist in one field can get in so deep that he may soon look to the reader just like the other experts.

The reader needs a reporter closer to the reader's own layman's approach to the specialty. It is hard for the specialist to realize all that has to be explained—to appreciate where the reader begins. The newspaperman turned specialist must work to keep himself in the middle position between expert and lay reader, so that he can interpret the expert. Experts always need interpreting—not merely to get out of their own jargon into the common tongue, but to know where to begin and how to tie on the special information to the pattern of what the reader knows and can take for granted.

Now the intelligent reporter can do this. It's his job. He is the reader's advocate. He has to know first. And he has to get it in terms he can understand. That is a protection for the reader. More than that, the reporter sees the special information in perspective. It is an amateur perspective, a layman's point of view, that can evaluate its importance, its interest today to the reader of today's paper.

That is a quality of a good reporter that a specialist, even of a newspaper, tends to lose if he spends all his time with specialists and is preoccupied in the literature and reports of one special field.

So I suggest that by and large the kind of men the newspaper is going to depend on to keep the reader informed, to interpret the news, even when complicated and specialized, is the good staff reporter. He has to have special qualifications. But they are qualities of mind rather than content. The first is, of course, intelligence, and an informed intelligence with a good range, fed by much reading and retention of the essence of it. But a flexible mind, capable of adapting its interest, of relating one interest to another—above all, an intellectual curiosity.

A great reporter of my cub days, once asked to name the essential quality for a reporter, replied "perennial curiosity." You know what he meant. The capacity to be interested; to start each day with a fresh zest for the new assignment; to be able to get absorbed in it; to dig for the facts; to have questions to ask and to find the answers—never to be blase, not to get bored with an assignment—in short, a man with the eternal quest to know and to understand. That's the man we need. You give him a complicated subject today and by tomorrow he's the keenest specialist in the office. But he's still a reporter, and just as keen next week on his next assignment.

And one more thing he needs and is apt to have. Some of my friends interviewing candidates for Nieman Fellowships say they look for the man "with a spark." They want to see a capacity to get excited about the assignment—to feel that this is important—that the reader needs to know it—and is entitled to have it put in language he can understand and made so interesting it compels his attention.

And finally the adequate reporter needs the moral courage to fight it through, to make sure the story gets to the reader in full flavor and total significance. He may have to educate the city editor and stand up to the managing editor. We need men to fight for the story that is a must.

And beyond that he needs to have the stamina to resign if he can't get a chance to do the job. Now nobody but a fool is going to resign on a disagreement on one story. But a good man is also a fool to stay long in a shop where he finds he is not given a chance to do an honest job, to give the reader a fair chance to see the facts whole.

Now I think there are not many such shops—not many

of a level that would ever have a good man in them.

By and large, editors want a man who will stand up for the facts as he finds them and will argue for his stories. A city editor is absolutely at the mercy of his reporters. They are his eyes and ears. He sees a story or feels one and hopes on it. But whether there is one depends on the quality of his reporters.

The city editor is the key to the paper. We have a strange myth about city editors—the tough guy, the cold fish, the martinet to his staff. Well, the city editors I have known have mostly been stimulating men, with ideas and ability to communicate to the staff, to pick the right man for the job and to act on him like a coach who gets his team “up,” as he says, for the game. It is a tragedy and a travesty to have a negative character on the city desk; a repressive or narrow or cynical or mean city editor can destroy staff morale and ruin the chances of productive results.

It is a chance for a really creative mind, for a teacher, a coach, a leader. Joe Herzberg, city editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, is all these and a walking encyclopaedia on New York City besides. The consequence is that the city desk is the central heating plant of the *Herald Tribune* and the focus of its radiant energy, and all stories relate to their local interest in New York.

Louis Seltzer, although the top editor of the Cleveland *Press*, has never lost that creative touch of the good city editor, and the result is that the *Press* is impregnated with that dash and flavor of human interest and excitement in the local features that makes it the brightest paper in the state.

Joe Herzberg is the only kind of city editor to have, and Louis Seltzer the only kind of man to be editor, just as Meyer Berger and Scottie Reston are the only kind of men to be reporters—all of them creative minds, all geared to informing and interesting the reader.

Incidentally, both Berger and Reston are specialists. But one—Berger—has ranged far beyond his crime specialty over the whole range of human interest—and Reston has brought to his specialty of international problems the whole range of human interest.

Reston, who began as a press agent for the Cincinnati Reds, persuaded the *Times* to yield its earlier rigid concept of the news story pattern to let him explain the meaning of events in his field of complex affairs where things are not always what they seem.

To put meaning into the news seems to me one of our most essential functions. I think the AP has moved a long way very effectively in doing that. I don't mean editorializing, but explaining. Telling “this means that.” They've done a lot of it, even in the touchy field of politics—giving the score, letting the reader see what goes on behind the statement or the convention choice. Doing the story in depth.

Indeed, I think newspapers generally have treated the reader well in this season's pre-convention campaign. The headline in the *Christian Science Monitor* as I wrote this was “Rule by Bosses Looms for Republican Parley.” A day or two earlier they ran a very candid story on the Texas steal and ended it by quoting a leading citizen as seeing a chance of the Republican Party in Texas committing suicide if the steal held. The machine maneuvers in Chicago have reminded reporters, columnists and editorial writers of the last time a steamroller job was done on the popular choice in the interest of the machine candidate. The reader has been reminded of the 1912 convention that split the GOP. The machine operators have been told bluntly in the news columns that this time TV will be watching any steal and everyone will see it done.

This is straight from the hip news writing. It makes an informed and sophisticated readership. And the readers are the voters. It seems to me the best papers and the wire services have moved fast to keep their reporting to the pace of the candid camera. And that's what reporting ought to be, as close as you can make it. That's our function—telling the story—letting the reader know. And of course it builds confidence in the paper. All Bill Townes has done, so far as I can see, in tripling the strength of his Santa Rosa paper in four years, is good, hard, honest, candid, everyday reporting—and following it up with meaningful editorials that say something. And of course in that process infusing into a young staff the excitement and the zest of doing a job that counts.

Believe me, a newspaper can be more than just a sheet with ink on it and advertising revenues.

When one candidate for a fellowship got through answering a question about a campaign he'd been running, I said to him: “You mean you see a newspaper in your community as having the function of a social agency.” “Yes,” he said right off. That was the function he'd been spelling out, unconsciously. “They look to us,” he said.

Another candidate's reference letters included one from the prosecuting attorney:

Our continued success in constant warfare with the criminal elements has been due in large part to the support of an interested and militant press. In the vanguard in the struggle has been Mr. B.

Another described a story he'd done about a stupid piece of race discrimination. And it stopped. A couple of days later the stupid official was explaining it, he'd been misunderstood. The rule was changed.

“If you just tell people the facts, a lot of things won't happen,” this reporter said.

Up in Eugene, Oregon, Bill Tugman puts more in his *Register-Guard* about every candidate for local and state office than even the League of Women Voters puts out. His readers know all he can find out about the people who

are asking for their votes. Then he adds it up editorially and offers his choice for whatever guidance the reader wants to take. That's reader service.

It was reader service to give the full text of Eisenhower's Abilene press conference that told so much more than his opening speech about the issues, but especially about Ike. You needed the full quotes to see how his mind worked, to feel the tone of his answers, to get the attitude of the man. The New York and Boston papers printed it in full—a whole page. I was in some other cities that day that didn't, and I don't know how their readers could understand what Walter Lippman or Scottie Reston were talking about when they said Ike's handling of that press conference was a great test of his quality and that its content was much more revealing than his set speech.

It takes space, it takes judgment, it takes a sense of what the reader needs, it takes a keen time sense. You wouldn't go on printing a full page of every press conference. But this was the first one and everyone had been waiting for Ike's response to all the questions a hundred reporters could throw at him. It was news, and awfully good reading too.

The only way you ever get the best newspaper work is on a newspaper run by newspapermen. I mean all the way to the top. In Louisville it is Mark Ethridge who sits in and argues with the editorial writers when Barry Bingham, the owner, isn't sitting in himself—and writing a piece himself. The other day I asked a copy desk chief who made the decision on the spread given a major news event that day. "The publisher," he said. "Do you mean the publisher came in to the desk and read the copy and sized it up himself?" "Sure, he always does on a big story if he's in town. If not, the executive editor will."

I know intimately a paper where the publisher sits in on election night and keeps right beside the slide rule boys who are adding up the score. And he gives the word when to make a commitment, when the headline says "X" is elected. In 1916 he waited to hear from California and his was the only paper in our region that didn't elect Hughes. It took a lot of courage to come out the morning after election with the head: "Election in Doubt," when the competition put out a positive story—Hughes Wins. But it has paid off all the years since. All my 25 years on that paper people were waiting to see what the *Globe* said on election night and the politicians were calling up or coming it. They needed to be sure. It's a great reputation to get—that they can count on your final report.

If I may stick my neck out about editorial pages and staffs, it's my philosophy a paper is a unit—all for one and one for all—and that the editorial page ought to be a constituent element in it—closely related to the news. I think the editorial writers should be the graduate reporters—some of the best of them—with a strong admixture of the critics and the editors—part-time, or as incidental or occasional contributors. I think it ought to be pretty open

for contributions from all around the shop. I think every one on the page as nearly as possible should have something else to do—the book column once a week, as Irving Dilliard did for years on the *Post-Dispatch*—or the Sunday symposium signed article, as James Morgan or one of his editorial writers does on the Boston *Globe*—or such a weekly article as Carroll Binder does in Minneapolis—or a column, as Anne O'Hare McCormick does in the *Times*—or reviews or criticisms as many editorial writers do on other papers. Something to bring the editorial writer out into the paper and to bring the news man into the editorial page. I know all the reasons for a tight separation. Some of them are very good reasons. But I think it is like the reasons for sending a boy to a private school. Not good enough to balance off the democratic influence of bucking up against all the kids in public school. The ivory tower is sterilizing. The editorial writer needs to keep the quality of the news gatherer. The institution needs to feel the cohesion of being a team. The less differentiation the better. And when I hear an editor say his editorial writers go out and do their own investigations, in spite of what the news reporters are doing, I wonder why the duplication and segregation. Of course, we want editorial writers to go and keep in touch with events, to do their own research. But not to ignore or overlook or duplicate the news gathering of the city room.

A good deal is said about the pattern and balance of editorial page subjects. The papers that seem to me most readable don't seem to fuss much with that. Each member brings in the subject that interests him. They discuss it all around and he comes out writing it. Somebody will have to take on the "must" piece from the big news. But by and large people are writing what interests them, and so it is interesting. Geoffrey Parsons runs the *Herald Tribune* page that way, with great results, and wouldn't think of trying to bring the style of any writer into conformity with his own. Of course you have to start with a group whose interests fairly well cover the waterfront.

But when I heard the editorial writers conference at Chapel Hill last month saying that one of the most distinguished pages in their clinic was a one-man page, I could understand how. Of course he's an exceptional man. But he didn't have to spend any of his time or energy convincing the editor. He didn't have to dilute his piece to fit a policy groove. He didn't have to educate or appease the rest of the staff. So he could write the full vigor and full flavor of his ideas. He'd make mistakes. He'd miss some tricks that conference might have added. His range would have its limits. But his stuff would have individuality, any originality he had, and the full force of his views and the freshness of his own expression.

Now I'm not arguing for one-man editorial pages or for absence of conference. But I think the challenge to the editorial page conference is how to keep the vigor,

originality, individuality of each man's work, when you instal him in a group. The curse of our institutions is that they institutionalize us all and de-individualize us all. The problem is to keep the individuality while informing and reinforcing it. For there is no substitute, in writing, for individuality. The ersatz product shows and the statistics of editorial page reading reflect it.

The columnist has moved into the vacuum of such stereotyped editorial pages, and when it is a canned column from a New York syndicate, it just means we've forfeited our function and lost our readers. Lost the chance too to interest them in many things the big New York columnist is not even aware of and couldn't cover if he were.

Individuality is a great part of the total resources of journalism. It should not be diluted or institutionalized.

When we have done all we can, we can leave the rest to the readers with confidence. We don't half enough appreciate the role of the reader. Mrs. Roosevelt says we always underestimate the reader's intelligence and overestimate his information. I think we also underestimate the reader's relish for good solid newspapering. Carl Sandburg was saying the other day: "I read the papers a lot. I go with Robert Louis Stevenson who said that an intelligent reader with imagination can make an Iliad of a newspaper."

That's giving us as high a role as we can seek. To deserve such readers is a worthy goal.

This was the Ernest L. Finley Memorial address for 1952, established in honor of the late publisher of the *Santa Rosa Press Democrat*.

The Independence of the Washington Star

by Samuel H. Kauffmann

On next December 16, exactly 100 years will have passed since the *Washington Star* began publishing. In that period of time, a new concept of the journalistic function has evolved—the idea that a newspaper should have one purpose in life, and only one purpose: to serve the public; to serve it with the truth. As a sample study in the development of this idea, the *Star* has an unusual advantage. It is not so much that our paper has taken the idea more seriously and applied it harder than other newspapers, although we like to think that the *Star* has been close to the front of the march. It is, rather, a question of continuity of development.

For the past 85 years, ownership and management of the *Star* have been in the hands of one group of people. In 1868, Samuel H. Kauffmann was elected president of the company. The ideas of the man of the same name who had the honor of taking over in 1949 may be different from his grandfather's, but they descended from those earlier ideas in an unbroken line of training and experience.

A man named Crosby Noyes had much to do with the first stages of this learning process. A native of Maine, he rode into Washington on a farmer's wagon on New Year's Eve in 1847, aged 22 and with \$1.61 in his pocket. He learned his way around working as a bookstore clerk, as a theater usher, as string correspondent for a number of northern newspapers, and as local route agent for the *Baltimore Sun*. He came to work on the *Star* in 1853, and soon was serving as Wallach's right-hand man, at a salary of \$12 a week. When the chance finally came to buy the *Star* in 1867, he was ready and willing.

Four friends joined him in that \$100,000 purchase. There was Clarence B. Baker, who had been business manager under Wallach. There was Alexander Shepherd, a

municipal politician whose faith in Washington—with the *Star's* help—was to bring the modern city into being. There was George W. Adams, able correspondent for the *New York World* and several other out-of-town newspapers. Finally, there was Grandfather Kauffmann. He had put out a small newspaper in Ohio before he came to Washington during the Civil War to work for the U.S. Treasury Department. These five published the paper for one year as "Noyes, Baker and Company," until the present Evening Star Company was formed under a special charter granted by Congress. Clarence Baker dropped out in a matter of months, and Alexander Shepherd sold his interest to the other partners in 1874. The Adams, Noyes and Kauffmann families have carried on ever since.

Under the dominant influence of Crosby Noyes as editor, the *Star* was to grow and prosper for another 40 years. It also was to take long strides along the road leading away from the old idea of personal journalism, toward the new ideal of newspapering as a carefully organized exercise in public responsibility.

While all this was going on, a number of younger men were growing up with the *Star*. The ideas they acquired and the lessons they learned were to affect the character of the paper for nearly half a century.

But the men of the then younger generation who were to lead the *Star* through the period of its greatest growth—the first team, so to speak—were Crosby Noyes' two older sons, Theodore and Frank, and Fleming Newbold, Frank Noyes' brother-in-law.

The second son, Frank, was primarily concerned with the business side of the *Star's* operations—he served as president of the company from 1910 until a year before his death

in 1948. In this capacity he led the paper through a remarkable era of physical growth, for it was the two decades between 1910 and 1930 which saw the *Star* converted from a prosperous small-town business to the great metropolitan enterprise we know today. But Frank Noyes' interest in journalism, and his knowledge of it, went far beyond considerations of business management. He had had eight years' experience editing a newspaper in Chicago, and he had inherited from his father the same stern code that made Theodore the newspaperman he was. The full significance of that code is the more readily appreciated in Frank's case because, as first and long-time president of the modern Associated Press, he projected these ideas beyond the walls of the *Star* office into a field where they influenced the whole course of journalism in this country.

The beliefs which qualified him for his role in this fight so thoroughly saturated the thinking of *Star* men as a whole as to become almost a part of their natural equipment—a sort of faith, as rarely subject to analysis as it was to question. Yet these beliefs, at that time, were quite new, even a little revolutionary. They were based on the novel concept that news—the unvarnished fact as to what is going on—is a public commodity, like fresh air. It belongs to the people, who have the right of free access to it at all times.

The president of the *Star*, for instance, would no more think of directing its editor what position to take in the coming presidential campaign, than the editor would think of telling the president of the *Star* what advertising policies are to be pursued. The editor's job, and that of the news department, is to pass on to the public the information and opinions which the *Star* has acquired. The job of the business management is to bring our readers and our advertisers into contact with each other. It is as simple as that.

* * *

The editor, like the president, is an elected officer of the company, and therefore his decisions are subject to the approval of the board of directors. But the fact is that no board of directors of The Evening Star Newspaper Company has even given an instruction to the editor of the *Star*.

* * *

This principle of editorial independence has been practised on our paper through three generations.

Since the early part of this Century, the independent position of the *Star's* editorial department has been guaranteed by a provision of the company's by-laws, and it is the source of as much pride in the business office as it is in the news department. If the years have taught us anything, it is that the only course which makes any sense—business sense, or any other kind of sense—is the course steered by the compass of public service. Our whole experience leads us to the conviction that so long as our first

concern remains the welfare of our readers, the success of our business operation should be assured.

* * *

The function of the journalist is to collect this news and distribute it—that is the service for which the public pays. But the news itself is public property. Since this is so, it clearly is beyond the just powers of any individual—editor or publisher, reporter or re-write man—to tamper with the news by coloring it with bias, diluting it with fancy, or diminishing it with suppression. The newspaperman is dealing, in the public interest, with something which passes briefly through his hands on the way to its rightful owners, to whom he owes his primary allegiance. This is the concept which made Frank Noyes speak of journalism as a public trust, and of the *Star* as one of its trustees. This also is the concept which justifies the principle of freedom of the press.

To a large extent, in its day by day coverage of the news, the *Star* still operates in accordance with this presumption. In recent years, however, we have been feeling our way cautiously, as other newspapers have, toward a somewhat broader concept of our duty as stewards of the public property, news. The life of each individual, these days, is affected by such a mass of tangled and distant complexities that it is almost impossible for him to digest their meaning if they are fed to him raw. Let me drop this culinary metaphor before it gets too involved—in plain words, much of the news does now require interpretation along with fact. The enormous popularity of the weekly news magazine proves that people are hungry, not just for information, but for guidance which will permit them to relate the information they are getting to their own fields of understanding. The rise of radio—and now television—as fact-dispensing media means that the newspaper must take on this additional task of presenting in the news itself enough explanation to make it all intelligible to the average man.

The dangers which the previous generation saw in such an attempt are still there. But this does not mean they cannot be coped with. Bias and distortion can creep more easily into an interpretive story than into one which simply sets down the facts, one by one. But again, this does not mean that the interpretive story must necessarily be biased and distorted. The new approach calls for more intelligent reporting than the old approach did. It calls for more scrupulous editing, to make sure the issues are impartially presented. Above all, it calls for plenty of that plain, old-fashioned attitude of fairness which, we believe, has characterized the *Star's* handling of the news from the beginning.

Samuel H. Kauffmann is the president of the Washington *Star*. This is from a recent address to the Newcom Society in Washington.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

by J. R. Wiggins

The right of people to know about their own government is being obstructed at local, state and federal levels.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for citizens to satisfy their just curiosity about the transactions of their own government.

This is true, in part, because the multiplying functions of government grow more and more difficult to disclose and dissect even where there is the freest access to institutions and agencies.

It is true, in part, because world conditions have made unwise the full and free disclosure of some facts to which democratic peoples, historically, have demanded access; and because these world conditions have provided a pretext for the withholding of other facts.

Circumstances such as these, rather than the conscious conspiracy of individuals or of groups or political parties are responsible for the main challenge to our right to know about our government.

And we have not met this challenge skilfully or successfully. Our failure is in part the consequence of our relative freedom from the impairment of this right in the recent past. With the boon of uninterrupted exercise of a right goes the bane of impaired ability to defend that right. We tend to forget the history of the struggle by which we acquired the right to know, the theories by which we justified it, the nature of the right itself and its relation to all the democratic institutions of which it is an indispensable part.

The exercise of this right to know is associated in history and in the public mind with the story of printing, with the development of the press. From the beginning, however, the printing industry and its proprietors only furnished the device and the technique by which citizens as a whole most effectively exercised a right belonging to all.

Only after generations of struggle did democratic peoples succeed in gaining, by constitutional provision, by legislative enactment, by a climate of political opinion, almost universal acknowledgement that the people have these rights:

- (1) The right to get the facts about government.
- (2) The right to publish them, without prior restraint or censorship.
- (3) The right to publish them without fear of savage and unfair reprisal.
- (4) The right of access to the facilities for disseminating these facts.
- (5) The right to distribute these facts to others.

J. R. Wiggins is managing editor of the *Washington Post*. This is from a recent address to the National Conference of Farm Bureau Editors, June 2, at Atlantic City.

We have enjoyed them so long that we are only dimly aware that democratic government is impossible without them. We have exercised them so freely that we are only faintly conscious of the long struggle by which they were acquired. Nor are we even mildly apprehensive lest some judge may one day say again, what Lord Chief Justice Scroggs said in 1679 when he declared it criminal at the common law to "Write on the subject of government, whether in terms of praise or censure it is not material, for no man has a right to say anything of government."

It took a long time to overcome this once prevailing view. The right of Englishmen to know (through publication) was constrained, in harmony with this philosophy from the first days of printing, when the church exercised licensing powers, through 1695 when the last of the English licensing laws expired. But even the end of licensing did not end the struggles of those who wished to learn about the transactions of the English government. It took a long fight to gain public access to the proceedings of courts and parliament.

From 1642 on, for decades, all acts of Parliament ended with some such words as "And—(the parliamentary printer) to have the printing hereof and none other to presume to print."

Finally, after generations of struggle, under which citizens were hanged, jailed, exiled and had their property confiscated for defying such edicts as these, the parliamentary prerogative of forbidding the publication of debates was destroyed, chiefly through the brilliant struggles of the harried and persecuted John Wilkes. There were press riots in London as late as 1810 to assert this right. Finally in 1834, the press galleries were installed in the House of Commons. From 1853 to World War II there was no attempt to exclude the press, or to obstruct it in the work through which the English public exercised the right to know.

There were many eloquent and famous arguments for this right, in the course of this struggle. I am going to quote one made in the *London Magazine* of 1747 which states, simply and without flourish, why a democratic people need to know something more about their legislative proceedings than the government's announcement of decisions made. This distinguished journal stated:

"Every subject not only has the right, but is duty bound, to enquire into the publick measures pursued; because by such enquiry he may discover that some of the publick measures tend towards over-turning the liberties of his country; and by making such a discovery in time, and acting strenuously according to his station, against them,

he may disappoint their effort. This enquiry ought always be made with great deference to our superiors in power, but it ought to be made with freedom and even with jealousy."

Access to the courts was also dearly bought, but as early as 1649, John Lilburne, charged with high treason, won an argument for an open trial with an argument based upon the ancient law of England, and couched in these words:

"I have something to say to the court about the first fundamental liberty of an Englishman in order to his trial; which is that by the laws of this land all courts of justice ought to be free and open for all sorts of peaceable people to see, behold and hear, and have free access unto . . . and yet, Sir, as I came in, I found the gates shut and guarded, which is contrary to law and justice."

The struggle commenced in England was carried forward in the American colonies, frequently at a more rapid rate.

The systems of licensing and control prevalent in England were repeated in the Colonies.

Governor Berkeley arrived in Virginia, rejoicing that there were not yet any schools or printing presses in the colony. In 1682 John Buckner, a merchant and landowner, brought to Jamestown a printer named William Nuthead. The press was set up and the printer began to compose the acts of an Assembly not long adjourned. A few other papers were printed and proofs of two sheets of the acts of the Assembly were drawn. At this point, the printer and his patrons were called before the Governors Council and bound over to let nothing pass the press "until the signification of his Majesties pleasure shall be known therein." In 1684 Lord Howard of Effingham reached Virginia with a royal order that "no person be permitted to use any press for printing upon any occasion whatsoever." The mandate was effective for 50 years, until William Parks in 1730 started another Virginia press at Williamsburg.

Massachusetts unfolded the same story. In Oct. 1662, the General Court passed its first formal act of restrictive censorship of the press in a law providing: "For prevention of irregularities and abuse to the authority of this country by the printing press, it is ordered that henceforth no copie shall be printed but by the allowance first had and obtained under the hands of Cpt. Daniel Gookin and Mr. Jonathan Mitchel, until this Court shall take further order therein."

It took a long fight to throw off the licensing law that thwarted the public's right to know in Massachusetts. The fight did not end until 1723 after James Franklyn was thrown into jail for criticisms of the Massachusetts government, in his *New England Courant*. Following his release he was put under injunction to publish nothing without supervision by the Secretary of the Province and placed under a personal performance bond. This he evaded by

putting on the masthead of his paper the name of his younger brother, Benjamin Franklin. An indictment against him was sought but the effort failed and the last Massachusetts licensing law fell into dis-use.

Samuel Adams was in the thick of this fight to make known the acts of the Massachusetts legislature and he outraged the government by taking advantage of his post of the House (1767) and furnishing newspapers the texts of addresses sent by the House of Representatives to the Royal Governor.

Typical of the intervention of the government is a Massachusetts Order in Council of May 13, 1725 directing that "the printers of the newspapers in Boston be ordered upon their peril not to insert in their prints anything of the Publick Affairs of this province relating to the War without the order of the Government."

In New York, Peter Zenger was imprisoned (1734-35) for quoting the attacks of the colonists on the government. He gained his freedom by Andrew Hamilton's successful attack upon the common law theory that juries might judge only of the fact of publication and not consider the truth or falsity of matter printed.

By 1747, the right of the people to know about the transactions of their legislature was sufficiently well established so that the New York House passed on Oct. 26, this resolution:

"Resolved that it is the undoubted right of the people of this Colony to know the proceedings of their representatives in General Assembly and that any attempt to prevent their proceedings being printed and published is a violation of the rights and liberties of the People of this Colony."

These beginnings favorably disposed the new United States government toward the principle that the people have a solid right to know about their councils, legislatures, courts and executive departments.

In 1790, the House of Representatives voted to admit reporters. In 1801, the press was admitted to the Senate and the House on a strict party vote of the new Republican Congress and it has been there ever since. State constitutions give the public access to legislative bodies—except when in executive sessions. Constitutions and municipal charters generally granted them access to the proceedings of council chambers. Public records are laid open in a variety of laws and ordinances.

The long struggle for the right to know succeeded. It has been acknowledged in our courts, our congresses, our legislatures and in our fundamental law and it has entered into the unwritten law of our society. Yet, in our time, this right is undergoing a three-fold erosion.

The changing character of the American government has transferred many legislative and judicial functions from the courts and the congress, where the right to know was

safeguarded by specific enactment and by long-standing custom, to independent and executive offices of government, where no such protection prevails. The powers have emigrated and the public's right to know has not emigrated with them. Rules, having the force and effect of statute, are being debated and adopted in executive and independent offices by processes to which no citizen is witness, for reasons that are not disclosed, to achieve purposes that cannot be scrutinized in advance.

This emigration of legislative and judicial function started at the turn of the Century with the Interstate Commerce Act. It has continued now for five decades. For a long while, it led to the combination of legislative and judicial duties in single agencies, in disregard of Madison's wise warning: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary—may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

The Administrative Procedures Act of the 79th Congress undertook to surround the operation of these agencies with some of the legal safeguards so long neglected. The Act did provide for the publication of the rules and regulations promulgated by these agencies, and for the publication of official findings, opinions, rulings and conclusions. It did not provide then, and there has been no provisions since, for the exercise by the citizens of the right and duty to be informed of public matters while they are being considered.

The wide dispersal of legislative and judicial function, I must confess, would make it difficult for the people to exercise their right to know even if every instrument of secrecy were removed. As a people, we certainly are not as well informed as we should be of the transactions of Congress, where the chambers are open, most hearings are public and law-makers ordinarily of ready access. But Congress, by comparison with the agencies to which it has delegated many of its responsibilities, is operating in a gold-fish bowl.

A second erosion of the right to know is taking place as a result of the military crisis in which we live. The full disclosure of all information about the state of our defenses would be folly in the present state of things. Prudence compels us to forego the exercise of our right to know about policies of government that concern not only our own survival as a nation, but the survival of the free world. It is a strange anomaly of our time that we must be content to know the least about the measures that most vitally concern us. Of two dangers we have had to choose the one that seems the least likely to prove fatal. We ought to be aware, constantly, that we have consented to undergo one danger in order to avoid another. We should not forget for a moment that it is a dangerous thing to put out of the reach of democratic citizens the facts essential to the formation of intelligent opinion of governmental policy.

Nor should we forget for a moment that the habits of concealment that this emergency encourages may corrupt conceptions of democracy hitherto held by American public servants. The withholding of military information, justified as it may be, may inspire imitation in other areas where there is not the same foundation in necessity.

Perhaps even more disquieting than the erosion of the right to know resulting from broad changes in the structure of government and the military situation in the world is that which seems to be resulting from a widespread change of popular attitude in our time. A few decades ago, a law suit over the right to get information, in the form of records or access to proceedings, was a rarity. Dr. Cross told the American Society of Newspaper editors in 1951 that in 35 years of practice in newspaper law he had seldom encountered a case of refusal of access. He added: "Now scarcely a week goes by without a new refusal. The last five years brought more newspaper lawsuits to open records than any previous 25 years."

Public officials at every level are asserting the right to withhold information with greater frequency and private citizens have been more quietly acquiescing in the invasion of their right to know.

Let us take some examples of these three currents that are grinding away at our right to know.

The Office of Price Stabilization recently gave us an illustration of how executive agencies, for a lack of the safeguards obtaining in legislative bodies and the courts, may drift into a policy of secrecy that is fraught with danger for the democratic process. On Wednesday, December 12, 1952, the OPS District Office in Washington announced that it had "found nine Washington grocery and meat stores guilty of ceiling price violations," and that as a result of these violations the stores had made "payments" to the U. S. Treasury amounting to \$361.00 and ranging from \$25. to \$136. It stated that the names were not being released because the violations were not willful or the result of negligence.

This action was taken in conformity with OPS Manual on Enforcement Information. In paragraph 5.3, section A-2, the OPS Manual declared that

"If a settlement is made for an amount not greater than the over-charge or over-charges (or the best possible estimate of the over-charge or over-charges), his fact, for the purposes of public information, shall be taken as evidence that the violator has proved to the satisfaction of the Office of Enforcement that the violation was not willful, the result of negligence, or the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violations, and the name of the violator shall not be made public. However, the number of such cases and the cumulative amounts of such settlements shall be released periodically along with an explanation they have shown be-

yond a reasonable doubt that no willfulness was involved. While the violator should not be permitted to keep money he has received in excess of price ceiling, it is believed that publicity in such instances would be unfair to him."

On the face of it, this sounds fair and leaves the impression that a government agency is trying to be considerate of those who have violated its rules inadvertently. But the policy is a dangerous one that a democratic people should never allow a governmental agency to pursue. As innocent as this suppression of information appears on the surface, it involves dangerous violations of democratic principles.

How did the enforcement agencies decide that the violation was non-negligent, non-willful and not the result of failure to take practicable steps to abide by the rules? It is not a widely accepted theory of law that intentions wholly govern the imposition of penalties and the affirmative decision of all these three questions seems to involve some nice questions of judgment.

By announcing the imposition of penalties on un-named lists of violators OPS reflected unfairly upon individuals in the business community not at all connected with the offense. Those who abide by the regulations are entitled to be exempted from any blanket accusation of violation.

More serious than any of these considerations, of course, is the whole broad question of secret administration of the laws. Perhaps these cases are not "court cases" and maybe this is not "judicial process." The danger is not the less thereby. A government that can secretly divest a citizen of any part of his property is a government dangerous to individual liberty. It is a long way in fact, from these simple mercantile transactions to the examples of secret trial and secret punishment that we are frequently furnished by dictatorships that confront the citizen with sudden allegation of deviationism. There is a vast difference practically between the hard-working enforcement officers of this bureau and the secret police of dictatorships who accuse, arrest and condemn the citizen in one operation. But wide as the difference it, in fact and practicality, there is no difference in theory. And the whole idea of such secret imposition of fines and penalties ought to fill American citizens with horror and with apprehension.

I am glad to say that the OPS has amended its information policy so as to make available to the public the names of this class of violators. On April 13, it published a revision of its policy, abandoning its earlier rule of secrecy. I think it deserves congratulations for making the change, just as it deserves, incidentally, credit for an information policy that generally has been enlightened and democratic. The instruction in his episode, in my opinion, would be mostly lost, if someone took away the mistaken notion that this incident illustrated the wickedness of OPS. Far from it, it shows how the best of intentions, in the absence

of legal safeguards for publicity, can result in dangerous suppression of information.

Another example of this kind of secrecy was provided by the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The *Knickerbocker News* learned that bars in Albany had been diluting whiskey. It tried to get the names of the bars. It was told that the cases had been compromised by fines and the Internal Revenue Bureau declined to give out the names. The chief counsel of the Internal Revenue Bureau said the information was not a public record, claimed congressional sanction for secrecy and added that "the transaction is primarily of interest to the individual and the bureau." The counsel, at that time was Mr. Charles Oliphant. James Pope, chairman of the ASNE committee on Freedom of Information, called attention to this case a year ago last April and branded this practice for what it is—"blackmail."

Subsequent events in the Internal Revenue Bureau have shown that persons not as entitled to information as the ordinary citizens of Albany have been able to get information out of the Bureau for purposes nowhere near as good as those of citizens bent on asserting their right to know about the transactions of their own government.

These are but two examples of how the right of secrecy has been asserted in executive agencies that make and enforce laws, free from the safeguard of public access provided for legislatures and courts. The remedy for this situation is not easy. While the right of public access to courts and legislatures gained wider and wider recognition in the United States, the right of the executive department to withhold information was being recognized. Thomas Jefferson, in his refusal to release some of the Burr papers to the Supreme Court, set a precedent which has been abundantly cited since. The confidential character of executive files in a day when the executive department did not make laws of conduct quasi-judicial proceedings was one thing. Since that day, the legislative and judicial functions, in many instances have found the shelter of the executive establishments, the shelter of a secrecy that they never would be permitted in court and congress.

The *Indiana Law Journal*, in a recent issue, points out some of the inadequacies of the laws affecting public access. It appropriately cites James Madison's statement. . . "the right of freely examining public characters and measures and of free communication thereon, is the only effectual guardian of every other right."

The orderly conduct of government and the dictates of common sense indicate that every transaction of government can not be made the instant object of public scrutiny. There are operations in many departments and agencies that must be protected from premature disclosure—the functions of the crop reporting board, some of the work of the Federal Reserve Board and similar activities else-

where. In the absence of compelling reasons of this obvious nature, other governmental activities ought to be so conducted as not to deny the people's right to know.

The problem probably cannot be solved in any single statute or sweeping enactment. Congress certainly ought to improve the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act and the laws affecting many other agencies if secrecy and suppression of information to which the people are entitled is not to become the rule in the executive departments generally, and especially in those executive agencies to which legislative and quasi-judicial functions have been assigned.

THE MILITARY SITUATION

Democratic peoples often have been compelled to waive their "right to know" in order to safeguard military secrets which, if placed in the hands of an enemy, would jeopardize the nation's safety.

This waiver, in the past, has not fatally impaired the right momentarily given up. Wisely handled, we should be able to conceal vital military information from an enemy without destroying the principles that we are fighting to preserve. At the same time, if we are realistic about it, we must admit that the risk now is greater than it has ever been before. The amount of information involved is greater. What is more serious, the duration of our self-denial in previous war periods was self-limiting. The provisions for war-time secrecy generally contained sections providing for their termination at the expiration of the emergency. Government acted at once, on the end of hostilities, to relax the secrecy precautions. Now we enter upon an era of extensive military secrecy of no predictable limit. We are in greater danger of setting the permanent pattern of secret government whether we measure the risk by how much is to be kept secret or how long it is to be kept secret.

The first step towards a democratic solution of security secrecy, it seems to me, is an honest recognition by all parties to the debate, that there are two sides to every proposal involving the withholding of information for security reasons, and that it is too much to expect that parties having only one interest in mind will ever weigh satisfactorily the right of the public to know. In the present state of things, those who are making the decisions on withholding information are persons primarily concerned with secrecy. Both in the making of the rules for withholding information and in their administration, the public has a right to ask that there be brought to bear upon all decisions the viewpoint of those who are especially charged with seeing that the public knows about the defense program everything that it can be told, consistent with the national interest.

Let it be said to the credit of many people in the Defense Establishment that they have tried to keep the two-sided

nature of the problem in mind; but it is too much to expect that diverse and conflicting interests here involved can be entrusted to unilateral decisions of even the most conscientious personnel of the defense establishments.

Military handling of news of casualties involving military personnel has demonstrated how easily suppression (admitted on sound military security grounds to start with) is extended to incidents that have nothing to do with security. There is sound military reason for concealing battle casualties in combat areas or at least deferring information about them until the facts have lost any merit as military intelligence. There might even be sound reasons of security for concealing figures on disaster casualties in the zone of the interior. But there is no military security reason in the world for postponing public knowledge of isolated casualties involving military or civilian employees of the defense establishment in the zone of the interior in time of peace. The practice of the Defense Establishment of deferring for 12 hours beyond the notification of next of kin the identification of victims of accidents is an indefensible unilateral assertion of the right to withhold information. It cannot be defended on military grounds. It cannot be supported on humanitarian grounds. The stubborn insistence of the military upon the continuation of this policy has done more than any other single decision of the Defense Establishment to convince informed citizens that the military departments can not be safely entrusted with the right to decide such issues.

Many fine officers of all branches of the service have worked hard to minimize the damage done by this departmental policy and have managed to get the facts out to the public with a minimum of delay, in spite of the policy.

In some cases these intelligent officers have failed. In others, the policy, in the hands of officials more poorly prepared for their duties, has worked hardship upon the relatives of service personnel, complicated the duties of those who are charged with informing the people and impaired the public confidence in the Defense Establishment.

I wish to quote a first person account of a recent misguided application of this rule, written by an Associated Press reporter .

"On Sunday afternoon (5:30 p.m.), May 4, two automobiles crashed nearly head on 30 miles west of Cheyenne on the Lincoln highway. Three persons were killed and one injured.

"One of the cars carried Airman Third Class Ernest A. Laramee, 21, of Indian Orchard, Mass., and his wife Mrs. Evelyn Laramee, 21, of Springfield, Mass. Laramee was killed instantly and his wife died in a Cheyenne hospital nearly three hours later.

"By 9 p.m., I finally was able to get names and details from the Laramie County coroner and state highway

patrol. Because Laramée was military personnel, the Warren Air Force Base took over and placed a ban on the use of his name. However, since his wife was a civilian the county coroner released her name to us.

"I called my story to Denver and pointed out that due to military censorship we could not get Laramée's name, his station or home. However, I pointed out that the wife's name had been released. We carried the story stating the husband's name had been withheld by the military pending notification of next of kin, the only ban placed on us by the county coroner because he had to work with the military.

"Laramée was not stationed at the Warren Air Force Base but was enroute to Travis AFB, Calif. Incidentally, the air force did not release his name and station until around 1 p.m. on May 5, and when I talked to the coroner around 9 a.m. on the same date he indicated the boy's father had not been notified the night of the accident. The military ban on using names of military personnel killed is supposed to carry over for 12 hours after the notice has been sent to the next of kin.

"When our story hit the radio and newspapers the air force was quite irked at us for using any reference to Mrs. Laramée's husband. It contended we should have said an "unidentified airman." How we could have explained Mrs. Laramée's presence in the unidentified airman's car didn't bother them. Of course they felt her name should have been withheld too, but I saw no reason for that since both the highway patrol and coroner released it. I got Laramée's full name, age and home address from the highway patrol and coroner the morning after the accident and several hours before the air force came through with it.

"In this case Laramée's relatives would have known it hours before the Army came through with the notice since Mrs. Laramée's parents would have learned of the accident and her death before the air force swung into action. The coroner notified her folks.

"Also had the accident occurred further inside Wyoming where no military control could be exercised the names would have been released immediately.

"What irked the Air Force was that it got trapped by its own stupidity. The opposition did the same thing we did with the story and handled it in the same manner. There was no other way out."

The Air force, of course, explained that the PIO did not expressly direct the coroner's office to withhold the facts; but, at the same time it acknowledged the whole matter was thoroughly mishandled. But it insisted that the policy could not be changed.

The story is not an unusual one. The most regrettable

aspect of the situation is the hardship imposed on the relatives of military personnel on bases, in air craft or on ships involved in accidents.

The Navy imposed a similar hardship upon the relatives of every man aboard a Navy vessel that lost a boat carrying a shore party to a foreign port. The parents of every man aboard learned by press and radio of the accident. They frantically besieged the Navy for word of their own boys while the Navy stubbornly sat upon the information that could have allayed their anxiety, waiting to unwind their 12 hour next of kin rule.

This policy has been maintained with all the governmental arrogance of a Massachusetts Order in Council of May 13, 1725 which directed that: "the printers of the newspapers in Boston be ordered upon their peril not to insert in their Prints anything of the Publick Affairs of this province relating to the War without the order of the Government."

The philosophy behind this policy is about as modern as that in the parliamentary act of 20 September 1649 which required that all Army news was to be licensed by the Secretary of the Army.

As long as the Defense Establishment persists in this policy there is only one remedy. Media of information, the press and the radio, have a duty to circumvent this suppression by every means at their command. They have an obligation to release the names they can obtain as swiftly as possible. And what is wrong with this solution? In the first place it invites inaccuracy with the possibility of injury and anguish for many people. It is a policy that is dangerous in the long run. We may fairly ask if it is wise for the military establishments to confront the public with a manifestly absurd and arbitrary policy that encourages disregard of military directions at a time in the history of the world when military officials may at any hour desperately need the instant and ready compliance of the people with military instructions essential to their survival.

Last September, the President of the United States promulgated an executive order providing for the classification of information involving national security as restricted, confidential, secret or top secret, by all the agencies of government.

The order has been defended as setting up uniform standards of classification, but it only provides minimum standards which executive agencies may make more restrictive if they choose.

It has been upheld as an effort to put order into the exercise of authority already possessed by the non-military establishments—but if such authority was indeed possessed by the civilian agencies, few of them exercised it, or have found occasion to use it now that the executive order has been put into effect.

It has been supported as a means of discouraging over-classification, but the discouragement, to all practical purposes, is only hortatory. Agencies are enjoined not to over-classify but the order provided no means by which any authority outside the agency originating a classified document could keep abreast of classification decisions, and currently discover if instructions were being disregarded.

Subsequent to the institution of this order, a sub-committee of the interdepartmental security committee of the National Security Council was entrusted with supervising the enforcement of the order. The members of this committee are all members of the classifying agencies. They are in no position to give anything like an equal or an independent voice to the national interest in making information known. The right of the people to know about their own government is being asserted, under this order, by a sub-committee of a sub-committee, the individual members of which are the employes of the agencies they are supposed to be policing. The order moreover makes no provision for protecting the public's right to know by continuous and concurrent examination of the classification decisions of all the agencies of the government. The reviewing authority is without power or status or procedures by which it might hope to defend successfully the right to know.

The improvement of this order remains a first concern of every citizen honestly interested in military security, and in the right of the public to know.

There is a general erosion of the right to know, apart from this wearing away, that is occurring as the result of changes in government function and in consequence of

military problems. Signs of it are to be seen everywhere about us.

Press conferences by cabinet officials, once a weekly institution, have become a rarity. Months go by without a single correspondent having direct access, in an open press conference, to a department head.

Public relations policies of federal agencies more and more restrict the direct access of reporters to most officials.

Welfare agencies increasingly assert their right to conceal public knowledge of cases, to keep secret their disposition by judicial bodies, to hide records of the disbursement of public funds.

Local government boards, councils and commissions continue to conduct much of the public business behind closed doors in many communities.

Congressional committees are more and more inclined to imitate an action taken in the House of Lords on 10 Oct. 1643, when the Lords made inquiry into how one Aulicus had obtained information which he had printed "concerning certain things that passed privately in the House." Mr. Aulicus has had his most recent successor in the person of Mr. Milne of the *Providence Journal*, who was called before the Gilette committee to explain the source of information he had printed.

It is hoped that we are not going to be required to repeat entirely the monotonous history of such inquiries in the past 300 years.

There is evidence enough that there is abroad in government at every level a spirit of secrecy that is inciting public men to attitudes toward the disclosure of public business not unlike those exhibited in government generations ago.

The Nieman Fellows for 1952-3

Nieman Fellowship awards to twelve U. S. newspapermen for a year of study at Harvard were announced by the University in June. At the same time three Associate Nieman Fellowships were announced for a Canadian, an Australian and a New Zealand newspaperman. These three associate fellowships are supported by the Carnegie Corporation and the selection made by newspaper committees in the three Commonwealths, continuing a program started a year ago.

This is the 15th annual group of newspapermen awarded fellowships under the program of the Nieman Foundation, established in 1938 by the legacy of Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*.

Mrs. Nieman left Harvard what amounted to about \$1,400,000 "to promote and elevate standards of journalism in the U. S." The Nieman Fellowships, starting in 1938, have afforded 170 newspapermen a chance of a year of study at Harvard University to strengthen their background for

newspaper work. All schools and departments of the University are open to them in their own choice of studies for their own professional uses.

The 15th group of Nieman Fellows, to begin their studies in September are:

ARTHUR C. BARSCHDORF, reporter, *Hammond (Ind.) Times*. Native of Adams, Mass., he attended Williams College and Northwestern University night school, served four years in the Army in World War II, started the *Yankee Division* newspaper. He has been six years on the *Hammond Times*. He is 35, plans to study the political and social problems of an industrial community.

KEYES BEECH, Far East correspondent, *Chicago Daily News*. Starting newspaper work at 12, after finishing the 8th grade in St. Petersburg, Fla., he has been a newspaperman ever since except for three years as a combat correspondent in the Marines. On the *Chicago Daily News* as Far East correspondent since 1947 he has fought censorship and covered the Korean War, was a Pulitzer prize

winner in 1951. He plans to work in Harvard's regional studies program on the Far East.

ROBERT B. FRAZIER, reporter, Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*. A graduate in journalism of the University of Oregon, 1948, after four years of war service in the Army in Europe, he began newspaper work in Bend, Ore., in 1941, has served the *Register-Guard* since 1948. He is 31, plans to study sociology and psychology.

WILLIAM GORDON, managing editor, Atlanta *Daily World*. After four years of Army service, he was graduated at LeMoyn College in 1947, then began a newspaper apprenticeship as copy boy in New York and took graduate study at New York University to earn a master's degree in 1949. He then joined the *Atlantic World*, the only Negro daily in the South. Now 36, he plans to study social and economic problems of the South.

DONALD D. JANSON, copy desk editor, Milwaukee *Journal*. Born in Barry county, Michigan, he was graduated at the University of Missouri in 1943 and took a master's degree at the University of Minnesota in 1948, after three years in the Navy. He joined the Milwaukee *Journal* in 1948, where his assignments range from slot man to acting telegraph editor and acting news editor in different editions. He plans to study American history and politics.

ROBERT E. LEE, reporter, United Press Associations in Washington. A native of Newark, N. J., graduate of Amherst College, 1940, Lee had five years in the Navy, ending as Lt. Commander and executive officer on a destroyer. He began newspaper work on the Newark *News*, joined the UP in 1949, and has specialized on major developments, currently the steel issue. He is 33, plans to study history and politics.

CALVIN W. MAYNE, 26, reporter, Rochester *Times-Union*. Born in Marion, Ohio, he was graduated from Ohio State University in 1948 (summa cum laude). After two years on the Detroit *Free Press* he joined the Rochester *Times-Union* in 1950. He plans to study problems in local government.

MELVIN MENCHER, state political reporter, Albuquerque (N. M.) *Journal*. Born in New York, he was graduated at the University of Colorado in 1947. He served as capital correspondent of the United Press at Santa Fe for two years, has been with the Albuquerque *Journal* since 1950. He plans to study anthropology, economics and sociology as a background for New Mexico problems. He is 25.

WATSON SIMS, Associated Press correspondent, Chattanooga, Tenn. A native of Georgia, he was graduated at Tufts College (during Navy service) in 1946 and received an M.S. degree at Columbia in 1947. He has served the AP since 1947, first in Nashville, since 1948 in Chattanooga. He is 30. He plans to study regional problems of the South in economics, sociology and politics.

WILLIAM STEIF, 29, reporter, San Francisco *News*. Born in Chicago, he was graduated at Stanford University in 1946,

after three years in an Army Air Force Arctic Weather Station on Baffin Island. Since 1946 he has been reporter, feature editor and makeup editor on the *News*. He plans to study Far Eastern history and civil rights problems.

JOHN STROHMEYER, reporter, Providence *Journal*. Born in Cascade, Wis., he was graduated at Muhlenberg College in 1947 after two years as a Navy officer on a submarine-chaser, then was graduated at the Columbia University School of Journalism in 1948 and went to Europe on a traveling fellowship from Columbia. He began newspaper work on Pennsylvania papers in 1941, joined the Providence *Journal* in 1949 and has been assigned to investigations of political corruption. He plans to study accounting, finance and politics. He is 28.

KENNETH E. WILSON, managing editor, Santa Rosa (Calif.) *Press Democrat*. Born in San Francisco, he was graduated at the University of California (Berkeley) in 1948. He began newspaper work for the *Press Democrat* at 17, and with time out for war and college has continued with the same paper, to become managing editor in 1949.

ASSOCIATE NIEMAN FELLOWS

J. H. FLOWER, assistant chief of staff (assistant city editor), Sydney *Morning Herald*, Australia. He is 31, and has been on the Sydney *Herald* since 1939 except for four years in the RAAF. He has served as sub-editor and foreign correspondent to Palestine and the Middle East, and as assistant chief of staff and assistant news editor. He plans to study government and economics.

ROBERT F. NIELSEN, political writer, Toronto *Star*, Canada. After three years at the University of New Brunswick, he joined the Canadian *Press* in 1943 and has been with the Toronto *Star* since 1945, three years as Parliamentary correspondent at Ottawa, more recently as editorial and feature writer. He is 29. He plans to study history, government, literature and economics.

ROSS C. SAYERS, 33, chief reporter (city editor), Auckland *Star*, New Zealand. He had early newspaper experience before joining the Royal New Zealand Air Force in 1940 as a pilot. After five years in the war and a year in Fleet Street on London newspapers, he joined the Auckland *Star* as general reporter, has been its chief reporter for four years. He plans to study history, international affairs and U. S. politics.

The Nieman Fellows were chosen from applications by the following Selecting Committee: Wallace Carroll, executive editor, Winston-Salem (N.C.) *Journal and Sentinel*; Eugene S. Duffield, assistant publisher, Cincinnati *Enquirer*; Victor O. Jones, night editor, Boston *Globe*; David W. Bailey, secretary to the Harvard governing boards; William M. Pinkerton, Director, Harvard News Office; and Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships. Jones, Pinkerton and Lyons are former Fellows.

Political Portents

by John L. Steele

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN POLITICS. Samuel Lubell. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952, 285 pp. \$3.50.

LET'S GO INTO POLITICS. Raymond E. Baldwin. Macmillan, New York, 1952, 179 pp. \$2.75.

Samuel Lubell's *The Future of American Politics*, already has been marked by reviewers of the daily press as a most significant contribution to understanding the American political scene and the forces involved therein. To this reviewer, too, Lubell's work represents high grade political reporting, and, on the advice of his friends among the historians, competent social history as well. Lubell's analysis of American politics appears the most thorough of its kind extant; the author's research data is voluminous and convincing; his style is sprightly and he never is dull. It is with the end results, the adding up of the score and the superimposed portrayal of the Truman administration that issue should be taken.

Lubell is a long-time writing man, an ex-newspaper reporter who now devotes most of his time to magazine writing for the *Saturday Evening Post*. He also has done time among the bureaucrats and as a hod carrier for some of the governmental missions of James F. Byrnes and Bernard M. Baruch. His book is built on careful studies of the election returns compiled over the years in the more than 3,000 counties of the United States, plus census figures of all kinds, and an inordinate amount of doorbell pushing. Lubell successfully uses the statistics as "tracer material" in analyzing the political scene, but he never lets his figures bog him down.

He finds that American politics now represent "the politics of twilight," meaning frustrating deadlock between competing forces in which essential and long range decisions cannot be made. He sees American politics, and hence governmental decisions, spinning furiously in an erratic course not unlike a Hollywood conception of an inter-planetary collision. It might have been all good, clean fun in the old days, Lubell suggests, but it is playing with dynamite in mid-20th century Cold War years. An end to political

stalemate and a national political realignment to cut the knot must come in time, and it had better not take too much time at that, Lubell believes. Somehow government must be released from political deadlock and its capacity for decision restored; and to Lubell this means a soft-peddling of sectional-minority interests, in the interests of the national state.

The deadlock, the author finds, has resulted from the "Roosevelt Revolution" and subsequent efforts of the Democratic party to hold together a political coalition comprised of a bewildering Jacob's coat of dissimilar and competing interests. It is in analyzing these interests which now have comprised an uneasy national majority for 20 years that Lubell is at his very best. Within the Democratic party—where "the issues of our time are being fought out, for better or worse"—the author finds these often competing forces: a seething urban population struggling toward political recognition and economic advances, heavily larded with the now adult offspring of immigrant parents; a new frontier of new middle class citizens pushing toward the greener acres of suburbia and fearing that the Republican party may, in fact, not be a conservative party in the sense of conserving their gains from the New and Fair Deals; the Negro moving from the South to Northern and Western cities where the question of assimilation or segregation remains unanswered; ethnic groups swayed by memories of past wars and fluctuating between the political parties; the farmer torn between memories of long depression years and his current status as a man of property; and organized labor, its dynamo slowed down from "getting . . . to keeping."

Lubell does believe that this change from acquiring more to conserving the gains already won embodies a fatal competition of interest between each of the major elements in the Democratic coalition, one which is driving that coalition inevitably toward a smashup. He thinks this smashup is inevitable despite an important delaying factor—that of compensating forces (for example, loss of some Southern conservative support because of the forthright 1948 civil

Book Reviews

rights platform plank, balanced in turn by big city liberal gains). Lubell sees a strong likelihood that the breaking point for the Roosevelt-Truman coalition will be the issue of inflation with its ravages on all segments of the coalition.

But before Republicans can sit back and take comfort from this Democratic date with destiny, Lubell reminds his GOP readers that they, too, face a dilemma, as well as an opportunity. The Republican problem, as Lubell sees it, is that of finding unity between Midwestern Republicans with their emphasis on preserving an anti-Democratic alliance of economic conservatives and so-called isolationists, and Eastern Republicans more sensitive to the vote-getting pull of big-city liberalism and internationalism. This Republican split, Lubell points out, mirrors the Democratic schism represented by the current deadlock of President versus Congress. The Republican battle between the conservative GOP coalition with its headquarters in Congress and a more liberal wing of the party, Lubell finds coming to a head in the current Taft-Eisenhower struggle for the Republican Presidential nomination. Taft as the Republican nominee would sharpen issue after issue (with the possibility that this might drive straying Democrats back to the reservation), while Eisenhower as the candidate temporarily would blur the cleavages. Eisenhower, to Lubell, represents the prospect of a one-term respite from political attrition (but only a four-year truce with the battle beginning again in event of a second term for Ike), and the temporary substitution of an "atmosphere of at least partial reconciliation along the Potomac."

It is thus in analyzing the political scene in which Lubell's star shines most clearly; and that indeed is no mean feat. The author, to this reviewer at least, is much less clear in expressing his expectation of a nation-wide political realignment. He indicates that such a realignment, based mainly on economic factors, is inevitable. But he leaves unclear the prospects for anything more than merely a change in management of the coalition.

Objection can be made to Lubell's claims that political coalition between varying in-

terests means only serious handicaps in setting long range and consistent national policies. Even a high-speed bobsled has brakes, and it may be that the brake is as valuable as the accelerator in a nation's life. Unchecked and violent swings engineered by dominant interests never have been known for salutary contributions to a nation's life. A reader also is entitled to objections at Lubell's description of President Truman as the man who ran like mad in order to stand still; a President who above all reflected indecision and an effort to duck a showdown, instead of seeking to break prevailing stalemate. Lubell raises this as a condemnation of Truman foreign policy. Such an argument would seem to be stating the case for either supine appeasement of Soviet demands or for the "let's fight 'em now" boys. In the delicate and complicated field of foreign policy, the primary rule is that the best usually remains impossible in this far from best of all possible worlds. It takes at least two to make either peace or all-out war, and to condemn the Truman administration for failing to do either would seem gratuitous neglect of the men in the Kremlin. There are points indeed upon which the Truman administration can be assailed. But its point of least vulnerability is its formula for peace-through-strength (which despite essential Republican collaboration IS Truman administration foreign policy), including support for the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic defense treaty, the NATO army, and even limited war in Korea.

The objections in no way effect the Lubell analysis of political forces; they merely point up the difficulties facing social analysts daring contemporary conclusions. Lubell's contribution is a unique departure in the study of American politics, and an extremely important one because it looks deeply behind the party slogans. It deserves the widest reading from those who study American politics, and certainly from those who practice it.

It is to those who would practice the politics to whom Judge Raymond E. Baldwin's *Let's Go Into Politics*, is addressed. His is a valuable little book, giving the reader everything but the street number of the local precinct captain telling how to become a political practitioner. He starts out in fact at the precinct level and traces the business to the United States Senate.

And Baldwin does it in terms of his own successes and disappointments over many years. This kind of book—written essentially for the young person with an itch for politics—is doubly valuable because it was written by Ray Baldwin, a Republican who always seemed to combine the realities of an effective political leader with the ideals of a statesman. He reminds his readers that "the finest framework of government that the mind can conceive . . . would come to naught unless capable, energetic men and women of principle administer it." His perquisites for those seeking public office include a genuine capacity for human friendships and a bull hide able to absorb the cruel lashes of criticism and disappointment.

One chapter which Baldwin's friends will regret that he omits could be entitled, "On Getting Out of Politics." There is an important and untold story here because Baldwin at the height of his political career decided he had had enough; accepted a judicial appointment from a Democratic governor and vacated his seat in favor of a Democratic successor. Those even vaguely familiar with the reasons involved in his decision will regret that he omitted an account of this matter which raised a considerable, though brief, hue and cry among some GOP "regulars."

Senator Vandenberg

by Waldo Proffitt

THE PRIVATE PAPERS OF SENATOR VANDENBERG. Arthur H. Vandenberg and Joe Alex Morris. Houghton, Mifflin Co., N.Y. 599 pp. \$5.

One sentence appears over and over again in *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*. Whether debating in the Senate or writing to a constituent, Vandenberg frequently would drive home the point of his case with:

"It is a condition that confronts us and not a theory."

The picture of the Michigan Republican that emerges from his diaries and scrapbooks is not that of a political theorist. Even as a policy maker, Vandenberg had few opportunities to demonstrate whatever talent he may have possessed. His great accomplishments in the hectic and harrowing decade that began with Pearl Harbor stemmed, rather, from his genius for hammering out agreement on the best way of

meeting a particular situation without sacrifice of principles.

His nearest approach to theorizing concerned, as might be expected, the nature of bi-partisan foreign policy, or, as he preferred to put it, a bi-partisan agreement on a non-partisan approach to foreign policy. Bi-partisanship, for Vandenberg, was a state of mind, an attitude, rather than a specific doctrinal code. His concept of the geographical areas coming under bi-partisanship varied from time to time. It included Western Europe from the first. South America was added later. China never was.

The test of what was bi-partisan and what was not turned on whether legislative leaders of both parties had been brought in during the early stages of planning and not simply asked to go down the line for a program that was handed them. When Vandenberg was to stay with the pilot for the crash landing, he wanted to be consulted about the take-off.

If he was dedicated to the proposition that domestic politics must stop at the water's edge, he had equally strong convictions on the efficacy of the two-party system. The two came into conflict during his campaign, in absentia, for re-election in 1946. On the same day Vandenberg received from President Truman a commission as an American delegate to the assembly of the United Nations—a commission reposing special trust and confidence in his integrity and ability, two of the most prominent orators at the command of the Democratic National Committee arrived in Michigan to work for the defeat of the Republican Party in general and Senator Vandenberg in particular.

"If I am defeated," wrote Vandenberg in a letter to the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Robert E. Hannegan, "it is the Administration's 'foreign policy' which really takes the licking because I am so closely identified with it. Yet, if I win, I may contribute to a major political defeat for the Administration."

Vandenberg did not succeed in resolving the dilemma. Neither did he drag foreign policy back into the political arena.

It would be pointless here to recount Vandenberg's achievements. They are still too much with us—from that day in January, 1945, when the man who had once been a leading isolationist contender for

the Republican Presidential nomination rose in the Senate and pledged his support to American participation in an international organization to secure world peace to the time when he spurned the orders of his doctors so that his personal support might not be lost to the arms bill that put teeth in the Atlantic Pact.

There are enough previously unpublished incidents in *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg* to make it palatable to those who like their history flavored with the excitement of "the inside story." But it is definitely (and happily) not in the tradition of the Now-It-Can-Be-Told books, probably because much of Vandenberg's most important work was done in the open and because the reasons he gave publicly for his actions were the same he recorded in his diary.

The book brings together much of the data on which historians must base their estimate of the man who in the years before his death held a virtually unassailable position in American politics. It will be

surprising if their estimate does not find in the example of Senator Vandenberg a vindication of the value of sticking by principles, compromising on non-essentials, dealing in facts rather than theories, saying what you mean and meaning what you say—in either domestic or foreign affairs.

In editing his father's papers, Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., was assisted by two newsmen: Joe Alex Morris, who has been foreign editor of the New York *Herald Tribune* and the United Press, managing editor of *Collier's* and a writer for the *Saturday Evening Post*; and John L. Steele of the *United Press*, who was a Nieman Fellow at the time the book was published. Steele collaborated on the section covering the years 1946-49, during which Steele was covering the Senate, particularly foreign affairs, and was in almost daily contact with Vandenberg. These were the years when Vandenberg attained the height of his influence.

Selling Free Enterprise

by Lawrence Nakatsuka

IS ANYBODY LISTENING? How and Why U. S. Business Fumbles When It Talks with Human Beings. By William H. Whyte, Jr., and the Editors of *Fortune*. Simon & Schuster, New York. 239 pp. \$3.

This is a book primarily about Big Business and its campaign to sell Free Enterprise at home and abroad. It contains the findings of more than two years of study by William H. Whyte, Jr., assistant managing editor of *Fortune*, and his associates.

Many business spokesmen were offended when parts of the research first appeared in *Fortune*. This book, based upon the magazine series, probably will upset them even more, for there is no letup in the devastating inquiry into the mind and methods of the American businessman. (Mr. Whyte's concern is with the executives of the giant corporations, not with the proprietor of the corner grocery store.)

In the dressing down process, Mr. Whyte makes some caustic comments about the foibles and folkways of management wives as well. Then he chides the social scientists who are trying to foist "group thinking" upon the business so-

ciety. All this the author does without malice. He is sincere in his criticisms. His writing is lively, often humorous, sometimes irreverent.

Answering the question, "Is Anybody Listening?" Mr. Whyte says the huge campaign to sell Free Enterprise to the nation is "not worth a damn." "The Free Enterprise campaign is psychologically unsound, it is abstract, it is defensive, and it is negative . . . it represents a shocking lack of faith in the American people, and in some cases downright contempt." At the current rate, the campaign is costing at least \$100,000,000 of industry's annual advertising, public relations and employee-relations expenditures, plus more and more of the energies of top men in U. S. management.

Moreover, the author says, the campaign is unnecessary. "The fact is overwhelming that the people are *not* against Free Enterprise, *not* weakened in moral fibre, and, by and large, quite willing to work with and for business." If, as Mr. Whyte discovered in private interviews, most individual businessmen do not put much confidence in this selling job, who specifically is behind it? The N.A.M. Mr.

Whyte calls the National Association of Manufacturers the "bell-wether of the Free Enterprise campaign." The individual businessman, we are told, hesitates to speak up against this campaign for fear that his is the heretical view.

The sell-America crusade is a failure abroad also, Mr. Whyte contends. Overseas, the myth still persists widely that America is "all money no spirit." Business has been deluded into thinking that democracy and free enterprise can be merchandised as readily as toothpaste and frozen food; that the scientific techniques of communication would solve all our selling problems, whether the commodity be an idea or a concrete article.

Turning to the "Language of Business," Mr. Whyte pokes fun at "businessese"—the pompous, wordy jargon of business English. Lately, he reports, a more revolting trend has set in. It is called the "reverse gobbledygook"—the opposite of businessese. It relies on fancy analogies and metaphors. Example: "So business enterprise of America is trying to hone a sales force into the cutting edge of an economy and there is a virus running rampant in the flock. Security-mindedness is a log across the stream when it comes to developing the optimistic salesman outlook."

The author complains also about the readability and "plain talk" movement popularized by Rudolph Flesch. The movement is being carried too far, Mr. Whyte asserts. One result has been a "writing down" to the reader. This is a disservice, says Mr. Whyte, "for though they (the readers) will respond to the tawdry, they can also respond to the best we can give them."

Mr. Whyte explores management's social system and finds it depressing. Take, for example, the role of the executive's wife. She endures a lot to fit into the "corporation way of life." (Half of the corporations surveyed "screened" wives before hiring their husbands. In other companies, the wives must pass a social test when their husbands are being considered for promotion. In one corporation, when the husband reaches the \$8,000 to \$10,000 bracket, his wife gets unsolicited advice from the top boss's wife—which are the preferred shops, where to dine and what to wear when doing it, etc.).

Too much pressure for adaptability and conformity, in Mr. Whyte's view, can

A Newspaperman's Bookshelf

smother the individual, and he castigates the new social engineering movement for promoting the trend. "To people outside the Movement 'mass communication' is merely an objective study of advertising, radio, movies, and other mass media. To the social engineer, however, it is a weapon. By welding all the mass media into one instrument, he explains, we can now 'culturally orchestrate' the attitudes and motivations of an entire nation. Adolph Hitler seemed to have had some success along this line, and social engineers like to dwell on how wonderful it would be if we were as assiduous in doing it with good ideas."

The result, however, will be the end of healthy, partisan debate, says Mr. Whyte.

Is Anybody Listening? is a stimulating book, even if an unorganized one. Businessmen especially can profit from the advice given in it. But will they listen?

THE CULTURE OF INDUSTRIAL MAN. By Paul Meadows. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln. 216 pp. \$3.75.

A variety of writers from Lewis Mumford on have pondered the effects of technology and industrialism on human values and individual personality. Dr. Meadows, a sociologist, has produced a compact and helpful synthesis on the subject which should be useful reading to reporters and editorial writers. For one thing, he clarifies the concept of industrial society as a series of conflicts by identifying various opposing forces—not only labor and management, but owners and non-owners of businesses, and owners of enterprises of various magnitudes. The multiplication of these conflicting interests, and the passing of the European age of liberalism, thus forced American industrial society into pioneering new methods of resolving the issues. This neo-industrialism, according to Dr. Meadows, is essentially a re-discovery of the belief in the free man, through more or less enforced humanization of labor relations and the steady decline of the idea of a planless economy. Politically this has taken the form of an administrative revolution in the twentieth century. The result, the author believes, is a continuing trend toward a liberal State which organizes and regulates the uses of the human and material resources of the earth.—William F. Swindler.

ONE MAN'S AMERICA. By Alistair Cooke. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 268 pp. \$3.50.

A sharp eye and a keen ear have enabled the gifted correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* to see much in America that does not meet every eye and to put it in a perspective that is as revealing to Americans as to the British, to whom his pieces were tuned, originally, as B.B.C. broadcasts.

Mr. Cooke has got over the country as few Americans ever do, but New York has been his home for a dozen years and he confesses a prejudice for it. He writes the American idiom and has at the same time a visitor's detachment that adds a dimension to his discoveries and a freshness to his descriptions.

He enjoys America and writes in happy vein of its changing seasons, its cities, its perplexing politics, its abounding energy, and the inevitable paradoxes of our unpatterned life. He deals with such Americans as Joe Louis, Damon Runyon, Robert E. Lee, Margaret Truman and Will Rogers; also about anniversaries, democracy and our spring flowers. A mellow book of impressions—and an uncomplicated book that makes a lot more sense than the self-conscious metaphysics of his earlier *A Generation on Trial*.

ROOSEVELT AND DANIELS. By Carroll Kilpatrick. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. 223 pp. \$3.50.

These letters between Josephus Daniels and Franklin D. Roosevelt cover chiefly the period when the North Carolina editor was Secretary of the Navy and Roosevelt the Assistant Secretary—and the early part of the New Deal when Daniels was Roosevelt's ambassador to Mexico.

Carroll Kilpatrick, a Southern newspaperman now on the editorial page of the *Washington Post* after a decade of Washington correspondent experience, calls the book in its sub-title, "A Friendship in Politics." It was political friendship. The relation is suggested by the change in the letters in the two periods. In the Navy Department days Roosevelt was writing long, urgent letters of what should be done and his chief was paying little attention. In the second period the

elderly ambassador was writing the President at length of many matters he felt should interest the President, and Roosevelt's answers were for the most part only polite acknowledgments. The pattern of the letters is nevertheless a revealing footnote on both the Wilsonian and Rooseveltian eras. They tell more about Daniels than Roosevelt, although now and then FDR delivers himself pungently on the press.

One letter discloses that Roosevelt knew in 1932 that the Al Smith people planned to shift to Newton D. Baker for the nomination and also that Baker could not be nominated. From the perspective of his later career, Roosevelt's aggressive and persistent pushing and prodding of Secretary Daniels to take action that the younger man felt important to the Navy assumes a significance that they clearly did not hold for his chief at the time.

Mr. Kilpatrick has done such an informed job in fitting the letters into their historic pattern with adequate notes on their contents that the whole is a useful addition to our recent political history.

Carroll Kilpatrick was a Nieman Fellow in 1939-40, from the Montgomery (Ala.) *Advertiser*.

THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY. Papers and addresses of Learned Hand. By Irving Dilliard. Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y. 262 pp. \$3.50.

The vigor and clarity of the great judge's principles glow in these occasional pieces that Irving Dilliard has collected and presented with an unpretentious but sufficient biographical sketch.

The journalist's function can go no higher than to present some of the finest thought and language of our day, which otherwise would be denied to a large audience. All his long life, Learned Hand has spoken his fine mind magnificently to his own court room or to the intimate circle of his colleagues of bench and bar and fellow alumni of Harvard College. He had the gifts of insight and wisdom and clear practical expression of his views. He believed in simple justice, in the worth of true men, and in democracy as the surest basis for a free society. "The spirit of liberty" from which Dilliard took his

book's title, is a passionate affirmation, in the midst of war, of what America needs to be to justify the lives of its sons.

The mind that is recognized as the greatest of the judges since Holmes ranged widely over such themes as public morals, tolerance, democracy, education, the role of the judge, and the qualities of humanity he appraised in his sketches of his great contemporaries—Hughes, Stones, Brandeis, Holmes, Thomas Swan and Simon Flexner. Many of these pieces were occasional addresses, as at the Harvard Tercentenary where his text was "be thyself." Others were articles for law reviews. His humanity and humility and his sense of the limitations of all institutions of men, even the law, show through his utterances. His skeptical view of perfectionism is mellowed with quiet humor in his fascinating colloquy with Senator Douglas' committee on public morals, which Dilliard had the journalist's sound inspiration to pluck textually from the record.

Hand is always affirmative even in his skepticism, and his faith shines in the darkest days. Warning against Absolutes, he said "Meet them with gentle irony, friendly skepticism and an open soul. Nor be cast down, . . . We shall learn to walk straighter."

Dilliard, himself a close follower and interpreter of our courts and the great issues that come before them, is editor of the editorial page of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. He was in 1938 one of Harvard's first Nieman Fellows. Dilliard's own work will bear collecting one of these days for since Frank Cobb of the old *World* we have not had many of his stature on our editorial pages.

THIS IS IKE. The Picture Story of the Man. Edited by Wilson Hicks. Henry Holt & Co., New York. \$1.00.

This is a most exceptional and successful attempt to reveal a man in pictures. General Eisenhower is an easy and rewarding subject with his many faces, his extraordinary variety and subtlety of expression—his grins and grimaces. His personality reveals itself in candid photographs and this paper-covered book presents a lavish photographic production. It also does a comprehensive biographical job in pictures, with enough text to cover

the ground. A good job. Excellent photographs and a good many that have not been earlier used even in all the fancy magazine spreads on Ike and his family and career.

MR. PRESIDENT. By William Hillman and Alfred Wagg. Farrar, Strauss and Young, New York. 253 pp. \$5.00.

This is a big book, beautifully illustrated, and does President Truman to the life. Indeed he does himself with incredibly candid diary entries, notes, memos and the uninhibited letters for which he is famous. A fine souvenir of the man from Missouri. The revealing entries by the President have been fully publicized. But the pictures, many in color, of the President, his cabinet, family, the White House and the many historical characters and incidents that interest him make the book a grand album of Americana.

A SCHOLAR IN ACTION—EDWIN F. GAY. By Herbert T. Heaton. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 260 pp. \$4.25.

To a newspaperman the extraordinary career of Edwin F. Gay is of interest, not from the inventive talent by which he started the Harvard Business School and first applied statistical controls to government in the First World War, but in his management of the *New York Evening Post* in its tragic twilight.

This was the one failure of his brilliant career as economist, administrator, teacher and innovator. It was a spectacular, stupendous, dramatic, incredible bust, that lost Thomas W. Lamont a couple of million, before that public-spirited financier could get out from under. It was failure on so grand a scale that it was magnificent, but also ironic and tragic. The *Post*, which had a great tradition under E. L. Godkin, had been losing under the eccentricities of Oswald Villard. To prevent its falling into purely commercial hands, Lamont bought it and appointed Gay, fresh from his distinguished work in developing the Audit Bureau of Planning and Statistics in 1918, to run it. With Lamont's purse opened to him, Gay began by assembling a staff of all the talents, at a vast expenditure, and quickly changed the paper's modest deficit of less than

\$100,000 to one of three-quarters of a million a year, without any appreciable gain in readers. Almost as suddenly he had to turn around and fire his all-star cast and cut to the bone. This had no effect on the readership either and disappointingly little on the deficit.

Lamont, incredibly patient for three years, finally had to withdraw from the sinking ship. Gay might with honor have accepted the presidency of any of several colleges. But he hung on with new stockholders, who soon took away all the freedom and fun there was in it for him, and lost their money too. So finally it went to Cyrus Curtis and on to oblivion, and Gay was welcomed back to Cambridge for years of productive labor in the academic field he clearly should never have left.

By hindsight it is easy to see that the old *Evening Post* had had its day and was done before Tom Lamont embarked on his sentimental journey to save it. Also it was worn out and obsolete in every detail of plant and equipment, which neither banker nor economist had bothered to discover before they took on its losses. And the climate of the times was against its stubborn Mugwumpism and its old-fashioned moralism and rather tedious literary pretensions.

Lamont managed an almost unworldly abstention from interference with the paper's unpopular course. But Gay was unable to find a way to widen its appeal or even to interest the few staunch souls who followed an independent course in those bleak years of sterile conformity in the 20's.

If Gay, the great analyst, ever diagnosed the cause of his disaster his biographer remained unaware of it. For with all its detail and interest, the episode as related does not make much sense. Gay was not a newspaperman, but at no stage in the *Evening Post* affair does he appear as a man of judgment or business sense. Yet he had both, and high creative organizing capacity, in creating a business school on lines that quickly made it great, and in developing a statistical office that was an indispensable tool of government in managing a war. Perhaps it takes a rarer talent to make a newspaper succeed, or to resurrect one that has failed.—L. M. LYONS.

The Hate Campaign Documented -

The Nation has heard of the smear campaign against General Eisenhower. But how often do newspaper readers have a chance to realize the incredible depths of the lying bigotry that twisted minds concoct in a campaign. Here is a stark report of it by C. Delbert Willis, veteran newspaperman of the Fort Worth Press. Willis was an infantry captain who lost one leg and most of the other fighting Japs; then had a Nieman Fellowship before returning to his old paper.

Smear! Taft GOPers in Texas Turn Flips In Effort to Daub Ike With Commie Red

by Delbert Willis, Press Staff Writer

Copyright, 1952, by The Fort Worth Press

Texas Old Guard Republicans, in a desperate attempt to stay in power and keep alive the presidential hopes of Senator Taft, have started a publicity barrage linking General Eisenhower with the Communists.

The red paint has been smeared on thickly in Fort Worth, both openly and in whispered huddles behind closed doors.

Henry Zweifel, GOP committeeman from Texas and ardent Taft supporter, said in a public statement:

"The Almighty has moved Sidney Hillman (former labor leader) from his political dictatorship, but his heir, and the Daily Worker (official Communist newspaper), and all their group are supporting Eisenhower."

Mr. Zweifel, who was outvoted in his own precinct and county conventions, has attacked the doctrine that democratic majority rule is always right. He admittedly is going to fight for his minority Taft bloc because he thinks it is best for the majority of the people.

However, Mr. Zweifel denies even having seen a copy of a newspaper called "Headlines" which pulls out all the stops to make General Ike look like a man manipulated by the Reds. This paper, not circulated generally but mailed only to a selected list of persons, smears practically all persons connected with the Eisenhower bandwagon.

A second pamphlet making the rounds in Fort Worth on the eve of the state Republican convention is called "Closer Ups" and it warns readers to beware of the "Jewish political machines" that are behind Eisenhower.

Still another pamphlet bandied back and forth in Fort Worth is "Conspiracy—The Philip Dru Case," by Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kan. Winrod, a violent anti-Jewish writer of the Gerald L. K. Smith-Upton Close class, cries that the "plot of international Jewry" has selected Dwight Eisenhower to carry forward the plot to control America.

Winrod was indicted by a U. S. Grand Jury as one of 28 men allegedly associated with a nation-wide conspiracy to cause disloyalty and mutiny in the armed forces. Indicted along with him was William Dudley Pelley, leader of the Silver Shirts, a Nazi-like organization, and George Sylvester Viereck, a German. The tenor of their pamphlets then was that Germany and Italy were right and the U. S. was wrong in the last war.

The newspaper "Headlines," which is causing so much stir in Fort Worth parlors, is edited by Joseph P. Kamp, a close confederate of Gerald L. K. Smith, the screaming demagogue who was a henchman of Kingfish Huey Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Kamp, a professional pamphleteer, also gained notoriety writing a booklet called "Behind the Lace Curtain of the YWCA," which purported to show how the YWCA is a Communist outfit. He wrote "The Fifth Column in the South," which was highly praised by "The Fiery Cross," official publication of the Ku Klux Klan in the early '40s.

Kamp was jailed and held in contempt of Congress two years ago because he refused to supply information about his questionable Constitutional Education League, which Congress was investigating.

Here's an example of Kamp's technique: Black headlines read—"MOSCOW THINKS IKE CAN GET THE VOTES."

Then in very small type is a one paragraph story to the effect that Warren Moscow, New York Times political writer, believed Ike could carry New York State.

Kamp reprints a letter to the editor of the New York Journal-American which says:

"The pose of Gen. Eisenhower's hands (in a recent photo), the left folded carefully over the right, in Marxian dialectics connotes the domination of Communism over Capitalism."

A headline clear across the top of Page 1 reads:

"Reds, New Dealers Use Ike in Plot to Hold Power."

Then Mr. Kamp proceeds to write his big expose how the Reds decided that Ike was the only man they could ride to victory in 1952.

Another big Kamp story deals with Joseph F. Barnes, former foreign editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*. Kamp claims Barnes ghosted Ike's book, "Crusade in Europe," and without qualification says he is a Communist Party member and a Soviet agent.

* * *

But Mr. Kamp fails to mention that Barnes took a round-the-world trip in 1941 with Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for president in 1940.

Kamp devotes an entire column to Jay Franklin, who handles publicity for the Eisenhower-for-President Committee in Washington. Kamp tells his readers that Franklin wrote a biography of Fiorello H. LaGuardia, whom Kamp labels "pro-Communist."

Of course, Mr. Franklin wasn't such a bad fellow two years ago when he was hired by Tom Dewey to do publicity work in Albany, N.Y.

Kamp put his favorite stamp of "left wing" on the "Saturday Review of Literature." The magazine's sin was to carry the story of a straw poll which showed that Ike was miles ahead of Senator Taft.

Some more typical headlines in "Headlines":

"Red Rag First Newspaper to Ballyhoo for Ike."

"First Eisenhower Booster in '52 was Sinister ADL Secret-Agent."

"Internationalist Left Wingers Pay Tribute to Ike."

"Red Publication Honors Ike with Dubious Award."

"Ike Gets One More Red-Tainted Award."

"Commy-Lover Stanley M. Isaacs Is Out for Ike."

"General Ike Accepts Endowment from Commy Poland."

"Ike Coddled Communists While President of Columbia University."

"Philip Jessup, Commy Frontier, Gets Big Pat on Back From Ike."

"Ike Responsible for Morgenthau Plan Which Cost Countless American Lives."

The paper lashes out at Leonard V. Finder who wrote an article in Collier's magazine titled "Why Ike Will Run." Finder is a member of that "power secret subversive group," the Anti-Defamation League, which is associated with B'nai B'rith, a Jewish fraternal organization. "Headlines" claims that the Jewish society has been infiltrated by Communist agents.

The ADL is headed by former New York Supreme Court Justice Meer Steinbrink. The paper fails to identify a member of the Communist spy ring which, it screams, masterminds the organization. "The Jewish Family Almanac" is spotlighted by the paper because it had praised B'nai B'rith.

* * *

General Ike received the New York Newspaper Guild's "Page One Award" in 1945. "Headlines" says that award was "red-tainted."

Copies of "Headlines" turned up in Texas homes of persons who were leaning toward Taft.

Inside the publication was a story which said: "Warning! Don't lend your copy of HEADLINES! Don't give it away!"

THE RESPONSE! *Note that neither the complete documentation of the report nor the terrible scars that Willis carries from his own patriotic sacrifice protect him from the smears of the hate crusaders.*

Letters to the Editor —

Delbert Willis Is Called 'Red' — But, Then, So Is Gov. Tom Dewey

Editor, The Press:

DELBERT WILLIS' article in last night's Press is an amazing piece of ignorance.

No better Americans live than William Pelley and Upton Close and if Mr. Willis and The Press care to obtain facts they know this for themselves.

The Press poses as being against the Truman administration, yet they are supporting Eisenhower who is backed by the same groups and individuals who have been back of Truman. If you want a continuation of Socialism, why not keep Truman? There will be no difference in policies if Eisenhower becomes President.

Hold on to it!" The paper obviously was not intended for general circulation, but was sent only to a select mailing list.

Upton Close, who sends his "Closer Ups" to a carefully screened mailing list, is known as a violent anti-Jewish writer. Often he and Gerald L. K. Smith use the same mailing lists.

All of the newspapers and pamphlets are careful to point out that Ike himself is not considered a Red. But he is being "held captive" by the Commies and will be manipulated by them.

Mr. Zweifel, in the second paragraph of his statement, says:

"General Eisenhower is a great American."

Then he proceeds to link him with the CIO Political Action Committee and the *Daily Worker*.

The smear treatment against Ike was used in New Hampshire and other states just before the decisive test for delegates to the national convention.

There is no evidence of any direct connection between Taft and these pamphleteers. But Taft supporters are making good use of them.

May 23, 1952.

Mr. Willis indicates he doesn't believe La Guardia was pro-Communist. What ignorance!

He doesn't see yet to know that Willkie and Dewey were mere tools of the Communists! Where has he been, or is he a fellow-traveler himself?

Speaking of "Smear"—this was the worst smear article I've seen lately and as it was front page stuff, it must be your idea!

What's the matter with Roy Howard? Why doesn't the man wake up!

As for "Headlines" and "Closer Ups" being for a select few—rot! They're for anyone who wants them, and should be

in the hands of every American who wants the liberties of the American way of life saved from destruction.

I venture to say this article was the result of your advertisers' pressure! Now, wasn't it? Wake up, you. Get facts before you start your smears.

MRS. L. M. SCOTT.

Fort Worth.

(Editor's note: William Dudley Pelley, leader of the Hitlerworshipping Silver Shirts, was indicted during World War II for trying to undermine the morale of the armed forces by saying that Hitler was right and the United States was wrong. Upton Close writes anti-Jewish pamphlets out of Washington. He trades mailing lists with Gerald L. K. Smith, ex-henchman of Huey (Every Man a King) Long).

* * *

Editor, The Press:

DELBERT WILLIS' article is an insult to your readers! Doesn't he know red when he sees it?

The same forces that captured Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Willkie and Dewey must have Mr. Willis in hand.

You will find Mr. Close a lot closer to the truth than Willis! William Pelley is a real American—and so was Lindberg, but look what they did to him when he tried to speak the truth.

This article is smear all right, but you are smearing the Americans who would save freedom—what does that make you?

MRS. D. S. ALLEN.

Fort Worth.

* * *

Editor, The Press:

FOR YEARS I have read The Press, sat on the porch and waited for it. But never again will I read it. You and your smear campaign against Henry Zweifel and Senator Taft. My friends and neighbors had been telling me that you would smear anyone, regardless of guilt, just to make headlines. Now I believe them. I had not realized you had such ignorant reporters as Delbert Willis. Print this letter, will you? Stop my paper immediately.

RUBY MILLER.

1730 S. Adams.

P.S.: If I were to continue reading The Press, I might get mad enough to write you a Harry Truman letter.

If We Were Governor

(These three pieces are from a series of 12 in the Portland Press Herald in May by its editor, Dwight Sargent. He says of them "I did the spadework for the series on my Nieman Fellowship at Harvard last year. With the help of Tom Eliot, Prof. Hanford and my State government library, I wrote rough drafts for about 15 editorials. On returning to Maine, I did further research, talked with many State political leaders, deleted some ideas, added others, revised and rewrote and the result is something I think holds water relative to conditions in this State.")

On Appointing Judges

May 14

If We Were Governor - 6

(This is the sixth in a series of proposals we would make to the Maine Legislature, "if we were governor.")

Maine's judicial selection system is a standing invitation to influence peddlers. We need tighter screening of candidates to stay the hand of injurious politics and create for the bench a durable guaranty of excellence.

Judges for the Supreme and Superior Courts are now appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Executive Council. Appointments are frequently and heavily influenced by campaign friendships and partisan alliances. Friends of the governor, or of the governor's friends, stand the best chance.

The system has produced many worthy judges, but there are two things wrong with it: Some of our best legal minds will never have a show as long as political considerations take precedence over judicial considerations: There is no protection against future abuses of the appointive system.

If we were governor, we would propose remedying the situation by establishment of a non-political screening board of seven members, three to be lawyers chosen by the Maine Bar Association, three to be outstanding lay citizens chosen by the governor, one to be Maine's chief justice.

To fill a vacancy, the selection board would survey the field of eligibles, seeking out little-known young men as well as well-known veterans, examine their judicial capacities without regard for political affiliations or campaign associations, and place before the governor the names of three candidates they consider most likely to succeed as judges. The governor would pick one.

The reform would prevent even an occasional incompetent from ascending to the bench. It would raise the caliber of Maine justice to a point as high as that of any state in the Union. It would greatly increase the public's respect for and confidence in our high courts.

While many lawyers will admit privately that there's room for improvement in our method of picking judges, few dare say so publicly. If a change ever is to be brought about, it must be the work of vigorous governors, courageous legislators and interested private citizens.

**Four Year Term for Governor
May 16**

If We Were Governor - 8

(This is the eighth in a series of proposals we would make to the Maine Legislature, "if we were governor.")

Two years isn't long enough for a governor to catch his breath, to say nothing of governing effectively. His tenure should be doubled.

It is more than coincidence that a majority of the 48 states has abandoned original constitutional provisions for one-year terms — the trend started 30 years ago — and allotted governors four years in office. The longer term has "produced" to the satisfaction of theoretical scholars and practical politicians alike.

The record shows that a four-year term:

1. Fosters greater continuity in policy making.
2. Results in more economy.
3. Creates more durable coordination among departments.
4. Relieves governors of petty political annoyances and gives them the courage and independence to combat inefficiency.
5. Chops off extravagance and waste inevitably bred by on-the-job campaigning and changes in administration.

Inertia and the shackles of tradition, not intelligent opposition or denial of the above claims, have defeated bills calling for four-year-terms in several Maine Legislatures.

Maine governors usually are awarded two terms, a total of four years (even a Democrat can be re-elected), so a constitutional amendment to that effect would do nothing to rile the customary tenor of our ways. It would legalize a tradition.

By granting the chief executive a genuine chance for leadership, undisturbed by mid-stream campaigning and allied pressures and distractions, the governorship might attract prominent and able citizens now repulsed by the baser political necessities of the office.

We do not wish to give the governor broader powers over the people. We propose merely to add muscle to his present capacity for service, to encourage greater freedom of action and liberalize his initiative. This would be accomplished by a longer period of uninterrupted employment.

**A Presidential Primary
May 22**

If We Were Governor - 11

(This is the eleventh in a series of proposals we would make to the Maine Legislature, "if we were governor.")

Maine should have a presidential primary, giving the voters a direct voice in nominating Presidents.

The best plan would be for voting-day results to bind delegates to National conventions, and for the number of delegates pledged to each candidate to be determined on a proportional basis.

For instance, let's assume that 100,000 votes are cast by Republicans in a certain primary. Seventy-five thousand are for Senator Hardscrabble for President. Twenty-five favored Governor Tweedle Dee. In the event of such a 3-1 split,

(Continued on next page.)

Nieman Notes

1939

It was Ed Lahey—it would be—who asked the final questions that evoked the most pungent response from General Eisenhower at his Abilene press conference—leading to the remark that when he left Abilene as a boy he was undecided whether he wanted to be a Honus Wagner or a railroad conductor.

Irving Dilliard's *The Spirit of Liberty*, a collection of the papers of Judge Learned Hand, published by Knopf in May, was on the New York Times "Best Sellers" list by the end of June.

Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., director of the Paducah *Sun-Democrat's* Radio Station, WKYB, still writes editorials in the *Sun-Democrat*, which has just doubled its press capacity by installing a 48-page Goss universal press, to meet a 25 per cent circulation rise.

Paxton was appointed this spring to the county commission, which has its problem with 9,000 families living in trailers around Paducah.

Since last November, Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, has been doing a five-nights-a-week news broadcast for 15 minutes over the new FM Station, WGBH, operated by the Lowell Institute Broadcasting System of which Harvard is a supporting member. The new station, carrying Boston Symphony concerts and many lectures and forums, has drawn on the Nieman Fellows at Harvard for many background talks. The Fellows participated, three or four at a time, in a weekly radio series of luncheon discussions, called "American Ideas," with a faculty member leading each discussion. The Nieman curator has been on the road considerably the past quarter. Log follows: April 17, talk at Photographers seminar, University of Kansas; May 2, talk at Canadian national press awards dinner, Toronto; May 22, moderator at dinner Kentucky Niemans, Louisville; May 24, attended North Carolina editorial writers conference, Chapel Hill; June 21, Ernest L. Finley memorial address at California State Editors' Conference, Stanford; June 27, talk to Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. Mr. and Mrs. Lyons were guests of the William M.

IF WE WERE GOVERNOR (Cont.)

12 of Maine's 16 delegates, or 75 per cent, would go to the National convention pledged to the senator on the first ballot, the other four, or 25 per cent, would support the governor.

Maine voter opinion would be faithfully reflected in the delegation. Not a soul could complain, as many do now, that he has no influence in nominating his party's candidate for President.

Many a professional politician opposes the idea. It would weaken his power to pick delegates. From the voters' point of view, this is the best argument in favor of presidential primaries; the people's will would be decisive. And the professionals, although they would lose some of their present power, would still have the opportunity to mold and organize that will to their heart's content.

It is argued, mostly by people who prefer their own power to the people's power, that presidential primaries cost money. Of course a primary in Maine would cost money, but it would be worth a lot to give the people the right to say where Maine stands on party nominees. Democracy is never without price.

Another oft-heard argument, that primaries don't give candidates time to be heard, or sufficient opportunity to campaign, applies at times to the present hodge-podge situation, in which only 16 states have primaries, in which dates and rules are different, and there's no compulsion for any candidate to have his name on the ballot. There are a host of legitimate complaints against prevailing conditions that would not apply to an intelligently planned, properly regulated presidential primary.

Some day we may have a National law creating uniform primaries for all states on the same day, with all candidates listed. At present this goal is dimly seen, for it would take a constitutional amendment. And constitutional amendments take time.

The National objective—popular choice of presidential nominees—will be reached only through pressure from the states, by proddings in the form of state enactment of primary laws. Maine could contribute a lot to that pressure, and hasten the day when every American voter has a say in determining the occupant of the White House, by writing its own presidential primary law.

There's nothing wrong with the two-party system, or the convention system, that more democracy can't fix.

NIEMAN NOTES

Stucky's in Louisville, of the Hoke Norrises in Winston-Salem, of the William A. Townes' in Santa Rosa, California. During this quarter also the curator's family have produced two grandchildren; James Richard Lyons of Washington, D. C., son of Richard L. Lyons of the *Washington Post*; and Richard H. Ford, Jr., of Reading, Mass.; one Harvard degree, to John W. Lyons; one high school salutatorian, Thomas T. Lyons of Reading, Mass.; one dean's list scholar, Sheila Malone, Radcliffe '54.

1940

J. Edward Allen, information chief of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, writes from Brussels:

"Here to address World Congress of

Journalists, exactly 15 years after I came to represent the Newspaper Guild at the ill-fated first Federation Internationale des Journalistes."

Hodding Carter's *Greenville Delta Democrat-Times* won three of the six first place awards in the Mississippi State Press Association's annual competition. The firsts were in local news coverage, agricultural news coverage and advertising layouts. It also took second in front page appearance and editorial content; third in news pictures.

1941

Lowell Limpus, chief of the New York *Daily News* UN Bureau, has been appointed chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the West Point Society of

New York. He was also detailed by his West Point classmates to present memorial plaques to the "Sons of the Class of 1924," graduating from the Military Academy this June.

Vance Johnson, Washington correspondent of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, covering the Eisenhower-Taft competition for the Republican nomination, and the conventions, was the first voice on the radio after Eisenhower's Detroit speech to note that Ike had coined his first campaign slogan: "I'm strictly a No-Deal Man."

David Clark Pinkerton 2d was born in June to Lucille and William M. Pinkerton. Mr. Pinkerton is director of the Harvard News Office and a member of the Nieman Fellowship Selection Committee.

Arthur D. Eggleston returned to newspaper work this spring after nearly ten years abroad with OWI during the war and as consultant on the German press under the Occupation Authority in Germany after the war. He was a labor columnist on the *San Francisco Chronicle* when appointed to a Nieman Fellowship. He is now on the staff of the *New York Compass*.

1942

One of the interesting projects of James E. Colvin for the *Encyclopedia Britannica* this Spring was a series of seminars on press photography, developed in cooperation with the National Association of Press Photographers. One was held for two days at the University of Kansas in April, one at Boston University, another at the University of Wisconsin in June. Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, was a speaker at the seminar at Lawrence, Kansas, April 17.

Christopher Lasch, son of Robert Lasch of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* editorial page, won the Harvard College prize for the best sophomore tutorial essay in history this spring. His freshman adviser at Harvard was Louis M. Lyons (1939).

1943

Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the *Scranton Times*, on leave for a Reid Fellowship, was home in June for his daughter's graduation, then flew back to England to complete his studies of coal mining conditions in Britain and Europe. He will complete his year's field studies by October. Meantime he has this picturesque address: County End, Magpie Hall Road, Bushey Heath, Middlesex, England.

(Continued on page 47.)

Funeral of Reese Closes Up Town

Workers Rebuilt Factory When It Burned to Ground

by Robert E. Hoyt

SCIO, O.—They buried the biggest man in Harrison County Monday. There were 1400 persons crowded in and around the modest main-st. home of Lew Reese to pay their last respects to the man.

Away from the Reese home there wasn't a person to be seen and in each store window there was a sign.

"Closed from noon to 4 p.m."

There was no need for explanation. At the Scio-Ohio Pottery Company there were only two people working, both of them tending the kilns which normally produced, among other pottery pieces, 21,000 dozen cups every 24 hours.

The funeral was more pretentious than Lew Reese would have liked it.

The employees sent a basket of 2123 orchids which cost \$1100.

And he was buried in an \$18,000 casket which weighed more than 1000 pounds.

Rev. Jacob Schrader said, "Is it too much to ask, O Lord, that You raise up other men with the same spirit of brotherhood?"

Had Lew Reese heard those words he probably would have reacted as he did on Feb. 12, 1948, when his employees came to congratulate him on the rebuilding of his plant.

The pottery had been destroyed only 64 days before by fire. Lew Reese said later:

"They came to congratulate me, employees and townspeople, those who had worked long hours to do the rebuilding. I had to turn away. I just couldn't talk."

The job of rebuilding had touched Lew Reese deeply, he felt again the warmth of friendliness shown to him when he first came to Scio in 1932.

He Was Will Rogers Type

The townspeople pitched in and helped then too.

Reese and the people of Scio have taken turns in the last 20 years doing nice things for each other. And the people say it was all because Lew was "such a wonderful guy."

As informal as the sport shirts and the overall trousers he wore almost always, he

was a Will Rogers type who had captured the imaginations of thousands with the story of his Scio pottery.

He came from nothing, made millions, lost it all, and came back stronger than ever.

Lew loved people and the people loved him. He was almost constantly getting one of his friends, his workers, out of trouble or helping them in some way. He spent months in a personal feud with the War Department over the discharge papers of one of his workers. To him that was an essential part of running the Scio pottery.

Lew Reese was born in Glass, O., an Ohio River town near New Metamoris in Washington County, Feb. 28, 1893.

Scott, a brother, said, "things were tough," for the Reese family while the father worked a farm there and later when he was a shrubbery and fruit tree salesman in Dixonville, near East Liverpool.

Considered a Union Man

But it was the move to Dixonville that took Lew and his brothers to the pottery works while they were still small boys. Lew first worked for the Lomode Pottery Company in East Liverpool and was a star pitcher on the company's baseball team.

Before he left there he was president of the Jiggerman's local of the National Brotherhood of Organized Potters. And even though there never has been a union at the Scio pottery, he's always considered himself a union man, his brother says. There was an attempt to unionize the plant in about 1941.

About that Scott said:

"Lew called in the workers and we discussed it. Lew even pointed out that it might be a good thing in the event the company should ever end up in another's hands.

"But the workers decided they didn't want the union."

Lew later worked for the Homer Lockland China Company in East Liverpool

and the Edwin N. Knowles Company across the river in Nowell, W. Va., before going to the Cronin China Company in Newcumberland, W. Va., as a foreman in the late 20's.

Machine Process Reached

In 1932, the Cronin Pottery was shut down by the depression and Lew Reese was out of work. At the invitation of an old friend, Aaron Wagner, who lived near Scio, Lew, his brother Scott and a nephew Eugene Pugh went to Harrison County to hunt for rabbits, and incidentally to "look over the old pottery that Aaron had been harping about."

Wagner had worked in potteries himself and he had heard Lew talk about his plan for doing the jiggerman's job by machine, instead of by hand, and thereby cutting production costs.

(The jiggerman is the worker who molds the clay into the desired shape—cup, saucer, plate.)

They looked over the old pottery which had been the Albright China Co. before it closed in 1926. And they went back to Wagner's home and they talked. Wagner brought in William Miller, an old-time Scio resident who "ran the town" the people said in those days.

Bill Miller had watched the town shrink from 1000 people to about 400 since the old pottery had closed.

Historic Date—Dec. 11

Miller had real estate holdings, he had "connections at the bank," and he knew the people of Scio. It was an historic date—Dec. 11—for 15 years later to the day came the fire. Around the dining room table at Aaron Wagner's home it was decided: they would try it.

Miller did most of the work selling the townspeople on the idea. The townspeople owned the stock in the old pottery. They had lost \$85,000 in its failure. They turned in their stock holdings so Reese could buy the property for the back taxes, about \$8000 at a sheriff's sale.

With some money he had and some he

borrowed Reese raised about \$3000 and with that they were able to move into the plant and start cleaning it up.

Wagner, Pugh, Don Noah, a cousin of Reese's wife; Floyd Harris and Hinkle Stahl went to work. They were all friends of Lew's; all except Wagner lived in the pottery for four months. Reese had 11 cents in his pocket and in no time at all he found himself almost \$20,000 in debt.

Plant Opened in 1933

Meanwhile Bill Miller had been working too. And 100 townspeople raised \$100 each to pay off the final indebtedness to the sheriff and to help pay for equipment.

Wagner had done some construction work and to him fell the burden of fashioning the design Reese carried in his mind.

On Feb. 13, 1933, the plant was opened and Reese hired 60 people. And as time rolled around to meet the payroll, Lew told his friends:

"I'm going to Chicago. I'll come back with the money."

Eugene Pugh says: "And he did. He sold five carloads of cups to Butler Bros. in Chicago and got paid for three carloads in advance. He met the payroll."

Since that time, Scio-Ohio Pottery Company has been a bustling place. His first Christmas as president of a thriving business, Reese handed out 39-cent boxes of chocolates to each of his employees. And each year the Christmas gifts got a little bigger.

Gave \$705,000 in Bonuses

In 1938 he started handing out cash bonuses to his workers. The peak year was 1946—the year before the fire—when he gave away \$705,000 in bonuses. The only party the next Christmas was the work party of townspeople and employees who rebuilt the plant. A bigger and better plant.

Materials were hard to get, but Reese got them. Friends he had made through the years saw to it that he got the materials he needed.

The plant had not been insured. The loss was estimated at \$1,500,000, but he'd been offered \$3,000,000 for it shortly before.

Their checkbooks in hand, the people of Scio came to Reese. They offered him \$400,000. He turned them down. The fire loss was to be his.

And so they offered something else: Their hands.

It was a tremendous sight. Typists grabbed hammers, clerks took up welding, a clergyman pushed a wheelbarrow. One January day with the temperature eight below zero, 400 workers turned out to help roof the plant.

Rebuilt in 64 Days

Reese worked with them when he wasn't on the telephone asking a friend for materials.

The rebuilding took exactly 64 days.

The job was held as a national record, even beating the Texas City explosion rebuilding. They built the equivalent of 3000 square feet of floor space a day. In Texas City the rate was 800. The State Department told the Scio story on the Voice of America.

When the plant opened—on the 15th anniversary of the 1933 opening—the town went wild. There were bands and speeches and banners across Main st. Civic pride had been whipped to the fever pitch.

The first shift at the plant produced 4000 dozen ware in the three new kilns in operation. The workers donated their first day's pay to the boss.

Last December, Lew Reese was up to his old tricks. The party was at Pittsburgh again and he handed out \$250,000 in bonuses. People at the plant say he planned to give away twice that much, but the government wouldn't okay it. It brought to about a million and a half the bonus total over the years.

Value of Human Relations

After the famous fire, Reese was called on many times to address business, civic and educational groups. And to each of them he told the same story:

"I don't care if you give an employee \$1000 a day, he'll do a better job if he likes you and you give him only \$2 a day.

"There isn't a man at my pottery who couldn't tell you how much we are in debt, how many orders we have and how much we're producing. And he could probably tell you about when we'll be out of debt.

"Human relations is worth more than all the money you can make. A pat on the back, a word about a worker's home and kids are worth more than you can ever pay a man in money."

Our Reviewers

**William F. Swindler, Director,
School of Journalism, Uni-
versity of Nebraska.**

**Waldo Proffitt, of the Harvard
News Office.**

**Louis M. Lyons, Curator, Nie-
man Fellowship.**

**John L. Steele, Washington Bu-
reau, United Press.**

**Lawrence K. Nakatsuka, Hono-
lulu Star-Bulletin.**

Letters

The Zip Complex

To the Editor:

In looking over some back issues of the NIEMAN REPORTS I reread the material in the October, 1951, issue dealing with journalism education. I wholeheartedly agree with those who favor the liberal arts approach.

I base my judgment on four years work toward a B.A. degree with a journalism major and two quarters in graduate journalism at the Medill School of Journalism.

Dr. Curtis D. MacDougall's graduate reporting class brought to sharp focus the value of a liberal arts education for the newsman. Each week the group conducted interviews in Chicago with authorities in health, welfare, labor, business, juvenile delinquency, and housing fields.

The greatest danger in professional training, I feel, is that technicians, not educated men, are being produced. Neither technicians or scholars guarantee good journalism, but the scholar is better equipped to engage in the effort.

The liberal arts approach goes far to beating one of the most serious charges laid at the door of newspaperdom—superficiality. I shall never forget the words which followed me after an undergraduate interview, "Whatever you do, don't lose your superficiality." Indeed, journalistic technicians can make superficiality

NIEMAN NOTES (Cont.)

attractive. To the scholar superficiality never is attractive.

Incidentally, I wonder if any of the Fellows could give me some views on the "Hey you" lead which seems to have this school by the lake in its grip. I have noticed a tendency here to cover a number of inadequacies with a "bright, flashy" lead. I may be wrong, but I suspect it's an influence from the Chicago *Daily News*.

I am not in favor of the stuffy lead, but I wonder about this "zip" complex. Frankly, I don't think it's healthy except from a readership standpoint. The over-lively lead has limitations, I feel, but all bets are off in Evanston.

Many thanks to the circulation group for keeping after me to renew my subscription.

Yours for more mature leads,

JOHN L. SHEPHERD

716 Brummel St.
Evanston, Ill.

Competition!

June 17, 1952

To the Editor:

I'm writing you this morning, on the heels of Gov. Payne's victory over Sen. Brewster, because I think there is a real story here for you.

We were the only daily paper in the state to support Payne—and we went out for him and against Brewster lock, stock and barrel.

It was in our circulation area that Brewster's back was broken. This was completely contrary to the "experts" dope, all of whom conceded the area to Brewster.

But when the votes were counted the only major town in the Penobscot County for Brewster was his home town of Dexter.

Needless to say the Bangor *News* was for Brewster.

Brewster attacked us repeatedly throughout the campaign and we hit back. It was a real Donnybrook.

Doesn't this prove something about newspaper competition?

James D. Ewing, editor,
Bangor *Commercial*

Frank K. Kelly was one of the strategists of the spectacularly successful Washington, D. C. primary victory of Averell Harriman. Kelly resigned in May from his old post as assistant to the Senate Democratic Policy Committee and is scheduled to take charge in July of the International Press Institute's American office in New York.

William A. Townes served as program chairman for the California State Editors' Conference at Stanford University, June 19-21 and presided at some of the conference sessions. In his four years as general manager, the Santa Rosa *Press Democrat* trebled in gross business and gained in circulation from a 14,000 non-ABC morning and evening, to a 24,000 ABC for evening alone. Townes having combined the two papers. On Sunday, June 22, his paper carried nine columns of letters to the editor, many of them from critics and political opponents. Bill says they are the best-read department of the paper. His managing editor, Kenneth E. Wilson, was awarded a Nieman Fellowship for 1952-53. On his application, Wallace Carroll, executive editor of the Winston-Salem papers commented: "He is producing one of the few original papers in America."

1946

Mary Ellen Leary (Mrs. A. H. Sherry), State political writer on the San Francisco *News*, covered the California primary June 6th, then went on leave to have a baby, Virginia Ellen, born June 29. The *News* hopes its distinguished political writer will soon be able to find a baby sitter and resume her position but she has made no commitment about that.

Richard E. Stockwell became editor June 1 of *Monsanto Magazine*, known in the trade journal field as "an external house organ," which has a circulation of 65,000. His office is with Monsanto Chemical Company, St. Louis.

1947

Ernest H. Linford, editorial writer on the Salt Lake *Tribune* and an officer of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, writes that he is heading up a Salt Lake City newspaper group petitioning for a professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, journalistic fraternity.

Bill McDougall, old China hand of the

UP, became Rev. William H. McDougall May 11. He was ordained a Catholic priest at Salt Lake City's Cathedral of the Madeleine.

Science published an article, April 18, by Francis E. Carey, science writer for the AP, on "Science Reporting."

A son was born to Mr. and Mrs. Jack Foisie in June, their second child. Jack is on the San Francisco *Chronicle* staff; his brother Phil, who was a senior at Harvard when Jack was a Nieman Fellow, is now on the staff of the Santa Rosa *Press-Democrat*, 55 miles north of San Francisco.

Anne Katherine Waggoner was born May 9 in Washington to Margaret and Walter H. Waggoner. Walt Waggoner, the New York *Times* State Department correspondent, was elected president of the State Department correspondents' association in June. Other officers included two other former Nieman Fellows: Donald J. Gonzales, of the United Press, vice president; and Peter Lisagor of the Chicago *Daily News* to the board of directors.

1948

Charles W. Gilmore of the Toledo *Times* and John M. Harrison (1952) of the Toledo *Blade* are serving as a program committee for the Toledo Newspaper Guild to plan a forum for the public in November on the subject: How NOT to Read a Newspaper.

1949

Mr. and Mrs. Robert deRoos finished building a new home at San Mateo, California, this spring, and held open house in it for the Nieman Fellows of the San Francisco Bay area Sunday, June 22. Bob deRoos is working on an article series for *Collier's* besides a new regular assignment for special articles for his old paper, the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

Christopher Rand has contributed a number of articles on China to the *New Yorker* this Spring and a notable series on Hong Kong, where he has been making his headquarters.

Charlotte and George Weller returned to their base in Rome in May after an 18 months' Far Eastern tour for the Chicago *Daily News*. Address: Via Oreste, Tomasini 13, Rome.

C. Delbert Willis, State editor of the Fort Worth *Press*, was elected president of the Fort Worth chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, which he proudly identified as the only professional chapter which has twice won the honor of selection as the best chapter in the nation. Del placed second in the Sigma Delta Chi feature writing awards in Fort Worth. He was presented the Catholic Rural Life Medal for promoting the *Press'* soil conservation awards program in Texas "without regard to race, creed or color." Several Negroes have won awards in this program. Del also reports that a Negro won the local Sigma Delta Chi high school journalism scholarship this year, for the first time.

Lawrence Weiss went to Geneva this Summer as a delegate to an International Labor Organization conference, representing the United States Department of Labor.

1950

Clark Mollenhoff of the Washington Bureau of the Cowles paper, teamed up with his bureau chief, Richard Wilson, in an article in *Look* for May 24 on secrecy in government.

Little Brown & Co. is announcing, for November publication, *Anatomy of a Satellite* by Dana Adams Schmidt, New York *Times* foreign correspondent, now assigned to Israel. The book is about Czechoslovakia where Schmidt was one of the last American correspondents. He left the country just ahead of an order for his arrest, in early 1949. Much of the work on his book was done at Harvard on his Nieman Fellowship in 1949-50.

1951

The Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel* assigned Hoke Norris to the national political conventions at Chicago to represent the interests of the editorial pages. Hoke and also A. G. (Pete) Ivey (1952), serve with Editor Reed Sarratt and two other editorial writers on a combination team that produces the editorials for both morning and evening papers, working from a single daily editorial conference and running a wholly different group of editorials in each paper. Hoke achieved national notoriety in June through the wide publication of the "utility editorial, good for all purposes" that he did for the *Masthead*, publication of the National Association of Editorial Writers. It was a

parody of the banalities of some editorials that Hoke seems to have observed in some papers, written like a composite stock Western Union telegram.

Angus MacLean Thuermer left the AP Washington night desk in June to join the State Department in expectation of an early assignment to India or Southeast Asia. He had directed his year of Nieman studies to this area in hope of assignment to the Far East.

A daughter, Roberta Jean, Jr., was born to Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm C. Bauer May 2 at Portland Oregon, where her father is associate editor of the *Oregonian*.

A second son, Edwin Herbert, was born April 11 to Mr. and Mrs. Edwin O. Guthman in Seattle, where Ed Guthman is on the staff of the *Seattle Times*.

1952

John M. Harrison, editorial writer on the Toledo *Blade*, is recovering from a bout with peritonitis that hospitalized him in June and will keep him convalescing through July. But Mrs. Harrison reports he is coming along well. Address: 121 Cherry St., Perrysburg, Ohio.

Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence K. Nakatsuka took a flying trip to Europe at the end of their Nieman Fellowship year before returning to the Honolulu *Star-Bulletin* at the end of June.

Michael Brooks Martin was born in May to Mr. and Mrs. Robert P. Martin at Richardson House, Boston, and is now on his way to Japan with his mother, and sister to join Pepper Martin on his return to his CBS post in Tokyo.

First post-Nieman baby of the year, Scott L. Steele, was born June 10 in Chicago, to Mr. and Mrs. John L. Steele, their third child. John returned to Chicago in July to cover the national political conventions for the United Press.

Times Gets Ike Off Ice

The New York *Times* snaked SHAPE and the Pentagon out of an official SNAFU on—of all days—April 1.

Cyrus Sulzberger, chief foreign correspondent, had managed to get fast delivery from Paris of an advance copy of General Eisenhower's NATO report, an internationally significant document, and big news. It was in the office and in type when Sulzberger cabled managing editor

Turner Catledge from Paris on April 1:

SHAPE REQUIRES OUR URGENT UTMOST ASSISTANCE BECAUSE OF SNAFU ALL COPIES OF EISENHOWER'S REPORT FLOWN TO WASHINGTON FROM HERE FAILED TO ARRIVE. THEREFORE PLEASE PERSONALLY TELEPHONE CLAYTON FRITCHIE IN SECRETARY DEFENSES OFFICE IMMEDIATELY. ADVISE HIM NEW YORK TIMES HAS COPY OF REPORT TEXT. PLEASE OFFER TO TELETYPE IT TO WASHINGTON OR SEND IN ANY OTHER WAY FRITCHIE DESIRES. PENTAGON OF COURSE WILL PAY ALL COSTS INCLUDING THIS CABLE. PLEASE CABLE ME URGENTLY (REPEAT, URGENTLY) AS SOON AS YOU ARRANGE WITH FRITCHIE SO I CAN ADVISE SHAPE.

Orvil Dryfoos, assistant to the publisher, learned from Mr. Fritchie by telephone that the Pentagon had not gotten its NATO report copy, and could not trace it. Would the *Times* hand its proofs of the report text to an Air Force courier who would pick it up in a half hour and fly it to Washington? The *Times* would—and did.

The Department of Defense was not only grateful. It carefully read proof and, through the *Times* Washington bureau, called the newspaper's attention to a minor typo.

General Eisenhower next day cabled publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger his warm personal thanks:

OUR PROFOUND GRATITUDE GOES TO YOU AND YOUR ASSOCIATES OF THE *TIMES* FOR YOUR IMMEDIATE AND SPLENDID ASSISTANCE IN FURNISHING PENTAGON WITH GALLEYS OF ANNUAL REPORT. OUR ENTIRE SHIPMENT WAS OFF-LOADED AT ICELAND FOR REASONS UNKNOWN AND WITHOUT INFORMATION EITHER TO WASHINGTON OR SHAPE.

The General's guess was right. The Pentagon's missing copies turned up, days later. An Air Force pilot had dumped the packet on an icecap airbase by mistake. The episode ended on that frigid note.—*Times Talk*, April, 1952.