



BP 198.1

Nieman Reports

January, 1952

LOUIS STARK'S OWN STORY

Pioneering Labor News

Can We Have Any More William Allen White's

Evan Hill

Headlines: Their Use and Abuse

Keen Rafferty

Canadian News Has an American Accent

R. A. Farquharson

The Writing Isn't Good Enough

Carl Lindstrom

The World of the Journalist

William F. Swindler

"The Truth About Korea"

John Davies

Reviews: Harold Ross and His Formula; Evolution of Reuters; George Kennan's Diplomacy; Historian's Deadline; The Theodore Roosevelt Letters; John Crider's Review of Taft's Book.

Scrapbook: James Morgan at Ninety; Edwin L. James' First News Beat; Gordon Walker on General Willoughby; Houston Waring and his Weekly; Trollope on the U. S. Press — Letters — Notes.

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.

Nieman Reports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Malcolm C. Bauer, Portland, Ore.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John L. Hulteng, Providence, R. I.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, Ohio; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, Ohio; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, New York City; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Washington, D. C.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. VI, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1952

The New World of the Journalist

by William F. Swindler

This is from a message to new students in Journalism at the University of Nebraska, by the Director of the School of Journalism.

The journalist is truly all things to all men. The smaller his newspaper—if he is a newspaperman—the more he must telescope many functions into his time. The wider and more complex—the more he must try to grasp the significant details of every kind of activity. To political and business leaders he must appear aware of the practical facts of government and industry. To the scientist and other specialist he must demonstrate an intelligent grasp of their fields. To his readers he must be informing, entertaining and interesting.

He must know that a successful newspaper editorially must also be successful financially, and thus the practical realities of advertising and circulation management must be constantly before him. And, particularly on a small paper, he must understand the mechanics of production well enough to know what to do to keep the back shop running smoothly.

This has always been so, but harsh developments of recent decades have made it much more evident. In the past quarter-century, scores of newspapers have gone out of existence, a number of new media of communications have appeared, and the world has been confronted with the economic upheavals caused by depression and inflation, the political crisis created by mutually repellent ideologies, and the scientific revolution dramatized by the term "atomic age."

This is the new world of the journalist. There is no doubt

but that it will become more complex and more difficult. Moreover, since we live in a democracy where the people really can control their affairs if they are sufficiently well informed to act intelligently, the modern journalist must do more than provide surface data. He must interpret these data—which does not mean that he describes them from the standpoint of his personal bias. It means that he digs out the hidden facts and shows the relationship of various persons and events, with a zeal for truth irrespective of its relative popularity. He needs to understand the methods of the political practitioner, but he needs also the suspended judgment of the political philosopher. He needs to follow the accomplishments of the laboratory scientist, but he needs also the skeptical and imaginative attitude of the theoretical scientist.

If you gather from this rather heavy description of the state of things that more is expected of the journalist than is expected of other people, you are on the right track. Professional education for journalism is concerned very little with techniques of newspapering which you can and will learn faster and better on the job. It is concerned even less with students who think that a broad education consists of spreading themselves thin over a great body of miscellaneous subjects. It is primarily concerned with the correlating of subjects and the practical development of the resulting knowledge. Broad education is the best possible preparation for professional journalism—professional journalism education is essentially the process by which the student learns to use his broad education purposefully.

The College of Arts and Sciences declares that its function is to introduce the student to "the spirit and content of liberal learning. Its disciplines are designed to develop the student's mental powers and to give him his bearings in the universe of nature and man. The agencies of the education which it offers include both actual experience of the methods of investigation employed in the several branches of learning, and acquaintance with the bodies of knowledge ascertained by those methods." Within this framework of liberal learning, the function of the professional journalism program is to teach our students to apply the subject matter of arts and sciences to the news of the day, thus giving the reading public the benefit of the perspective the journalist has gained through his college training.

That is the primary purpose of this school of journalism, and of most schools of journalism. This is the job the newspaper cannot do—it will train a new reporter in techniques better and faster and far more thoroughly, but it has neither the know-how nor the time for this professional indoctrination. Conversely, the proper function of the liberal arts division is to provide the broad education which is the indispensable background of superior newspapermen—but the aim of the professional journalism program is to enrich this background and effectuate it.

Louis Stark's Own Story

Foremost Labor Reporter Tells How He Started Making Labor News

by Louis Stark

When Louis Stark left his long-time Washington labor beat to join the editorial page staff of the New York Times, his colleagues and many others joined in a dinner of testimonial to his pioneer work in developing the field of labor as news. At the end Mr. Stark responded with this autobiographical statement, unique in the record of this modest man.

Just for the record, I'm not the pioneer in labor reporting, although you might say I'm one of the pioneers. The New York *World* had a man, John Leary, and he was very helpful to me. It was a lesson that I never forgot. And if I have been of any assistance to any of the men who have spoken so handsomely tonight, it's probably due to the fact that I wanted to be a teacher and did teach school for six months before I gave it up. Maybe there's something about that in my blood.

It's been a kind of dual job that I've had all these years. When I came to know the field of labor fairly well, I had a feeling of responsibility to the fellows who were coming in and didn't know it. Because I didn't want them to go off the deep end and make mistakes, which wouldn't have done them any good and wouldn't have done their papers any good. And yet, this is a competitive business. And I really don't know how it is that I did whatever it is that I did. Because those were the two things that were working at the same time. And the thing that pleases me, perhaps, above all else—one of the things is, that despite the fact that I've been in a competitive business—and a "beat" is, well, what it is; although it's something that's forgotten about very quickly—despite the rivalry, nevertheless, the men with whom I have worked, by and large, have held me in esteem, and trusted and respected me and have shown how they feel in honoring me on this occasion.

There are many things that I think about, that rush through my head from the early days. They say that I counselled people; perhaps I did at times. I was reminded today, by Bill Lawrence of our paper, of something that I said to him in Detroit about 1937 during the General Motors strike. We were talking about labor news and he was just beginning and he said: "You told me that when you're writing about the A. F. of L. or the CIO to think out the logical thing they would do and then write the opposite." Well, with due respect to

Phil Pearl, Charlie Herrold, and my friends, Green and Meany, there was not only a little truth in that; there was quite a bit of truth in it even though it sounded paradoxical. By this time I had learned that these labor leaders were terrifically shrewd traders. And I knew that I couldn't outsmart them in thinking what they might do. And in collective bargaining, they would, very frequently, just turn the thing upside down. And it may have been my facetious way of speaking but Bill told me he hadn't forgotten that.

You've been reminded that I came down here in '33, a greenhorn to Washington. And I like to think of two incidents that occurred on the first and on the second day of my arrival. On the first day, I ran into some railroad people here and one of them told me something about a coordinator of transportation being named by the President soon, a man named Joe Eastman. Well, I thought that was a story the *Times* would be interested in. So I made some notes, and went back. The notes were based on the executive order which had not been published. When I got back to the office, Delbert Clark who was on the desk was rather excited. He said: "We've been looking for this story for a week. Do you think you can get a copy of this thing verbatim?" Well, I said, I copied it from a verbatim thing, but I'll see if I can borrow a copy. I went uptown and borrowed a copy and they sent it verbatim. And Felix Belair, who had been covering the ICC and who knew Joe Eastman like he knew the top of his hand, very kindly and graciously helped me write the story. The next day reporters flocked in to President Roosevelt, into a conference, and they asked him about the story, whether it was true. "Well," he said, "I had a copy of this order here last night and it isn't here now." Well, I don't know what he meant to convey by such an intimation, but he did verify the fact that the story was correct.

Well, that was the first day. The second day I was here, I came downtown from the Capitol with Jett Lauck, who was the economist for the United Mine Workers. And he told me something about a bill called the National Industrial Recovery Act. Well, that idea had been kicking around Washington and people had taken a poke at it and he told me the origin of it, what it was to contain, all in the course of this taxi ride. When I got up to the office, I said to Delbert Clark: "Do you know anything about this National Industrial Recovery Act?" He said: "What do you know?" So I told him what Jett Lauck had told me. And he said: "Write it; we'd like to have it." So I wrote it. Well, that was a "beat" like the first one.

The reason I tell this story is the sequel. Ted Wallen was then the head of the New York *Herald Tribune* bureau, and some malicious friend of his ran into him on the second day and said: "Ted, that fellow Stark, he has a contract. He has to deliver a 'beat' once a day."

Well, I don't know how seriously Ted Wallen took that statement but, of course, I couldn't keep up with the record, and didn't.

I think it has been my good fortune—through fate, accident, or what you will—first to be associated with a paper that was willing to have men explore this particular field when other papers didn't see the opportunity in labor news, and to give me a free hand. And in the second place, the idea captivated me when it was first broached in 1923. Although as a general work reporter, I had reported labor news just as other people had on occasion—having reported my first big labor convention in 1919—that was the A.F. of L. convention in Atlantic City. I was fortunate in another way, to which I have alluded. And that was that I had the edge of perhaps ten years on the other papers and so had acquired a background which came in such good stead in 1933, when the National Industrial Recovery Act, and Section 7A, and the codes of fair competition became the order of the day. It was easy for me. All I had to do was to stand on the third floor of the Department of Commerce Building, figuratively hold my hat in my hand, and people would go by and drop stories in it, people I had been cultivating, people I had known for ten years. And by that time many of them knew and trusted me.

It was no particular credit to me but it was a fact that I had had what Arthur Meyer, an arbitrator in New York, once called a monopoly. He said: "The trouble with you, Stark, is, you've got a monopoly." Well, that monopoly didn't last forever. Because beginning in 1933 other papers began paying attention to labor news and assigning men to this beat.

Covering the labor movement and labor-management relations has been an unending source of wonder and interest to me from the very beginning. The psychologi-

cal relation between those who manage industry and those who take orders is a delicate one not yet sufficiently understood.

I was offered the choice of covering Wall Street for the *Times*, at first. And I said: "Thank you very much. I think I'd like to pass it up." I was asked if I would like to specialize in the very important and complicated transportation problem in New York City—which is still a problem and Page 1 news. And I thanked them and passed that up. And why they chose me for the third one, I don't know. But they did. And I'm very glad that they did. It was a pioneer effort. I was not the first one there; but it was a pioneer effort.

And very early in the game, I learned one thing. And that was to take no part whatever; to be under no temptation whatever to take sides in an inter-union dispute. I had seen one or two other labor reporters who were very strongly biased in favor of people whom they liked. And I felt that not only were they doing themselves a disservice, but in the long run they would rue the day. I remember one man, whose name I won't mention, who was so biased in favor of the A. F. L. United Garment Workers that when the Amalgamated Clothing Workers was formed as a split-off and began to make news he would never go up to Sidney Hillman's office. But he would use the stuff in his paper by rewriting the City News Association. Well, that was such an obvious thing to learn that it didn't take anybody with any great brains to learn it. And I think perhaps I can pride myself on the fact that in all these terrible inter-union disputes—perhaps there's nothing quite as bitter as an inter-union dispute—I meticulously kept away from offering any advice and from making any suggestions whatever. Not that I have refrained from offering counsel, but only then if I were asked to do so. I never volunteered advice to any trade union leader on his problems.

Of course, I have been very timorous for a very good reason. And that reason is a simple one that you will appreciate. No matter how much I myself might know about his particular problem, I could never in the world place myself in his position. And this goes for the industrialists who have asked me for advice, too. I could never place myself in the exact place of the individual who has the responsibility for acting. He was responsible, the trade union leader, to his people; the industrialist to his board, the president and to his associates. I, as a newspaperman, was completely devoid of this kind of responsibility, despite whatever kind of imagination I may have had. I could never really completely place myself in his position. And therefore, as I say, I always approached such a task with a great deal of diffidence.

I'm not going to keep you but another minute. What I would like to say in closing is what I feel about the future of labor news reporting in this country. In a sense,

despite the strides that it has made since 1933, due to the situation with which you are all familiar, I think it is nothing in comparison to what will come in the next quarter of a century. I recall that Carr Van Anda, the managing editor of the *New York Times*, and one of the most brilliant editors I have ever heard of—and under whom I was privileged to work—said after the first World War: "This war will be on the front pages for ten years!" He thought he was saying something. Well, that was very much of an underestimate. And about 1937, somebody in *Editor and Publisher* who talked to me quoted me about a conversation I had with him, and he said that I thought that labor news would be on the front pages of the newspapers for 15 years. Well, I think I underestimated, just as Mr. Van Anda did.

It seems to me that the whole field is becoming more and more professionalized in the sense that men who take an interest in labor and industrial relations come to it with a certain amount of background, preparation and economic training in college—which I didn't have; I picked

mine up as I went along. But it seems to me that the labor field will be of prime importance because the industrial society in which we live is so complex; it has so many bottlenecks; there are so many keys at every point which may lead to disaster that the mechanism in the machinery has to be understood. But I think that as the labor movement develops, the papers will use more and more labor news and more newspapers will take on additional labor reporters. I think that even newspapers in one-industry towns will take on men with the part-time job of covering labor as a specialty. And I think that it's a semi-profession—it will never be a profession; there are no state regents' examinations, similar to bar, to pass.

But, the people who are here tonight are all in earnest in doing their jobs and I count them very happily among my best friends. It's been a privilege to be associated with them as colleagues. What I want to leave you with is, thank you for your esteem, and your confidence, and your friendship in me.

What His Colleagues Said About Louis Stark

Frank Edwards, A. F. of L. News Commentator, in a broadcast, Aug. 28, 1951:

"At this moment, a rather unusual affair is going on in the National Press Club in Washington. Members of the fourth estate are gathered together to say good-bye to one of their colleagues, Louis Stark of the *New York Times*. For more than a quarter of a century, Mr. Stark has covered labor news for the *Times*. And the highest tribute that could possibly be said to him is the fact that he is admired and respected universally by the labor and business leaders he writes about daily as well as his fellow reporters, whom he has scooped consistently. After his long and distinguished service on one assignment, Mr. Stark is going back to New York to write editorials for the *Times*."

Edwin A. Lahey, Chicago Daily News:

"There probably wouldn't be any labor reporters to be class conscious if it wasn't for Lou Stark. Because he has carried more men on his back than the local loan company. I've been told—Phil Pearl corrects me—but I always understood that up until '35 and '36 the only people seen covering these dreary labor conventions would be the *Daily Worker*, the *Federated Press*, *Women's Wear Daily* and Lou Stark of the *New York Times*.

"So when labor did become news and a lot of people were assigned to cover it, most of us not only did not know the forces involved; we didn't even know the ditches of labor. So we all started covering labor by hanging around the corridors on these stories and waiting

for something to happen. And when these conferences would break up the two sides would walk out of the meetings and Lou would walk quietly down the hall with one of them to the elevator and there would be a whispered conversation. And we would hang back and then a few minutes later Lou would come back over to us and sit down and hold a press conference.

"Lou is going back to New York with all of our affection and respect. I think the most remarkable thing about Lou is that he has attained a certain gentleness of soul in an area where callousness and cynicism are supposed to be virtues. I'm sure all of us wish Lou whatever blessing an editorial writer is entitled to. That's it."

Fred Perkins, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance:

"We regard Louis Stark as the pioneer of labor reporters. He has made the daily affairs of labor unions sought-for news among the newspapers. Labor news is no longer restricted to the back-alley sort of items about the dry and routine items concerning the meeting of Local 364 of the Amalgamated Association of Hairbrush Makers; but now it's big news on the front pages. Lou Stark has done a big job to put it on the front page. And why not? Most of this country's 150,000,000 people are working people. And to Lou Stark, this vision came first among newspapermen, of making their affairs the subject for newspaper treatment. The unions themselves—organized labor—number 15,000,000 people—and the unorganized have the same interest as the unions. May I say, that Mr. Stark's

pioneering made jobs for lots of us, not only the labor reporters who work for the newspapers and the press associations, but also the industry and labor press representatives.

"Every Washington labor reporter probably can tell a personal instance of something that this *gentle* man—the words are separated—has done for him; the good things this man has done. My first acquaintance—this is my instance—was in 1933. I had just become the Washington correspondent for the *Pittsburgh Press*. I learned that there was a coal wage conference going on out at the Shoreham Hotel. It had been going on for weeks. So on my first day on the *Pittsburgh Press* job, it occurred to me: My God! maybe Pittsburgh would like to know something about the coal conference. So, down I went to the Shoreham, where, after about half an hour, this coal wage conference conducted by the late Charlie O'Neill on one side and John Lewis on the other—this coal conference, after I'd been in it, around the outskirts for half an hour, this coal conference suddenly blew up in my face. They had reached an agreement!

"Well, I knew absolutely nothing about the background. So they gave me sheaves of papers and all that, which I couldn't understand. But I was lucky. I met Lou Stark the first time that night, and I drove him downtown in my old Ford. And on the way downtown, this man explained to me what it was all about. I remember the night very well. I came down to the writing room of the press club. And I wrote a story which was so good that the *Pittsburgh Press* gave it an eight column line on the first page and thought I was a pretty damned good reporter. Well, the credit for that goes to my friend, Lou Stark."

Herbert Little, formerly of Scripps-Howard and now with the U. S. Department of Labor:

"I'd like to present a footnote on the observations of the personality and operations of Lou Stark. One is that by personality and charm Lou has overcome the chief obstacle to labor reporting; that is, the distrust of union people, people who have grown up in the union movement for outsiders, people who have not come up in the union, who are not on the payroll. And I speak for us press agents. Because his example, the example of a warm, brilliant and intelligent outside person who has not been a pie-carder and who has convinced people of his sincerity and honesty really made a terrific difference in the labor movement itself. And he is responsible for the labor movement hiring smart, intelligent people with hearts and brains both,—people like Phil Pearl, and Justin McCarthy, Cecil Owen and Henry Fleisher—people who came in from the outside with adequate training and who could do a writing and press and public relations job. Another thing that Lou has done, it seems to me, is that through a process of integrity and able reporting and digging up the facts and

working day in and night out, he has got honest, decent labor reporting for 25 years into one of the greatest newspapers in this country. That's half a tribute to Lou Stark and half a tribute to the great institution for which he works. I think that about says it."

Telegram:

"Lou Stark, care of the National Press Club: I want you to know that you carry with you in your new position the respect and admiration of all those who have had the privilege of reading your careful reporting. Since you came to Washington in 1933 you have been the dean of all reporters on the labor scene in the capital. Your work has brought you many honors, including the Pulitzer Prize. Your friends wish you equal success and happiness in your well earned promotion.—HARRY S. TRUMAN, The White House."

Telegram:

"Dear Louis: As you prepare to relinquish the Washington assignment which you have carried out with such great distinction over so many years, I do want to express my respect and admiration for you and your work. Those of us who are occasionally called to Washington on administrative assignments have come to look to you for advice and guidance which has always been helpful. All of us who are developing sound labor relations attest to your invaluable contribution in helping develop informed public understanding of issues and problems. You will be missed very much in Washington. In undertaking your new assignment may I express my very best wishes and high regards. May continued success and happiness be yours. Sincerely, GEORGE W. TAYLOR, Chairman, Wage Stabilization Board."

Telegram:

"To Louis Stark, I consider it altogether fitting and appropriate that his colleagues and competitors of the press should celebrate Louis Stark's departure into a new journalistic field. Because from now on they will be able to sleep soundly—at night of course. Seriously, I join with you in tendering to Louis Stark the highest Oscar a newspaperman can earn: The confidence and respect of his readers. I have followed his accounts for more than a quarter of a century. And I can readily say that aside from accomplishing a monumental job of reporting, he has awakened the American press generally to the fact that labor's activities constitute news. Looking back, I would like to express my gratification to a man of Louis Stark's integrity, judgment and fairness, who pioneered in this field and was permitted to carry on. Looking forward, I hope to be able to read the editorial page of the *New York Times* with a great deal more confidence from now on that I have hitherto felt.—WILLIAM GREEN, President of the American Federation of Labor."

Canadian News Has an American Accent

by R. A. Farquharson

Superficially the American visitor picking up a Canadian newspaper finds little evidence that he has crossed the border. U. S. news is still covered in detail. The opposite situation is, however, not true. This is natural because a small country does not expect to make news to the same extent in a large country.

Careful reading of Canadian papers in direct comparison with American papers shows that Canadian papers reflect the greater interest Canadians take in external affairs.

We carry—and I speak of all Canadian papers—a larger percentage of external news than the press of any other country. Incidentally, the word "external" rather than foreign is in common use in Canada. We do not regard the U. S., where most of our external news comes from, as foreign, and in the same way we never apply foreign to news from any part of the British Commonwealth. We have no foreign office at Ottawa. Our Secretary of State's full title is "Secretary of State for External Affairs."

In a breakdown of how Canada gets its news, before the last war it was shown that 20 Canadian dailies ranged from a low of 21% to a high of 48% external news content. The same survey showed foreign news content in the *New York Times* of 16%; in the *New York Herald Tribune* of 13% and in the *Times* of London of 14%.

Of course, these figures are misleading. They are based on date-lines and include American crime as well as American politics, American sport and British sport as well as international conferences. They do not mean that Canadian news desks are that much more concerned with the serious affairs of life as the figures seem to imply.

But with due allowance for the trivia we import, I think it can be safely claimed that Canadian papers try harder to cover a larger part of the world than the whole press of any other country attempts.

The reasons are not difficult to find. We are a small nation living in your shadow. Until the last few years the reading matter of Canadians, that is in the form of books and magazines, has been over 90% of external origin. Canadian magazines are now playing a much more definite part in Canadian life. But Canadian magazines face the competition in Canada of all American magazines, which is very difficult competition because of the

comparative resources. That is why Canadian magazine staffs work so much harder than magazine staffs elsewhere.

When it comes to books the story is very much the same. Our book stores handle almost all the American books, almost all British books and very many French books, because a third of the people of Canada speak French. On top of this imposing list of titles we pile our own output of Canadian books. The Canadian percentage of Canadian reading matter has been increasing but when it comes to the printed word we still are very large importers.

There is a factor which weakens Canadian initiative and that is the dumping of American syndicated features in Canada. American columns are sold at ridiculously low prices and are used by many smaller papers because they cost so little. This makes it exceedingly difficult to develop Canadian features on a national scale. The Canadian features cannot be dumped across the border on the basis that any money at all is money in the till.

As a nation we live on our export trade—thus the Canadian reader is interested, as a result of sad experience, in anything that affects world prices. A tariff change in Washington, for instance, may mean far more to Canadians than it does to Americans. This has a sobering effect on both politicians and newspapers and makes editors more conscious of the importance of political-economic news.

In sport we follow American major leagues in as great detail as we follow our own baseball leagues. We carry horse racing results from American tracks as well as Canadian tracks. We carry British cricket and soccer scores, and in finance Wall Street quotations as well as Toronto and Montreal stock prices.

In politics Washington debates are reported daily, and some Canadian papers run as much, perhaps sometimes more Washington news, than do some American papers. In addition, we keep a close and sentimental eye on the Commonwealth developments.

This type of comparison could go on and on. In many respects your radio is our radio. At the moment your television is entirely our television. Your theatre is our theatre and we are just as easy marks for the Hollywood press agent as you are. You can see why the survey I quoted above showed that of the external news carried, as high as 68% came from the United States. If anything, the proportion of U. S. news is greater now than it was when the survey was taken.

I have quoted these figures to give you a background

R. A. Farquharson is editor of Canada's *Saturday Night*. Until last summer he was managing editor of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. This is from a talk to the Nieman Fellows at Harvard, Nov. 30, 1951.

appreciation of why the Canadian news man is so much concerned with what happens outside Canada. Strangely enough, when this is admittedly the case, we have done very little ourselves towards providing our own external news coverage.

To just as great an extent as you do, we rely on the Associated Press. A few of the larger papers have their own correspondents abroad but no Canadian paper looks to Canadian correspondents to provide the basic external coverage. The Canadians write features but the day-by-day reporting is done by American news services.

Canada's relations with AP started without Canadian papers even being consulted. In 1893 Reuters and the AP marked out spheres of influence and Reuters agreed Canada came within the AP orbit. The following year the AP report began to circulate generally in Canada through a contract between AP and one of the Canadian communications companies. That situation has changed to this extent: some 35 years ago the Canadian newspapers formed their own co-operative CP, the Canadian Press—and took over distribution of the AP world report themselves; and the old "sphere of influence" deal no longer exists. CP distributes or integrates into its own report both AP and Reuters news.

But the AP pattern is there. CP was modelled on it, and there have been the most cordial relations between the two organizations ever since.

The Canadian Press covers Canada for the AP. AP covers the rest of the world for Canada.

I cannot help regret that the pull of geography and the cold facts of comparative population make it economic common sense to depend on the AP and to a lesser extent on Reuters, UP and INS to cover world news for Canadian papers. No matter how much AP strives for objective reporting, there still exists an American accent which undoubtedly is more noticeable to us than it is to the news editors of the U.S. If there is to be a national accent on news we would naturally prefer that that accent be not American and not British but Canadian. Sometimes we in Canada have to reconcile the British accent and the American accent that conflict on the same story.

There have been times when the AP, in reporting the stand Canada has taken abroad, has reported the State Department's interpretation of that stand without even inquiring of Canadian delegates for the Canadian background behind the stand. I know that it is natural for the AP correspondent to check the State Department. I think that it would be better for U.S. papers as well as for Canadian papers if the AP made it a point always to check the representatives of the country involved.

Because Canada relies on the reporters of other nations to write the news of the rest of the world, Canadian papers are not as aggressive in developing their own world news. An editor's job is overly simplified when he relies

on what comes in and does not have to direct the di and supervise the selection of what is written.

International conferences of nations have a habit of pushing out unofficial material to strengthen their case. I hope you will forgive me if I express relief that among the worst offenders in this way is the United States. American diplomats tend to be impatient in diplomacy. They want things done the way they think they should be done, and quickly.

At the NATO meeting in Brussels, Americans and Canadians were flatly told in reports from reliable sources that the rearmament of Germany had been settled and that the qualms of other European countries on the subject had been overcome. Today, a year later, the rearmament of Germany still has not been settled.

I mention this as just an instance. Undoubtedly there are others. The point I would like to make is that we are in the same boat with you and when you carry out national propaganda we carry it too.

At the NATO meeting in Ottawa things did not follow quite the line expected. Some of the Canadian reporters were closer to the facts than their more distinguished visitors but almost without exception the Canadian papers played down their own men and put up the by-lines that were internationally known. For instance, one reporter found his story on a back page, while Scotty Reston on page one. A couple of weeks later Scotty wrote the story from Washington the Canadian had written from Ottawa and again Scotty's story got a larger place.

If Canadian editors were directing their correspondents abroad, it would lead to more objective handling of a great volume of external news Canadian papers carry.

I would not like to leave the impression that we in Canada just meekly follow the line your papers set. We are more conservative in temperament and, so far as we can generalize safely, we do not go to as great extremes. The fact that Canada is a bilingual country has its effect on the whole national life. Our government combines the racial characteristics of the Latin as well as the Anglo-Saxon and the need to carry the support of both groups leads to careful consideration of policy. This is reflected in the English sections as well as in French sections and is a factor in making Canadian people more cautious. Canadian newspapers more cautious too.

A large part of our press is French, and the Canadian Press operates the only bilingual news service in the world. The French papers have a character entirely of their own. Incidentally, our chief French paper, *La Presse*, is the only Canadian paper to publish an American edition which is read daily in northern New England.

I hope I have not given you the impression that the 100-odd Canadian newspapers are all daily editions like the *New York Times*.

The influence of the box office to reach mass circulation

figures is just as prevalent in Canada as it is in the States. I think that, in so far as more news of serious international importance is carried in Canada, it is carried because of the pressure from the Canadian readers.

Even at that, in centers of intense newspaper competition, the influence of the Hearst school is very strong and the play of sex, crime and trivia is strong enough to win the admiration of the London *Daily Express* or the New York *Daily Mirror*,

I think there are plenty of instances to justify a study into the reverse power of the press. When we say that the press has lost its power, I think we are misreading the situation.

But it is not enough to rule out political campaigning in news stories. If we are to attain the respect of our readers, news direction should cease to have any political affiliations. There are many papers that feel they are fair because they fairly report their political opponents. I want to see the day when, in the heat of an election campaign, as well as at other times, the news play is decided on the merits of a story and not on friendship to a party. As long as political friends get more space and larger play because they are friends, a newspaper cannot lay claim to objectivity. Front page editorials are disappearing but there still are papers who believe they are honest news columns which distort the honesty of their news presentation by overplaying friends, by putting editorials, not always plainly labelled as editorials, on the front page.

When it comes to influence of the press in an election we are developing the same picture that the British and the American press have developed.

Some time when Nieman Fellows have time for a project, I would like to see them attempt a measurement of the influence newspapers have in reverse. For instance, the overwhelming opposition of the American press to Roosevelt was, I believe, a factor in Roosevelt's unexampled success. In the same way the violence of the Labor campaign in the 1945 British election which saw the overwhelming return of Labor was perhaps the secret weapon of Mr. Attlee. In the same way in Canada Mr. Mackenzie King continued to be elected in the face of screaming criticism.

We have just come through an election in Ontario where one newspaper went to greater lengths in supporting the Liberal leader than we have ever seen before. This paper has by far the largest circulation in Canada. Its campaign became the main issue in the election and when the votes were counted only 7 of the 90 seats were held by the Liberals.

I hope that the election in Ontario has taught a lesson and that we will never again see a newspaper or a group of newspapers carry violent partisanship into the news columns. As long as opinion is confined to editorial pages I think there is a chance that the opinion will have influence in the direction the newspaper expects. But when the news stor-

ies become editorials in disguise they boomerang. If our profession is to have the confidence with the public that it should have, I believe we must reach the point where we believe the news columns are a public trust and that, so far as we are able, we handle news objectively.

I think newspapers will come to realize that mass readership and influence do not go together. When a newspaper sets out to get the largest possible circulation, built on the basis of crime, sex and comic strips, when important news is only carried if it also happens to be sensational, it cannot expect to exert influence. The public likes entertainment but it does not go to an entertainer for counsel. You do not ask a clown for advice, no matter how much you laugh at his antics. There is a field for mass entertainment but the publisher who achieves success in this field should not expect to be a power in government.

Physician, Heal Thyself

by Theodore Long

Of late months there has been a great deal of excitement in the professional newspaper press and elsewhere about the "cult of secrecy" in government. This has been accentuated by President Truman's so-called security order, but the excitement antedates that executive act. James S. Pope, chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has been most articulate. He has told—in the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Nieman Reports* and elsewhere—how Government tries to suppress news. Not just news which may be embarrassing to those in power or to their friends, but news of almost every kind. All that Mr. Pope says—and much more—is regrettably true. But is it something new or is it in contravention of the rights of the Press?

The First Amendment says that Congress shall leave the Press alone, but no guarantee is set up, in the Constitution or elsewhere, for the Press to move where it wills in Government. Government admits the Press on sufferance and the Press agrees. If the press galleries of House and Senate and the White House Correspondents' Association are not acknowledgment of this fact, what are they then?

Nor is sufferance of the Press confined to Washington or the Federal establishment. It extends through the courts and the state capitols and the city halls and the precinct police stations. And everywhere the Press has gone along to some extent. It has admitted that there were some instances where it better remain outside.

But while making such admissions the Press has not been willing—in the past, at least—to wait for handouts or official announcements. The history of American journalism is full of examples of reporters going out and getting the facts despite the efforts of officialdom to bar them. While admitting that it could not be expected to be admitted to every hearing, conference or grand jury

session, the Press has been willing to get the complete story when it wanted to.

That is the flaw in the sad story of the "cult of secrecy." Mr. Pope and others apparently believe that the way should be cleared to complete information. Is there any statute which would be "open sesame" to the robbers' cave? Or would not executive sessions, private sessions and the whole apparatus of concealment be used to balk a "cult of non-secrecy?"

Mr. Pope and his fellows deal with secrecy in government. They might also consider such subjects as secrecy in business. Corporations are only slightly less representative of the people than is Government. Management acts for stockholders whose knowledge of what is going

on is limited to carefully worded annual reports. Yet there is much which should be known—and at the time, not weeks later—to both stockholders and the general public. How are those stories to be broken? By passing a law or by fundamental reporting?

Mr. Pope does journalism a service. He diagnoses the growth which may strangle freedom of information. But the thought remains that bureaucracy would not be so impudent today if the pursuit of the story had not been neglected yesterday. It is well to be aware of the "cult of secrecy" but it would be better to spurn the easy handout and dig out the hard story.

Theodore Long was a reporter and news editor before becoming an editorial writer on the Salt Lake *Tribune*.

"False, Dull, Unreadable"

Trollope on the U. S. Press, 1862

"In the whole length and breadth of the United States there is not published a single newspaper which seems to me to be worthy of praise . . . All idea of truth has been thrown overboard. It seems to be admitted that the only object is to produce a sensation, and that it is admitted by both writer and reader that sensation and veracity are incompatible. Falsehood has become so much a matter of course with American newspapers that it has almost ceased to be falsehood. . .

"But American newspapers are also unreadable. It is very bad that they should be false, but it is very surprising that they should be dull. Looking at the general intelligence of the people, one would have thought that a readable newspaper, put out with all pleasant appurtenances of clear type, good paper, and good internal arrangement, would have been a thing specially within their reach. But they have failed in every detail. Though their papers are always loaded with sensational headings, there are seldom sensational paragraphs to follow. The paragraphs do not fit the headings. Either they cannot be found, or if found they seem to have escaped from their proper column to some distant and remote portion of the sheet. One is led to presume that no American editor has any plan in the composition of his newspaper. I never know whether I have as yet got to the very heart's core of the daily journal, or whether I am still to go on searching for that heart's core. Alas, it too often happens that there is no heart's core! The whole thing seems to have been put out at haphazard. And then the very writing is in itself below mediocrity;—as though a power of expression in properly arranged language was not required by a newspaper editor, either as regards himself or as regards his

subordinates. One is driven to suppose that the writers for the daily press are not chosen with any view to such capability. A man ambitious of being on the staff of an American newspaper should be capable of much work, should be satisfied with small pay, should be indifferent to the world's good usage, should be rough, ready, and of long sufferance; but, above all, he should be smart. The type of almost all American newspapers is wretched—I think I may say of all;—so wretched that that alone forbids one to hope for pleasure in reading them. They are ill-written, ill-printed, ill-arranged, and in fact are not readable. They are bought, glanced at, and thrown away.

"They are full of boastings,—not boastings simply as to their country, their town, or their party,—but of boastings as to themselves. And yet they possess no self-assurance. It is always evident that they neither trust themselves, nor expect to be trusted. . .

"I shall be accused of using very strong language against the newspaper press of America. I can only say that I do not know how to make that language too strong. . .

—Anthony Trollope, in *North America*, published in England in 1862 after a tour of the United States and just republished by Alfred A. Knopf in a new edition edited by Donald Smalley and Bradford Allen Booth.

Suppleness

What we want in the journalist's English training is first a suppleness of writing. . . .

WILLIAM F. SWINDLER, Director,
University of Nebraska, School of Journalism.

Can We Have Any More William Allen Whites?

The Young Reporter Must See a Chance to Do a Real Community Job If He Is to Stay on the Small Paper

by Evan Hill

Is the community newspaper a springboard or a career for young persons headed for a life of journalism?

In the last issue of *Nieman Reports*, Charles T. Duncan of the University of Oregon School of Journalism poses the question and toys with the answer. He calls it one of the great challenges confronting the community newspaper today, and he is right.

Young newspaper hopefuls are being told, "Get some experience on a good weekly or a small daily, and then try for the big time." It's sound advice. Rarely can a man without experience hope to land, or keep, a position on a large metropolitan daily. Yet that's his goal. So he reaps the harvest of various experience thrown at him on the community newspaper, develops himself until he's valuable to his publisher, and then he hits for the big city, leaving his publisher and his community somewhat poorer in his advancement. The paper finds another youngster, eager for experience and training, and the process is repeated. Journalism as a whole is improved, but the community newspaper is continually taking one step forward, and fighting hard not to slip back two.

It seems doubtful that there is a solution to this problem, but perhaps there is a partial answer that might cause some of the most valuable men to stay in Tanktown and Eureka, instead of breaking loose for the bright lights of Big Town.

As Professor Duncan reminds us, the problem revolves around the old song title, "How Ya Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm?" and the answer is simple. It's the application that's difficult. The answer is to make the farm more attractive than the city. Make the reward for working and spending a lifetime on a small community newspaper as great as or greater than that received from the large metropolitan daily.

How is it done? Well, let's see what attracts Joe Novice to the city in the first place. Why does he set as his goal the large daily? We know why he came to Tanktown, but why does he regard it as a stepping stone to bigger things?

Evan Hill was raised on small dailies and weeklies and edited a semi-weekly in New Hampshire. He teaches the courses on weekly papers at Boston University.

The big puddle is always more fascinating, mysterious and active than the smaller one. The migration from rural areas to large urban communities has been going on for generations, and there seems to be little hope of reversing the trend. In the case of Joe Novice, he sees bigger stories, association with newspaper "names," the prestige of being connected with a nationally known newspaper. Even though he never wins a Pulitzer prize or covers a war or a scandal, he will get satisfaction from knowing those who have. The community newspaper cannot compete with such an incentive. Joe is going out to make a name for himself, and he is convinced that he cannot do it in Tanktown.

Then there is the incentive of greater salary. A man wants his income to grow with his increasing skills and abilities, and the community paper is limited in the amount it can pay. As a \$40 a week reporter in Tanktown, Joe can't be happy about the slim possibility of his reaching the city editor's desk in 15 years and taking home \$80 if he's lucky. He knows what reporters are getting in San Francisco, Boston, New York and Chicago for fewer working hours. Almost all community newspaper publishers can increase the salaries of their overworked and underpaid news staffs *some*, but they actually cannot compete with the scales in the larger cities. All they can do is offer a raise, and tell Joe about the advantages of living in a small city or town where living costs are lower and life is sweeter and less hectic. But the small raise does not swell Joe's pay envelope very much, and the sweet talk doesn't buy a marriage license or a bathinette. If the publisher will examine his salary outlay a little more closely when he wants to keep a good man, he might be able to take a little spring out of the board that sends his good men to the big city, but admittedly there must be greater incentive than that.

And there is one. It's one that you can't put your finger on, but it's there nevertheless. At the risk of sounding too idealistic, it is probably fair to say that a good newspaperman, like a minister or a teacher, has a "call." Obviously the young newspaper hopeful does not select newspapering because of its large material reward. Salary scales are just not that large. To some extent he

is fired with a do-gooder's desire to set things right. He wants to watch-dog government, and this includes local as well as federal and state. He often has natural instincts for community leadership. He wants better education, more efficient operation, steady growth and a sensible, informed electorate. Underneath the veneer of cynicism and healthy skepticism, he really thinks that good should triumph and evil be punished. He might not admit it, but generally he feels that way, and it doesn't take much urging for him to work up a righteous indignation about apathy, inefficiency and dishonesty.

Here is one area where a publisher might be able to make the farm as attractive as the city. If a publisher is willing to direct these crusading instincts into the proper channels, he might take more than a little spring out of the board that is flinging potentially good men out of his office.

If the publisher is willing to present an editorial challenge to his news staff, and insists on a better product, he may keep some of these men from heading for the city. For Joe Novice will get satisfaction out of doing a good job. And although satisfaction is not as good as bright lights and \$100 a week, it makes the local lights look a little brighter and the pay check feel a little heavier. Satisfaction is a kind of substitute.

Now that Pulitzer prizes are being offered to weekly newspapers, some weekly reporters are beginning to feel that their area of effort is beginning to be recognized and will not always be treated as a stepchild of journalism. And as more small daily and weekly publishers regard their news staffs as the heart of the paper, rather than an entry on the debit side of the cost accounting ledger, more men will be encouraged to stay. Certainly this is not the answer to the problem, but it can be a start.

The farm will be more attractive as the barnyard is cleaned up a little. When a newsman sees the business side dominate editorial policy, and when he is treated as a country cousin in contrast to the advertising staff, which "after all brings in money, while all you guys do is want to spend it," he is frustrated. And frustrated men do not hang around very long.

When timid publishers with timid minds kill important stories because some company annually buys a double truck and should not be offended, the newsman is left with little incentive and his curiosity is dulled.

It is interesting to note that the community newspapers, both weekly and daily, which are regarded as leading their fields, are papers with fairly stable news staffs. Of course a stable news staff makes for a better paper, but it should be obvious that a better paper is more likely to keep its staff.

And there should be no doubt that the better, more responsible community newspapers have a policy of edi-

torial or news dominance rather than business dominance in questions of judgment.

If a publisher works with the prime motive of the corner grocer—that of making money—and publishes with the premise that the (advertising) customer is always right, it seems doubtful that he can publish a good product. And poor products seldom attract or keep good men.

A publisher does not need expensive equipment, luxurious offices, or unlimited budgets for pictures, exciting typographical layouts, or special reportorial projects. With the equipment at hand he can turn out a good product if he is willing to attract men with the necessary skills, originality, curiosity and energy. But he cannot hope to keep those men so necessary for a good product if he is not willing to accept and use at least some of their ideas and direct their energies into useful news channels.

Almost every American is positive that he can edit and publish his newspaper better than the man at the desk. He knows his judgment is superior and his accuracy is greater. It is wonderful, this attitude, and should never be lost, despite the constant sore it rubs on the professional journalist. As Frank Lloyd Wright, one of America's foremost architects, says, "Anyone can poke a fire and build a house." And the new reporter with ten minutes' experience often feels pretty much the same way about his editor and his publisher.

Often, of course, he is wrong. He is either lacking in experience, or he does not have the big picture. But quite often he is right and knows it. He cannot help resenting interference from the business and circulation departments, the protection of the sons of advertisers, the suppression of news because his story might lose a commercial printing account or an advertising contract.

Many young newspapermen want to stay in the small community. Their roots have gone down there and they do not want to take the tap root from the soil. But if the soil gives them slight financial and moral nourishment, they must transplant themselves.

The challenge is there, and it's an editorial challenge. It's not absolutely necessary for a publisher to have a dirty barnyard to make money. If he is willing to do a little local shoveling, if he is willing to make editorial judgments on news value and not so much on dollar value, he can keep his young newsmen until they ripen into more valuable maturity. And he need not go into receivership in the process.

Otherwise his newspaper will ring with the constant twang of the springboard sending another young, but disillusioned, hopeful to another and larger newspaper with a barnyard that is a little cleaner.

"The Truth About Korea"

by John Davies, Jr.

As a correspondent for the Newark News, John Davies covered the Korean war for four months in daily association with Hal Boyle of the Associated Press and Homer Bigart of the New York Herald Tribune, two of the newspapermen accused by Maj.-Gen. Charles Willoughby of "inaccurate, biased, prejudiced, petulant" coverage of the war.

Headlined in a splash of blood-red across *Cosmopolitan* Magazine's December cover is the announcement:

EXCLUSIVE MacArthur's Intelligence Chief Accuses the Press of Demoralizing Our Fighting Men

The reference is to retired Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby's article, "The Truth About Korea," in which he accuses six American newsmen of aiding and comforting the enemy by "inaccurate, biased, prejudiced, petulant" coverage of the Korean war.

The six are Hal Boyle of the Associated Press, Homer Bigart of the New York *Herald Tribune*, Hanson Baldwin of the New York *Times*, Drew Pearson and Joseph Alsop, columnists, and Christopher Rand, former *Herald Tribune* Far East correspondent. Similarly attacked are *Time*, *Newsweek* and *U. S. News and World Report* magazines.

Willoughby's attack itself appears biased, prejudiced, inaccurate and petulant in its castigation of Boyle and Bigart, with whom I worked in Korea during the nightmarish first four months of the war.

The comments here center on Boyle and Bigart because they, of the six so-called "careless chroniclers," primarily "reported" rather than "interpreted" the war. What Willoughby says of their reportorial work in Korea, according to this reporter's observation, is untrue. Other newsmen who have accompanied Boyle and Bigart on risky frontline missions undoubtedly will confirm this.

Willoughby's contumely introduces Boyle and Bigart with a Hollywood flourish. They are, he writes, "both the rough-and-ready frontline type, recognizable by a cigarette hanging precariously from a corner of the mouth while the straps of the steel helmet are never fastened." Due to working conditions rather than exhibitionism, this description could have been applied from time to time to most of us, including the correspondents of Hearst and Scripps-Howard—pro-MacArthur organizations whom Willoughby praises as "invariably reliable and well-informed."

According to Willoughby, Boyle and Bigart were among the writers who "confused an unhappy public" during the most difficult days in Korea, the initial withdrawal and the Chinese intervention periods of the war.

If the homefront was confused during that gloomy summer when the giant North Korean war machine chewed up the heroic but insufficiently-armed and undermanned 24th Division, GHQ at Tokyo should be blamed. A complacent homeland had anticipated a quick victory as American troops rushed to South Korea from Japan—a homeland which did not realize how woefully lacking in combat preparedness were the occupation forces which had policed Nippon so long.

Dramatic but factual reporting by Boyle, Bigart and other correspondents, Hearst's and Scripps-Howard's included, offset GHQ's often lulling communiques and alerted Americans to the possibility of a Korean catastrophe. Within the ambiguous limitations of self-censorship, the correspondents reported a succession of enemy encirclements and victories, the enemy's advantage in mobile armor, the pingpong-ball-effect of our anti-tank bazookas, the qualitative and numerical inferiority of our howitzers and mortars—facts which the enemy knew and which shocked an American home front.

Difficult days, however, heightened difficult sensitivities at Tokyo GHQ. Criticism of warfront reporting, usually followed by retractions, was frequent. Top brass antipathy toward certain correspondents crystallized, military censorship was invoked, then broadened. In this brittle atmosphere Boyle and Bigart did their jobs as creditably as any other correspondent.

Willoughby is generally critical of alleged belittlement of the Eighth Army and of the disparaging analysis of his Army intelligence job at the time of the Chinese communist intervention. A pattern of defeatist thought was shaped, he writes, which "created an atmosphere of tension, uneasiness and distrust." This was the major cause, he says, of the Truman-MacArthur split.

The Associated Press reported these comments from newsmen Willoughby accused:

Boyle described American intelligence in Korea as "tragically bad," adding that "generalities about 'bias and prejudice' cannot outweigh the hard facts of defeat and the cold statistics of losses."

Bigart cabled from Paris: "General MacArthur and his tight little circle of advisers have never been able to stomach criticism, whether from a war correspondent or the Presi-

dent of the United States. In an attempt to silence criticism, they have adopted the line that anyone who questions their judgment is 'inaccurate, biased, prejudiced and petulant,' and that any criticism of them involves some sort of slur on the whole Army."

Baldwin, who was criticized for going "out of his way to attack the armed forces of America in a widely circulated magazine article," replied that the article had been

written before the Korean war although it was not published until after the war began. He added that Willoughby's article "is as misleading and inaccurate as were some of his intelligence reports."

Also, in part: "... men like Homer Bigart and Hal Boyle, who were frontline correspondents right through the war, knew more of what was going on than General Willoughby, so far as I was able to observe."

The Writing Is Not Good Enough

by Carl Lindstrom

Carl Lindstrom is managing editor of the Hartford Times. This is from his report to the APME meeting in San Francisco as chairman of their Writing Committee

Floyd Taylor used to say: "The major fault of the press is that the writing is not good enough."

There's the theme for your Writing Committee. In the formal report you will find a good deal of praise mixed with the criticism. But here and now, I am going to repeat, with Floyd Taylor, that "the writing is not good enough."

It's an encouraging sign when we begin to disagree. It means that we have begun to think about our problems analytically. We want new leads—and we do not want them. It is our duty to interpret; on the contrary, we must be objective. Explain; but do not explain too much. Some swear by short sentences and short words; others insist that too much sweating down of newspaper style results paradoxically in—excess Flesch!

And so—we are disagreed. Can there be any disagreement about the need of arresting the attention of our readers; about a direct, vivid, dramatic, give'em-the-picture presentation of the news? Yes, I think so, and upon this issue we can perhaps fix a sort of benchmark to measure progress in our writing studies to date.

Here it is: We have learned how to attract the attention of our readers; we have not learned how to engage their attention.

Let's not get hexed by radio and films and television. They are concerned only with attracting audiences. The fare they offer is cotton-candy and barley water. I believe that the audience which is still in our house—they haven't left us yet, but sometimes I wonder why—that our audience expects nourishment; neither bean soup nor pate de foie gras, but a wholesome diet which presupposes neither a strong stomach nor a feeble mind.

The difference between attracting attention and engaging attention is so pointed that I wish I could say I saw it first. I've got to credit it to Clifton Fadiman who once wrote a brilliant piece on "The Decline of Attention". The decline of attention, he said, was a phenomenon first noted by Wil-

liam Wordsworth in 1802 and observed again by William Dean Howells exactly 100 years later.

Here's the burden of Fadiman's argument: Newspapers and magazines, particularly the digests, the pulps, the picture magazines, have these things in common when appealing to the faculty of attention—brevity, superficiality, simplification, planned non-literary English, fear of abstract ideas and emphasis on personalities rather than personality.

Finally he sees an obsession for timeliness with a conscious neglect or an unconscious ignorance of the past.

Fadiman says that this kind of journalism deals with facts of momentary interest but does nothing to stimulate thought and reflection. He attacks the rapid alternation of appeals, known as balance or something-for-everybody. He feels that this business of trying to attract attention instead of engaging attention is the result of making a shibboleth of the word "readable"—that is, presenting material which can be easily read and quickly forgotten.

Technology has had a startling effect upon writing. The written word has been a powerful instrument through several thousand years and it is little short of appalling to see signs all around us that it is in actual danger of being invented out of existence. The telephone was the first invention to give a body blow to the business of writing. In a moment I want to show you what it did to reporting, but it definitely hurt writing in general.

It was left for our own day to discover that Boswell will probably outlive Johnson because Boswell proved to be a better reporter. But I cannot imagine Boswell reporting either the mores of London or the aphorisms of Dr. Johnson by telephone.

As to the other achievements of technology, I gravely doubt that the movies would have greatly promoted the visual education of Henry Adams, that Shakespeare could have telescoped his plays for radio, or that Emerson could have sustained life on the television rights to his Essays.

But let's talk about news writing. I want to make it clear that if anything I say sounds like criticism, this criticism is aimed just as much at member papers as it is at the Associated Press.

No detail of wire technique has been more put upon than the habit of New Leads. If I could avoid talking about it I would do so, but it gets hopelessly tangled up in the writing problem. The element of time is the adhesive with which you organize your story. If you lose control of it, you're in the fly-paper. Bad for you; worse for the reader. The surest way to lose control of the time element is to fall victim to the formula by which the wire services determine what makes a new lead. It is a very simple formula. What happens last is most important.

For the reader, it's like digging for the ruins of ancient Troy. The archaeologist found recent history in the top-most layer of centuries-old rubble. Next most recent history in the second, then the third and so on down to the seventh. The seventh layer is where Dr. Schlieman found the remains of the "topless towers of Ilium," the city of Priam and of the matchless Helen, whose face launched a thousand ships and whose fame was secure until history and San Francisco produced a new lead in the person of Henry J. Kaiser!

Thus we pursue our excavations in Associated Press style! By spinning the clock backwards you get to the causes only after bewildering the reader with the enigma of effects. I see no point in trying to get news to the reader in reverse. That's the result of the disease of the new lead.

This disease of new lead-itis is commonly found in the Second Cycle. It produces in its victim, the reader, such symptoms as dizziness, inattention, confusion and in acute cases, nerve disorders and high temperature. It is seldom fatal—though it has been known to affect the circulation.

We are not satisfied with obituary reporting, or better said obituary writing, because when a man dies there is usually too little reporting done. We make a dive for the morgue, the clip file, the reference library or, at most, we have a talk with the undertaker.

The trouble with most obituaries is that they show signs of rigor mortis before the copy comes out of the typewriter. You seldom read one that brings home the realization that a person has left us. I am not suggesting eulogies. Perhaps explanatory writing is the answer—a selection of facts which explain that the body under discussion was once a human being.

By way of illustration: The name of Constant Lambert may not mean a great deal to us because he was, after all, a specialist, a London critic and composer. The Associated Press report of his death at the age of 45 gave all the vital statistics, and other routine data which might have fitted a college professor or a railroad crossing tender. You might

say that he was laid away in a ready-made suit of verbal grave clothes.

The story didn't suit me and I suggested that the obit editor refer to the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*. I confess that we lifted some of the details found there. Here was one, for example: Lambert was deaf in his right ear, but was fond of saying, "I hear music easily. It is only as far as conversation is concerned that deafness affects me."

From a non-newspaper source, I read a week after the man was buried that Lambert was a "big man physically, with broad shoulders, a fleshy body, and a brow-profile of Churchillian expanse." He was the author of one of the most brilliant books of criticism written in the last 30 years.

I maintain that the seemingly insignificant quotation from Lambert himself and these other little details were brush strokes toward the making of a portrait. In the obit department we need more portraits and fewer cadavers.

I can think of a fairly recent instance in which I had to wait for the weekly news and picture magazines to get perfectly allowable details of a death bed scene of considerable drama and human interest. There are too many things in this world which everybody knows except the newspapers.

Human interest? Yes—there's a pass key which is thought to open all the doors of newspaperdom, and yet I wonder. What is human interest? Why, that's easy—children, dogs, pathos, dramatic coincidence, rescue, grief, joy and so on. Simple enough.

Stop to think about it, many people are afraid of dogs; our interest in children can be terrifically academic or in the case of the neighbor's children, violently prejudicial; pathos is too often spelled with a B and we are frequently mystified that our best efforts produce humor where none was intended.

Further to simplify the simple, I have another quotation. Clarence Dean is the assistant city editor of the *Hartford Times*. He once wrote a paper which he chose to call the Me-Angle. The Me-Angle is Mr. Dean's term for human interest. He argues that nothing interests a human being so much as himself.

He says that "The impulse to create a better world, as well as the impulse to achieve an advantageous place in the automat line, both have their origin in self-interest. What interests people in news—as in religion, morality, food or entertainment—is what concerns themselves. If someone tells you he has a cold, you are politely sympathetic, and that is all. If he tells you he has found a remarkable way to cure a cold, you are interested."

The basic criterion for determining reader appeal is self-interest. Dean wants to call it, for brevity rather than elegance, the Me-Angle.

"In Tibet they grew 10,000,000 bushels of gourds last year—you do not care. But if farmers grew so many potatoes that they are practically giving them away—you are somewhat interested."

The Me-Angle has three stages.

First, personal involvement. There is a strike at a local factory. The workers, management, their families and friends are interested because of personal involvement.

"Secondary involvement concerns the grocers and other merchants because they will sell less goods.

"Third is the vicarious involvement of any who are able to place themselves in the situation of persons affected."

Too many stories are not Me-Angled—that is, Reader-Angled: Human-Angled, if you like.

Your committee is not satisfied with the writing of crime stories; we see room for improvement in sports writing; we divide on the subject of Second Cycle writing. Some of us, particularly your chairman, believe that much so-called interpretive writing explains only the opinions of the writers.

I'll not dwell on these points beyond saying that if there is a single remedy for all of them, that remedy is better reporting.

A couple of months ago I dined at a restaurant in the Berkshires. It was an inn which had once been the private residence of persons of wealth and elegance. Some of the family's original china was still in use. I looked down at the serving plate before me and saw a motto and a crest. The Latin of my school days is pretty well forgotten, but there was enough of it left to translate the motto: *Sed ultra quæro* ("But I inquire further").

That, it seems to me, is the perfect newspaperman's motto. It is the talisman for the reportorial mind.

It is impossible to separate writing from reporting; it is also impossible to separate reporting from observation. News writing, whether you study it for style, clarity, punch or completeness, is only as good as the power of observation which is behind it.

Most acute of the faculties for observation is the power to see. In recent years your reporter has come to depend less upon this most reliable of witnesses in favor of a much less dependable one—the ear. With the invention of the telephone, newspapers had at their service a valuable mechanical aid. But our best servants have a way of taking over. There was a time when nearly every item in everybody's paper was based on a personal meeting, a face to face interview or eye-witness reporting of an event.

This is no longer true. By an actual stock taking, I found that on our paper during a given week exactly half of our local stories were gathered by telephone. What is the difference? How do you observe a twinkle in the eye, the glint of anger, or the reflexive glance of defense

mechanism going into gear? Can you get it over the telephone? Hardly.

You can catch a chuckle over the phone and report it, but you can't read a face. Good and bad writing are often separated by distinction between observation and surmise. I never heard of detectives, in fiction or real life, solving crimes over the telephone. Nor do I think that the Pulitzer Prize has ever gone to a telephone-checked rewrite.

What happens if reporters the country over are getting at least half of their stories by telephone? It is a safe bet that as you move into the metropolitan centers the proportion of telephone reporting is greater. This has a very great deal to do with writing; it has a very great deal to do with AP writing too.

In summary: Can it be, while we are selling 55 million papers a day, that we are actually losing attention? Have we got our audience in the house, but given them no reason to stay and hear our story?

Perhaps we have developed a panic psychosis due to the deterioration of our time sense.

But we have as much time as we make for ourselves; as much time as we successfully dispute our competitors' claims to. We rush to get the paper into the house before the customer turns on TV. Why—because we are afraid we haven't put anything into the paper quite so engrossing as what the television will screen? Are we that scared?

Our reporters save time by telephoning, and so save the reader's time, too—for movies, for book club selections and the picture magazines.

A man is dead a long time. And yesterday's paper is as dead as he is? O no, it isn't. That obituary is clipped and mailed and saved in quarters of the globe where you never imagined that you had circulation. There is time to do the last story right.

Can it be that we put a new lead on a story because we're afraid that the reader won't get to Paragraph Three, or the middle of the story, or the end of it? Having destroyed our own time sense, we destroy the reader's too—and he has no time for us!

In conclusion: The art of news writing—and it is an art—is running a desperate race with the fascinating tools of science and the mesmerizing toys of entertainment. But it is my considered belief that today's best writing is being done in news rooms. That is not because of a sudden flowering of the art of news writing, but rather by default. Nobody happens to be doing any better writing today than the American reporter.

I am not really pessimistic, but from this low-down perspective I get a magnificent sense of the importance of writing—of news writing—and if we are really the last of the arrow makers, let's point our flints with keen words, true words, lean, hard words that fly swiftly to the mark.

NO ONE WAY TO EDUCATE NEWSPAPERMEN

Variety, Not Standardization, Held Desirable for Journalism Schools

by A. L. Higginbotham

A survey of the newspapers of the United States will reveal a journalistic variety to match the nation's variety in topography, climate and mores.

Some are large, some are small. Some appeal to the local folk, others to the residents of large areas. Some are published in cities, others in the country. Some are given over largely to entertainment, others chiefly to the substantial fare of public affairs. Some appeal to economic, political, social or religious groups; others are published for the public at large. Some have large staffs and are meticulously edited; others are marked by the roughness which comes from hasty reporting and editing.

This is natural and to be expected in a free society.

There is room in the United States for any newspaper which has sufficient appeal to draw and hold a list of subscribers, provided it serves the public interest.

It is natural, therefore, that education for journalism should show a similar variation in nature, organization and method.

This has not always been so. For many years, the pattern of journalism education was the same or similar, wherever found. The schools and departments, no matter what their environment, largely imitated each other. In that comparatively pioneer state, the practice probably was a good thing. Education for journalism was fighting its way up, and what one institution did was a good argument for doing it elsewhere.

In more recent years, with journalism generally accepted as a college subject, both by educators and by working newspapermen, there has been a tendency for some schools to strike out a bit more for themselves.

Local problems of education for the field were approached in a more individual way, with less reliance on the traditional and conventional approach. New ideas in methods of teaching were developed. Different subject matter was introduced as germane to the teaching of journalism, and, perhaps, essential to it. Research was undertaken.

In fact some of the newer schools, abandoning the experience of their fellows, struck out along entirely new paths. Disregarding, or even denying the validity of the traditional approach, they became frankly experimental.

The result is that in America today a prospective student of journalism can find somewhere a university or college which will offer about any type of journalism education he might have in mind.

As in the journalism of the country, there is variety, and plenty of it.

Now, if sound standards of scholarship are maintained in these many and varied approaches, that is all to the good.

For there is no one way for a young man or young woman to educate himself for the practice of journalism. There are not only as many ways as there are schools; there are as many approaches as individual teachers and as individual students.

In some professional fields, this variety of education is not possible. In them, the state has set up certain standards which must be met for practice of these vocations.

The prospective physician must attend a school which offers work of a type which will enable him to pass the state medical examinations. If he fails these, he is a doctor in name only.

Now, the basic criteria of medicine are generally the same in the various states. Since this is the case, the schools of medicine are much the same.

The principle holds true also for law, dentistry, engineering, accountancy and other similar professions.

All of these, however, are of a scientific nature. Achievement in them is, generally, fairly readily measurable by mathematical means.

In journalism, however, there are no such criteria. No state has yet set up examinations for the licensing of newspapermen, and none will as long as the first amendment to the federal constitution and similar declaration of rights in state fundamental law remain in effect.

For the criteria which govern professional work in the field of journalism are not susceptible to scientific measurement. They are intangible. They involve understanding, skill in expression, imagination, interest in public affairs, devotion to the public welfare. None of these can be measured as can the requirements of medicine, law or engineering. Journalism is not an exact science, and never will be.

It is, therefore, normal, natural and right that the journalism schools of the nation should vary and vary widely. There is no one avenue to education for journalism, just as there is no one formula for successful newspapering.

Prof. Higginbotham is chairman of the Department of Journalism, University of Nevada, and chairman of the American Society of Journalism School Administrators' committee on standards of education for journalism.

"THROW GIRL IN RIVER"

Headlines: Their Use and Abuse

by Keen Rafferty

Headlines cause most of the libel suits, most of the criticism and most of the conversation about newspapers. Keen Rafferty wrote a lot of headlines in his ten years as head of the copy desk on the Baltimore Evening Sun. Now as head of the Journalism Department at the University of New Mexico he finds he needs to state rules for the writing of headlines and he has had to write the rulebook himself. This is it.

One of the best ways to start an argument among newspapermen is to say that such-and-such, such-and-such, and such-and-such must be done in writing headlines. There is so wide a variation among newspapers in standards and practices that, on almost any rule, some disagreement is conceivable or even to be expected.

There are good newspapers which use no capitals in heads except at the beginning of first lines and on proper nouns. There are newspapers which have no standard for line lengths except a maximum count, and there are poor newspapers which split verb phrases, and even split words. Some papers begin headlines with plural verbs and others always omit the articles *a* and *the*, and omit forms of the verb *to be* even when illiteracy results.

Nevertheless, there are "rules," most of which are basic, and certainly none of which is capricious. Their mastery does not come from a single reading, or from many readings. It comes only from full awareness of and understanding of every rule, plus a great deal of practice in applying the rules in actual heads, written on actual stories. Every beginner should comprehend these rules, even if some of them seem trivial; and many a veteran can profit by them.

Here is an effort at stating rules, with discussion.

1. Tell the news in the head at once, specifically. Avoid all generalities.

The headline should seize unerringly on the meat of the story. Usually this main item of information lies plainly in the lead of the story, but the headline should avoid verbatim repetition of the lead.

State the news, but state it, at least to some extent, in your own words, if you can.

If there are figures, use them. It is much better to say 45,000-ton Battleship Sinks than Huge Battleship Sinks. Where huge means nothing, 45,000-ton means much. If people have been killed, say so, and tell how many. If a man has been elected, say so, and give the figures.

Generalities are the refuge of the lazy and incompetent

copyreader. They are the easy things to state in headlines, and they are also the least informative.

2. Write caps and lower case heads as you would titles of books or magazine articles: begin each word with a capital, except conjunctions, prepositions and articles. Begin every line of each head with a capital letter.

This seems like a simple enough rule, but here again there is deviation, since many papers capitalize any word of more than five letters. Do not capitalize the *to* in an infinitive unless it is at the beginning of a line.

3. If in a two-line head one line is shorter than the other, then it should be the second line. If the lines of a three-line head are of uneven length, then the top line should be the longest and bottom line the shortest.

This is one of the rules than can provoke argument. Where the most meticulous newspapers insist that all lines of headlines be of the same length, the great majority are satisfied with heads which are sometimes ragged on the right. They argue that such a head tells the story just as well and that its white space is pleasing to the eye. The fact remains that order and consistency are essential in newspaper headlines. Permission to step a head in from the right is really a compromise with the best practice, which requires flush-right lines, achieved by careful counts and letter-spacing.

4. Never split a verb phrase from the end of one line to the start of the next.

Example:

**President Will
Talk in Boston**

5. Never split a word on a syllable.

This rule is so obvious that it needs no comment. The hyphen may not be used on the end of a line in a main deck.

6. Never end the top line of a head with a conjunction, a preposition, any form of the verb *to be*, or an article.

This is one of the most important of all the rules, since it is one of the most frequently violated, and one of the easiest

to violate. Among the words that may not ordinarily be used at the end of a first line are if, and, for, over, to, is, are, the.

(There is a subsidiary rule that an effort should be made to write heads in which each line is a unit, that is, a sentence or a phrase or a word or a name.)

Presence of the above words, at the end of a first line particularly, destroys that line as a unit and confuses the reader. It makes it harder for him to understand the head, whereas it is the copy-editor's job to make it easy. This is what is to be avoided:

\$160,000 Fund for Charities Sought

It should be said that many good desks permit such words as *for* and *over* at the end of a line if they are part of an adjectival phrase, as:

\$16,000 Asked For, Campaign Going Over, Head of Drive Says Head of Drive Says

7. Never begin a head with a plural verb.

What comes out is a line like *Throw Girl in River*. This sounds like a command to toss some poor innocent into the stream, whereas what is meant is that some other persons did the dirty deed. Its ambiguity is so apparent that it would seem that no desk would countenance the practice, and yet this very head appeared as a banner in one of the nation's biggest, if not best, daily papers.

Corollary with this rule is a permission granted by most papers that a head may begin with a singular verb, as *Throws Girl in River*, since here the proper subject is better understood. If a head is begun with a singular verb, however, and if the head has a bank, then that bank should begin with the subject of the verb.

Thus you might get something like this, usually acceptable (except that it represents a possibly unfair approach to a serious matter):

Throws Girl in River Uncle Confesses

8. *Is, was*, and other forms of the verb to be may not be omitted from headlines if they follow the word *says* in the same sentence, or if they follow any of the synonyms for *says* except declares.

This is a simplification of an important rule. It is by all odds the most difficult of all the rules to understand and to put into practice. Even experienced desk-men sometimes do not comprehend the rule—and do not practice it. Here is an example of what may not be done:

Greece Asserts Bandits Killed

Were the bandits killed, or did *they* kill someone?

Garst and Bernstein have discussed this error elaborately.*

They say:

... Parts of the verb "to be," when used as auxiliaries in the passive voice, may be omitted. The headline may say either "Banker Is Hurt" or "Banker Hurt."

While parts of "to be" may always be omitted in the instance just mentioned, there are other cases in which they definitely must not be omitted. Let us consider as illustrations two head lines that phrase an identical thought in two different ways:

Robinson Asserts Country Sound, Country Sound Robinson Asserts

An experienced copy editor recognizes instantly that the head on the left is wrong while that on the right is correct, but if asked to explain why he will probably reply that—well—it's just a question of the sound of the thing. This answer is correct so far as it goes; the head on the left does sound wrong. But that is not an adequate explanation.

The verb "assert" and many others like it normally are followed by the objective case: we assert *a fact*, we say *something*. The ear trained to English therefore expects the noun following these verbs to be in the objective case. But in the headline under consideration, the noun "country" is not in the objective case, but in the nominative case; it is the subject of a clause "that the country is sound," which clause itself is the object of "asserts." We must therefore indicate that the noun is not in the case normally to be expected. How shall we do it? If we use the conjunction "that," we run counter to an unfortunate circumstance because the conjunction may be mistaken for a definite article. There is only one way: by using the verb of the clause—"is." The head therefore should read:

Robinson Asserts Country Is Sound

How about the other head cited, "Country Sound, Robinson Asserts"; why is that correct? The answer is simple. In English the first noun mentioned in a sentence is, virtually without exception, in the nominative case. Reading this head, then, we would normally expect "country" to be in the nominative case, which it is, and therefore no further indication is necessary.

Omission of this vital verb "to be" may sometimes lead to ambiguity. Here is an instance:

Physician Says President Well

If "president" were taken to be in the objective case—the logical assumption—then the head would mean that the physician was a capable elocutionist. The real objection to omission of the verb, however, is not based on the possibility of such an ambiguity, but rather on the awkwardness of the situation as explained before.

These perceptive New York *Times* men lay down the rule in an inclusive form as follows:

A part of the verb "to be" may not be omitted in a headline when it constitutes the principal verb in a clause.

The rule does not apply, of course, when the clause begins the sentence.

Difficulty over *to be* comes in clauses following such verbs as *say, deny, assert, allege, contend, maintain, affirm*. Garst and Bernstein point out that the word *declare*, while a synonym for *say*, has another meaning commonly employed in headlines, which makes the following head correct:

Jones Declares Country Sound

Here, they explain, *declares* is not synonymous with *says* but is used in the sense of *pronounces*, so that *country* "is in the objective case in accordance with our normal expectation."

Told is a word to watch. In the following example, the *are* may be omitted from the first line, but the *is* may not be omitted from the second line, because *is* is the principal verb in a clause which does not begin the total head-sentence:

Las Vegans Told New Blast Near

If the head's lines were reversed, to read New Blast Near, Las Vegans Told, it would be correct in construction, and the same applies to this one:

Chamber Is Told Tax Outlook Bad

The *is* may not be omitted in the second line, but may be in the first, if the space is needed.

Sometimes substitution of the word *sees* will give a good head. Governor Says China Losing is incorrectly done, but Governor Sees China Losing is all right. In the second example, "China Losing" is a phrase, not a clause; *China* is the object of *sees*. In the first example, *China* is the subject of the clause "China Losing," and hence cannot be an object. The *is* there cannot be omitted unless by inversion the head is written China Losing, Governor Says, which makes it acceptable.

Besides *sees*, *calls* is also a handy word at times. Jones Says Smith Liar is incorrect, but Jones Calls Smith Liar changes the construction and creates an adequate head—if it will fit. The danger in words like these is that they will come to be over-used.

Sometimes the *to be* itself must not be omitted. Here is a head representing a sad practice:

Rock Lake Highway Said Hazardous

What is it that is said? Obviously it must be "to be hazardous"; the *to be* may not be left out. But if *reported*

is substituted for *said*, a head is obtained, providing a fit can be found. This would do it:

Rock Lake Highway Reported Perilous

Reported, like *declared*, has another meaning common in headlines, and the *to be* may be omitted.

One more example of a head made awkward and amateurish by omission of a form of the verb *to be*:

One Killed, Six Injured When Brunswick Hotel Razed in Morning Blaze

The head is awkward, to put it mildly, when the *is* is omitted before razed.

9. *Is, was, are*, and other forms of the verb *to be* do not have to be omitted from any head except, where permissible, to save space. Neither do *and, a* and *the* have to be omitted.

Omission of these words is so common a practice because of space limitations that many headline writers have come by habit to assume that there is something wrong in using them. This is not the case. *Is, the* and *and* are just as good words in headlines as in any other kind of written English, and their more frequent use might keep the copy-editor away from the head-line-ese that can become so dangerous to the freshness of his work.

Omission of *and* is a commonly accepted practice but it can lead to serious ambiguities and incongruities. Every head from which *and* is omitted should be re-read for sense.

Of course these words usually are omitted from the sheer necessities of space, and that is a very good reason. The headline writer would be foolish to try to squeeze them in when a head without them can be grammatical and clear. If there is room, though, why not use them?

There are in fact cases where *a* must be used. Sales Tax Is Basic Way to Solvency means something different from Sales Tax is a Basic Way to Solvency. There is a difference between these two headlines:

Hunter Takes Game Hunter Takes a Game

If the second means a Hunter College team won a volley-ball contest, the first could mean something entirely different.

Some copy-editors will argue that use of *the, a, and* slows up headlines, makes them less newsy or makes them sound less like heads. It is true that even the most sedate desks tend to avoid these words in banners, which in large type are nearly always crowded. Nevertheless, much of the omission of the words in question is from habit; it is illogical and does not add to a head's newswiness so long as the facts and the space are there.

10. The major marks of punctuation are the comma and the semi-colon.

Beginners have difficulty in realizing that the end of a line in a head does not mean the end of a sentence or a clause unless punctuation so indicates. But in the main decks of a head, periods are not used in the top deck at the end of a sentence; semi-colons take their place. Some papers do permit use of the period to close sentences in inverted-pyramid secondary banks of a head.

Dashes and colons have headline value but should be used sparingly. Dashes in top decks particularly make hard reading. A common practice which is bad is the use of a dash after a quotation and before a man's name to attribute the quotation to him. Everyone has seen heads like UN to Bring Peace—Johnson. Again this is a lazy way of doing a hard job and papers with the highest standards frown on or prohibit it.

Another common practice is to use single quotation marks on quoted matter in headlines. The practice arose in an effort to save space. If the space is there many papers require that the regulation double-quotes be used. However, a justification of use of single quotes lies in a line which begins with quotes. In such a head, an appearance of indentation of the line can be partially avoided if single quotes are used. In the following examples, note the difference:

**"Damn the Newspapers,
We Love 'Em," They Say**

**'Damn the Newspapers,
We Love 'Em,' They Say**

Periods are used in heads in abbreviations like U. S., or Rockford, Ill. Most papers now waive use of periods in abbreviations of universally known agencies or organizations like UN or AEC. Meanings remain clear and space is saved. Periods must be used in "U.S." or it will read *us*.

11. Avoid the word *today* in heads unless the reference is to something yet to happen today.

Do not say John J. Jones Dies Today. The present-tense *dies* means today in a daily paper. *Today* may be used, however, in such a morning-paper head as Council Meets Today to Award Paving Contracts. Many weeklies use *today* more freely in headlines because it has meaning in a paper coming out only once a week.

Yesterday should be avoided in a present-tense head: Regents Approve Tuition Increase Yesterday, jumbles tenses. Since the head should by practice be in the present tense, *yesterday* must be omitted. Present-tense heads may include *tomorrow*, however: Regents Act on Tuition Increase Tomorrow would be all right if *to act* could not be used for space reasons.

12. Do not repeat any word in any of the successive decks of a headline except minor ones like articles and conjunctions.

Do not say \$60,000 Fire Wrecks Store; Fire Starts in Basement. Use synonyms like *flames* or *blaze*.

13. Do not pad heads to fill out lines.

If the lines are short try adding a new fact rather than rewording the old lines to fill. This is a very general rule. Frequently a longer synonym for a short word will fill a line—and improve it. Use of *the* or *is* where there is space is not padding.

14. Avoid headline abbreviations not permitted by your paper's style sheet.

Do not abbreviate such words as *department*, *company*, *Maine*, *Territory of Hawaii* when they stand alone in heads. Most papers permit "Bangor, Me," but not "Me." without the name of a town preceding it. Some permit "Treasury Dep't.," but never use "Dep't." alone.

Do not use alphabet abbreviations for organizations unless they are known to nearly all your readers. IFC might be clear in a headline in a college newspaper where it would mean nothing in a paper of general circulation.

15. Avoid quotation marks except on quotations, or on words used peculiarly.

In a head like "Injured" Man Is Just Inebriated, quotes are properly used on *injured* to indicate that the word is not used literally. Some headline writers overuse quotation marks to indicate puns or other attempts at somewhat shallow humor. If a pun is clear enough to use, it should be clear enough to be understood without the help of quotes. In the following head the quotes are a condescension to the reader:

**"Dog"-days Do Him No Good,
Pooch Tells Weatherman**

*Robert E. Garst and Theodore Menline Bernstein, *Headlines and Deadlines*, Columbia University Press, 1933. Pp. 146-148.

Letters

Childish Review

To the Editor:

The ill-tempered review of Scripp's *Damned Old Crank* is really unworthy of your usually informative and useful publication. It isn't a great book, but to say that it "answers no questions about anything" is simply childish. It answers a lot of questions about Scripps, concerning whom (I and no doubt others) have been curious at least since Steffens's *Autobiography*. And it throws a great deal of light on capitalist society. Chapter 2, for instance, contains precious evidence on the psychology of the lower middle class, especially its dread of falling into the lower class. Don't you think you owe your readers an apology and maybe even a somewhat better-balanced review?

Paul Sweezy
Wilton, N. H.

Farquharson's Talk

I am hoping that you will reprint Mr. R. A. Farquharson's talk before the Nieman Fellows which sounds as if it were interesting and important, as reported in the *New York Times* of December 1st.

May I add that I read the *Nieman Reports* with the greatest of interest. It seems to be the most valuable publication dealing with newspapers that I know.

ROBERT D. LEIGH,
Russel Sage Foundation.

Nieman dinner talks are off record unless, as in this instance, a speaker chooses to release his remarks. [Ed.]

Influx of Journalists

To the Editor:

I hope you still have a copy of the October *Nieman Reports*, as mine did not get here.

Gene Cervi called me 10 days ago and said he was happy to see you had reprinted that piece of his. I think you are doing a job with the quarterly that no one has ever done for American journalism.

It has been my pleasure recently to entertain visiting journalists on various occasions. They have come from Germany, India, England, Finland, etc. This sort of thing is not new to Cambridge, but we have never had such an influx before and we welcome the exchange of ideas.

Houstoun Waring, Editor,
Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*

What a Cartoon Can't Do

Louis Lyons, in his review of Mike Berger's book in the *Nieman Reports*, speaks of the *Times*' "inexplicable taboo of cartoons," or similar words. Next time you see him tell him that when Mr. Ochs once was asked about the taboo he said: "A cartoon can't say 'Yes, but—'." An editorial, of course, can.

Arthur Krock
Washington, D. C.

Best Investment

To the Editor:

Please renew my *Nieman Reports* subscription for 1951-52.

I feel this is one of the best investments a journalist can make. You're doing a great job—keep it up.

Curt W. Hibbard, Jr.
City Hall Reporter
Dubuque (Ia.) *Telegraph-Herald*

Cart Before Horse

To the Editor:

James S. Pope has annoyed me for some time since I have felt that in his attack on the "cult of secrecy" he was putting the cart before the horse.

I hope that I have not done him an injustice. I know that he does not propose a law to remedy an undesirable situation, but I can not help feeling that writings such as his lead eventually to a half-baked legislative remedy.

May I say that as a reporter and news editor of many years and as an editorial writer of a few months standing I find *Nieman Reports* extremely stimulating.

Theodore Long
Salt Lake *Tribune*
Salt Lake City 10, Utah

On Suppression of News

To the Editor:

My hunch (not based on experience or a factual analysis, if the latter is possible) is that the fault on Governmental suppression of news lies more with the press than with the Government. Too many decent Government officials have been burned too often by irresponsible reporting, with the result that the best of them figure the safest course is to say nothing. I scarcely blame them. Perhaps if the press spent more time making its reporters responsible

—or, more important, recognizing responsible reporting from irresponsible by "getting managing editors out of the second grade"—it wouldn't have to spend so much time carping at the Government.

Edwin L. Dale, Jr.
Silver Spring, Md.

Commendation

May I add my whole-hearted commendation for the work the foundation is doing with the quarterly *Nieman Reports*. It is a source of pride, as well as of personal benefit, that journalism has so outstanding a journal. I find much solid information in *Journalism Quarterly*, and I'm enthusiastic about the great improvement in *The Quill*; but neither of those publications could do the job the *Reports* does. At least, neither does the job now, and their tone and objectives seem to preclude the chance. No regular addition to my library do I rate as high as *Nieman Reports*.

As for the other work of the foundation—the material you sent me speaks for itself.

John F. Valleau
2298-2 Patterson Drive
Eugene, Oregon

A Fine Thing

To the Editor:

This acknowledges receipt of your recent note advising that my subscription to the quarterly *Nieman Reports* expired with the July 1951 issue.

Thank you for calling this to my attention. I do indeed wish to continue my subscription to the *Reports*. On October 30, before receiving your notice, I forwarded my check in amount of \$4.00, requesting that my subscription be extended for another two years, as I had just remembered that my previous two-year subscription to *Nieman Reports* was about due for renewing. The new issue which you sent to me was the reminder, and I sincerely appreciate your kindness in this regard.

The Society of Nieman Fellows is doing a very fine thing in improving the standards of journalism, and I wish for the Society great success.

F. L. Mays
1808 Petroleum Bldg.
Houston 2, Texas

Misconceptions About Journalism Schools

To the Editor:

The opinions of twelve of last year's Nieman Fellows on education for journalism, as reported in your October issue, were surely of great interest to journalism teachers. It is encouraging to know that most of these newspapermen feel that college journalism courses have some value.

But what is one to think of the opinions of the two or three former Nieman Fellows who, to judge by their remarks, have no conception of what goes on in a good school of journalism? College journalism teachers, most of whom know their way around a newspaper office, are accustomed to the amazing misconceptions some newspapermen still have of their work; but they expect more informed judgments from Nieman Fellows.

For example, Angus Thuermer, of the Chicago AP Bureau, says that he weeps "to think of all the broad courses that could be taken in place of copyreading."

Mr. Thuermer may as well dry his tears. He could easily have found out, by a bit of investigation, that the typical accredited school of journalism requires exactly *one* course in copyreading (although it may offer an advanced course as an elective).

Mr. Thuermer also says that when the beginner comes into a newspaper office he will learn to write news style and headlines "under a good city editor."

That may well be true for the unusually gifted beginner, especially the one who is related to the paper's publisher. But how are the others to get their start? If Mr. Thuermer had a try at teaching first year journalism students, he might realize that not all of them can quite learn "how to write news stories" in a "couple of weeks." And that, despite the fact the journalism teachers perhaps have as much patience as city editors.

Why not give the beginner of average ability the head start of getting some advanced practice before being exposed to the big leagues? It may be true that students who need such training may not often be of the calibre that will make the Chicago AP Bureau, but at least some of them, if carefully trained, may eventually get a chance to do a creditable job in

some other phase of their chosen profession.

Another of the former Nieman Fellows, Hoke M. Norris, of the Winston-Salem *Journal*, observes that he "certainly wouldn't devote an entire four-year college course to journalism."

Well, who in the world would—or does? Where did that idea that journalism students take nothing but journalism ever come from? And why that common misconception among newspapermen that the student who majors in journalism has no time to get a much-desired liberal arts background?

At the majority of accredited schools and departments of journalism, the journalism student *is* a liberal arts student as well. Here at Penn State, for example, journalism is a curriculum within the School of the Liberal Arts. Students in the curriculum receive a minimum of 32 credits or a *maximum* of 38 credits, of the 132 required for their degree, from journalism courses. These students fulfill every requirement that other liberal arts students fulfill. And besides, their courses in journalism help give their general education a direction and purpose that some straight liberal arts majors may lack.

Most people connected with education for journalism heartily approve the liberal arts background for journalism majors. And they generally agree that there is no substitute for learning on the job. But they do not see why the offering of professional journalism courses should be considered inconsistent with those beliefs. They feel that college journalism courses can help bridge the gap between academic studies and professional work.

Robert M. Pockrass
State College, Pa.

Lasting Value

To the Editor:

Enclosed is a check for a dollar for the last issue of the Nieman Reports and for the copy of a year and a half ago which was so comprehensive and of such lasting value.

David W. Howe
Business Manager
Burlington (Vt.) *Free Press*

C. P. Story Was Not A Rumor

To the Editor:

We have seen in *Nieman Reports*, October, 1951, the text of R. A. Farquharson's talk to an Editorial Department Study Group on the Toronto *Globe and Mail*.

In dealing with the rumor story, Mr. Farquharson cites a Canadian Press story from United Nations, N. Y., "reporting diplomatic excitement over a formula for ending the Korean war." The story he refers to was carried by the Canadian Press last May 20 and we should like to make a few observations about it.

The story was written by Norman Altstedter, who has covered the United Nations from our New York Bureau and now is covering the U.N. General Assembly in Paris. It quoted informed sources as saying that Russia had indicated privately in western diplomatic circles that she was anxious to end the Korean war.

Altstedter picked up his information May 19 while having a purely social evening with some of his U. N. contacts. He double-checked his information with another source and on the following day wrote his story, backgrounding it with the Russian newspaper treatment of Senator Edwin Johnson's proposed U. S. Senate resolution asking the U. N. to call for an armistice and with Gen. Matthew Ridgway's report to the U.N. released May 19.

Subsequently, Jacob Malik, the chief Soviet delegate to the U. N., made his now-famous June 23 speech, and talks which may lead to a Korean armistice have been under way, off and on, since early October.

The story followed a flood of speculative stories from Europe but, to our knowledge, the article was the first out of the U. N. to indicate the course which Russia would adopt.

Altstedter's sources must remain confidential but the story was not in any sense a "rumor story." Nowhere did the story use the word "rumor" and there was no attempt to convince the reader that "peace was in sight," as Mr. Farquharson has suggested. Nor did it mention "diplomatic excitement."

Mr. Farquharson has also used the

phrase "gossip session" disparagingly. But, as Altstedter has pointed out, the gossip session is recognized as one of the most fruitful sources of diplomatic news.

I am attaching a copy of the story which Mr. Farquharson made the subject of his remarks.

Gillis Purcell
General Manager
The Canadian Press

[The C.P. story follows.]

By
NORMAN ALTSTEDTER
Canadian Press Staff Writer

United Nations, N. Y., May 20—(CP)—Informed western sources said today Russia has indicated privately in western diplomatic circles that she is anxious now to end the Korean war.

And the United States now would back peace terms which left North Korea and South Korea as they were constituted before the North Korean attack last June 25, these sources added.

Diplomats seeking possibilities of a negotiated end to the conflict viewed these present attitudes of the U.S. and Russia against the background of these developments:

1. The Indian delegation here was sounding out other missions on the possibility of getting both sides to agree not to cross the 38th parallel again. The parallel was the dividing line between North and South Korea before the Communists attacked.

2. Russian newspapers gave great prominence at the week-end to Senator Edwin Johnson's proposed resolution in the U.S. Senate asking the U.N. to call upon both sides to declare an effective armistice along the 38th parallel June 25. Western diplomats in Moscow wondered if this indicated Russia might support such a proposal.

3. The U.N. Unified Command—in effect the U. S. government—released Saturday the first regular report to the U.N. of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.N. commander in Korea. In the report he said his command is emphasizing constantly to soldiers and civilians in Korea the U.N.'s desire to arrange a peaceful settlement of the war.

The Indian delegation was emphasizing in its talks with other delegates that Ridg-

way said March 12 that attainment of the 38th parallel would be a great victory for U. N. forces.

The Russian hints that she would like to see the Korean war ended were said to have been made to western European diplomats. The U.S. delegation said there have been no approaches to the U. S. mission here which could be interpreted as "peace overtures."

Some western diplomats expressed be-

Nieman Scrapbook

Why People Like to Live in Boston

There's a law office in downtown Boston so old and rich and respectable that none of its activities ever finds its way into the papers. The net effect of its operation is thus almost furtive. Even so, its members are uninhibited individualists and the senior partner sounds to me like a thoroughly one-of-a-kind sort of senior partner.

"I had to call on this man the other day," a friend of mine—banker—told me. "He had a more or less ordinary looking office, a bit cluttered. I don't know his age but he is fairly well along. We began talking over our business. Everything normal. Things progressed quietly. One point after another was settled. But it became necessary to send for a document.

"The senior partner raised his voice and called for Miss Jones, or whatever his secretary's name was. Nothing happened. He waited about ten seconds, then opened his desk drawer and took out a small brass bugle. It was about the same bugle that you'd find in a Boy Scout troop—nothing fancy—just a good stout bugle on which a bugler could undoubtedly blow anything from Reveille to Boots and Saddles. I judge that the senior partner did not go in for anything like that, for he simply raised the bugle to his lips and blew a single penetrating blast. He put the bugle back into the drawer and we resumed talking. No mention was made of the bugle by either of us.

"Within a very few seconds indeed the door opened and in came not Miss Jones, but Miss Smith. It appeared that Miss Jones was out to lunch, and so it was Miss

Smith who went off and got the document for us."

The present U. S. attitude was seen as a modification of previous aims which sought unification of North and South Korea.

Smith who went off and got the document for us."

The bugle, my friend learned by discreet inquiry downtown, is simply the next step whenever Miss Jones fails to answer the first spoken summons. He said the general opinion was that it's a good idea: always gets fast action and saves a great deal of futile button-pushing and telephone explanations.—Charles W. Morton, *The Atlantic Bulletin*, Dec., 1951.

Gobbledygook

Paul R. Porter, acting United States special representative in Europe for ECA, would banish government gobbledygook.

"The worst writing of English today is surely produced in the United States Government," sputtered the exasperated ECA chief in an "unclassified memorandum" to all employees.

Some of his pet aversions are words and phrases like "ratiocination," "dichotomy," "conceptual," "implementation," "built-in inflation," and "disincentive."

Washington reporters could add a number of others. For a while almost every government release referred to the need for "firming up" this or that. One of the latest pet words of government writers is "slippages." Instead of saying there is a lag in or a loss in production, speech writers are now referring to "slippages."

Mr. Porter finds that the "internal papers used in making decisions are often more clumsy, obscure and long-winded than the writing found in university social science departments and law schools, whence comes much of the present-day corruption in style."—Josephine Ripley, *Christian Science Monitor*.

Yalu Disaster: Inside Story of UN Front Commanders in the Dark

by Gordon Walker

Mr. Walker served for nine years as Chief Far Eastern correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. He was attached to General MacArthur's command during both the Pacific campaign and in Tokyo.

*Assistant Foreign Editor of
The Christian Science Monitor*

*Copyright, 1951, by
The Christian Science Publishing Society*

The dramatic story of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's last unsuccessful attempt to bring a quick end to the war in Korea can now be at least partially unveiled.

Until now, war correspondents in Korea voluntarily have withheld details of the disastrous push to the Yalu River in late November, 1950.

This was due partly to censorship regulations. But it was due more to the fact that few newsmen who were in North Korea at the time were willing to write anything which might detract from the almost unbelievable individual heroism of field officers and men who—operating virtually in the dark as far as intelligence is concerned—nevertheless managed to improvise and avert what readily could have been a military debacle.

Set Off by Willoughby

Now, however, the Yalu River offensive has come back into the news as a result of charges by General MacArthur's top intelligence officer, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby that war correspondents reported the operation erroneously.

General Willoughby, in general, claims that "inaccurate reporting" of newsmen in Korea was a major cause of the split between President Truman and General MacArthur.

Specifically, General Willoughby declares that, contrary to some criticisms, he was fully aware of the fact of Chinese Communist intervention in Korea at that time, and of the huge extent of the enemy's buildup south of the Yalu River.

Information Held Back?

This declaration by General Willoughby appears to hold particular significance. At the time of the Chongchon River offensive, there was what appeared to most observers to be a concerted effort on the part of intelligence headquarters at Tokyo to make it seem that the enemy buildup was not extensive.

There is strong evidence, in other words, that General MacArthur's staff withheld its own intelligence information on the Chinese intervention not only from newsmen in Tokyo, but even from the President and from front-line corps and division commanders.

The reason for this have never been explored fully, at least within range of the public ear and eye.

Began on Wake Island

The effects, however, are obvious today.

The offensive was launched without adequate preparation.

Front-line commanders ordered their troops into battle without prior knowledge that they faced overwhelming odds—odds which in most cases were as high as three or four to one.

And General MacArthur—at least to some extent because of this situation—was himself relieved of his command.

The full story actually began in mid-October when General MacArthur journeyed to Wake Island and there told President Truman that in his opinion there was "very little chance of Chinese intervention in Korea." This now is a matter of public record.

The overwhelming bulk of evidence available to newsmen at headquarters in Tokyo, however, shows conclusively that

General MacArthur at this time was fully aware that a Chinese expeditionary force of major proportions already had moved across the Yalu River into Korea—probably beginning in mid-September.

This information, incidentally, came from Chinese Nationalist quarters in Taipei, Formosa, from British intelligence sources in Hong Kong, and finally from Koreans who were parachuted along the Yalu River and who walked back down through the enemy lines to bring information into Allied headquarters.

The presumption is that General MacArthur believed that this Chinese force could be "bluffed" out of full-scale intervention by a major United Nations thrust; believed that the Chinese Communists could be placated by a deal with them over the vital hydroelectric power dams along the western end of the Yalu River.

Undoubtedly, General MacArthur felt that if Washington were fully aware of the extent of Chinese intervention, it might veto his own plan for an offensive toward the Yalu and refer the entire matter back to the United Nations General Assembly.

A precedent for such autonomous action can be seen in General MacArthur's overriding the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in pushing through his own plan for an amphibious landing at Inchon in September—a highly dangerous but highly successful undertaking.

First accounts of Chinese Communist intervention, meanwhile, actually had reached Tokyo in mid-September.

War correspondents in Tokyo who sought to establish the facts, however, were officially discouraged by headquarters from writing about it.

A correspondent of this newspaper, for instance, pointed out at one briefing that he personally had spoken to Chinese prisoners in their own language, and they had told him of their recent entry into Korea. He was informed that "he must be mistaken."

It was only after days of hammering by newsmen—and shortly after the Wake Island conference—the headquarters in Tokyo permitted newsmen to report on intervention.

They permitted, however, only mention of "nonindigenous forces fighting with the North Koreans." The North Korean, of course, had virtually disappeared from the war by this time.

Sudden Shift

Conclusive evidence that General MacArthur's intelligence division was fully informed on enemy strength came only after his Chongchon River offensive had begun and had been turned into a near rout of UN armies.

Newsmen had returned to Seoul to file their stories two days after the offensive jump-off. It was a Sunday morning, Nov. 26, and they gathered about in the Eighth Army briefing room, watching a briefing officer mark positions with a grease pencil on the acetate overlay on the briefing map.

Until that morning all UN troop dispositions were marked in blue pencil. A blank space to the north marked the area where enemy positions normally would be filled in.

When the briefing officer finished his penciling that particular morning, however, the acetate overlay was a mass of red squares showing the location, size, and numerical designation of 18 Chinese Communist divisions, three army headquarters, and various scattered regimental units—all in positions which directly opposed the UN armies in their jump-off area.

Front Units in Dark

This belated admission of intelligence foreknowledge of the overwhelming numerical superiority of the enemy buildup apparently was made because it was considered necessary to justify to the world at large the sudden collapse of the UN offensive and the ability of the enemy to mount an immediate counter-offensive.

Aside from this, the most startling

aspect of this withholding of intelligence information was the fact that front-line units also were kept in the dark on enemy strength and disposition.

Just before the offensive was launched in the bitter cold dawn of Nov. 24 I toured the entire length of the front with other newsmen, talking with division intelligence officers, many of whom were close friends from Pacific war days.

General MacArthur himself had just completed a tour of the front, and had told front-line units that they could expect to be home by Christmas.

Uneasiness Voiced

Division intelligence officers, however, were less optimistic.

They were aware that some Chinese had come into North Korea. But they stated unanimously that they had no idea of what actually faced them across the narrow stretch of no man's land.

Many of them at the time expressed uneasiness over the situation, and explained that after their first brief skirmish with the Chinese in early November, an order had come down to break off contact and pull back from the fighting area.

As a result, insufficient Chinese prisoners were taken to fill out an adequate intelligence picture.

The 150,000-odd American, Turkish, British, and South Korean troops who participated in the Nov. 24 offensive were not told that they faced a virtual stone wall of well-dug-in Chinese Communist resistance.

Split in Command

Newsmen might not have been quite so critical of the handling of the abortive Yalu River push had it not been for the damaging split which existed between Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker's Eighth Army and Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond's 10th Corps which was in the Northeast.

This split was in large measure the reason for the sudden collapse of UN resistance. For it was through the large, unmanned gap which existed between the two autonomous "armies" in Korea that the Chinese poured their men—around the right flank of the Eighth Army. And if it had not been for the heroic resistance of the American 2d Division, backed up by fanatically brave Turkish bayoneteers, the flank-turning operation of the enemy might have resulted in disastrous encirclement.

Contact Kept by Lowe

The split-command situation was so serious in the autumn of 1950 that Maj. Gen. Frank Lowe, at that time on a roaming assignment in Korea as President Truman's personal observer, felt impelled to take the matter into his own hands.

Borrowing an L-5 artillery-spotting plane, he made daily liaison trips back and forth between the two (by this time antagonistically minded) commands, carrying battle map overlays showing respective troop dispositions.

He made each commander promise, he related privately to this correspondent, that if their liaison knowledge leaked out they would say it came out of general headquarters press release.

Inadequately Prepared

The split-command situation, incidentally, contributed substantially to a serious disaffection on the part of British forces in Korea at the time, reflected in their field reports back to London. And only through skillful handling later by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway was a serious inter-Allied situation cleared up.

The most tragic aspect of the actual offensive itself, probably, was the fact that corps commanders, because of their limited intelligence, were unable to make adequate preparation for the huge enemy counter thrust.

As a result, they placed the 2d Korean Corps—a notoriously weak and under-equipped group—on the vulnerable right flank.

After preliminary probings, the Chinese quickly picked out this flaw in the UN setup, struck hard, turned the flank, and thereby endangered the entire UN operation within a period of 24 hours.

Likewise, on the UN's left flank, the Korean 1st Division was the sole defender. This division, originally with a 10,800-man table of organizations, was only about half strength because the other half was still in Pyongyang, North Korean capital, protecting property which had been confiscated by the division's stop staff officers.

Patently, if the UN field commanders had known of the full potentialities of the enemy, they would have made more careful arrangements and, indeed, might have vocally expressed their disapproval of the entire operation.

Columbus (Ga.) Ledger
Nov. 18, 1951

We Won't Commercialize Death

The following communication was received last week by *The Ledger-Enquirer*:

Gentlemen:

We, the local members of the Florist's Telegraph Delivery Association, kindly call to your attention that the publishing of requests "Please Omit Flowers," has become very detrimental to our industry and individual businesses. This has become a national problem, however where the newspapers cooperate with the florists it is doing very little harm.

We florists are purchasing advertising to promote the sales of our product and in the same issue you will tell the public not to buy flowers.

To request no flowers is neither news nor information and if the family requests you to inform the public that they wish no flowers it should be and can be handled as a paid advertisement. We feel that we are being discriminated against by your publication and in all fairness we wish to discontinue any advertising until we are given some consideration. You will therefore cancel our ads that follow the Florists Telegraph Delivery Association monthly ads and we will also have the Association to cancel their ad also if necessary.

We will be pleased to confer with you if you wish.

Yours very truly,

WM. E. JOY
 Joy's Flower Shop
 MRS. T. W. GURLEY
 Gurley's Flower Shop
 HELEN PAINE
 Helen Paine-Flowers . . . gifts
 EDGAR J. ALSOBROOK
 Bennin Boulevard Nurseries

* * *

The foregoing letter is made a matter of public record because we believe that our readers are entitled to full information concerning our policies and our determination to maintain at any cost a free and unbiased press.

The news columns of this newspaper are and will continue to be edited according to what we sincerely believe is in the best interests of the public. The primary function of a newspaper is to inform its readers of events of the day and no advertiser, however large or small, will be permitted to influence or dictate to us in this performance.

The four florists listed above, who represent a minority of the florists in Columbus, have every right to withdraw their advertising from these newspapers but we challenge the propriety of their action in using such a lever to restrict legitimate information because publication of that information would harm their business.

The American press has remained free because it has risen to fight every attempt to limit its coverage of the news. These newspapers strongly criticized President Truman only a few weeks ago because he attempted to restrict the free flow of information from Government agencies. We likewise criticized the Department of Defense when it barred our reporters from demonstrations at Fort Benning about which we felt that the public had a right to know.

Having taken those actions, we would be inconsistent if we permitted encroachment on our rights to report the news freely and fairly from any other quarter.

The statements to which the writers of the above letter referred were published at the request of bereaved families. Presumably they conveyed the wishes of their deceased relatives that funds which ordinarily would have been spent for flowers be donated instead to trust funds as a living memorial to their loved one. In acceding to the wishes of the survivors, we gave no thought to the commercial aspects of the situation, nor would we agree to do so in any future instance. Of paramount importance was the fact that the statements revealed establishment of new trust funds, a legitimate news story.

Edwin L. James

The hallmark of this exceptional career was integrity. That quality was inherent in every service he gave this newspaper. It was so notably present in his work as a young reporter, and so evident in his eager search for the true facts of every story which fell his way, that it quickly impressed itself upon his editors. It was present in the high courage and tireless effort with which he reported the news of the battlefields and later covered the news of all of the great international conferences in the first years following the end of the war. It was abundantly present, and had its greatest opportunity to be of rich service to this newspaper, in his twenty years as Managing Editor. No decision that he made, no objective that he sought, no standard that he set, in these long and critical years, failed to reflect a deep and abiding sense of integrity in his work, in his purposes, in his straight-forward handling of the news.—From editorial in *New York Times*, Dec. 4.

First Story a Beat

On the very day that he drew his first reporter's credentials at the *Times*—May 13, 1915—Mr. James returned to the office with a story no other New York newspaper had. It developed at a diplomatic dinner in the Hotel Astor, just around the corner from the *Times* office.

Host at the dinner was a "Lieut. Comdr. Ethan Allen Weinberg, K. G.," who had announced to the press that he was the new Consul General for Rumania. The U. S. S. Wyoming had given him an eleven-gun salute in the harbor. He had acquired a guard of United States Marines, and had collected an imposing guest list for the evening's feast.

Mr. James, subsequently to make journalistic history by reason of his extreme sharpness and his extraordinary eye for detail, noticed that the new Consul General wore badly scuffed shoes though he was top-heavy with gold braid and assorted decorations, and that his accent had more Greenpoint in it than continental Europe.

Mr. James left the wine-bibbing guests, the snowy napery and the glittery table service, and slipped back to the *Times*

newsroom to call its Washington Bureau. He got a quick check from a reporter there, who telephoned the State Department. That department had no notice of a change of Rumanian consuls in New York.

Government agents in New York were sent at once to look the situation over. They verified Mr. James' suspicions, and when the last guest had left, the "new Rumanian Consul General" was in custody and on his way back to Elmira Reformatory to serve out an unfinished prison sentence. He had, it developed, a psychopathic weakness for posing as a dignitary.

The *Times* was out on the street next morning with the headline:

BOGUS CONSUL GENERAL
GIVES DINNER AT ASTOR

and Edwin L. James was launched on a long career as a *Times* reporter.

Worth Being Said

Though his feet itched often to be off again when the news was breaking, he found satisfaction in his executive post. "Believe me," he once said, "the day-to-day story which goes to make the record of the great human comedy is a piece worth being said." Convinced that the newspaper, "the daily story of the progress of mankind," "is the textbook of democracy," he thought that "there is a charm and a lure" about the job of making it "which is beyond compare."

Managing Editor James kept in close touch with what *Times* readers were thinking as well as what was going on the world over. An average of 1,600 letters a day reached his office. He sometimes said that his "pet aversion" was the charge, made by some letter writers, that the *Times* had "suppressed" some piece of news.

He once explained to a conference of school teachers that one of the big problems of the *Times'* editors was the selection of the 125,000 words of copy that fit into the daily paper from among 1,000,000 words that come in every day from the paper's own reporters and correspondents and the news services.

"Our principle is objectivity tempered with relativity and nothing else," Mr. James said.—From New York *Times* obit of Edwin L. James, Dec. 4.

Resignation of an Editor

First journalistic casualty of the on-rushing presidential campaign of 1952 was the Boston *Herald*, which lost its Pulitzer Prize (1949) editor, John H. Crider, over a review of Taft's campaign book. (The controversial Crider review is on page 29.) Crider, a liberal Republican editor, and a frank Eisenhower advocate, was much outweighed in the total impact of *Herald* views by more conservative and heavier-handed associates (Bill Cunningham, Bill Mullens and Managing Editor George Minot, all for Taft or further right). How uncomfortable this had made his editorship (of the editorial page only) and for how long, is not a matter of record. But *Herald* readers had long noted that Crider's internationalism and his resistance to the strident ways of McCarthy, MacArthur and McCarran were heavily countered by Cunningham, Mullens and Minot. He had been *Herald* editor for five years, after 17 years in the different climate of the New York *Times*. He was a Nieman Fellow from the *Times'* Washington bureau in 1940-41. When Crider's editorial criticism of Taft's book was immediately countered by a Mullens column favorable to Taft, Crider did a review of the book for the review column of his Monday (November 19) page. His publisher, Robert Choate, telephoned Sunday night to say the review wouldn't be run. Crider simmered over that a while and then called the publisher back. Mrs. Choate answering that Choate had gone to bed, Crider gave her the message that he had called to resign. To make sure he wouldn't sleep on the decision, he telephoned the New York *Times* the news of his resignation. This was front page news in Washington but was carried in Boston only in the *Christian Science Monitor* and the Hearst paper, until two days later (Wednesday, November 21) Publisher Choate ran a statement about the resignation and published the Crider review he had earlier refused to use. With it he printed a New York *Times* review of the same book, longer and less critical, and announced that the *Herald* was not supporting anybody until after the Republican convention. He announced also that

the *Herald* was running the Taft book, which it started on the front page that day. Editor Crider had not known the *Herald* was running Taft's book until he saw Choate's announcement after his resignation. This fact is suggestive of the extent to which Crider was isolated within the *Herald* while he was nominally editor.

Invitations came to Crider immediately to join other editorial pages. On December 17 Crider joined the staff of CBS as a news analyst and began a five-nights-a-week program at 6:15 from Boston.

L.M.L.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Nov. 21, 1951

Not News in Boston

At our latest report, no newspaper in Boston had printed the news of John H. Crider's resignation from the post of editor-in-chief of the Boston *Herald*. That is, no Boston newspaper except the *Christian Science Monitor* which is an international journal rather than a local newspaper.

Whatever else Mr. Crider's resignation is, it is news. He gave up his high-ranking place in New England journalism in protest against the refusal of his publisher, Robert B. Choate, to print an article which Mr. Crider wrote about Senator Taft's new book on foreign policy. He said that though he favors Gen. Eisenhower, he bent over backwards to be fair to the Ohio Senator. When the article was not printed, Mr. Crider decided it was useless for him, believing as he does, to continue to work for the Boston *Herald*. And so he resigned.

News of this notable occurrence in contemporary journalism has been carried over the country by the Associated Press and the other press services. It has been circulated in Boston via the New York *Times* and other outside newspapers. It will be in the news weeklies. By what possible reasoning did the Boston newspapers themselves fail to print it?

Thoughts on Books

by John H. Crider

The major opposition to Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio springs from serious doubts as to his abilities and convictions in the vital field of foreign affairs. Although he has seemed always to have strong feelings as to some aspects of foreign relations, he was never regarded by his party as particularly knowledgeable in this field, and only sometime after the death of Senator Vandenberg of Michigan did he ever profess to be an expert in these matters. He had been recognized in the top party councils of the Congress as an expert on matters domestic. After Senator Vandenberg's death when Mr. Taft occasionally presumed to speak expertly on international matters, he was almost always opposed in his views by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts and others of similar mind who looked at world problems from a global rather than a North American continental point of view.

Now, as a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, Senator Taft has written a campaign document called *A Foreign Policy For Americans* (Doubleday, \$2) in which he attempts to overcome the objections to his international policy views. In doing so he at one and the same time approves in principle every major administration policy and lambastes certain details in these policies. And, to be expected, he has rewritten the recent history of American policy in Asia to conform with the official Republican partisan view that recent Democratic administrations gave China to the Communists and otherwise completely bungled Far Eastern policy.

Admits Prejudice

This reviewer must confess at the outset that he cannot come to this task with an entirely open mind. For too long has he observed closely and carefully as a trained reporter the words and actions of Mr. Taft, and it would take more than this book, written for the purpose of winning a Presidential nomination, to convince him that Robert A. Taft has suddenly shed the coat which he has worn for so many years.

Some will say that Senator Vandenberg was at one time an isolationist. So he was, but the late Michigan senator never made a record as a shrewd internationalist by writing a book. He made it by leading his party away from isolationism; by his votes; by courageously flying in the face

of narrow concepts whether or not they emanated from the ranks of his own party.

As one who has always admired Senator Taft for his forceful manner on the Senate floor and in the interrogation of witnesses before Senate committees, and who must profess general approval of his views on domestic matters, it is with regret that this reviewer must confess to genuine fear of Taft blind spots in the international area. These fears are not based upon imagination but from having watched the man for days on end both in Senate committees and on the Senate floor with respect to such matters as the Bretton Woods agreements and the post-war loan to Great Britain. He fought the administration on these issues with great force and such surface knowledge of the subjects that during the floor debate on the British loan members, even on the Democratic side, would address informational questions to him rather than to the majority floor leader, Senator Barkley.

There were plenty of valid reasons for quarreling with both of these proposals (Bretton Woods and the British loan), and one can only have admiration for Senator Taft in standing by his convictions and leading the fight as he did. But in the course of detailed following of the Taft questions and arguments, it became apparent to this reporter that the senator simply didn't understand certain basic elements of international trade.

Notes Blind Spots

These same blind spots, as this well demonstrates, extend into the general field of international politics and relations. There are so many examples of this in the senator's new little book (127 pp.) that it would take a couple of columns of this length to list them, so one which relates to economic as well as political aspects of our foreign policy will have to suffice.

Though he says he is in favor of extending economic and military aid to "many countries," it should be extended only where "it can be clearly shown in

each case that such aid will be an effective means of combating Communist aggression." That is an excellent statement of basic administration policy. Mr. Truman could not have stated it better. But then he says:

"Any United States government contribution is in the nature of charity to poor countries and should be limited in amount. We make no such contribution to similar projects in the United States."

Looking at the quotations above in juxtaposition, it is clearly apparent that Mr. Taft does not see the vital difference between aid to our own people and economic aid abroad, and that he misses the significance of foreign economic aid in combating the most potent kind of Communist aggression; namely, that which preys upon the misery of peoples to exploit them for Soviet purposes. To liken economic aid for such a purpose to "charity" is to completely miss the point. Of course, it should be "limited"—not even the administration proposes unlimited foreign assistance—but where such aid is given within the Taft formula to combat Communist aggression it is the very opposite of "charity." It is actually self-serving.

Senator Taft's book should be widely read, but it should be read discerningly. It is full of booby traps. And always, Mr. Taft's voting record should be contrasted with his new platform.—*Boston Herald*, Nov. 21.

Straw Vote

If Senator Robert A. Taft were running for President next Tuesday he would receive only four out of twenty-one votes cast by book reviewers who have commented to date on his book *A Foreign Policy for Americans*. Seven would vote against him and an unusually large number—ten—would stay away from the polls.

Seldom has a book received the news coverage of the Taft creed—partly the result of the publisher's strategy in maneuvering the Senator into the limelight on publication day; partly because of Senator

Brien McMahon's whopping 20,000 word counter-attack, issued over the name of the Democratic National Committee. Sixty-five copies of the book went to editorial writers by request, 500 were autographed, a display was set up in New York's Republican Club. Eighty-eight newspapers are serializing the book. One newspaper (the *Boston Herald*) reviewed the book

three different times, once by its political editor (favorably), once by its editor—but only after he had resigned in protest after the review was killed the first time for being too critical—and once by an outsider, whose pro-and-con review originally appeared in the *Times* Book Review.

Within the first eight days after publication, *A Foreign Policy for Americans*

has doubled its advance. Forty thousand copies are now in print. Publishers' Row agreed that much of the hue and cry had been skillfully stage-managed by Doubleday's alert publicity department. One competing publisher said: "Senator Taft would do well to get Doubleday to manage his campaign."—David Dempsey, *New York Times* Book Review, Dec. 9.

Boston Sunday Globe
December 2, 1951

WHY WARS FAIL TO WIN PEACE

by James Morgan

Another first Sunday in December 10 years ago will be unforgettable so long as memory remains for those who heard over the radio the dire news from Pearl Harbor, where a foreign foe crossed the American frontier for the first time since the War of 1812. Young men and women in military service this December Sunday were children on that other December Sunday and more interested in the funnies than in first page news. They can hardly recollect now the event that was to turn them aside at the threshold of college or a vocation and put them in uniform. Nor did we elders know then nor know even now the meaning of it all.

The Japanese had fired at Pearl Harbor the signal gun for our entry into World War II, to be followed by this cold war, so-called but miscalled, in view of the 100,000 casualties our youth have suffered on the trampled rice paddies and heart-break hills of Korea. But Little Peterkin asks us in vain to tell him what became of the famous victory we and Russia won against Germany and Japan, now that the Russians are our enemies and we are trying to make friends of our enemies of yesterday, the Germans and Japanese. We have lived since Pearl Harbor through as bewildering a decade as may be found in the pages of history.

Two by-products of World War II are more renowned than any victories in battle: The unlocking of the power of the atom and the rise of the disinherited masses of Asia. We have not been able to make peace by force of arms in a world divided against itself, with more than half of it hungry, ragged and illiterate, without a habitation fit for human beings,

while the prosperity of the other half rested on the exploitation of the natural resources, the cheap labor and the misery of Asia, Africa and too much of Latin America.

We are in the presence of nothing other than the greatest upheaval of humanity in the recorded story of man. It is like an earthquake, resulting from the removal of what the seismologists call a fault. To get mad about it is a waste of energy which should be put to a better use. Shouting at Stalin may be a vent for the angry passions. But anger could blind us to the real question of whether the rising multitude shall be guided by the free nations or the unfree.

In keeping the country and Congress scared into building up armed forces, we are overemphasizing that necessary means of defense and neglecting less costly methods. Moreover, our offering the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights to hungry people is like answering their cry for bread by telling them to eat cake. For a Communist promise of a mess of pottage, despairing people well may be tempted to sell their birthright to a freedom they never knew.

Peaceable but drastic changes in an antiquated and heartless land system is the one alternative to a violent revolution in the countries liberated from foreign rulers. These next must be freed from native landlords. A disciple of Gandhi is carrying on a crusade in India for a voluntary transfer of ownership of the soil to peasantry that till it. This difficult problem must be solved by each nation in its own way. A solution cannot be im-

posed by outsiders, but we of the West must be ready and watchful to offer help.

Not Communism but the desperation of the masses is our foe. When the newly risen people shall have adopted a modern land system, as they shall have to do without much delay if a Communist revolution is to be averted, we of the free world must stand ready to give the hungering masses something they can get their teeth in. The West has an enormous advantage in its capacity to supply the products of its industry, while the Russians cannot produce enough to meet their own wants and still are lagging far behind in their standard of living. Here is an open field for extension courses by our agricultural colleges and experiment stations. The undeveloped regions of the earth should be infiltrated by men like our county agents, training the peoples with a primitive agriculture in the use of farm machinery and the methods of scientific farming. We could make customers for our wares while making converts to our way of life.

Civilizations before ours have fallen because they failed to lift the outer barbarians above barbarism. The nineteenth century empires paid the penalty for the same failure. The advanced nations today are in like peril. They must begin to bridge the gulf that yawns between the living standards which divide the world or risk being dragged down into another dark age. Sink or swim, survive or perish, all men are in the same boat for the first time. No more are Kipling's lesser breeds without the law.

This is no theory. It is a fact. America has poured and is pouring out billions

of dollars to save the Atlantic nations from the consequences of 40 years of warfare. We and they are confronted with the greatest issue of modern times, and the greatest opportunity. Amid the confused alarms of this bewildering decade since

Pearl Harbor, a fateful decision has been forming. We are in the process of deciding whether the free nations or the unfree shall gain the leadership of the more than a billion people who are groping their uncharted way in the gray dawn of a new world.

WGBH Newscast
Dec. 7, 1951

Harold Ross

Harold Ross, editor of the *New Yorker*, died last night. He was only 59. He had been in a Boston hospital about two weeks for a lung operation. The mourning will be very great and widespread, far beyond the small company of those who knew this very retiring, seclusive, almost anonymous and, to most people, mysterious man who was the heart and soul and dynamic force of the *New Yorker*, that most lively, informed, sophisticated, enlightened, mellow and literate modern magazine. One hopes that the death of Harold Ross will not put a period to this bright chapter in modern journalism.

Ross began the *New Yorker* with a little coterie, chiefly of those who with him had edited *Stars and Stripes* in the first world war. They were an all star cast, Alexander Woolcott and the rest. And Bob Benchley for humor. But Ross was the dominant figure and the dictatorial, demanding, exacting, impossible-to-please editor, who made it tick. He saw everything that went into it, pencilled and polished almost everything himself. His querulous, testy, inquisitorial pertinacity pestered and pressured his writers into the precision, the finish, the completeness that made *New Yorker* articles the envy and despair of all other editors.

New Yorker cartoons for a quarter century under Ross have created a new pattern of humor in America. *New Yorker* articles have set a new standard of journalistic writing. *New Yorker* criticism in any field has had no close competition. *New Yorker* profiles have outmoded every other type of biographical description. To be on the *New Yorker* has been enough to establish a writer. One need only name the names, E. B. White, James Thurber, A. J. Liebling, Edmund Wilson, John Hersey, Morris Markey, E. J. Kahn, Jr., Wolcott Gibbs, the late Clarence Day, and among cartoonists, Charles Addams, William Steig, Peter Arno, the incomparable Cobean, so recently gone, and the late Helen Hokinson, whose gentle caricatures of unmistakable club ladies became the accepted visualization of America's women's club members.

James Morgan at Ninety

James Morgan was 90 two weeks after this article was published in the place on the editorial page of the Boston Sunday *Globe* where readers have looked for his familiar name and mellow wisdom for very many years. When the last issue of *Nieman Reports* referred to James Morgan casually as the greatest newspaperman in New England a protest came promptly from a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States: "Why do you limit it to New England?" The correction was in order and the latitude is hereby extended. Two groups of Nieman Fellows will recall two historic dinners at which James Morgan, then only in his 80's, was the enlivening guest. At one he reported the Bryan convention of 1896, which he had covered. At the other he reported the opening up of Oklahoma to settlers in 1889, which he had covered. A Kentucky lad who entered on the fascinating new career of telegraphy in his teens, he soon moved over to journalism on the new Boston *Globe* which Gen. Charles H. Taylor had founded in 1872. Morgan became successively State political editor, Washington correspondent, Sunday editor, editorial director. He started and developed the "Uncle Dudley" editorial which has been a distinctive feature of the Boston *Globe* for two generations. He never ceased to be a reporter and kept politics as his own contribution to the paper. Always he covered the great quadrennial conventions that nominated for president. Through more than half a century, starting in 1888, he reported every one of both parties' until 1944, when he began covering them by radio. His practical and competent book, *Our Presidents*, is known to schoolboys and adults alike as a welcome guide through the central developments of the American story. It is one of seven books of biography he has done, all after he was 50. At 89 he began using a typewriter and started traveling by plane.

After middle life he succeeded in avoiding executive editorships. The editors were all men he had trained, but he managed to pass the desk work on to them. He has always taken long travels, earlier on assignments, latterly as vacations, to escape the New England winters. For the past three decades—the paper refusing to allow him to retire—he has been a contributing and consulting editor. From home he has telephoned or mailed in suggestions for editorials and articles. When he came in to the office he presided at the editorial conferences. This finally became only on Fridays, when luncheon with James Morgan was the best Club in Boston. His presence among the staff has been a living history and memory. For years the most usual instruction with a difficult editorial or news assignment has been "Call up James." And he has never failed to supply a fertilizing idea or to simplify a complicated problem with a shrewd appraisal of its central question. He has inspired or coached most of the best work on the Boston *Globe* within the lives of those now serving that paper. It has been their luck to serve with James Morgan. The greatest judgment the paper has shown has been never to let him go. His own commentary on his life as a newspaperman is: "I wouldn't swap my luck for any other."

Promotion Commotion

A photographer grabbed a New York *Times* from a mild-looking man in a New Jersey town one recent morning, substituted the *Herald Tribune*, then started to snap the astonished citizen's picture. "*Herald Tribune* promotion campaign," the photographer told him, fussing busily with a flash.

But I wouldn't look good on a *Tribune* poster," the victim protested. "I'm George Cable Wright. I cover ship news for the *Times*."

Times Talk, Oct., 1951

Harold Ross was a perfectionist and within the medium that he created a tremendous stimulus to the development of a whole generation of artists and writers. The influence of the *New Yorker* was not only national but world-wide. A Nieman Fellow coming up from Australia this Fall felt he already knew America at its best through the *New Yorker*. Writing home about an invitation to visit the magazine, he received from his news editor a letter he has just shown me. Let me read a bit of its excitement, all the way from Australia, to show the reach of this little *New Yorker* magazine:

"He's been invited to go over the *New Yorker*!! To see the doors through which Jim Thurber has passed; the wastepaper-basket where Stanley's notes have oft finished; the well-thumbed Fowler in Mr. Ross's room. Perhaps to see—to SEE, Bill, in the flesh—or even to have described by someone who *has* seen him, Charles Addams. If you forget to tell me one tiny detail of that visit, sight, sound or smell, may the everlasting curse of the Kings of Ireland rest upon you. Because I am sure that somewhere kernelled in the *New Yorker*, or its Editor, or its staff, is America. If we could make within coo-ee of defining what that kernel is we might be able to see the real essence of whatever it is that makes America great. And, perhaps more important and certainly more interesting, what it is that can make blokes like you and me catch a sentence or a phrase every now and then (perhaps in the Notes of the Day; perhaps in Around the Home; certainly in such pieces as the obit of Sam Cobeau) that makes you mutter to yourself, 'Behind all the ballyhoo and "Life Goes to This and That," and hot-dogs and shin-kicking filmsters and non-Anti-American activities and corruption and noise and synthetic cowboys and rope-peddling and so on, there are real people whose pants get shiny and who save up to get presents for the wife and kids and grieve quietly for lost, dead friends and lost dead liberties and decencies, and know and worry about things like commas and the right way to spell Macmahon Ball—the sort of things we loved long since and lost awhile.' Which is not very clear, but anyway a note as soon as you can of *everything* that happens when you go over the *New Yorker*."

Well, that exaltation comes all the way from Australia about the idea of a visit to a little magazine in New York. I'd like to see, and indeed I intend to, the obit of Harold Ross in the Melbourne *Herald*. For all their paper shortage they won't scamp on that. Believe me, the thing Harold Ross set going 25 years ago is no minor item in the American story. To create an art form at a new level and inspire artists to perform at that level is a sufficient title to greatness. Let us hope that the untimely death of Harold Ross will not too greatly dim the shining brightness of the *New Yorker* which he created.

Let me make no apology for taking so

much of this newscast on the death of one man. No news of this day will be longer remembered. None other is such a benchmark on the culture of our times. This is twice this week. The death of the great managing editor of the *New York Times*, Edwin L. James, on Monday, punctuated an era in another great American institution. Fortunately we know that the continuity of great editing is secure in the *Times*. The *New Yorker* was so much the projection of the personality of one man that we shall have to wait to see whether its unique quality will endure without Harold Ross.

—LOUIS M. LYONS

Book Reviews

Harold Ross And His Formula

by Edmond W. Tipping

ROSS AND THE NEW YORKER. By Dale Kramer. Doubleday & Co., Inc., N.Y. 306 pp. \$3.75.

What is it about the *New Yorker*?

Why is it, for instance, that in this reviewer's home office—10,000 miles down under from Manhattan as the strato-clipper flies—hardly a day passes without somebody or other opening up an exchange in the washroom or the back bar across the way with a "By the way, did you see that glorious bit in the *New Yorker* about . . .?" And this in a land where the magazine arrives by sea mail usually seven or eight weeks after issue and invariably maddeningly out of sequence so that one often finds oneself reading part 3 of a profile series before the first.

For 26 years Americans have been asking themselves the same question. Some buy the *New Yorker* for the cartoons. Or the wit, more often the acid satire, of the essentially sane Notes and Comment. Some subscribe for the superb reporting of the Genets and Wachsbergs in their Letters from abroad; the inimitable humor of the fill-in "newsbreaks" like the "Go climb a lamp-post" and "Raised eyebrows" departments; the razor-sharp reviews. Others like to torture themselves with the often pointless short stories. Some, nowadays, part out their 20 cents week after week because the

New Yorker has come to be the done thing in established circles, the most sophisticated journal in the world, in keeping with its ads.

But not newspapermen. Most journalists, you find, begin the *New Yorker* at Talk of the Town and finish on the book reviews, even taking in Audax Minor's The Racetrack and On and Off the Avenue along the way.

The reason, of course, is their envy of the magazine's uniformly unique writing style. For journalists that is the main interest of this important piece of newspaper history by Dale Kramer, who will be best remembered for his earlier biography of Heywood Broun and to some, perhaps, for his Yank news story on the Japanese surrender which earned him a place in *A Treasury of Great Reporting*. In recent years there has been a spate of articles and essays on the personalities who have contributed to establishing the *New Yorker* as smartest in its field, but Kramer is the first to trace the hard work and sheer determination which went into the unfolding of that writing style and the pattern of the jokes which go to making the magazine so different from the rest—the "formula," he terms it, which Harold Ross evolved. Whether the "formula" will survive now that its creator is dead is a question which journalists, indeed all who are interested in aiming

at the high standards which he set for his team, are asking all over the world these days.

Ross and the *New Yorker*, however, is no mere profile of the man who gave an entirely new technique to the "personality" type of article and gave the world a new journalistic form. (That form has, unfortunately, been badly overdone in recent years by its imitators. But that can hardly be blamed on its originators, Alva Johnston, Wolcott Gibbs, A. J. Leibling and the rest of the Ross team, who set a new mark in candid, often satirical human interest in the weekly's ascending days.) But Kramer does separate much of the fact from fiction surrounding the enigmatic, almost mythical founder and editor of the *New Yorker* who remained to the last, and even beyond his obituaries, one of the most discussed yet little known figures of the newspaper world.

The author surveys most of the legends which have grown up around the paradoxical figure whose character apparently represented almost the exact antithesis of the delicate-featured, top-hatted dandy, Eustace Tilley, who reappears on the magazine's cover each anniversary issue. He relates in full detail the story of the hobo reporter who became editor of *Stars and Stripes* in World War I and later decided to draw on the talents of his colleagues in that venture—men like Franklin P. Adams and Alexander Woollcott—to start up a weekly for the more sophisticated residents of the world's greatest city, modelled more or less along the lines of the *London Punch*.

But it is Kramer's tracing of the gradual development of the "formula" which will have greatest interest to newspapermen.

Getting the facts straight was one of the four elements out of which Ross built up the distinctiveness of writing of the magazine which began as flop and, inside 25 years, grew to a circulation of 350,000 readers, not all highbrow and only a third of them New Yorkers. Harold Ross always insisted, by the way, that the *New Yorker* had no particular style of writing except for "Talk" pieces. The second element was clarity. Ross's bible was Mark Twain's celebrated advice to budding writers . . . the author must "say what he is proposing to say, not merely come near it; use the right word, not its second cousin; eschew surplusage;

not omit necessary details; avoid slovenliness of form; use good grammar; employ a simple and straightforward style."

The third element, perhaps the most distinctive, was casualness. "Say it casually," was one of Ross's slogans. "Try to tell it as if talking to a friend." He forever harangued his authors to take it easy, to use the rapier instead of the bludgeon in attack. The fourth element, says Kramer, was less easy to define but probably the most important—the attitude of the paper to the big city and its way of life. Its mildly ironical but paternal attitude toward the city's growing pains and the vicissitudes of modern, mechanised existence. Certainly these fun-poking pieces on the great city's pretensions to sophistication—like the flippant description of sidelights on the recent atom bomb raid drill and the *New Yorker's* typical discovery of the superstitious lack of a 13th floor—have always endeared the journal to its down under fans.

Apart from Ross, who apparently insisted on seeing everything before it got into type and often sent copy back with pithy comments like "What mean?" and "No understand" in the margins, those who had the most telling influence on the "formula" were E. B. White, Thurber, Katharine Angell (who became Mrs. White), and Wolcott Gibbs. It was White, apparently, who set the present pattern of Talk of the Town Notes and Comment, evolving the style which is still rigorously adhered to week by week. He also built the newsbreaks up from fillers to one of the most popular and most unique features. Whenever a cartoon caption line didn't seem right the picture was simply dumped on White's desk and, when it had been in his way long enough, he composed a fitting line. That was how the world was given the famous "I say it's spinach, and I say the hell with it" and many other world-known gags. White did the subbing later when Ross decided that no *New Yorker* caption should, except in special circumstances (remember the late Sam Cobean's superb ribbing of the "Man of Distinction" ads, which ran to about 20 lines?), run to more than one line.

Kramer's account of how the most famous of all *New Yorker* artists had to break into print elsewhere brings his reader into the laugh-out-loud bracket. White per-

sued Ross to hire Thurber who, at the time, was making his mark as a rewrite man on the *New York Post* and as a humorist by pointing up the absurdity of the current demand for short leads by circulating such contributions as "Dead. That's what the man was the police found in an alleyway yesterday" around the copy desk. White made full use of that touch in "Talk." But Thurber's work brought him far less attention than his bad habit of drawing funny sawed-off dogs, with the head of a bloodhound and the short legs of a basset, on other people's memo pads. Ross thought he was being kidded when White and others suggested the peculiar dogs and peculiar ("All right, have it your way—you heard a seal bark!") people should take their place in the magazine. So they were first accepted as illustrations for the joint White-Thurber effort, "Is Sex Necessary?", published by Harper in 1929. "These I take it," said the Harper editor when shown the illustrations, "are the rough sketches for the drawings themselves." "No", said White, "these are the drawings themselves." Eventually he argued them in. And eventually Ross came around although, says Kramer, Thurber's draftsmanship was, technically speaking, no better on the hundred millionth sawed-off dog than it had been on the first millionth.

White and Thurber set the Ross tone of the *New Yorker* in one field. Dorothy Parker, Helen Hokinson and others were adding their own distinctive notes. Rea Irvin, creator of the original Eustace Tilley cover (Ross suddenly, after running it on anniversary issues for a decade, accused him of having been too flippant) and many unique covers since, was always behind the master advising him on the art work and passing on the same Ross curiosity and fierce demand for accuracy in this field as well as the editorial side. "Where am I in this picture?" was the query the Peter Arnos, Charles Addamses, and George Price heard most often. Ross incessantly maintained that the reader should always be watching an action or overhearing a conversation. Once he had a drawing redone because the screws on a fire hydrant went the wrong way. "Who's talking?" he would ask and the artist would be ordered to open the speaker's mouth wider.

Kramer tells it all. He tells it critically

in parts too. For example, he devotes one chapter to how, apart from its early ups and downs, mainly financial, the journal reached its greatest low during the war when, inevitably, it proved almost impossible to adapt the formula to fit the grim conditions which were such a long way removed from the escape worlds of the Walter Mittys and the "Hoky" women. Here the Ross genius proved itself again. He developed the Reporter at Large idea and sent his men into the battle areas. The war reporting of such men as E.J. Kahn, jr., who wrote as a serving infantryman, not as a war correspondent, and A.J. Liebling proved to be on such a high plane that the new feature helped pull the magazine out of the doldrums. Of course, everybody knows the story of John Hersey's "Report on Hiroshima" and how a great editor gambled successfully on devoting the whole paper to the one piece. But few have heard the Helen Hokinson story of the woman who made the typical "Hoky" woman comment to her: "I've read that long Hiroshima article from beginning to end and I just wish you would tell me what was funny about it!"

He deals finally with Ross's most recent fear—that his magazine had gotten itself

into what he called "a plush-lined rut." Success brought new worries and imitators were making it increasingly difficult for the editor to succeed in his eternal search for something "fresh." "Those who feel that Ross was happiest while the *New Yorker* was being created," Kramer writes (before his death), "are convinced that his instinct is to scramble it and start all over again." Worse than that—the journal had recently lost Helen Hokinson and Sam Cobean, two of its most distinctive individualists, in untimely accidents. Thurber was blind, his output practically restricted to his life in Columbus, Ohio, outpourings. Now the peculiar genius who bred and made the *New Yorker* all that it is and has been, and whose breath could still be inhaled on every page, has passed on, it can be said that the paper's troubles on the "plush-lined" score are only beginning.

Meanwhile Dale Kramer has given us an invaluable, if at times jumpy account of Ross's and the *New Yorker's* rise to the top in the magazine field. Despite several split infinitives coming rather oddly from the pen of an author chronicling the writing attainments of some of the greatest purists in the world of journalism,

the complete passing over of the inimitable Our Man Stanley, and total neglect of one of its most distinctive features—the dinkuses—all newspapermen will relish it. Another thing—the book has a "new" picture of Harold Ross, one obviously taken many years ago, which shows him much more hoboesque than in the familiar snap taken at the triumphant Grand Central Station broadcasts hearing.

Say It's Terrible

Lois Long, trying to describe for her new shopping column a jewelry display which had not impressed her, went to Ross.

"The stuff is terrible," she said. "What will I do about it?"

"Say it's terrible," Ross answered.

The remark nailed down, in a way, the editorial standard of the *New Yorker*. Willing as he was to appeal to a "class" audience and to luxury advertisers, Ross's editorial integrity—plus his natural irreverence—prevented a policy of kowtowing. He held to his conviction that if he could get out a magazine that was read by a small but select audience the advertisers would have to come in and stay in. —From *Ross and the New Yorker*.

When Human Rights Lost the Right of Way

AMERICAN CONSERVATISM IN THE AGE OF ENTERPRISE, by Robert Green McCloskey. Harvard University Press. 193 pp. \$3.25.

By A. G. IVEY

What happens when an irresistible property right meets an immovable human right? Which right has the right of way?

Ultraconservative Americans made a discovery late in the 19th century: They found out that liberty, equality and freedom, guaranteed by the Constitution, could be revised semantically and juridically to mean, chiefly, economic liberty, economic equality, economic freedom.

How that came to pass is presented by Robert Green McCloskey, assistant professor of government at Harvard University. He has undertaken to show how property rights, during the era of great free-enterprise industrial growth from 1865 to 1910, came to assume the right of way over human rights. An authority on de-

cisions of the Supreme Court, McCloskey was once an administrative aide to a Republican governor of Michigan; he came to Harvard as a Littauer Fellow and has been teaching at Cambridge six years. McCloskey has advanced, in this book, a distinguished and scholarly analysis of the ultraconservative credo.

Careers of three typical conservatives are examined: Yale sociologist William Graham Sumner, Supreme Court Justice Stephen J. Field and industrialist-philanthropist Andrew Carnegie. Unbridled competitive free enterprise found in these men a forceful teacher, an implacable defender and a driving practitioner. With replete documentation McCloskey shows Sumner, Field and Carnegie as willing and eager followers of Social Darwinism. A "survival of the fittest" economic doctrine meshed smoothly with the moral and intellectual gears of their own philosophies.

The conservative creed of the period

needed a Saint Paul to spread the new economic gospel; that teacher was William Graham Sumner, a clergyman turned sociologist and pamphleteer. Though some conservatives were too discreet to voice fully their strongly-felt advocacy of untrammelled enterprise, Prof. Sumner of Yale suffered from no such timidity. Boldly he said, "Let it be understood that we cannot go outside of this alternative: liberty, inequality, survival of the fittest; not—liberty, equality, survival of the unfittest."

Sumner preached the gospel of wealth from the university platform. Justice Field, aggressively and with moral zeal, promoted it in the Supreme Court. Carnegie used the same gospel in the markets and in the mills. Justice Field did not have much difficulty winning his fellow jurists to his conservative views. Lawyers were ripe for the new philosophy; de Tocqueville called American lawyers of the period "eminently conservative and

anti-democratic." Field spoke first as a dissenter—largely because other justices could logically find no juridical precedents for supporting the new conservatism, nor any wording in the Constitution that could be bent to conform to Justice Field's principles. However, the change in emphasis was made easier when the 14th Amendment was passed. The "due process clause" provided a flexible definition of property rights, suitable for elastic interpretations by the Supreme Court. "I deny," said Justice Field, "the power of any legislature under our government to fix the price one shall receive for his property of any kind."

Materialism versus humanitarianism posed a conflict of ideas troubling many Americans of the time. Among those was Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie accumulated great wealth. His industrial methods were adjudged harsh and ruthless. Yet, Carnegie wrote touchingly of the difficulties of labor and of the plight of the poor. After having achieved his wealth, Carnegie then fulfilled his community obligations. He wrote: "A rich man must look upon himself as a trustee for the poor, intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it far better than it could or would have done for itself."

In addition to auditing the records of archconservatives Sumner, Field and Carnegie, Prof. McCloskey also explains the points of difference between those who place greater store in the humane definitions of liberty, equality and freedom and those who put economic values at the top.

These things McCloskey assumes to be true: free enterprise is desirable; competitive economy promotes production and enhances material progress; economic freedom earns a consequential position as an essential value in American democracy. But McCloskey insists economic freedom is not absolute; it is not self-justifying; it is valuable only as means to an end. It is one of the supporting freedoms to the greater freedom—freedom of men to maintain their dignity, to develop their moral capacities. McCloskey declares that conservatives of the Sumner, Field and Carnegie philosophy are men who deplore rule of the majority, believe in government by an elite, contend economic rights constitute the primary value in society.

Mr. McCloskey didn't remind his readers in detail that the Supreme Court and the nation moved, after 1910, far away from the philosophy of Sumner, Field and Carnegie. Perhaps the swing in the other direction calls for another volume of analysis. Meanwhile Mr. McCloskey has performed a public service of identification and definition, and he has indicated this principle: When a property right meets a human right, there is no need for either right to get off the road. The human right has the right of way.

A. G. Ivey is associate editor of the Winston-Salem *Sentinel*, now on leave on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard.

Evolution of Reuters

REUTERS. By Graham Storey. Crown Publishers, N. Y., 276 pp. \$4.00.

By JOHN DAVIES

American newspapermen will appreciate this book not only for what it is totally—the history of Reuters from the days of pigeon-posted news—but also as a sequel to the 1942 account of the Associated Press campaign for world press freedom, Kent Cooper's *Barriers Down*.

The sequel is contained in the final 45 pages of the book, covering the years between 1941 and 1951. In that decade there emerged a new Reuters, so different from the concept of Julius Reuter that the founder "would undoubtedly find it strange or even alien." This evolution fulfilled a promise which a Reuters' director made to Cooper at an AP luncheon in June, 1942:

"Reuters's aims and plans for the future have been laid largely on the same basis as the principles and ideals and practices of The Associated Press. Reuters will go forward with the same objectives of service rather than of dividends, of unbiased reporting of the world's news in a co-operative endeavor."

The impact of the book's final pages is heightened, however, by more than the recollection of Cooper's account of AP's crusade. The whole of Storey's story is an essential stimulant.

Reuters is what it is today because of its century-old history—and despite it. You get this double-impression almost from the start of Storey's report, which begins

with Julius Reuter's short-lived agency in Germany in the mid-1800s, when European speculative fever had placed a high premium on a unique product of the Industrial Revolution—commercial news. Here was merchandise which defied materialistic definition and Reuter's market, as Lord Layton says in the book's foreword, "was in the minds of men."

That is the key to the book. The minds of men more than the events they precipitated shaped Reuters as we know it in 1951.

The journalistic outlook was a narrow one when Julius shifted his operation to London in 1851—but the eyes of British newspapermen even then were on new horizons as the result of the extension of telegraphic communications, of British world trade and colonial relationships, of mass newspaper readership.

The Reuters's story from 1851 to World War I is of the growth of a family business concentrated on the acquisition and sale of news, political and general as well as commercial, into a "pronounced and occasionally mispronounced" British institution.

Storey tells of Reuters's "sphere of influence" relationships with its old French and German rivals, Havas and Wolff, its turbulent development as the chief gatherer and distributor of news throughout the British empire, its coverage of such far-flung conflicts as the American civil war and the South African Boer war, its almost disastrous ventures into advertising and banking.

World War I precipitated Reuters's "fight for life." Contractual relations with Wolff and Havas suffered under the impact of Continental political pressure. Domestic crisis ended Reuters's status as a family business; it became a corporation called "Reuters Ltd." And, while American news agencies resisted government pressure to join in a national propaganda effort, Reuters decided that it could survive only if it could "serve the state without succumbing to government control."

This was the period in which Cooper began his long campaign for freedom of international news exchange. Reuters's pre-War I relations with the European agencies, its government propaganda commitments through that war, its post-war fight for survival added fuel to the fire Cooper stirred.

"In both America and the British Empire," Storey observes with the approach of the 1930s, "new and strong forces were accusing the agency of being a voice of the 'Old World': of standing for a monopoly in international news, of reflecting an ultra-British point of view, of being too intimate with government."

Storey's description of the difference between the Reuters operation and that of American press agencies and his analysis of Cooper's campaign are fair and sympathetic. A news-agency era collapsed as the AP crusade scored in South America, Japan, Europe. Writes Storey:

"With the crumbling of the old Four-Power alliance went the central idea upon

which news-gathering by the great world agencies had been based for nearly eighty years: the division of the world into territories for the 'exclusive exploitation' of the news."

By 1941 Reuters had become a cooperatively-owned, non-profit enterprise, patterned after AP. This method of news agency procedure spread to India, Australia and beyond the bounds of the British world. From World War II, when it refused to subordinate itself to the British propaganda campaign, emerged a "new Reuters" which embarked on its second century, Storey says, universally recognized and accepted as an independent, international news agency.

Historian's Deadline

THE RISE OF MODERN AMERICA, 1865-1951, Arthur Meier Schlesinger. The MacMillan Co., New York; 607 pp. \$5.25.

By JOHN HARRISON

The American historian's job gets tougher by the year. Ponder, for example, the problems confronted by Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger in preparing this fourth edition of *The Rise of Modern America*.

Allowing for changes in format, only about 40 pages have been added to the third edition, published in 1941. Since 120 pages are now devoted to events of the intervening ten years, the author has had to rewrite and condense most of the material in the earlier edition.

What has happened is that American history has become world history. The role of the United States no longer can be interpreted on the basis of events within its own borders. The historian must range the globe for his material. He must be as alert to what goes on in Moscow as to events in Washington if he would record accurately the history of a nation which has emerged—however reluctantly—from insularity into world leadership.

Wisely, Mr. Schlesinger has left the starting point of his study at 1865. He might have eased his writing task had he chosen, for example, to begin with the rise of the Populist movement in the 1880's. But how understand Populism, and what developed out of it, without some consideration of the Granger agitation of the 1870's? In explaining why

he begins at the end of the Civil War, the author correctly asserts in his preface that "the movements and problems that have arisen since then form an indispensable background for comprehending current situations at home and abroad."

Social history is bound to suffer from the compressing process. It lacks the dramatic sweep of history as it is interpreted in geographic terms, the doctrinaire certainties of economic determinism. Social history is a patchwork of human reactions to all sorts of forces and situations. Its effectiveness depends much on the richness of the variety of detail which sustains its contention that human beings make history in their own right.

Mr. Schlesinger's study has not escaped the loss to synthesis. But the only fair test is whether or not he has accomplished this compression without seriously blurring the focus of the social historian. Some students of the period may find the treatment scanty in spots. The average reader will not be seriously bothered, for the abridgment has been done with skill and care.

In any event, the controversial portion of this book will be those 120 pages which record and interpret events of the last ten years. Interest in these chapters will be heightened by the fact that the author has outspokenly expressed his personal convictions on all sorts of public issues. Dating back at least to the Sacco-Vanzetti case, when he was newly arrived at Harvard from the Midwest, Mr. Schlesinger has arrayed himself with the

group of articulate teachers sometimes denounced as "political professors." His part in organizing Americans for Democratic Action and in its continuing activity puts his political predilections on the public record.

How has he assessed the role of the United States in World War II and its subsequent part in world affairs? What are his conclusions concerning the Truman Administration? Have his known political beliefs distorted his appraisal of this eventful era?

These questions will be widely asked. There will be no want of variety in the answers. Mr. Schlesinger's personal convictions certainly aren't wholly concealed. Some will pounce on his enthusiasm for the Roosevelt foreign policies, even though he emphasizes that they were based in part on the mistaken belief that Russia would be a cooperative partner in One World at war's end. Others will deny his contention that President Truman was able to activate an important part of his Fair Deal program after the 1948 election, despite congressional obstruction on some key issues.

But this is no job of historical whitewash. Too many times, to support such a charge, Mr. Schlesinger questions the wisdom and motivation of specific acts and policies of the period. Only the most rabid haters of Roosevelt and Truman will attack the author's objectivity. For the most part, differences of opinion will be matters of degree.

The most impressive portion of this study is that which considers the pre-war period of the Roosevelt Administration. Even those who are thoroughly familiar with this era are likely to be somewhat overwhelmed by the detailing of the problems which presented themselves and the remedies applied to them. Here the resiliency of America is most convincingly demonstrated. And even though, as Mr. Schlesinger emphasizes, it required a war to put a final end to unemployment, only the most partisan can fail to be impressed by the ingenuity and energy which went into the job of patching up the American social and economic fabric in its moment of greatest strain.

There may be room, finally, to question the advisability of bringing this study of American history almost up to the moment—risky historical business any time.

Mr. Schlesinger obviously felt the need to consider the Korean incident as the fruition of the world's efforts to achieve collective security through United Nations. In the process, he has gone out on a limb at least once to assert that: "By July, Russia saw no further advantage in continuing the war; and at her suggestion the North Koreans and their Chinese allies entered into negotiations with the UN command for a cease-fire agreement preliminary to peace discussion."

Several theories of the Communist mo-

tivation in applying for truce negotiations have been advanced. Should the events of the next few days, weeks, or months prove Professor Schlesinger's conjecture to have been wrong, he may want to rush out an early revision.

But the American historian's job is getting tougher by the year. When it is done so well as Mr. Schlesinger has done it, one debatable conjecture won't mar an incisive description of *The Rise of Modern America* through 86 turbulent years.

George Kennan's Diplomacy

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY, 1900-1950 by George F. Kennan, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1951, 146 pp. \$2.75.

By JOHN L. STEELE

George F. Kennan, expected to return soon to government service as American Ambassador at Moscow, hoists in *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* storm warnings against the catch-phrase, the pat answer and the righteous tub-thumper in making and judging foreign policy.

For a nation's desperate groping toward the goal of sanity and safety in foreign affairs, Kennan pleads for a return to the half-forgotten diplomatic approach of limited objectives, calculated accommodations, clear definition of national interest and careful weighing of what may be possible in this, the far from best of all possible worlds. Kennan grants the difficulties facing a public opinion-conscious democracy in coldly conducting a Cold War policy, not to say a hot one. But he holds that a nation which excuses, rather than hurdles, its difficulties "can excuse itself into complete disaster."

And barring some tough thinking, he finds that the United States is in a fair way to do just that.

Kennan is one of a tiny coterie of justly titled State Department Russian experts. He organized and directed the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, a group charged with studying policy problems in the framework of the nation's total interests. He served as Counselor of the State Department and as a career diplomat of 25 years experience. The book is Kennan's first,

and, unfortunately, probably his last for some time to come because he soon will terminate an extended, diplomatic "Niemann Year" at Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies. The book is a compilation of the six Charles R. Walgreen Foundation lectures which he delivered in 1951 at the University of Chicago, plus his widely read "Mr. X" article on "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," published in *Foreign Affairs* magazine of July, 1947, and its companion piece, "America and the Russian Future," appearing in the same publication almost four years later.

Kennan rips into what he terms the "legalistic-moralistic approach" to international policy in a manner which will give little comfort either to Senator Taft's conception of a United Nations based on world law (see Taft's *A Foreign Policy for Americans*, reviewed in this issue), or to those who see world federation as a panacea for world ill health. The Anglo-Saxon concept of individual law, Kennan says, has little application to the jungle ethics practiced by some nations, and it provides no answer to the modern techniques of subversion and the puppet state. A legal strait-jacket, he contends, cannot freeze national state patterns against the process of change "... this is a task for diplomacy, in the most old-fashioned sense of the term." Furthermore, Kennan holds that Americans, hell-bent on doing for Europe what their forefathers did for the original 13 Colonies, too often forget that some nations hold aspirations, which they regard as "legitimate," above their interest in international peace and order.

Kennan believes that the "legalistic"

approach is based partially on faulty assumptions regarding collective sanctions against peace offenders. The effectiveness of a military coalition is limited, and in inverse ratio to the number of nations participating—the wider the coalition, the more unwieldy, he says. This law of diminishing returns makes it "doubtful" to Kennan whether small-state participation "can really add very much to the ability of the great powers to assure stability of international life." Sanctions against international sin, he says, now, as in the past, rest on "the alliances and relationships among the great powers themselves." Here Kennan may be open to some critical jabs. Certainly there are sanctions short of the ultimate military weapon. Specifically, they may be found in the economic field where non-cooperating small nations could prove to be the hole in an otherwise effective dike. And, plausibly enough, in an era where small nation neutrality is virtually impossible, the small nations find big power dictation a good deal less than satisfactory.

Finally, Kennan says the "legalistic-moralistic" approach has fostered false concepts of "total war and total victory" in two world conflicts. Total victory, he holds, is impossible short of genocide, and in the past has led only to exhaustion, bitterness, frightful blood-letting, and, in turn, to seeds for new struggles.

Instead, Kennan pleads for a new attitude on the part of Americans. It is one which he describes as not unlike that of a physician contemplating illness—detachment, soberness and readiness to reserve judgment. He calls for modesty in admitting that our own self interest is about all that we are capable of understanding. And he urges courage in recognizing that if our undertakings at home are "decent" ones, unsullied by arrogance or hostility, then the pursuit of our own self interest always will contribute to a better world.

Above all, he warns against those who would lead by the "pat and chauvinistic slogans" of some politicians, commentators and publicity seekers. He writes: "The counsels of impatience and hatred can always be supported by the crudest and cheapest symbols. . . And so the chauvinists of all times and places go

their appointed way: plucking the easy fruits, reaping the little triumphs of the day at the expense of someone else tomorrow, deluging in noise and filth anyone who gets in their way, dancing their reckless dance on the prospects for human progress, drawing the shadow of a great

doubt over the validity of democratic institutions. . ."

Kennan's plea is for realism with decency—at home as well as abroad. His slim book poses the alternatives of peace or war in grim relief. And he offers no easy answer.

Theodore Roosevelt When President and Party Leader

THE LETTERS OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT: THE SQUARE DEAL, 1901-05, edited by Elting E. Morrison. Harvard University Press, 2 volumes, 1438 pgs., \$20.)

REVIEWED BY
ROBERT LASCH

Most Presidents have grown in the White House. The second pair of volumes in this eight-volume edition of letters shows that Theodore Roosevelt was no exception. He is a bigger man in these letters than he was when on the make.

True, there are still traces of an amazing juvenility. He could take time out from statesmanship to write a letter exhorting the Harvard football team to get in there and beat Yale; the letter was read in the locker-room. He could describe the new game he had discovered; single-stick, in which the padded contestants beat each other over the head with staves. He could report that a couple of Japanese wrestlers had become regular callers at the White House. In the matter of eccentric exercise, he seems to have been an early-day Henry Wallace.

From the moment McKinley's assassination put him in the White House, T. R. was planning his 1904 campaign. The letters show how shrewd a politician he was, beating the drums against the corruption in government exposed by the muck-rakers, rattling the sword against corporations, wooing labor and at the same time fiercely resisting unionization of the Government Printing Office, facing down the threatened revolt of Mark Hanna, ably using the executive patronage to take control of his party away from the bosses.

In Missouri, he gave strong support to Joseph Folk, the Democratic circuit attorney who prosecuted St. Louis public officials and transit boodlers, even to the point of urging the Republicans to in-

dorse Folk for Governor though he was running on the Democratic ticket. The Republicans did not take T. R.'s advice, and he then had to write a batch of letters proving that he really favored the Republican nominee while not really opposing Folk. Missouri elected Folk and gave its electoral votes to T. R., the first Republican to win them since Reconstruction.

In retrospect, Roosevelt's anti-trust policy, with which he stole Bryan's following from the Democrats, does not look so ferocious as it was meant to seem at the time. But there is no sign that T. R. was consciously fighting with cream-puffs. He prided himself on being a "practical" reformer, which is to say that he nibbled at the trusts without really hurting them. But he sincerely believed he was putting them in their place.

He had a considerable ability to assert his righteousness without carrying it too far. Once he invited Booker T. Washington to the White House for the straightforward purpose of consulting him on Negro patronage in the South. A storm of criticism broke, and he wrote to Lucius Littauer: "There are certain points where I would not swerve from my views if the entire people was a unit against me, and this is one of them. I would not lose my self-respect by fearing to have a man like Booker T. Washington to dinner if it cost me every political friend I have got." All the same, Booker T. Washington never came to dinner again.

Roosevelt was never more convinced of his righteousness than in the fascinating case of the Panama Canal. Colombia had refused to ratify the canal treaty we proposed, and it seemed the most natural thing in the world to T. R. that the United States should help the Panamanians revolt in order that they might ac-

cept the rejected treaty. When critics charged that we were aiding secession, having put it down at home, he replied in effect that Panama's secession was for a good purpose while the South's had been for an evil one.

He never admitted that he or any other American official actually inspired the Panama revolt—not even when its leader, after visiting Washington, wrote a newspaper article predicting in detail what steps the United States would (and did) take to aid it. Roosevelt called this "a really remarkable forecast of our attitude and probable conduct." He insisted up and down that only by sheer coincidence had Bunau-Varilla been able to "forecast a line of conduct upon which I myself had not at the moment determined." He laid it to Bunau-Varilla's being "a very clever man."

Anyhow, T. R. got his canal. One must hope that no other nation with a strategic interest in a vital waterway—Russia at the Dardanelles, for example—adopts his method of military intervention in behalf of a puppet state as a precedent.—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* Nov. 4, 1951.

About Our Reviewers

Our Reviewers are current Nieman Fellows except for one former Fellow, Robert Lasch, editorial writer on the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*. The others: John Davies, reporter, Newark *News*; John L. Steele, Washington reporter, United Press; A. G. Ivey, associate editor, Winston-Salem *Sentinel*; John Harrison, associate editor, Toledo *Blade*; Edmund W. Tipping, chief of staff, Melbourne (Australia) *Herald*.

The Denver Post, Sunday, Nov. 4, 1951

EMPIRE PROFILE

Pen Powerful Weapon for Good, Littleton Editor Finds

by Mark Hansen

The pulsating sting, the soft caress of Houstoun Waring's gifted pen has had a forceful, guiding impact upon the destiny of Littleton—and, in the broad sense, his adopted state—for twenty-two years.

Waring's mettle as an editor was tested early, shortly after he established the *Independent*.

It came when the question of a gas franchise was presented by the town board for bids. Coal dealers, sensing the transition from coal to gas fuel, had banded together, seeking to control this new supply. And on the surface their bid appeared to be the best, better than one filed by the Public Service Company of Colorado.

Waring carefully studied the proposals, then argued before the town board: "The coal dealers want this franchise so that they can sit on it to protect their own interests—to keep on selling coal."

Old heads nodded approval. The boy was right. The council awarded the franchise to Public Service.

The story spread rapidly through the town. With the retelling of it the slender young editor seemed to grow more robust in the minds of the townspeople, and he became to them less the inexperienced youngster whose opinions had been open to question because of "immaturity."

The offended coal companies started another paper in opposition to Waring and the *Independent*, but it expired after about six months.

Waring's story is that of a young Naval Academy midshipman, who came to Colorado thirty years ago to inhale its health-giving air and has remained to become one of its freedom tonics.

But for the illness that interrupted his Annapolis career after two years, Waring might today be a southern gentleman wearing the broad gold braid of a high naval officer.

"There was nothing to do but read," he recalls. "I read everything I could get my hands on. Reading stimulated think-

ing. I finally got so full of ideas I decided to let them out in writing. I determined then to go into the newspaper business."

His illness arrested, Waring enrolled in the C. U. school of journalism in 1924 and studied there for two years. Then, as a journalism student he spent a week in Littleton with twenty-two other students putting out an issue of the Littleton *Independent*.

The contact resulted in a job with the paper on Sept. 27, 1926.

A few weeks ago Waring observed the completion of a quarter of a century of newspapering in the same job and on the same paper. In that time circulation has grown from 775 subscribers to 2,860.

The editor, too, has grown in prominence and influence. During these twenty-five years Waring has been accorded perhaps more honors and recognition than any other weekly editor in the nation, as a result of his unflagging quest "to find the right techniques that will hasten our approach to the Good Society."

Last summer saw Waring and the *Independent* singled out by the U. S. State Department as the model weekly newspaper of the nation to be featured in a "freedom of the press" propaganda motion picture.

The film is now being released in most of the so-called civilized countries of the world. It has sound tracks in twenty different languages.

"As editor of a country weekly newspaper, my job, it is generally assumed, is to write about my own community, to tell people what goes on in and around the town of Littleton, letting the big daily papers cover the problems of the world," Waring wrote in the *Times* article.

"This is a highly sentimentalized notion which I reject. For it seems to me that the old let-the-rest-of-the-world-go-by kind of provincialism belongs to the past. By this time it should be quite clear to everyone here that an 'event' or 'situation'

on the other side of the world can take the boys off Main street and send them to war again; there is no distance any more."

To gain viewpoints and information Waring says he "looks at thirty-eight to forty magazines a week, reads one or two books a month and attends an average of five meetings a week."

For ten winters, Waring has opened the livingroom of his home at 200 South Sherman street (Littleton) to what he calls a fireside forum. There University of Denver professors conduct panel discussions on various subjects. As many as sixty-four townspeople from all walks of life have packed the room for one of these.

Waring himself averages a speech every day. In the last three years he has addressed editors and journalism schools in Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Idaho and Massachusetts.

Among the honors that have come to Waring in his twenty-five year journalism career, are:

Founded department of journalism at University of Denver in 1933 and served as chairman on part-time basis through 1939.

Eight-time winner of Parkhurst Community Service award, C. U. department of journalism. Twice winner of C. U. Crosman award for excellence in editorial writing.

First former student to win C. U. college of journalism Outstanding Alumnus award in 1948.

Nieman Fellow at Harvard, 1944-1945.

Waring and his wife, the former Irene Fender, St. Luke's nurse whom he married in 1935, have three children. Jim is a senior at Littleton high school; Sally, a freshman, and George in junior high. "I hope none of them ever becomes orthodox in thinking," he says.

Waring's seldom-used satire has a delayed action fuse. A fair example was the encounter he had with a subscriber on the street two years ago about the *Independent's* wedding picture and story of a local young Negro couple on the society page.

"What's the idea of printing the picture of those niggers in your paper?" the reader demanded to know.

"Oh, we just wanted to see how many narrow-minded people there are in Littleton. And do you know, so far I haven't found anybody that has objected to it."

Nieman Notes

1939

The Dial Press brought out in October a novel by Herbert Lyons, *Other Lives to Live*, his second novel in the last two years.

1941

John H. Crider joined the Columbia Broadcasting System staff as news analyst Dec. 17 and began a program five nights a week, at 6.15 from Station WEEI in Boston.

The New Orleans *Item* has a Nieman team doing effective work in George Chaplin, editor, and Thomas Sancton (1942) as star reporter.

1942

Stanley Allen, administrative assistant to Senator William Benton, reports a Nieman Reunion in Belgrade in November. Alexander Kendrick of CBS went down from Vienna, Ernest Hill of the Chicago *Daily News* and Robert Shaplen of the New York *Post* went down from Paris, Allen had gone over from Washington,—all to cover the annual conference of the World Federation of Veterans which Allen had helped form. They spent the week of Nov. 25 together at the Hotel Muscova. It was during the annual "liberation" celebration and they met Tito at a State banquet. "They really hate the Russians," Allen reports, "and will fight if they have anything to fight with. Farm collectivization is going very poorly."

Harry S. Ashmore, editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, made a powerful speech at the Fall conference of Southern Governors which is reported to have been a factor in breaking up a plan of the Dixiecrats to use the conference as the stage for an open revolt against the Administration.

1943

John F. Day, Jr., returned from a year's leave on a Reid Fellowship in Europe to become managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, succeeding James S. Pope, who has been appointed executive editor for both the *Courier-Journal* and the *Times* of Louisville. Day had served two years in the Washington Bureau of the paper before his year in Europe. He had served earlier for several years as managing editor of the Dayton *News*.

Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the Scranton *Times*, was one of five American newspapermen awarded a Reid Fellowship for 1952 for foreign study. Donohoe, long a specialist in labor problems in Pennsylvania coal mining, intends to make a special study of British coal mining conditions and labor problems.

The California magazine *Fortnight* selected William A. Townes, general manager of the Santa Rosa *Press Democrat* as one of the Top Performers of 1951, in a list of 50 Californians distinguished for their achievements during the year. "The *Press Democrat* under Townes' management is rated as one of the best of its size anywhere. Townes has succeeded in extending its reputation as a public service newspaper," says *Fortnight*. The same week he received this distinction, Bill Townes was printing in the public forum on his editorial page one letter urging that he resign and another calling his paper "putrid" and "pink." Townes publishes some of the most abusive letters against himself to be found anywhere in America since Boss Crump went out of the letter-to-the-editor business in Memphis. The editor's note after the most vituperative recent letter said: "Rebuttal letters on anything in the paper are always welcomed."

1944

The memorial plaque of Harvard war dead in the second World War, recently unveiled in Harvard's Memorial Church, carries as the final name on the list, under the heading, Lucius W. Nieman Fellow, the name of John Terry. John was a Fellow from the Honolulu *Star-Bulletin*, studying Far Eastern affairs. At the completion of his Fellowship he went as a war correspondent to cover General MacArthur's headquarters. He went with the first American landing on Leyte and was killed in the first days there.

Charles S. Jennings, on home leave from his Central Intelligence Agency post in England, attended a Nieman dinner December 6th.

1946

James Batal's book *Assignment: Near East* published by Friendship Press has sold more than 20,000 copies. Batal is

executive secretary of the Syrian and Lebanese Federation of the Eastern States.

1947

Ernest H. Linford, editorial writer on the Salt Lake *Tribune*, is chairman of the membership committee of the National Writers and is working hard to increase membership and get a large attendance at the first western convention of the conference, in Denver, Nov. 15. Dwight Sargent (1951) editor of the Portland *Press Herald*, is vice chairman. Linford reports visits at the recent conference convention in Cleveland with other Nieman Fellows: Osburn Zuber (1939) of the Birmingham *Post*, Francis P. Locke (1947) of the Dayton *News* and Millard Browne (1943) of the Buffalo *Evening News*.

Francis P. Locke, associate editor of the Dayton *News*, is chairman of the schools committee of the Harvard Club in Dayton and with other such chairmen attended a recent week-end meeting at the University.

The Rev. William H. McDougall, former United Press Far Eastern correspondent who was imprisoned by the Japanese early in World War II, was ordained a deacon of the Roman Catholic Church, Oct. 2. He is author of *Six Bells Off Java* and *By Eastern Windows*.

1948

Two recent visitors to Cambridge have been Charles W. Gilmore of the Toledo *Times* and Rebecca Gross, editor of the Lock Haven (Pa.) *Express*.

1949

A large part of the *New Yorker* for December 8th was given up to an article by Christopher Rand, reporting on China. Writing from Hongkong, Rand wrote about the neighboring city of Canton, its people, its region, situation, circumstances and such developments under the Communists as came within range of his observation post. With this modest approach he was able to tell a great deal.

David B. Dreiman has been on a leave from *Life* magazine to write the report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education.

1951

Anne and Roy Fisher announced the birth of a girl, Patricia Alice, on October 13th in Chicago where Fisher is on the news staff of the Chicago *Daily News*.