

NiemanReports

July, 1953

OF WHAT AM I AFRAID?

Mark Ethridge

The News Behind the Facts

Robert E. Garst

Why Is A Newspaper?

A. L. Higginbotham

Journalism Is Everybody's Business

Armand E. Singer

Medicine in the News

**Frank J. Starzel, Irving S. Wright,
John E. Drewry**

Historical Pattern of Press Freedom

Frederick S. Siebert

Disciplines For Journalism

Louis M. Lyons

**Reviews — Scrapbook: The Book-Burning Issue; McCarthy and
Press Freedom; The New Art of Human Relations; Three Editorials
of Dissent — The Nieman Fellows for 1953-54 — Nieman 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.

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Malcolm C. Bauer, Portland, Ore.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; 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, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, New York City; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. VII, NO. 3

JULY, 1953

The Nieman Fellows for 1953-4

The Nieman Foundation at Harvard University has announced appointments of eleven newspapermen and one woman as Nieman Fellows at Harvard for the college year opening in September. They make the 16th annual group of newspapermen awarded fellowships for a year of background study for journalism under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman, who left Harvard University \$1,400,000 in 1937 "to promote and elevate standards of journalism." Mrs. Nieman's bequest was in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*.

The 1953-54 Nieman Fellows are:

Robert C. Bergenheim, 29, city hall reporter on the *Christian Science Monitor*. Native of Boston, he began work on the *Monitor* as copy boy in 1941. After three years of war service in the Navy, he returned to become a staff writer and has covered Boston municipal affairs for the *Monitor* for five years. He has been enrolled as an evening class student at Boston University in each of his 10 years on the *Monitor*.

He plans to study U. S. history, government and economics.

Barry Brown, 38, editorial writer on the Providence *Journal*. Born in Washington, D. C., Brown was graduated at Princeton in 1936 and Columbia School for Journalism in 1941. He did his early news work for *Pathfinder Magazine* and the Hornell, N. Y., *Tribune*. He served four years as Air Force officer in cryptography and communications. He joined the Providence *Journal-Bulletin* as a reporter in 1942, and has been since the war an editorial writer, now in charge of the editorial page.

He plans to study American foreign policy.

Alvin Davis, 28, general assignment reporter on the New York *Post*. Native of New York and graduate of Columbia

University, 1950, Davis began as copy boy on the *Post* in 1942. He was soon writing sports and serving on the copy desk. He had three years in the Army with the combat engineers and served on *Stars & Stripes*, European editions. Since the war he has covered major metropolitan news stories. While a full-time reporter he completed work for his college degree in evening courses.

He plans to study history, literature and science.

Richard B. Dudman, 35, reporter on the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*. Born in Centerville, Iowa, a graduate of Stanford University, 1940, Dudman worked in public opinion polling until the war, served the Navy five years, and then joined the Denver *Post* as reporter in 1946. He has been on the *Post-Dispatch* since 1949, on national reporting assignments.

He plans to study in the fields of government, labor and science.

Charles L. Eberhardt, 30, group editor, New Mexico Newspapers, Inc. Born in Salina, Kansas, Eberhardt entered Harvard in 1940. His studies were interrupted by the war. He served in the Marines and returned to get his degree in 1946, and later had a graduate year of journalism at Stanford University. After teaching a year at Middlesex School, he began newspaper work on the Albany (Ore.) *Democrat-Herald* and subsequently worked on the Kansas City *Star*, Denver *Post*, United Press in San Francisco, and since 1950 has edited the four small papers in New Mexico Newspapers, Inc.

He plans to study American history and foreign policy.

Robert E. Farrell, 27, reporter, Washington bureau of the *Wall Street Journal*. Native of Long Island, Farrell was graduated at Bucknell University in 1947 and has worked since then on the *Wall Street Journal*, first in New York, later in Washington, covering government agencies on news of business, labor and finance.

He plans to study economics and history.

Hazel G. Holly, 40, reporter on the San Francisco *Examiner*. Native of California, graduate of the University of California, 1933, Miss Holly served a year on the Oakland *Tribune* and since 1934 has been on the staff of the *Examiner*. As general assignments reporter giving special attention to women's affairs, she has covered many major national assignments of the war and post-war years.

She plans to study politics, history and philosophy.

Robert E. Hoyt, 29, assistant city editor of the Akron *Beacon-Journal*. Native of Springfield, Ohio, Hoyt was graduated from Kent State University in 1948. He did newspaper work in Bellefontaine and Springfield, Ohio, before going to college, and worked part-time on the Akron *Beacon-Journal* during college, joining its staff on gradua-

(Continued on last page.)

Of Whom Shall I Be Afraid?

Commencement Address, 1953

by Mark Ethridge

The distinguished publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal says he "had to get this off my chest." So doing, he has put all un-terrified Americans in his debt. It was the Commencement Address at Kentucky State College, June 2.

I should like to take as a text for what I have to say the last clause of the first verse of the Twenty-seventh Psalm: "Of whom shall I be afraid?" I would apply the question to the United States and to those of us who make up its citizenry.

We are, to paraphrase the Apostle Paul, citizens of no mean country. We are more nearly self-sufficient than any nation the earth has known; nature has been indeed lavish in her endowments. Our production and distribution systems, the marvel of the planet, are certainly the most effective history has known. They have permitted us to attain an economic position which all the world envies. They have made it possible for us three times within one man's lifetime to equip and transport huge armies three and seven thousand miles from our shores to fight in freedom's name. Taking what nature has given us and improving it with inventive, productive and commercial genius, we stand, in terms of power and the capacity to muster force, as a Mt. Everest among the lesser hills.

And yet, we seem to have lost along the way in the last few years what Holmes called "that faith in a universe not measured by our fears" and to have evidenced what the executive board of the American Friends Service Committee calls "a spiritual failure of nerve." I propose in what I have to say today to explore the how and why we got that way and to examine the dangerous miasma, reminiscent of the Dark Ages, into which it could lead us.

It is true that as a nation we face, across a dark chasm of ideology and of spirit, one of the most evil forces the world has ever known, a force more powerful than Fascism or Naziism ever was. It would destroy us if it could. I have been a personal witness to the brutality and the degradation which it brings upon men. I have had the misfortune to live in Germany during the first six months of Hitler's regime and to become involved, as an antagonist representing the United States, in the processes by which the Kremlin took over Bulgaria and Rumania and attempted to take over Greece. I can testify as eloquently as anybody living to the evil of Communism and the danger of Soviet imperialism. Most of my friends and many of my acquaintances in Bulgaria and Rumania have either been

hanged, shot, imprisoned, tortured or exiled. The State Department files and even the public prints bear full testimony to the warnings I gave the American government and to such people who heard or read me against the monstrous brutality and the power-lust of this force of darkness—this strongest of all reactionary forces against all the progress man has made since the Middle Ages toward attaining the good life of his own dignity.

We do indeed face a danger from the outside, less I believe than in 1947, when an armed Russia might have conquered a disarmed Europe and America. The danger diminishes; I am one of those who believes that the Soviets lost that chance at world domination which they have so long cherished and that, as after the Napoleonic war when the Czar rode his horse down the Champs Elysee and enjoyed a brief moment as the dominant figure of the world, the tide has begun to recede. We are not safe yet; we must stay armed and increase our strength. In the political field we must enlarge our sympathy and step up our efforts to restore economic stability and encourage the legitimate aspirations of all those people who demand, as they have a right to demand, their independence of foreign powers. We can not for a moment relax the vigilance that is the price of liberty or diminish our passion for the welfare of mankind.

But, to me and to many others, there is a danger greater than that, which comes from the inside: it is the fear of ourselves, the fear of our neighbors which has already whittled away a good many freedoms of the individual, a good many of the attributes of man's dignity for which I am satisfied that all men yearn. Lest I be regarded as sharing a reverse hysteria, let me summon a much more eminent witness who shares with me the feeling that the United States is passing through a degrading and dangerous period. God grant that it may be only a Black Friday, and that it, too, may quickly pass.

On his eightieth birthday, Justice Learned Hand surveyed the American scene. From his Olympian mind came these observations, "We are in the distressing position of all who find their axioms doubted: axioms which, like all axioms, are so self-evident that any show of dissidence

outrages our morals and paralyzes our minds. And we have responded as men generally do respond to provocation; for the most part we seem to think of nothing better than repression; we seek to extirpate the heresies and wreak vengeance upon the heretics. We have authentically reproduced the same kind of hysteria that swept over England in the time of Titus Oates and during the French revolution, and over ourselves after the Civil War and the First War, except that in our own case we have outdone our precedents." The judge warns that the "doctrines which so frighten us constitute a faith which we must match with a faith, held with equal ardor and conviction," but that we may be in danger of "destroying (the) foundations and abandoning (the) postulates of our own faith."

"What are its foundations and its postulates? On what have we staked our hopes?" he asks. The two questions he answers in these words, "Is it less than the thesis, as yet quite unverified, that the path toward the Good Life is to assure unimpeded utterance to every opinion, to be fearful of all orthodoxies and to face the discords of the Tower of Babel; all with the hope that in the end the dross will somehow be automatically strained out, and we shall be left with the golden nuggets of truth?" Shall we, in other words, be afraid of truth and of man's right to dissent?

What is this force which threatens to make us destroy the foundations and abandon the postulates of our own faith? I agree with George Kennan, who in his recent brilliant Notre Dame speech said that they are "too diffuse to be described by their association with any one man or any one political concept"; that they are yet largely matters of the mind and of the emotions, all marching, "in one way or another, under the banner of an alarmed and exercised anti-communism—but an anti-communism of a quite special variety, bearing an air of excited discovery and proprietorship, as though no one had ever known before that there was a Communist danger."

There are those who call it, superficially, I think, McCarthyism. That is flattering the evil genius of the senator from Wisconsin too much; he is only an arch-angel of Darkness, not the devil himself. Our illness goes deeper than any one man. It is a malady of the soul that summons all the evil forces of the Inquisition, of the Cheka, of Hitlerism, of Stalinism, of the Ku Klux Klan, and all those nauseous forces which claim dominion over the conduct and the souls of other men. The danger is that in our hysteria to achieve what we regard as security, we tear out the real roots of security—man's confidence in himself and in other men; in our hunt for subversives, defined by those who have arrogated to themselves the right to judge what is subversive and what is 100 per cent American, we create real subversives: those who would whittle away ancient and hard-won liberties; and we set in motion forces so dangerous that frequently they can be stopped only after they have left

deep scars upon all of us, or as the French discovered in their revolution, only after a nation is sated with blood-letting and vengeance.

What are the attributes of that mood of the moment of which I am talking? Let me be more specific than I have been. It is that spirit in Congress which has expressed itself in the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 and the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952—both of them, in their way, expressions of fear of fifth columns; both of them narrowing the concept of the competition of ideas so nobly expressed by Holmes. It is the spirit that gave rise to the recent revision of the government's internal security program under which employes may be released for almost any reason, with their only real appeal to the head of the department in which they serve. That program is a violation of all the concepts of justice as far as the individual is concerned; it is the substitution of presumption of guilt for presumption of innocence. The Eisenhower administration will not be glorified by future Toynbees if its achievement is to be written in terms of giving oil and other rights back to the states, but of depriving the individual of protection that has become a part of our instinct for, and our structure of, justice.

This evil spirit of which I speak is that which tends to elevate in esteem confessed traitors who turn informers on others; the spirit which makes Congressmen and Senators, drunk with power, bully and browbeat those who appear before them if they have held views in the past which do not meet the orthodoxy of the moment; it is the spirit of the Inquisition in which poor dupes of the past, mostly guillible artists or emotional reeds of one kind or another, parade before the altar of Congress to shrive their souls and try to save their jobs; it is the spirit which made our own Kentuckian, Mildred McAfee Horton, the leading figure, as someone said in a letter to the *New York Times*, of a new playing of Kafka's "The Trial," in which the accused never knows what he is charged with or who his accusers are and never enters the courtroom where his case is decided.

It is the spirit, in which groups, sitting in judgment upon what should be said, or thought, or read, or written, fire a librarian in Oklahoma for subscribing to the *Nation*; cancel a speech by Mary McLeod Bethune, a great and noble woman, because someone has whispered that she is subversive; boycott Copland's music; arraign Sarah Lawrence and Vassar College as hotbeds of radicalism; drive Canada Lee, John Garfield and Larry Adler, to mention only a few, from the American stage; drum a man like John Carter Vincent, guilty at most of mistaken judgment, if indeed he was even that—guilty certainly, as I can testify, of a devout passion for the welfare of mankind—out of public life, and, on the anonymous reports of anonymous scandalmongers, almost drive out "Chip" Bohlen, the

man who knows more about Russia than any man in the Foreign Service.

The catalogue is long, and could be longer. The danger is that such a spirit moves in ever-widening, concentric circles until at the end every man tends to regard himself as the only authority on what is 100 per cent Americanism. Minorities which stand to lose most by intolerance are inclined to join the pack. The Catholics want to prevent the showing of "The Miracle." Jewish groups don't like "Oliver Twist" and "The Merchant of Venice." The N.A.A.C.P. tries to suppress "The Birth of a Nation" and "Uncle Tom's Cabin;" a Negro bishop protests "Green Pastures." The American Legion tries to prevent performances of "The Death of a Salesman" because its author was listed in Red Channels. The mood to dictate to other peoples what their rights and their standards of culture shall be is a by-product of the spirit of which I have talked. It could be wished that all such gestures would have as ridiculous a denouement as the McCarthy-inspired ban on Russian works on the Voice of America. Edward Barrett, lately the able director of the International Information program, says that in late March of this year a Voice of America producer asked the librarian for a recording of the "Song of India," to be played upon the request of some Indians. The record was not available, the librarian explained, "because you see, it's by Rimsky-Korsakov, and we're supposed not to use anything by Russians."

A good many of these silly things fall of their own weight, but the result is not always happy. I should like to set down some of the evil consequences of the manifestations of the moment and relate them to their spiritual cousins whose names the world has come to know with loathing:

(1) We have magnified the atmosphere of tension, anxiety and insecurity by encouraging an informer system which is close to the Nazi and Communist cell systems;

(2) We have resorted to subtle and open methods of repression which become totalitarian states but degrade a free nation. If every man's house is his own castle, every man's mind and soul are the sine qua non of his own dignity;

(3) We have introduced fear of each other as an element of American life, where Americans have always been known by other peoples of the world as open-hearted, naively trustful creatures, an indictment in which we should have some pride, because we *do* believe in the natural goodness of man;

(4) We have tended to subscribe to the "gleichshaltung" which Hitler tried to achieve: that molding into one form the thoughts of all people. The cult of the gleichshaltungen in this country is that vast body which can define—always in its own terms—a 100 per cent American;

(5) We have violated the British-American concept of

justice by taking short cuts, such as the recent loyalty program; by torturing the doctrine of clear and present danger by hit-and-run character assassination, of which McCarthy and Jenner are expert practitioners; by using the power of legislators to intimidate in secret sessions and by the denial of counsel in what have been converted from legislative inquiries to judicial proceedings;

(6) We have adopted the Big Lie technique of Goebbels in too many instances, particularly those in which Senator McCarthy figures. The State Department is not guiltless of that in the Mildred McAfee Horton case. It has wilted so often under frowns from the Hill that none of us knows who is really the author of Foggy Bottom policy or the judge of the fitness of State Department employees. By some people the present period is known as the McCarthy interregnum as Secretary of State.

(7) We have been guilty of anti-intellectualism. We ban the books of those who do not write to formula and deny admission to those scientists and artists whose political standards do not conform to our own. The Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in December of last year, issued this warning: "The Council is profoundly disturbed over the present world conditions which so severely impede the free exchange of knowledge even among friendly nations. Danger to the future of our nation is implicit in such restrictions. The Council recognizes the need for measures which will effectively safeguard our security, but expresses its troubled concern over the manner in which such measures, in particular the McCarran Act, are being administered, to prohibit American citizens from going abroad and citizens of other nations from coming here to interchange knowledge of science which does not affect security."

We are inclined to forget that the atom bomb, our strongest weapon, was the product of many minds, among the more responsible for its success being Einstein and Meitner, German refugees, Fermi, an Italian, and Niels Bohr, a Dane. We are likely to forget the enrichment which our culture has sustained through those who fled authoritarianism and came here because they could work in a free atmosphere.

(8) It is a manifestation of the night rider and the Klan spirit when we undertake to stifle dissent. It is a betrayal of the central core of our political genius: the right to dissent. We gave the world, in our own Revolution, the finest justification for it. We set a great part of the world free because it followed our example and dissented. Our genius has been revolutionary. Our production line is a revolt against the ancient guilds; our distribution system is a revolt against the country store. Every invention which has increased the productive capacity of man, swiftened his travel, lightened the burden of the housewife is a revolt against ancient methods. Why are we so blind that we will

not see that the most precious heritage we have, in the field of ideas as well as in the field of industry, is the spirit that has cast out, pioneering and unafraid? And yet, it is true that some of our most successful business men, who spend millions a year on research for new methods and new ideas to improve their gadgets, help finance organizations which are designed to keep us in a rigid mould of thought and of culture.

(9) We have narrowed the limits of academic freedom. The word liberal has become "a poisonous word" to many potential employers, who regard the liberal graduate as an "obstructionist" and "organizer against the interests of the employers." It is unfortunately true that too many people in the business world are looking for neatly-turned-out little robots who will have no disturbing ideas. Personally, if my children had left college subscribing to the pattern of civilization as they found it upon graduation, with no passion to change any of it, I would have considered them intellectual morons and spiritual paupers. And, if any members of the Negro race so felt, they would betray every man and every movement which has sought to remove the stigma of "second-class citizen."

But it is not solely against the graduate that the thumb is turned. Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, says that "The miasma of thought control that is now spreading over this country is the greatest menace to the United States since Hitler." Some colleges have made a cowardly surrender to pressure; others, like Harvard, have made manly stands in accord with ancient and decent traditions. The college that suffers its professors to be punished because they are liberal, as opposed to Communists, is not worthy the name of an educational institution. This would be a poor country indeed if the college professor, free from the routine and demands of the business world, were not able to project his thoughts and his ideas beyond the grub-worm's eye view that most of us, bound by routines, do get. When we make them fearful to have their political ideas and to express them in their proper places, we breed that fear which, as Brandeis said, "Breeds repression, which in turn breeds hate, which in turn menaces stable government." We stifle the creative force of ideas by which we have become great; we make hacks of men and women whom we trust to train and stimulate the minds of our children.

(10) The final, and most deadly product of our internal mood is the effect it has upon foreigners, looking at us. Everybody in the free world knows that if there is a shield against Soviet Russia, we are it; everybody

knows that unless we are able to turn aside the heretofore inexorable force of history that when two nations of such power as Russia and the United States face each other in contention there will be war. In such a situation our greatest need is to exercise the leadership with which we are endowed and summon to our side in all confidence all those of like mind and like determination. But, if we are afraid, if we are divided internally, if we lack and fail to assert determination to remain free, if we have grown weary in expanding freedom for others and are set upon whittling away our own, the world will not rally to us.

Edward Crankshaw sounded an eloquent warning in his recent *Cracks in the Kremlin Wall*, when he said:

"I can think of only one way in which the Kremlin may still conquer us, and that without war. It is by so frightening us (but it is we who allow ourselves to be frightened) that for fear of the enemy within we transform our own society imperceptibly into an apparatus of totalitarianism indistinguishable from the society of Soviet Russia—a system which may not be criticized, whether the British parliamentary system or the American way of life, for fear of damaging national unity, the unity of the grave; a system in which the bully and the corrupt may not be denounced or the underdog uplifted because nobody will dare risk being called a Red."

In closing may I quote a paragraph from Bernard DeVoto:

"I like a country where it's nobody's damned business what magazines anyone reads, what he thinks, whom he has cocktails with. I like a country where we do not have to stuff the chimney against listening ears and where what we say does not go into the FBI files along with a note from S-17 that I may have another wife in California. I like a country where no college-trained flatfeet collect memoranda about us and ask judicial protection for them, a country where when someone makes statements about us to officials he can be held to account. We had that kind of country only a little while ago and I'm for getting it back. It was a lot less scared than the one we've got now. It slept sound no matter how many people joined Communist reading circles and it put common scolds to the ducking stool. Let's rip off the gingerbread and restore the original—

I repeat the question: "Of whom shall I be afraid?"

The News Behind the Facts

by Robert E. Garst

It may be interesting to take a look at regional reporting and describe our thinking about it on the New York *Times*. It seems to me that our altered outlook has brought about a drastic shift in basic reporting and what we want our men to do. The new attitude affects not only this type of reporting but also local, national and foreign.

What we aim for is what the *Times* Sunday Editor has called "the inner meaning of the news." As a practical matter, coverage of spot news can be left to the wire service, unless it is a major event to which we should give special attention.

We have found in many cases, and now accept the idea as a sound method of operation, that it is not the event itself that is of major importance but what caused it—or, at any rate, the cause is of equal importance. Too much of past reporting has dealt only with the surface facts—the spot news—and too rarely has dug into the reasons for them.

A race riot, a prison outbreak, a bad slum condition—even a murder—has a social background, deeply rooted perhaps in the customs, traditions and economic condition of a region or community, but it is there and discoverable. It's the newspaper's job, it seems to us, to discover it. Only with that knowledge can a remedy be found for many of the ills that affect us. Thinking knowledge may hurt our pride, or make us feel disgraced before the outside world, and therefore the less said the better, I believe is wrong, because a cancer cannot be cured without diagnosis and treatment.

I'm sure readers in other sections follow with interest, if not too great concern, developments in the battle to relieve the financial distress of New York. We are not proud of our plight, it hurts our self-esteem to know that you know the greatest city in the world is virtually bankrupt and is floundering in its efforts to get back on its feet. Yet all New York papers print all the official moves and factual data day by day. But is that enough in a situation so complex? I think not. Public service requires that we dig into the "inner meaning" of this factual information. With the subway deficit the key to the problem, the *Times* surveyed and printed some weeks ago the fare situation in the major cities of the nation, the essential conclusion being that a 10-cent fare is ruinous, and that fares elsewhere range from 15 cents to 24 cents. Even now, as another aspect of the financial problem, we are undertaking a study of services given by the city to its residents, their cost and

value, and the deficits entailed by them. With a growing need for such services—clinics, hospitals, schools, welfare, traffic cures, highways, and scores of others—we are also trying to ascertain—and maybe chart a course—whether any fiscal solution now being considered is adequate to the need, or whether some more radical step is required to keep us from falling further behind. I do not know the answer, I doubt that anyone does. But only by such studies can material be obtained that will state the problem.

Some may feel here that it's easier for a big city newspaper to take this attitude than for a smaller newspaper in a smaller place. But I can assure you that the civic and social pressures in New York against the exposure of bad conditions are great. It is not easy anywhere. But it is necessary if newspapers are to give the best service to their readers for the public good.

For illustration, I have no doubt taken melancholy cases, supporting to some extent the frequently-heard charge that newspapers exaggerate the seamy side of life—like crime—and minimize the good—like sermons on Sunday. This was only to point up the need to open up the seamy side, if it exists, and let light in and thus achieve good—and that is news, too.

In the main, *Times* regional correspondents are not looking for skeletons in closets. They are not after traditional news of the sensational sort. Their purpose is much more serious and fundamental. They are observers and reporters of trends in all fields—business, industrial, educational, cultural. Their eventual purpose is constructive—to record change and progress and achievement. They will of course report decline where it exists—but I am aware of no notable signs of decadence in any part of this country—except in Greenwich Village where I live in New York. The *Times* has a number of "regional correspondents" in that area who will come up with a report on the situation in good time.

What we want to bring to *Times* readers—and we number many in the South among them—is as complete a picture and understanding as possible of what is going on in the diverse and semi-independent sections of our nation. We have nine able men about the country in areas that are somewhat arbitrary but seem to us to be logical units, according to their economic pursuits, or social or traditional divisions.

In turn, we expect them to bring to the residents of their areas an assurance of our interest in them and their problems and a willingness to interpret them, in a friendly fashion, in terms that will relate them to other regions and to the nation as an indivisible unit.

Robert E. Garst, assistant managing editor of the New York *Times* gave this talk in Atlanta May 4 when Sigma Delta Chi honored John Popham for his regional reporting for the *Times*.

By and large, we get what we ask for. All our regional men, except our New England correspondents, are products of the home office and they are well-versed in the New York out look and in *Times* tradition. They are picked for the posts they now hold partly because of their own choice, but mainly because of ability, vision and understanding of our conception of the basic reporting problem.

For an example, let us take the world of John Popham, the *Times* regional correspondent for the South. We get what we want from him in full measure, and it is our hope that our readers in the South get from him and the *Times* what they want. I looked over his by-line clippings last week and found that since last October he had been in 16 major cities, some of them several times, in all the states of this region, covering major assignments. I haven't yet checked on his car to see what his mileage is, but whatever the total, the result is worth the cost.

I remarked earlier that the idea we had first applied to regional reporting has now affected all other kinds. Even in the city news field, which is traditionally of the spot variety, the *Times* now is developing the background and trend story, and dealing more and more with the cultural and community development phases of New York life. I don't mean to say that spot news is neglected. We are merely broadening the base of coverage.

This extends, too, to national, especially Washington, operations, and into the foreign field. Here, too, we want to go beyond the official area of information and find out what the people of the countries are doing and thinking, and present our findings in a fashion understandable to the people of this country. The striking thing, to me, in this development is that we obviously are becoming more concerned with people, with groups of individuals, rather than with officials and governments.

I would be hard pressed to get down to cases and give the reasons for this. It may be that the speed and efficiency of modern communications are one answer, or that advances in education in many areas of the world bring the individual closer to us in understanding, or—and I like this best—the complexities of civilization impress on all of us the need to unite in order to survive and in order to solve common problems, all of which are based ultimately, I think, on the individual and on his rights to think, and on his dignity and independence. That's a guess, but is there a better one?

Because of an impending visit in Atlanta, I noted with special interest the advertising section devoted to Georgia in the *Times* of Sunday, April 26. There was real news in it of Georgia's progress and progressiveness, of the new variety of her industries and of dynamic plans in the *Times*, of Georgia and of all other states. But the phrase that struck me particularly was "communities on the march." We in the newspaper world will have to be on the march, too, to keep abreast.

Medicine in the News

by Frank J. Starzel

Twenty-five years ago news reporting of medicine merited no consideration for an award of any sort.

The change which has occurred is due largely to the changed attitude of the medical profession. And let no one be misled into concluding that this is intended wholly as a compliment to the practitioners of the healing arts. Not until about 25 years ago did the medical profession begin to emerge from its own stygian darkness in the field of public information. The profession for the first time demonstrated a realization of some fundamental truths in human relations. This was a discovery which did not come from test tubes, laboratories, clinics or consulting rooms. It arose from some responsive pecking, often feeble and frustratingly irregular, from the inside.

There was, for one example, the discovery that medical news could be accurately reported in words and terms understandable to the average citizen. It caused considerable shock to some of the brethren when it was demonstrated that the news reporter's rather simple effort in prose could be more effective than the traditional multisyllabic polyglot of scientific jargon.

The heretical notion that the editor and reporter had a somewhat better and more precise appreciation of what interests the public was equally disturbing. In short, there began to open before the medical profession a vista of new possibilities and potentials which were both awe-inspiring and awful.

Here was a new and strong right arm to assist in public education through sound information. Here was opportunity to give medical science a new dimension in public service. Here also was an instrument that could and would tread and perhaps mash a lot of sacred toes.

Change is always a frightening prospect. It is especially so in the field of abstractions, in customs and practices. Relatively speaking it doesn't matter whether it is a child of four or a matured, graying scientist; venturing into the dark is business to be avoided. And utilizing the instruments of mass communication did seem to mean a bold foray into inky blackness for the medical profession some 25 or 30 years ago.

It would be gross exaggeration to say that the profession took the step boldly. It was an inching process. I dare say that, in the collective sense, no new technique or treatment was ever surrounded with so many safeguards, with so much caution or with such exhaustive clinical testing and experience. While perhaps unduly cautious the process was reasonable and understandable.

As a consequence, I can certainly concur in the conclusion of most science writers that the medical profession has

responded and is responding to the public interest in the field of medical news. There is a greater degree of cooperation than ever before in disclosing, clarifying and explaining to reporters the new developments and advances in research and practice. There is evidence of essential mutual confidence. Reporters and their editors are demonstrating awareness of their own responsibilities. It represents in sum an excellent prospect for public service. But it is still far from an idyllic present. The medical profession has not grasped fully the opportunity for its own and, more important, the public benefit.

Individual practitioners with great frequency demonstrate distrust or fear of this powerful aid at their command. There is an old German proverb which translates roughly into 'what the peasant doesn't know, he never eats.' I suggest it is *not* a sound philosophy for men of science restlessly seeking new truths.

The profession concerns itself overly much with blocking the activities of the publicity seeker. Reporters and editors have the broadest possible experience with this type of individual and know how to deal with him effectively, specifically by avoiding him and his handouts.

The fact that a limited number of practitioners are primarily interested in personal fame or fortune should not be reason for depriving the public of valuable medical information. And that is the result sometimes of organized medicine's efforts in this field.

The public is frequently deprived of useful and valuable information because self-imposed restraints arise from the fear the fellow practitioners will suspect or criticize the individual physician's motives in making public the fruits of his learning. This reflects a form of personal, professional jealousy which is immeasurably damaging to the public benefit. It is a throwback to the dark ages and has no place in an era of enlightened procedures.

In an other area, there should be recognition within the profession that the specialized full-time science news reporter may have opportunities to become acquainted with developments to an extent which the individual physician frequently cannot match, even though he be a prodigious student. Therefore when a patient presents a clipping of a newspaper or a magazine article the physician does a disservice to the profession and to the public if he covers up his own lack of knowledge by challenging the validity of information which obviously interests the patient. I am well aware of the physician's difficulties arising from the fact that few patients are very effective in either the diagnosis or treatment of their own ills. I am aware that, no matter how carefully the reporter develops the news, there is always room for misconception on the part of a hopeful reader. Nevertheless, this is the best system yet evolved for the information of the public and it deserves the physician's considered support—even at the price of acknowledging a lack of omni-

science. Besides a better informed public means more intelligent patients.

There are still some organizations which fail substantially to provide the essential link to sound public information. At one recent meeting there were presented some 1,600 papers over a five-day period. There was no provision for reporters to obtain evaluations or explanations of a mass of highly technical documents—many couched in language which was not clear even to qualified experts in the same field. I am *not* asking or seeking some sort of special privilege for news reporters. I do ask on behalf of the public. And that perhaps brings me to the core of the matter.

There is a unique affinity between mass communication facilities and the medical profession. Those of us engaged in dissemination of public information to worldwide audiences have only one sound reason for our existence—that is rendering a public service. The economic success of our enterprises, in the long run, depends wholly and entirely on the degree to which we discharge our public obligations. The spiritual quality essential to an information enterprise finds no counterpart in the marts of trade or halls of barter.

Medicine is likewise devoted to public service. Its activities touch and concern mankind universally. Its responsibilities extend far beyond the individual relationship in the consulting room, clinic or operating chamber. The fulfillment of its idealism is of much greater consequence to its own survival as an honored institution.

I believe that the relationship between the world of science and the media of information would be better served if we could achieve a universal acknowledgement that the public has a right to know all constructive advances in medicine or in any other field. The public provides substantial support of institutions of learning and research. The overall purpose is to benefit mankind. The news of medicine and science is not the private property of individuals or groups. It belongs to the people.

In joining in a tribute to these distinguished award winners here today, I express the hope that we reporters and you in the medical profession can continue on this course of progress—not for our personal benefit or reward, not on the basis of some small or narrow advantage for ourselves, but in the spirit of being the temporary trustee of a great responsibility to the millions of our fellow world citizens and to those millions yet unborn. It matters nothing at all whether we achieve the distinction of being the richest or most famous corpse in the cemetery; it matters much whether we have truly discharged our obligation for the present and the future.

This is from a talk by **Frank J. Starzel**, general manager, Associated Press, at the annual award of the Lasker Foundation for reporting on medicine and public health.

The Five Pillars of Science Writing

by Irving S. Wright

Repeated studies have shown that reader interest in both magazine and newspaper articles dealing with health are consistently in either first or second place—and they are usually read in great detail and not just scanned for headlines. They are supplanted only by items of world-shaking importance such as atomic blasts, war, major crises and presidential campaigns, but they hold a high reader interest even with such competition. Considering this, it is surprising that so few publications have developed staffs of sufficient size, training and importance to place such reporting in its proper frame of reference in relation to the whole.

What do we want and what should we rightfully require from a writer who purports to interpret science in any form to the public—whether he be newspaper reporter, magazine writer, or the author of a book on the subject? I have seen fine scientists tortured on the racks of poor writers for years, and I have seen them accorded national acclaim as a result of the efforts of fine, conscientious journalists. What was the difference in the reporting on the same or similar subjects? The best science writers have lived and worked by a code—consciously or unconsciously. What are the pillars of success and greatness in this type of writing?

1. *Accuracy* is the first pillar. Any intentional or careless deviation from the facts, while temporarily titillating, only acts as a boomerang—destroying the value of the article and seriously damaging the reputation of the writer and of the scientist. The standards used for the reporting of murder, rape, and other deviations of human behavior, have no place in scientific reporting. Unfortunately, the same reporters sometimes attempt both types of reporting, and the lack of refocusing of their mental processes is tragically apparent. Accuracy can not be achieved unless the final copy is carefully rechecked with the original source of information. I state this from a long personal and organizational experience.

This is a stumbling block which is too often encouraged by editors whose code consists of a “beat” instead of an accurate report—when actually the progress and excitement of scientific advance requires, and should have, no deadlines. To many reporters who have interviewed me, the editor and his deadline represent some kind of “sacred cow” before which all things and people, including science

and scientists, should bow. Let it now be said and forever remembered—that for science there are no “sacred cows”—even those scientists who are so regarded by the public. The truth of a year or a generation, too often comes tumbling down to permit of “sacred cows” in any field of human interest.

2. *The story must be virile and of wide interest.* This is the second pillar. Medical science is so full of exciting stories that a much larger portion of newspaper space could be utilized for this. What has appeared to be dull, like a bit of dirty mold on a culture plate—changed history of medical practice—it was penicillin. An obscure jar of a forgotten chemical compound sitting on a shelf for years, turned out to be sulfanilamide. Spoiled sweet clover that killed cattle has saved thousands of lives as dicumarol, an anti-clotting drug. A clump of earth—radium! They are all around us—no science writer need want for material, but rather for judgment, in selecting the most vital progress to report to the public.

3. *The style must be that of the best.* This is the third pillar. The best prose is not too good. It is sometimes difficult, but never impossible, to translate scientific advances into simple, clear stories. The details are not usually essential unless they illustrate a point. But sweeping pictures of great beauty can give the correct emphasis—witness Rachael Carson's Portrait of the Sea, or The World In Which We Live series, in *Life Magazine*. The public is often more advanced in their perception and grasp of science than newspapers and magazines give them credit for—just as the public is often far ahead of the politicians in their reaction to major issues.

4. *The impact of each story should be weighed.* This is the fourth pillar. Is it a story of justified hope of victory, of encouragement, or one which will bring despair to the homes of thousands afflicted with a specific disease? There is only one thing worse than that—the raising of false and unjustified hope in the hearts of victims of incurable diseases and their families. Every time one of these frightful articles appears, the doctors of this country are besieged with pathetic calls for help which cannot be forthcoming. It happens several times a year and always spells tragedy. Here the responsibility must frequently fall equally on an over-enthusiastic investigator who cannot see the pitfalls in his own work (he is usually young and inexperienced, or a manic by temperament), and the writer and the editor. If a story is considered important and presents claims for a new cure, it should be worth a few minutes to check its validity with the headquarters of the leading health organization in the field. On the other hand, the impact of a

This is from a talk by Dr. Irving S. Wright of Cornell Medical College at the presentation of the 1952 Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards, April 29, 1953. The awards went to John Lear of *Collier's* and Cathy Covert of the *Syracuse Herald-Journal*.

fine story may bring new treatments and cures to thousands of sufferers and greatly hasten the general use of a new medical weapon. This impact may also be felt in terms of motivating many individuals to give their time and financial support towards the eradication of disease—the breakthrough to new horizons of well-being.

5. *Accuracy.* This is the fifth pillar. I purposely place this first and last. Without it, there is no science writing, only a false facade of pseudo-science. With it, a magnificent contribution can be made.

I now pay special tribute to the serious, sincere, science writers who work with the greatest human interest at heart and are dedicated to the principles I have outlined. They are a small tribe but steadily increasing. They need more support and cultivation by their publishers, and they must multiply many fold to fulfill what destiny has planned for them. To the publishers who cultivate, support and encourage them, the wide vistas of scientific advance lay ahead with great rewards. These will be in terms of personal satisfaction and increasing reader appreciation. To these ends, The Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards are dedicated.

Doctors and the Public

by John E. Drewry

Probably no name in medical history is held in higher esteem than that of the late Sir William Osler. He was the author of a book, *Principles and Practice of Medicine*, which was a basic text of thousands of contemporary practitioners, and was himself the subject of several important biographies, one of which, Dr. Harvey Cushing's *The Life of Sir William Osler*, published in 1925, won the Pulitzer prize. So wise were Dr. Osler's observations on such a variety of subjects that 31 years after his death a new book, *Osler Aphorisms*, was published and it had a substantial sale. The teaching and personality of this man, according to Webster's Biographical Dictionary, "strongly influenced medical progress."

The story is told (in *For Doctors Only* by Dr. Francis Leo Golden) that one day as Dr. Osler was leaving the hospital, a patient called out from a nearby bed, "Good morning, Doc." The great physician made no reply, but when he reached a corridor, he turned to the interns who were accompanying him and said:

"Beware of the men who call you Doc. Rarely do they pay their bills." This admonition, with all its public relations implications, is my text.

What does Dr. Osler's statement mean?

Are doctors primarily interested in their fees?

Do they place money above human relationships?

Do they want the proper distance kept between them and their patients?

Above all, is the attitude of professional medicine toward the public, and the agencies of public relations, a little like that of big business of yesterday: "The public be damned!?"

And is this attitude, as was the case with the corporations, intensified by fear? In the case of business—fear of government intervention? In the case of medicine—fear, again of government, but in this instance known as socialized medicine?

Fear, undoubtedly, is at the bottom of much bad medical public relations. But it is more than fear of socialized medicine. It is a fear much more general and fundamental. It is the fear of the unknown, and in the case of most doctors, the unknown is public relations—its purposes and techniques. Coupled with the frightening ignorance are a training, a tradition, and an ethical concept which eschew publicity. Doctors don't advertise (openly) and they are suspicious of those who get into the public prints (no matter how dignified the reference or reputable the publication). Dr. Osler had something of this point of view—although printer's ink played a far greater part in the establishment of his great reputation than many doctor critics may realize. Wrote Dr. Osler:

"In the life of every successful physician there comes the temptation to toy with the Delilah of the Press—daily and otherwise. There are times when she can be courted with satisfaction, but beware! Sooner or later she is sure to play the harlot, and has left many a man shorn of his strength, namely the confidence of his professional brethren."

The doctor does not, of course, want to be shorn of his strength—of his professional reputation. He is jealous of the esteem in which he personally and his profession are held. He wants, if he be the right kind of physician, to enhance the standing of both. The prescription then, is that of Holy Writ. "Heal thyself." He must analyze the fears that are at the root of many of medicine's public relations problems; he must deal adequately with those which merit attention; and he must free himself of the paralysis of what Roosevelt called the greatest of all fears—fear of fear itself.

What then is the treatment? There is no general panacea, and the several phases of medicine—general practitioner, specialist, hospitals, public health, nurses—all have their special problems. But there are a few general principles which may well serve as the basis of individual or group action—such questions as these:

What is it about doctors and medical practice that the public does not like?

Which of these complaints have merit, and what can doctors do about them?

What is the public?

Could it be that there is more than one public?

Are doctors, as such, aware of Capital and Labor, of civic clubs and veterans' organizations, of Congress and the Senate, of the Church and public education—and a host of similar groups, all of which are potential friends or enemies?

In the answers to such questions as these lies the beginning of wisdom in so far as good public relations are concerned. As Larry Rember of the American Medical Association, has so well put it, "Medical public relations is a continuous process by which the medical profession endeavors to obtain the confidence and good will of the public—*inwardly* by self-analysis and correction to the end that the best interests of the people will be served; *outwardly* by all means of expression so that the people will understand and appreciate that their welfare is the profession's guiding principle."

What are some of the areas in which doctors may well do some professional soul-searching? I have read some things that are not too complimentary to doctors about fees; about kick-backs in the sale of spectacles, drugs, and through referrals; about keeping patients waiting in the outer offices much too long; about treating the ailment rather than the person; about discourteous brush-offs of newspapermen whose missions are perfectly legitimate; about unkind references to publications which are making serious and intelligent effort to work with and for the medical profession in the attainment of better health for more of the people; about a high and mighty and holier-than-thou attitude toward those social agencies, such as the press and radio, which should and would like to be allies of the doctor.

Many are the times that I have told our journalism students that the newspaper is for society what the doctor is for the individual, and that this is the age of preventive rather than curative medicine. The press is concerned with the ills of society, just as doctors are with the ailments of the individual—or stated in the language of preventive medicine, the press would promote the health of the body politic just as doctors would see that the individual remains well. This means that the agencies of communication are potentially friends. But doctors must know these agencies, and the men and women through whom they function, if they are to enjoy this friendship and its benefits.

It is not without significance that propaganda—which is just another word for public relations—is of religious origin. The word derives from the College of Propaganda which was instituted by Pope Urban VIII (1623-44) during the 17th Century to educate priests. Propaganda or publicity is, therefore, a phase or form of education. And its greatest development has been during the present century. There are some fairly obvious and altogether logical reasons for this, among which are:

1. The complexity of modern civilization makes it impossible for any newspaper anywhere to cover all sources

of news. Much worthwhile news, therefore, must be provided the press through public relations offices if it is ever to be published.

2. Specialized subjects—and certainly medicine is one of these—need to be treated by those who understand them. A few of the better-heeled newspapers and magazines are able to employ science and medical writers, but the rank and file of publications can do a better job of interpreting medicine to the public if the stories are processed for readability and truth by a public relations man or woman who has the point of view of both the doctor and the press or radio.

3. Institutions and professions supported by and/or serving the public—and these would certainly include hospitals, doctors, dentists, et al—have an obligation to keep their constituencies informed about how they are functioning—their problems, difficulties, and achievements.

4. From the doctor's standpoint—and this may be regarded as the selfish point of view, albeit enlightened selfishness—proper publicity is a lever for the kind of support which medicine, like all professions and social agencies, constantly needs.

5. An important reason for public relations development—one which doctors and others who are publicity shy are likely to forget—is that the newspaper, radio-tv and magazine, as important social agencies, cannot ignore medical, scientific, and educational news. In the fulfillment of their obligation, journalists are entitled to the intelligent support of the medical world.

6. Possibly the strongest argument for active, aggressive medical public relations—and again this is from the standpoint of medicine, selfish, but enlightened—is the fact that publicity is a safeguard against misrepresentation.

Which brings us back to the word propaganda—indeed a tricky term. Some cynic has said that whether propaganda is good or bad depends on whether it is ours or that of the other fellow. Certainly the word means one thing for one group, and something entirely different for another. For many, it has an evil connotation. For them, it is something sinister, evil, under-cover, perhaps dangerous. For others (and we, I hope, belong to this group) it is a much abused word of honorable origin and great potential. It is a necessary part of our 20th Century mores. It is ours to use wisely through many media.

Medicine is one of the oldest of the professions, but one of the youngest to see the need for organized publicity. I was interested to read that it was only in 1951 that the Medical Association of my own state, Georgia, inaugurated a public relations program—thus becoming the 22nd such society to employ a full-time public relations director and the 32nd to set up a budget specifically for public relations activities. The church ministry, another old profession, is a newcomer to the public relations field. But much progress is being

made. Some of the theological seminaries are adding courses in public relations to their curricula. Possibly medical schools should do likewise. I had a student tell me recently that he was planning to be an undertaker and that he thought journalism would be a good pre-mortician's course. We now have a combination journalism-law course. Medicine, the ministry, and the law are, of course, the classical trilogy among the professions. Two have taken formal cognizance of the place of journalism or public relations as a part of their educational preparation of novitiates. The third, medicine, seems to be toying with the idea. It may not be a bad one.

In conclusion, may I point quickly to some of the good things by way of medical public relations which I think merit commendation:

1. Some of our best books are by doctor-authors. We Georgians are familiar, of course, with Dr. Frank K. Boland's *Crawford W. Long*, and the tremendous amount of time and energy which Dr. Boland has exerted in behalf of Dr. Long's claim to fame as the first to use ether as an anesthesia. Incidentally, this is a good example of medical public relations at its best. We also remember the great biographies or autobiographies of Hugh Young, Harvey Cushing, the Mayo brothers, and other towering giants of medicine. Some of our best fiction writers have a medical background. To cite but three among contemporary best-sellers, there are Somerset Maugham, A. J. Cronin, and Frank Slaughter. If we turned back the pages of history, there would be Oliver Wendell Holmes and others of equal stature. Have you ever wondered why some of our best literature is medical in origin? (In the book trade, it is said that books by or about doctors, books about Lincoln, and books about dogs always sell well.) The answer may be in the fact that physicians know life with its ailments, problems, difficulties, achievements, and moments of happiness as no other professional group can. They know life and death and all that comes between.

2. Our better magazines are devoting more space to medicine. *Time*, I think, does a good job with its section on medicine. *Reader's Digest*—in spite of some doctors' cryptic and critical comments—has carried many excellent articles and has a point of view which is admirable. *Look* magazine, with its illustrated feature on the American Medical Association, and its recent article by Margaret Mead

on psychoanalysis, has shown enterprise and discrimination in its approach to health subjects. *Atlantic Monthly*, *Life*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and *Ladies' Home Journal* come to mind, and in the case of the last mentioned, the work of Edward Bok in the realization of pure food and drug laws is indeed a milestone of great importance.

3. All over the country, those newspapers which are financially able to do so are adding reporters and special writers to handle hospitals, medicine, science, and related subjects. The *Atlanta Journal* has pioneered in this form of journalistic progress and has won sectional and national praise for its achievements in this realm.

4. Radio, through local and network programs, is giving more time and better talent to programs that relate to medicine and health. I remember that a Peabody winner in 1942 was "Our Hidden Enemy—Venereal Disease," Radio Station KOAC, Corvallis, Oregon, prepared by Dr. Charles Baker for the University of Kentucky.

5. Television has demonstrated its usefulness in revealing operation techniques. I was privileged to see those marvelous demonstrations at the Atlanta Municipal Auditorium of what TV cameras can do in this regard, and both the potentialities and actualities of these telecasts were impressive.

To close, I turn again to Sir William Osler—for whom I have great admiration, however much I may disagree with his statement which I used as my text. Sir William once said:

"Always note and record the unusual . . . communicate or publish . . . anything that is striking or new."

Did you note the key words in that injunction? The *unusual . . . communicate . . . publish . . . striking . . . new*.

How like the classical definition of news which is in every primer of journalism!

Perhaps medicine and journalism are not so far apart after all. Dr. Osler admonished: "Remember how much you do not know." Public relations is a new field. There is much yet to be learned. But progress is being made.

This is from an address, by **Dean Drewry** of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia, delivered at a press and radio conference of the Medical Association of Georgia.

Disciplines for Journalism

by Louis M. Lyons

My subject, as I understand it, is the education of the journalist and its relation to the teaching of English. That assumes a relation. I cannot prove it. Indeed in my own case it was a negative one. My experience with English A was so repelling that I never elected another English course in college. It convinced me that writing was an abhorrent exercise, that I could not write, and I wanted nothing to do with it. It was a highly formalized, rigid process, of a topical sentence and then a structured composition that just froze out any ideas or any facility I might have had.

Later, when I had begun to make my living by writing, I had a second chance and enrolled in a graduate course in composition with Dean Briggs at Harvard. That was wonderful. The dean with his great humaneness and interest picked up the little details of style and usage for us, one or two every session. And after every class I became aware of one more of the roughnesses of my sentences and eliminated it.

I began to appreciate the difference between "that" and "which," which had always been mysterious to me. This was partly because I had a great teacher, and partly because I had begun to have a use for writing and a need to know how to do it. This is a double plug for great teaching and for adult education. Either one makes the other less necessary. To have both together is sheer luck.

It has been my luck of recent years to be associated with Nieman Fellows, who are experienced newspapermen on leave of absence in a university to fill in their felt needs in education. They have found what their gaps were and what their needs are, and they are finding the answers to their questions in studies of their own choice. The relative efficiency of that kind of education is great.

But most students have to be taught at the age when you can catch them. That is the problem of the teacher.

English—writing—is the tool of the journalist and so important. But it is only the tool. Other things are also important. I have a notion it may be useful to de-emphasize the weight some may attach to English in the journalist's education, and also to journalism as an apprenticeship for literature.

Ever since young people began coming to see me to ask about getting onto newspapers, I have had some mighty misgivings about the literary fellow who wants to start

on a newspaper. For two reasons. One is that he is apt to find it disillusioning, even frustrating, if he is self-conscious about his style and his desires to express himself. The limitations of the newspaper are very sharp as to time and space. Both are confining. If a man has a literary style he may find it destroyed by the exactions of journalism.

He will be very impatient with the constant need for condensing, reducing, eliminating. And he won't have time for creative composition. There is a journalistic style which at its best is superb for its purpose. It is a lean economy of language, moving on active verbs in a simple structure that is effortless to read, and is given life, vigor and color by a sound ear for the needed word. But it is a modest style that submerges the writer wholly for the convenience of the reader. It is not self-conscious writing—the very reverse. The reader should never have to be conscious of the writing at all.

Now the lad who has prepared himself for creative writing is apt to be very impatient with that. Indeed he is probably out of his natural field in journalism. He is usually a very subjective person, to whom self-expression and individuality of style are very important.

Journalism calls for a different discipline. The objective. This is a hard discipline for the young. It means losing the personal in a concern for the facts and sacrificing favorite forms of expression to the demand for taking the reader rapidly through the report. This is a mature concept. It takes a long time to learn to be wholly objective in reporting, to take yourself out of it and be wholly factual. It is more than a style. It is a habit of mind, even a trait of character.

Now the journalist needs good training in facility in writing, in vocabulary, in precision, in accuracy of phrase, in definiteness of expression. Journalists have a term—fog—which is just what it says. Fog gets in the way of clear, definite statements. It has to be edited out and the sentence straightened out to say what it means. The word doctors are busy at that—Flesch and the rest.

A great deal of patience can be expended by an English teacher to develop in students such facility and precision in language. But it is actually what all of us need to communicate, in reports, speeches, statements, briefs, letters. It has no necessary relation to literature with a large L.

Neither, I suggest, has the literary man any necessary relation to journalism. We spend our time in advanced English courses on a few precious people. Maybe it's worth it for a few great writers. But it leaves out all the rest of us.

This was a talk to the College English Association on education for journalism and its relation to the teaching of English, by the Curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. It is reprinted from the *CEA Critic* of April, 1953.

For journalism we are concerned with the reader and his interests and capacities for interest. It is an American characteristic to be more concerned for the facts than the style, the content more than the form. Sir Philip Gibbs, in his *Adventures in Journalism*, once defined the test for journalism as "a feeling for the quality of words."

A fine thing. That is all style. He was an English journalist and an earlier generation. But I once heard a first-class American reporter answer a student's question as to the quality needed for journalism with "perennial curiosity." Now that is different. It is the concern for the facts. It is the American point of view.

Perennial curiosity is a good definition of what we need. It implies a capacity to be interested. It is the reverse of the blase, of being bored. The bane of the city editor's life is to have fellows on the staff who find it a bore to cover courts or report women's meetings or attend the school committee hearings or interview a politician. Such fellows are limited in their use.

The dimensions of journalism are as broad as human nature, human activity and human interests. Nobody can be a specialist in all of it. News is unpredictable. Hell may pop between now and breakfast. It takes a fellow with a capacity for being interested, to go get the answers. This implies some other qualities. One is persistence. To keep at it. One is efficiency. To know how to look things up, how to gather information, to know where to go to a source, to learn who are the sources. And such human qualities as will enable one to approach busy people, to persuade them to take time to inform him, both as to his integrity and his competence to get it right. So that he can go back another time. So that they will feel they are doing a public service in helping a reporter inform the public; and will not fear that they will have to be correcting and explaining or denying his story endlessly after it is printed. And the reporter needs some skepticism and tough-mindedness—the need to be shown.

I have said that nobody can be informed on everything the journalist must handle. But he must be informed, as well informed as possible, with such an appetite for informing himself that he will grow in information constantly. Now some strategic areas of information are available to him in college. In general the background of public affairs. Nieman Fellows over the years give me a clue, if I needed one, to the newspaperman's needs. More than anything else they have gone to American history. Next to government, local to national, and to international relations. Next to economics, including labor. Beyond those, sociology, psychology, literature and special fields like science, China regional studies, Russia, and so on.

Now the need for American history is obvious, just because they are reporting on the American scene. Government means the structure of their local, state and national

systems which they must report. And the basis of politics nowadays is apt to be economics, which they must hope to understand to give meaning to political coverage.

I would say that these, for very practical reasons, are the likeliest subjects for the journalist, and the type of student who wants to be a journalist is most apt to find his interest in those subjects. There is a field, so far a limited one, for such a specialist as the science writer, and certainly science is useful training in precise meaning and in accuracy. But the journalist is safe in pursuing any subjects that interest him most. He can use all.

Everything is grist to his mill. All information finds its use some time. My own background was agriculture and it proved a very acceptable field for feature stories on a city newspaper when I first got to the point of having a chance to develop features. We had on the *Globe* at that time, besides an ex-farmer, an ex-preacher, an ex-lawyer, an ex-dentist, an ex-engineer. A well balanced staff.

To communicate, the journalist needs to acquire habits of good usage, of careful language and smoothly joined sentences. Ability to organize his material rapidly into effective form. So does the lawyer, teacher, preacher, politician. It is a common need, for a sound pedestrian facility in language. The journalist uses everyday English and uses it every day. Facility in its use needs to become second nature to him so that his report takes form and flows over his typewriter as fast as his fingers can move. This of course is largely practice, provided the practice has a sound base.

Else he goes on practising the same faults unconsciously because he has never been made conscious of them. How to induce that consciousness is the problem. I think we have a right to expect that people who expect to make a living by writing will bring some aptitude to it. I think the teacher should do some selecting of students for such courses as point toward a career. He may save lots of grief later.

But given reasonable aptitude, I think consciousness of good writing can be developed by good models and practice. This may not come as readily as would suit your convenience.

It helps mightily if other departments also pay some attention to the English used in papers. One of the most careful editors of themes I know is a history professor. I suspect a student is more apt to be impressed by corrections of his sentences in a subject that is concerned with content rather than style.

I think that any approach to the practical application that a student has is exceptionally valuable. Thus if you encourage a student to go out for the college paper, or to work on the play or the yearbook, you have made him a

practitioner of the writing craft, and he immediately will see the application of the corrections on his themes. It brings more meaning to the exercise. It takes it out of the abstract. We are a very practical people. I am sure that the student on the college paper will be more receptive to the editing of his sentences than before he went out for this activity.

I suspect that much good English is taught under the guise of journalism because the student feels that he is doing something practical and sees the application. His paper is no longer a theme but a story. It ceases to be academic and becomes real.

Very hesitantly I mention grammar. Now I know the disdain of college English teachers for teaching grammar. We are supposed to have it in grammar school. We do. But obviously nobody is really grounded in grammar. What a business it is in our English language! And how incredible that grammar school children are expected to see meaning in it. They don't. Years later when they begin to use it seriously, they have forgotten all about it if they had anything to forget.

The business of "who" and "whom," of "that" and "which," and all that. This is important. It would take only two or three college sessions to point it up and give it a fresh meaning and utility. I don't know how that can be escaped. It is very desirable that journalists be able to parse sentences.

And as to style. I would plead not to make it too hard, too complicated, too pedantic, so as to discourage all but the genius. We want to make good craftsmen. It is effective, workmanlike prose that most of us need. English is a flexible vehicle and usage is tolerant with the writer who is readable and interesting.

Remember Churchill's retort to the criticism of his ending a sentence with a preposition—that it was a piece of pedantry "up with which I will not put."

To look at it from the other side:

What do you want from a journalist? What does his editor want? I have spoken of an objective frame of mind and habit of thought. And of the capacity to be interested, perennial curiosity. As most interests concern people, that implies an interest in people. Humanity is a quality useful anywhere, essential certainly in journalism.

Accuracy. It saves libel suits, besides making for reliable information and precise reporting. Get the thing straight. Look it up. Check the facts. Be sure of the middle initial, of the correct address, of the exact title. People have a right to their identity.

Concreteness. The journalist should use concrete language. Not a big crowd, but a crowd of 25,000. Not a costly fire, but a \$100,000 fire.

Painstaking. Leg work we call it in newspapering. Don't dream up a story. Go out and explore the sources. See the scene, look up the people. Get the feel of the situation. Understand what you are writing about.

Meyer Berger of the New York *Times* won a Pulitzer Prize for a story of a multiple murder that had spread horror and panic in Camden, N. J. A veteran went berserk and went down the street shooting almost everybody he met. Berger personally retraced the route of the killer, placed himself on every spot where a shooting occurred, talked to the people who were on the scene, noted exact locations, reconstructed the entire situation. So that his readers participated almost as though it was enacted before them. He could have covered it by telephoning the police. But the police themselves did not have as graphic and complete a report until they read it in the *Times*.

Imagination. I don't mean for exaggeration. But to feel the situation, to get enough inside it to make it come alive and have meaning to the reader: The reporter's role at its highest is interpreter to help people understand the conditions of the world they live in.

Doggedness. This I suppose is an inborn trait. But it can be developed. Newspaper work has its discouraging aspects. Reporting is often a lonesome business. It would be much easier to give up and go home after the first half dozen clues fail. Training in persistence is an invaluable discipline.

Discipline indeed is a useful word for much of the journalist's kit of needs. He needs to learn restraint. The laws of libel, the limits of space and time, all impinge on his consciousness.

And finally a sense of responsibility. *Responsibility* is a large word which needs to grow even larger in a journalism adequate to the need of a complex society.

These disciplines come down to habits of work and attitudes of mind and awareness of obligations. To one degree or another, these can be taught. Indeed during the four years of college they are either strengthened or weakened by every detail of the student's educational experience. They are, I suppose, the very residue of education's experience, that part which nobody can take away from us. The teacher who can inculcate them is truly preparing his students.

Why Is A Newspaper?

by A. L. Higginbotham

Some years ago, Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, made some pertinent remarks. He indicated that the critics of the newspapers, like the poor, are always with us. He also said "Blessed be the critics of the newspapers."

By this, he meant two significant things.

The first is that it will be a sad day for American journalism when it is no longer such an important social institution that it is constantly under surveillance by all and sundry.

The second is that American newspapers are far from perfect—as, of course, they will always be. It is only in a perfect society that newspapers are perfect. Presumably that is in the hereafter. Certainly it is not on this earth.

But it is unfortunate that so many of the critics of American journalism are so ill-informed, so juvenile in their judgments, and so irresponsible in their proclamations.

In part, this is our fault. We have never gone out of our way to explain the mysteries of newspaper publishing to the uninitiated. It is little wonder that they are so ignorant.

This is a challenge which we must not neglect. For ignorance leads to strife, and in strife there are always casualties on both sides.

More than twenty years ago the University of Nevada introduced a course plan open to all students in how to read the family newspaper intelligently and to enjoy it.

In the teaching of this course for two decades I have learned that almost none of the men in the street understand anything at all about newspaper reporting, editing, and publishing. It is a great wonder that they are as tolerant of us as they are.

As newspapermen we must encourage not only the colleges, but the junior colleges, the high schools, and even the grade schools to teach students and pupils the importance of a free American press and how to use it for their benefit and that of the nation.

Despite the critics' ignorance, however, there is undoubtedly validity in some of their charges.

So much on the defensive have we newspapermen been for so long that we have a tendency to discount *all* criticism. This is like sticking our heads in a hole in the sand. It is regarded by many as an admission of guilt.

Instead of this photo-electric cell, emotional reaction, wis-

dom dictates that we should examine the charges of our critics, ascertain which are well founded, and examine ourselves to see what can be done about them.

It has been the history of our nation that progress is made through change.

Journalism has progressed steadily and improved its standards at every opportunity, often largely because it recognized that the point of view of our readers was sound even when it disagreed with our own.

American newspapers are the best in the world. No competent student will deny that nowhere are the public journals of as high quality as in the United States. Even the critics will agree with this. But no good product ever got better through worshipping itself.

As I have looked at the newspapers over the years, both from the city room and from the university class room, I have observed that there are two fundamentals through which we as newspapermen may greatly improve our profession. Both of these are so obvious and so simple that we all are prone to overlook them, although they are first principles.

The first is that the greatest success, both professional and economic, is achieved through the publication of a *newspaper* which truly deserves to be called a *newspaper* in every sense of the word—a product of the very first quality.

The second is that the best newspapers are those which keep constant and intimate touch and harmony with the people—their readers.

Publishers are paying more and more attention these days to the business side of issuing a newspaper.

This preoccupation is caused by increasing costs of all kinds. Taxes, newsprint, wages, and other costs all are greater. Income from circulation and advertising is proportionately lower.

Many publishers think they can meet this situation by giving their greatest efforts to their business departments. As a result, the percentage of advertising in American newspapers has increased steadily until sometimes the readers are hard-pressed to find the news and editorial content. And the smaller the newspaper, the more likely this is to be true.

Now, financial independence is vital for any newspaper because then and only then is it in a position to resist social and economic pressures. Freedom to resist economic pressures is one of the most important liberties anyone can enjoy, and is one of the qualities of great journalism.

Nevertheless, the economic problems of modern American newspapers are not to be met in the business office. That is the last place they can be met.

Professor Higginbotham is chairman of the Department of Journalism at the University of Nevada. This is from an address to the California Press Association, delivered as president of the American Society of Journalism School Administrators.

What is a newspaper? The answer to this question is the answer to the economic problem of American newspapers today.

It is easy to say what a newspaper is not. It is not crossword puzzles and comics. It is not recipes and short stories.

A newspaper is not even advertising. It is entirely possible to have a newspaper without advertising, although everyone agrees that carrying of advertising has become a vital part of modern American journalism.

Journalism is the only vocation in America the practice of which is protected by the constitution of the United States.

The reason for this is not so that newspaper publishers can make money. It is obviously so that the people of America may have access to the facts through which to govern themselves. Freedom of the press, therefore, is the freedom of the people to know.

The special privileges which the constitution gives editors will be ours only so long as we serve the public welfare, and we don't serve the public welfare unless we rise above the counting of dollars. You can't edit a newspaper with a bookkeeping machine.

Moreover, the privilege of being a newspaper editor belongs only to those who respect it. We should stop defending every Tom, Dick, and Harry who shouts "freedom of the press" when his purse is touched. Freedom of the press is not at stake, only their freedom to abuse it.

Genuine newspapers are what the people want, and will support, and will fight for. Moreover, happily, they are what makes a profit for the publisher.

Take away the news and editorial part of our newspapers, and what do we have?—a printing plant which is worth its value as second-hand machinery or in the production of advertising which few will read because it is not part of a newspaper. Anyone can move into our communities with a similar set-up and take away our business by cutting prices.

What makes our plants valuable is the good will which goes along with our newspapers. That is the only true value a paper has. Many persons have tried to take newspapers away from genuine editors, but have found out they couldn't do it. That is because those papers were serving their true function in contributing to the public welfare.

Every newspaper is on trial every issue. If the readers want to, they can kill it at a moment's notice—just by not buying it.

However, if people want a newspaper enough, no power on earth can take it away from them.

It is a matter of quality. To be a financial success, a newspaper needs to be a first-rate journal. That is what the people want. That is what the people buy. That is what they demand. Such a paper is bound to be a financial success, as well as a power in the community.

Recently a noted publicist asked a group of leaders in American life to name the nation's ten greatest newspapers in the American tradition of journalism. I feel sure that every one of them is a financial success, and the reason lies in the city room and not in the treasurer's office. It is not a matter of the public welfare versus the cashbox—the two go hand in hand.

Great editors of the past were close to the people—they associated with kings, but never lost the common touch—and the results were landmarks in the evolution of American journalism.

James Gordon Bennett of the New York *Herald* was one of the first to realize that his own welfare and that of his readers were one and the same. Joseph Pulitzer built the New York *World* to greatness as a champion of the people. E. W. Scripps founded his chain of newspapers largely on news and opinion reflecting the standards and attitudes of the laboring people.

The story of Hercules and Antaeus in Greek mythology makes clear how we renew our strength from the people, as Antaeus did from the earth.

Newspaper editors and publishers must strive constantly to keep out of the ranks of the social, intellectual, and economic aristocrats.

We cannot let our thinking rise so high above that of our readers that we can't talk their language. We must never think that we know so much more than the people that we can be condescending toward them. We must realize that their attitude toward our newspaper is different from ours and try to fit ourselves to it. Increasingly the American people are thinking for themselves. They resent being told.

Many of the editors of the past were regarded by their readers with affection. Readers termed themselves Greeley or Dana men. This affection sprang from the feeling that those editors and their newspapers were fighting the battles of their readers. This attitude stems clear from the Revolutionary War.

Probably this newspaper-reader relationship is gone forever, but we can expect respect from our readers and we can give them, in turn, understanding.

A publisher must be more than a publisher. He must be a professional practitioner serving the public welfare.

So let us truly be newspaper editors in the finest sense of that very honored term, not just purveyors of the printed word.

Let us recognize the great responsibility which comes to us because our profession among all others is privileged under our constitution.

Let us realize that these rights, like all others, come from the people who—having given—can take away.

If we do these things, we need have no fear in our hearts, for we will know that we are on the side of the angels.

Human Relations

A New Art Brings A Revolution to Industry

by William J. Miller

"If it were desired to reduce a man to nothing," wrote Fyodor Dostoevsky in 'The House of the Dead,' "... it would be necessary only to give his work a character of uselessness." In the 20th century, such a character of uselessness was, in fact, imposed on much of the work done in American factories and offices. It was not a sudden occurrence; it was the result of a long historical process, sped by typical American haste and thoughtlessness.

The Industrial Revolution, which replaced the tools of the independent workmen with machines owned by lenders of capital, had transformed handicraftsmen who were their own bosses into hired hands subject to the orders of managers. Gradually, men felt themselves swallowed by a vast, impersonal machine, which rubbed away their self-respect and, in a way, their identities. In anger against this betrayal of the human spirit by the Industrial Revolution, millions of workers listened to the false promises of Marx's counter-revolution which, as Russia has proved, offered only greater loss of self-respect and, in the end, slavery.

Now a second Industrial Revolution, quieter but more profound, is sweeping through U.S. industry. Its name: Human Relations in Industry. Its purpose: to give the American worker a sense of usefulness and importance (and thus improve his work). Its goal (stated in one sentence): to make life more fun by making work more meaningful.

The Shovelers & the Spinners

The seeds of this change were sown by two great pioneers whose names are scarcely known—Frederick Winslow Taylor, a onetime day laborer, and Elton Mayo, an Australian immigrant turned Harvard sociologist. Their work did not seem related, but it was. Taylor, who died in 1915, was the father of scientific management; he increased industrial production by rationalizing it. Mayo, who died in 1949, was the father of industrial human relations; he increased production by humanizing it.

While working at the Midvale (Pa.) Steel Works in the 1880s, young Taylor made a discovery: it was the workers, not the bosses, who determined the production rate. The workers could go only so fast because, having learned their jobs by rule of thumb, they wasted steps, motion and time.

William J. Miller, associate editor of *Time*, Inc., was a Nieman Fellow from the Cleveland Press in 1941. This article was described by Publisher Linen of *Time* in the publisher's letter of Dec. 1, 1952, as "one of the most reprinted stories in *Time's* history."

Using a stop-watch, Taylor found that he could determine the most efficient speed for every operation by breaking it into its component parts.

Later, for Bethlehem Steel, he studied employees shoveling ore, coal, etc. He found that because they used different sized shovels, output varied widely. Taylor tried the workers with a shovel holding 34 lbs. of ore, then shifted to a shorter shovel holding 30 lbs. For every reduction in the load, each man's daily tonnage rose—until a 21-lb. load was reached. Below that, output fell. Taylor set 21½ lbs. as the ideal shovel load. Result: the yard force was cut by two-thirds, yet daily loadings rose from 25 tons per man to 45.

Taylor's pioneering in time and motion studies helped bring the mass-production era which enabled workers to raise not only their output but their wages as well. Taylor's own ruling motive, as Justice Brandeis observed at a memorial for Taylor, was to help his fellow men. Yet he also created a monster. By gearing human operations to the precision of machines, Taylor's system caused management to think of workers as little more than machines that had to eat. Since the only measure of efficiency was the utmost utilization of time, men were subjected to the intolerable nervous strain of the "speed-up," where assemblies moved always a little faster than men's natural work pace.

A point came where greater "efficiency" no longer yielded greater output. Example: at a Pennsylvania textile plant where the labor turnover in one of the spinning departments was 41 times higher than elsewhere in the plant, efficiency experts in 1923 set up various wage incentives, yet production remained low and spinners kept quitting. When Elton Mayo was called in, he discovered the men were poor producers for a reason which had not occurred to anyone: they were unhappy. The machines had been set up so as to deprive the men of virtually all human contact with one another; lonely, they fell into melancholy and hypochondria. Mayo prescribed four daily rest periods when the workers could relax, brought in a nurse to whom they could complain. The change wrought by these two relatively minor steps was startling. Turnover immediately diminished; production for the first time reached the established quotas.

Four years later, something even more startling happened. At its Hawthorne Works near Chicago, Western Electric tried to determine the effects of lighting on the worker and his output. As a test, it moved a group of girls into a special room with variable lighting, another group into a room where lighting remained as before. To its amazement, production shot up in both rooms. When the lighting was re-

duced in the first room, production continued to rise. But it also kept rising in the second room. Not until Mayo was called in to make tests of his own did the company discover what had happened. The simple answer: both groups were producing more because they had been singled out for special attention. The excitement of the experiments made them feel that they were no longer mere cogs.

Mayo's Hawthorne experiments were widely hailed as a landmark in social science. Actually, they revealed nothing which could not have been learned from any factory hand: every human being likes to feel that his work is important, that the boss is interested in him, and appreciates what he does. In a sense, the importance attached to Mayo's findings is a measure of the indifference to people into which management had fallen in its singleminded pursuit of Taylor's efficiency. Because of this indifference, the deep-rooted mutual interests of workers and management, as partners in production, were lost in shallow attitudes of suspicion and hostility. The folklore of each nourished a class warfare disturbingly like that which Marx had predicted.

The Myths of Labor & Capital

In the accepted myths of hardheaded, hardfisted management, tenderness was weakness; workers could not be "coddled" lest they loaf: the only drives to which they responded were greed (more money) or fear (of dismissal). To praise them was simply to invite increasing demands. Workers, for their part, nursed long memories of hired spies who betrayed their unions and of uniformed thugs (e.g., the "coal & iron police") who smashed them. In labor's mythology, management was a silk-hatted capitalist who automatically opposed anything good for the workingman; by reflex, the worker opposed anything management favored.

For Mayo's new science to make headway in this charged atmosphere, there had to be a great change in basic attitudes. The change began with the U.S. Supreme Court's 1937 decision upholding the Wagner Act; it made management realize it had to learn to live with unions. The change was sped by World War II, which not only brought the patriotic necessity for the U.S. industrial machine to achieve maximum output, but flooded the labor force with millions of housewives and other new recruits relatively free of the old suspicions and hostilities.

Management began to learn that the once-feared unions themselves held potentials of higher production. In Pittsburgh, the United Steel Workers challenged one management to name its most productive department. Then the union boosted production there by 210% in a month. In the Toronto plant of Lever Brothers, union and management, working together, trimmed the payroll from 693 to 512, the wage bill by 17%, yet achieved greater output in a 40-hour week than in 48 before.

Moreover, housewives coming into war plants were amazed to discover that they could far exceed the normal

output of old hands. At a big Cleveland war plant, one housewife found that she could easily produce 800 grenade pins daily, v. the plant quota of 500. When fellow workers warned her to slow down, she discovered another thing: old hands deliberately limited their output from fear that Taylor's time-and-motion-study disciples would cut their pay rates by raising production quotas. More and more managers realized that maximum output could be realized only by finding ways to remove these old fears.

In dozens of plants, surveys of employees exploded the prize cliché of management's folklore—that workers wanted only more money. Actually, higher pay rated far down the list of workers' desires. For example, 100 shop workers who were polled by Psychologist S. N. F. Chant on twelve alternatives rated "high pay" as sixth. The Twentieth Century Fund found that wage disputes, the ostensible cause of 80% of all industrial conflicts, are only secondary causes: "Some of the industries most plagued by strikes . . . are among those where the highest wages are being paid." After ten years of polling workers, Elmo Roper concluded that their four chief desires are 1) security ("the right to work continuously at reasonably good wages"), 2) a chance to advance, 3) treatment as human beings, 4) dignity.

Yet the alarming fact, as agreed by all investigators, was that modern industry largely frustrates these desires. Detroit Edison, in a poll of its 11,000 employees, found that 43% did not believe that the company was "really interested" in their ideas. After a study of the auto industry, Author Peter Drucker, management consultant, concluded that the average worker regards his status as frozen, with little hope of advancement, and hopes to keep his sons from doing the same work.

There was equal agreement on the causes of such widespread discontent and emotional frustration. Businesses had grown to such a size that the average worker lost all sense of personal contact with his employers. The constant increase in mechanization took away his sense of personal pride and self-identification with the final product; frequently he did not even know the use of the part he made. The robot nature of many tasks thwarted the craving for prestige.

The New Managers

These discoveries came to a head at a time when U.S. management was best equipped to do something about them: management itself had undergone a revolution. Death and taxes had all but eclipsed the great owner-management dynasties epitomized by Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller. In their place had come the professional managers, the engineer-trained technicians, e.g., Du Pont's Crawford Greenewalt, General Electric's Philip Reed, General Motors' C. E. Wilson, Standard Oil's (N.J.) Frank Abrams. They took over industrial societies grown so huge that the average owner (i.e., stockholder) seldom exercised more

than theoretical control. Profits were still the test of efficiency, and a fair return to the stockholder a prime duty of management. But the tremendous diffusion of ownership enabled the professional manager to give first concern to the economic health of the whole corporate body, in which the welfare of workers was as vital as that of stockholders. Since increased welfare promised greater efficiency, the new managers welcomed experiments.

In Marion, Va., the Harwood Manufacturing Co., which had 100 employees, mostly women, making pajamas, discovered that whenever it changed the work, only one-third of the workers ever got back to their old output rate. Many others quit, and most union grievances followed such changes. The company tried an experiment: one group was simply told of the change, another was told of the necessity for it and permitted to work out for itself the necessary revisions in quotas and rates. Result: its production quickly passed the old average of 60 hourly units per worker, and reached more than 80. The first group barely exceeded 50 units, and 17% of its members shortly quit. It also filed a complaint with the union that the new rate was "unjust," although investigations proved it generous. Yet when the survivors of this group were trained in the new way, they went up to a score of 73 within eight days.

At Detroit's Bundy Tubing Co., which had a history of ill will against the speed-up and fear of cuts in output rates, every attempt to boost production by special incentives had failed. The company offered the union a novel proposal: set a certain standard for labor costs, and let workers and management share all the savings when increased output drove costs below that figure. Not only did production beat all records, but the workers themselves began producing slackers and berating absentees.

These lessons have borne fruit. In most big U.S. corporations, the new field of human relations is regarded as important, and equally as promising, as industrial research. Ford Motor Co. is spending millions to explore the untapped potentials of man. General Motors, the world's biggest industrial corporation, is drawing useful lessons from its World War II experiences.

At one G. M. aircraft parts plant, the manager almost turned down the offer of a visit by a combat-scarred B-17 and crew; he feared it would disrupt production. Instead, output shot up, not because the workers were thrilled by the bomber, but because the maintenance crew told them for the first time what the parts they made were used for. Another G. M. plant, which had to train workers to make carbines, had each new employee shoot the actual carbine, take it apart to see the significance of the part he would make. Despite their lack of skill their output was high.

Other companies are tackling the problem of size and resulting loss of individual identity. Robert Wood Johnson, whose family's famed Johnson & Johnson had grown up as

a huge plant at New Brunswick, N. J., decentralized much of it into small, new, ultra-modern factories, each making a single product line and small enough so that the president can usually call every worker by name. Not only has Johnson & Johnson been free of strikes, but the C.I.O. Textile Workers union is the first to praise its enlightened methods.

A new concept of the role of employers and employees in the corporation is being formed. Some examples: Allegheny Ludlum Steel holds "open house" to let families see what their breadwinner does, and production goes up on visiting days; Weirton Steel now tags almost everything moving through the plant to let workers know what it will make.

The New Philosophy

Actually, far from being an occult science, human relations is nothing more than good will—and applied common sense. Much of it depends on simple things, such as making a plant more comfortable, and a friendlier place to work. Virtually every big company now sponsors plant bowling, baseball, dances, etc.; Westinghouse abets employee operettas, orchestras, picnics, even shows movies in its plants during lunch hours.

Yet that does not mean that every employer has seen the practical value of the new concept, or has accepted it. Some bitter-enders still regard any concession to the workers as a threat to their own authority. Others sometimes do more harm than good by doling out favors with an air of paternalism. Said one Kansas City industrialist: "We give our employees a Christmas party and that keeps 'em happy until we throw 'em a summer picnic." Still others have made the mistake of trying to create good human relations by mere words.

But by and large, the intent of this swiftly growing trend is not only genuine, but represents a movement toward an entirely new philosophy of management.

Nowhere has this new philosophy been better expressed than by General Foods' Chairman Clarence Francis at a postwar convention of the National Association of Manufacturers. Said Francis: "You can buy a man's time, you can buy a man's physical presence at a given place; you can even buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour or day. But you cannot buy enthusiasm; you cannot buy initiative; you cannot buy loyalty; you cannot buy the devotion of hearts, minds and souls. You have to earn these things. . . . It is ironic that Americans—the most advanced people technically, mechanically and industrially—should have waited until a comparatively recent period to inquire into the most promising single source of productivity: namely, the human will to work. It is hopeful, on the other hand, that the search is now under way."

In that search, at mid-century, lies the finest hope and promise of the Capitalist Revolution.

"Reprinted from TIME, April 14 Issue, Courtesy of TIME, Copyright Time Inc., 1952"

Washington Post—April 28

SCRAPBOOK —

Definition Of Tyranny

Senator McCarthy has now put editors and other newspapermen on notice that criticism of him in the press may subject the writer to a summons and a star chamber grilling by the Senator's private *auto da fe*. He insists that this does not mean that he has embarked on an investigation of the press in general; and we have no wish to dispute a distinction that is essentially academic and semantic. The intended effect of what Senator McCarthy has done in regard to James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, is to silence editorial criticism of the Senator and compel compliance with his notions of how newspapers should be run.

The Senator will not succeed in silencing Jim Wechsler, of course. Mr. Wechsler is a man who has been speaking his mind, as an editor in a free country ought to do, for as long as he has been in newspaper work. Sometimes he has been wise, and sometimes he has been mistaken; he made the mistake, as he has acknowledged with complete candor, of joining the Young Communist League 20 years ago when he was a college student. When he found out what it was like, he got out of it and has been an effective opponent of communism, fascism, McCarthyism and all other forms of totalitarianism ever since. No, Mr. McCarthy will not intimidate Mr. Wechsler; but he may manage to intimidate editors and writers who are less doughty, less secure in their jobs and less skillful in defending themselves.

Intimidation is the Senator's plain pur-

pose. It takes a good deal of courage on a newspaperman's part to expose himself to a McCarthy subpoena. It means facing the overbearing arrogance of an inquisitor intoxicated with his own sense of power. It means subjecting oneself to the reckless accusations of a man with no scruples whatever about the misuse of his senatorial immunity. It means enduring a closed session in which neither the press nor the public can glimpse what goes on. Mr. Wechsler is quite justified in demanding that the record of the hearing be made public. Closed hearings are justified for the purpose of protecting national security or protecting individuals against unsifted accusations. They are not justified for the mere sake of protecting a committee from exposing its own excesses.

The most shocking aspect of the Wechsler hearing, in our view, was that no member of the McCarthy committee—indeed, no member of the United States Senate—seemed to be shocked by it. There should have been an outraged scream from every Senator brought up in the American tradition. The notion that any Senator should consider himself privileged to call a newspaperman to account for the expression of his opinions is a notion altogether at variance with the basic premises of American life. It strikes at the heart of the first amendment—not merely at a newspaperman's privilege but at the right of the American people to be served by a press that is genuinely free. It is the very definition of tyranny.

who are now actively engaged in the defense of liberty against the totalitarian threat. Oddly enough, while he pursues men who discarded years ago the passing Communist illusions of their youth and whose integrity is now unquestionable, Senator McCarthy extends his blessings to certain other former Communists, some of whom remained faithful to the party long after those whom he is attacking had left it. The only explanation for this peculiar behavior is that the objects of Senator McCarthy's wrath have dared to question the intelligence and effectiveness of his methods of fighting Communism.

Senator McCarthy evidently considers agreement with his own fantastic views about how best to resist communism as the acid test of democratic loyalty. Yet it can easily be shown that Senator McCarthy's behavior has strengthened sympathy for communism, and decreased friendliness to American democracy, all over the globe. In the light of the facts it is legitimate to interpret Senator McCarthy's actions as motivated less by an interest in combating communism than by a desire to exploit the authority he possesses as a Senator.

Validity of Charges

As one who has been active in anti-Communist work for many years I believe I am in a position to evaluate the validity of the charges Senator McCarthy has brought against two of his recent targets, Theodore Kagan of the High Commissioner's Office in Germany, and James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post.

Whatever his youthful fellow-traveling may have amounted to, Mr. Kagan has in the past decade proved to be a formidable opponent of the Communist movement. The record of his work in Austria and Germany is as unambiguous as it is honorable. The letters of praise and commendation he has received from Chancellor Figl of Austria and Mayor Reuter of Berlin express sentiments which are concurred in by all informed observers. To impugn his loyalty because of honestly avowed errors of his youth is a sign either of obtuseness or of calculated political insincerity.

The case of James Wechsler is an even more outrageous instance of senseless persecution. Senator McCarthy recently addressed a telegram to him, using Mr. Wechsler's party name of the Thirties. (It is safe to assume that Senator McCarthy,

New York Times, May 8

Letters to The Times

Mr. McCarthy Criticized

Senator Believed to Be Doing Great Harm to Country's Reputation

To the Editor of The New York Times:

Even those who for reasons of their own are inclined to be silent about Senator McCarthy's methods must be aware of the incalculable harm he is doing to the reputation of the United States abroad. The evidence mounts daily that he is a heavy

liability to the friends of American democracy and international freedom, and an obstacle to all efforts to counteract Communist lies about the true nature of American society.

But even more significant than his deplorable effect abroad is the new tack that Senator McCarthy has taken on the domestic scene. He seems to have turned from investigating Communists, while making reckless and exaggerated statements about them, to hounding former Communists

who knows the party names of his present associates who were once Communists, does not address them in this way.) He has gone so far as to insinuate that a fierce attack on Mr. Wechsler by *The Daily Worker* was either written or inspired by Mr. Wechsler himself!

Guilty of Criticism

One does not have to agree with Mr. Wechsler about everything to recognize the valuable services he has performed in exposing Communist pretense and duplicity at a time when the then Mr. McCarthy was vegetating in peaceful somnolence. It appears that Mr. Wechsler's unforgivable sin in Senator McCarthy's eyes is not his youthful communism, for otherwise Senator McCarthy would have to treat Messrs. Budenz, Rushmore, et al., in the same way. Mr. Wechsler has been guilty only of criti-

cizing Senator McCarthy, and the latter is abusing his political position to carry on a personal feud.

The issue, however, is not personal. After all, sooner or later all intelligent Americans concerned about freedom will have to criticize Senator McCarthy's irresponsibilities. Are they therefore to be slandered and pilloried?

The time has come to organize a national movement of men and women of all political parties to retire Senator McCarthy from public life. This is one movement in which we shall not have to fear infiltration by Communists. For the day Senator McCarthy leaves the political scene the Communists throughout the world will go into mourning.

Sidney Hook

New York, May 1, 1953

New York Times, May 9

Freedom and Fear

We have refrained from commenting on Senator McCarthy's interrogation of James A. Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, until the text of the transcript of the two sessions, held April 24 and May 5, had become available. Mr. Wechsler, who testified that his youthful association with the Communists ended some fifteen years ago, when he was in his early twenties, had been called before Senator McCarthy's investigating committee ostensibly because one or more of his books were to be found in American libraries of information abroad.

One of the fascinating things about this inquiry is that neither Senator McCarthy nor Roy Cohn, the committee counsel, nor anyone else knew just which of Mr. Wechsler's four books were involved. This is curious, because while two of the books were written while Mr. Wechsler was a Communist, two were written after he had broken from the Communists and had begun his present career as an effective anti-Communist writer. Since the books did not play a very great role in the five hours of hearings, anyway, we must look further to see just why Mr. McCarthy so assiduously attempted to show—without the slightest concrete evidence and in the face of Mr. Wechsler's entire mature career—that the editor of the *Post* is still "serving" the Communists.

We have repeatedly said that the investi-

gative function of Congressional committees is an important and a desirable one. We believe it is the citizen's duty to respond fully and frankly to Congressional investigators (as Mr. Wechsler did), just as it is the duty of the investigators scrupulously to observe the citizen's constitutional rights. We think that newspaper men are no more immune from investigation in respect to allegedly subversive or seditious activity than anyone else. The mere fact that a man works on or writes for a publication does not give him any special privilege if, as and when his loyalty comes under scrutiny.

But there is another basic American principle involved here, too, and that is the principle of freedom of the press. The real question is whether or not Mr. McCarthy was using his undoubted right of investigation as a cover for an attempt to harass and intimidate Mr. Wechsler as an editor who has bitterly and uncompromisingly opposed Mr. McCarthy. It is our opinion after reading the transcript that this is just exactly what Mr. McCarthy was doing.

The whole tenor of the questioning of this editor was to show that, inasmuch as he had never had a good word to say for the leadership of the various Congressional committees investigating communism, he must thereby be serving the Communist cause. The repeated references to the editorial policy of the *New York Post* re-

vealed clearly what was in Mr. McCarthy's mind. The Senator has every right to attack *The Post* or any other newspaper if he wants to, but we think it gets very close to an infringement on one of America's basic freedoms if he uses his vast powers as chairman of an investigating committee of the United States Senate to accuse an editor of continued subservience to "the Communist ideal" because that editor's writings are not to his liking.

The mere fact that Mr. Wechsler had fought Communists in and out of the labor movement, had resigned from one newspaper (now defunct) because he thought it was being manipulated by Communists, had participated in liberal and therefore bitterly anti-Communist organizations, had written innumerable articles and editorials against Communists and communism—all of this carried no weight with Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Wechsler's crime seems clearly to be that he has also fought Mr. McCarthy's methods, a fight in which this newspaper, too, has been proud to participate.

The rising threat of Communist aggression is and has been for years a matter of the gravest concern to all of us in the free world. It is not only right but necessary that we take every possible defensive step to meet this real and growing danger. We have to build up our armaments, we have to support our allies in Europe and in Asia, we have to use force to resist aggression whether in Korea or in Greece, we have to develop our own political, social and economic strength as well as military. But in the process of alerting ourselves and our friends to the Russian imperialist-Communist menace—which "peace offensives" do not dissipate—some Americans have become frightened. Fear leads to panic, and panic can lead to the subversion of our most precious institutions. Americans have to be alert, strong and steady. But they do not have to be scared. It is contrary to the best interests of the country to capitalize on fear.

Contribution

To the Editor:

The *Nieman Reports* are a genuine contribution to the profession.

A. L. Higginbotham
Chairman
Department of Journalism
University of Nevada

New York Times—May 19

SCRAPBOOK—

In the Nation

A Professional Survey of Press Freedom

by Arthur Krock

Washington, May 18—The question whether issues relevant to the freedom of the press were posed by Senator McCarthy's recent examination of James Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, has been submitted by Wechsler to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. But a television panel of Washington reporters yesterday strongly indicated that from their viewpoint this constitutional guarantee of press freedom was not in substance invaded by McCarthy and that the issue should not be raised except in instances where there is a clear violation of the guarantee.

The panel was composed of newspaper men, with different approaches to public questions and diverse political philosophies, who deal regularly with politicians who would if they could punish newspapers for publishing facts and stating opinions objectionable to these politicians. That is why their attitude, as revealed in their questioning, was particularly significant. They implied no dissent from Wechsler's estimate, and the plain story of the transcript, that McCarthy bullied the witness and based his inquiries not on the professed purpose of the hearing but on the thesis that the editor and his newspaper merited disbelief in its anti-Communist stand because of its steady attacks on certain other active anti-Communists, notably McCarthy. They did not dispute that, by its nature, the questioning showed the Senator was out to hurt the newspaper and its editor in the public view. But they were unanimously bearish on any contention that these actions infringed the freedom of the press.

The principal points the panel members made were that Wechsler and his newspaper had harshly and regularly attacked McCarthy and certain other proclaimed anti-Communists who have assisted the Senator in this particular activity; had not been intimidated in any way by the counter-attack; and were just as free, after as be-

fore the Senate inquiry, to write and print what they pleased. To this correspondent, listening to the "Meet the Press" Sunday program where these exchanges occurred, the refusal of these reporters to see an invasion of the First Amendment seemed soundly based and to furnish a precept for newspapermen who are too prone to complain that press freedom is being infringed when the incident does not qualify as such.

This freedom is definitely infringed and the guarantee of the Constitution violated when public political instrumentalities, including those of Congress and the judiciary, are employed to prevent a newspaper from publishing news or comment short of the penal laws that it elects to publish, to require a newspaper to publish something in the news or editorial columns it does not find factual or wish to include, etc. There may be certain organized economic measures that would fall in the same category. But none of this was attempted by McCarthy in his misuse of the Congressional investigatory system to strike back at an editor and newspaper that oppose him.

Moreover, freedom of the press is plain and broad, but it is not absolute, as judicial constructions of the First Amendment establish. Some of these were:

A newspaper was held in contempt of court that published statements concerning pending injunction proceedings in a district court, "tending in the circumstances to create the impression that a particular decision would evoke public suspicion of the judge's integrity, bring him into public odium and would be met by public resistance." The circulation of another, that carried the advertisement of a state lottery, was not prohibited, but the courts upheld a statute that forbade mailing issues containing this advertisement. An order from the National Labor Relations Board, restraining the Associated Press "from interfering with union activities of employees, did not infringe press freedom because it in nowise circumscribes

the full freedom and liberty of the petitioner to publish the news as it desires . . . or to enforce policies of its own choosing with respect to the editing and rewriting of news for publication." Also, said the court, the Associated Press "is free at any time to discharge . . . any editorial employe who fails to comply with the policies it may adopt."

On the "Meet the Press" program Wechsler most ably defended his position that the plainly revealed "nature and intent" of the McCarthy inquiry called for a study of the transcript by the A. S. N. E. to see if issues relevant to press freedom were involved. And his poise during what must have been an unexpected trend in the questioning of his colleagues, his quick thinking and his dialectical skill were of superior quality. But these did not preserve him from trouble when, asserting that his newspaper and he could not be intimidated by McCarthy, he said that the Senator's tactics in this inquiry conceivably might intimidate editors and publishers in smaller, less "liberal" or certain "Republican" communities and thus accomplish infringement of the freedom of the press.

He was asked if he was "tougher" than most other editors; if he thought newspapermen should be immune from Congressional inquiries, including the kind where other citizens get the treatment he did; and who were the editors he thought might be intimidated. Wechsler fenced deftly. But he had given ground to the argument that, if McCarthy has not frightened the *New York Post* into surrendering any part of its guaranteed freedom, the guarantee had not been infringed.

Not For Borrowing

To the Editor:

The April issue of the *Nieman Reports* with its forthright articles on the freedom of the press convinces me that yours is a publication to be kept on file, not merely borrowed from friends. I enclose a check for my own subscription, also one to:

Frederick G. Jackson
2141 University Boulevard
Houston, Texas.

I would like both to begin *by all means* with this memorable April issue.

Narcissa Williamson
Boston Museum of Fine Arts
Division of Education

Three Editorials of Dissent by the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*

April 21

The Press Shields Itself

The newspapers of the United States are strong for the unrestricted right to criticize public officials and individuals they do not like, but many of these same newspapers become suddenly allergic to the idea whenever criticism pertains to the press itself.

This conclusion is inescapable on the basis of two decisions taken last week within the ranks of professional journalism. "The People's Right to Know"—to use the title of a new book sponsored by the American Society of Newspaper Editors—ought to include the right to know the facts about these decisions against self-examination by the press itself. Hence this report from inside the family.

At its annual meeting in Washington, this society of newspaper editors, the A. S. N. E., devoted much of one day to a discussion of "freedom of information." Members vigorously opposed the ruling of New York's Judge Valente in shutting the press out of the Jelke vice trial. Many editors found the order an infringement of a free press and a dangerous precedent. Other editors called for release of more information on atomic power and for wider legal access to public records and proceedings.

All stood strong for freedom of information until that free information began to concern the press. Then it was a horse of another color.

* * *

A resolution was offered to take notice of "serious criticism of aspects of the newspaper coverage of the 1952 presidential campaign" and "grave charges made against the press by Senators Taft of Ohio and Morse of Oregon." It was a mild resolution and proposed merely that a committee of editors study these criticisms and report their conclusions to the society. The resolution did not refer to bias or slanting or distortion. It made no assumption of any kind. All it asked was that the facts be assembled.

In less time than it takes to tell it, the resolution was resoundingly tabled. Only one member had a chance to speak and he

was Walter M. Harrison of Oklahoma City, who immediately moved to kill it. Mr. Harrison, a past president of the A.S.N.E., said that criticisms referred to in the resolution were "old stuff" and now "dead and buried." He made it crystal clear that the editors' interest in "the people's right to know" did not extend to self-examination of charges against the press itself.

Earlier in the week, also in Washington, the executive council of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity, approved a report of a special committee which decided it "is not feasible" to survey the fairness of the press and other coverage of the 1952 presidential campaign. Only Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville *Courier Journal*, favored the survey. Mr. Bingham had been one of the first to propose, last year, that it be made. Charges of unfairness were raised in the midst of the campaign by Roscoe Drummond of *The Christian Science Monitor*, Eric Sevareid, CBS, and many others.

To his credit, Charles C. Clayton, St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* editorial writer and immediate past president of Sigma Delta Chi, stood firm for the survey and later opposed the committee. But Mr. Clayton was virtually alone in the Sigma Delta Chi council. Robert U. Brown, editor of *Editor & Publisher*, who wrote editorials for a survey last October and November, reversed himself and agreed that a survey "is not feasible."

* * *

Dean Earl English, of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, said new survey techniques were needed and proposed that steps be taken to prepare for the future. The editors who were bent on killing off any investigation of these sins of the press showed Dean English the courtesy of attaching his concurring report to their thumbs-down decision.

The American press is storing up trouble for itself by this dog-in-the-manger strategy. For it now says in effect that it will neither respect inquiries into the press by outsiders, such as the Hutchins commission's, nor sponsor an inquiry from within its own ranks. This double default in one week is all the worse after the failure of so many publications to print the news about

the C. Wesley Roberts-G. O. P. scandal and the Weeks-Astin Bureau of Standards controversy.

Joseph Pulitzer, the founder of the *Post-Dispatch*, said nearly 50 years ago that "our Republic and its press will rise or fall together." Editors and publishers who suppress or distort news and then forestall criticism are faithless to the greatest of trusts. They damage the good name of the press and its reputation for reliability and trustworthiness. They do the Eisenhower Administration no good and they weaken the very foundations of the Republic.

May 3

A Lot Has Been Gained

As agreed last week, the Senate will vote Tuesday afternoon on the Holland bill to establish title to offshore oil lands in the states. There is little if any question as to the outcome. Judging by the tests on amendments, the vote will be overwhelmingly for handing over this great natural resource to Texas, Louisiana and California—at the expense of the taxpayers in the 45 other states.

What then was the good of the month-long fight of some 25 Senators—approximately one-fourth of the membership—against the giveaway bill? What has been achieved?

The answer is that a lot has been gained. As Senators Humphrey and Douglas and Hill and Anderson have spoken and been succeeded on the floor by Senators Lehman, Fulbright, Morse, Kefauver and others, countless citizens have come to know for the first time what is involved. From all parts of the country they have sent their protests to Washington. These citizens know now who is for giving away their heritage and who is fighting to save that heritage from exploitation.

* * *

The record has been made and it will be referred to time and again. This record will be an issue in the midterm election next year. It will be a factor in the court tests that will follow congressional action. Let those who will dismiss the heroic effort in the Senate as a "talkathon" or even as a "filibuster." The fact is that this has been one of the most important debates in

the history of the nation, conducted on a high plane and without delay to the work of Congress.

This last statement is at variance with comments by many newspaper writers and radio commentators. It is at variance with the Eisenhower letter to Senator Anderson. It is at variance with remarks such as that of David Lawrence, editor of *U.S. News & World Report*, namely: "Congress has been delayed in getting started on important legislation at this session because a minority in the Senate have carried on a filibuster."

What the facts are can be judged from an exchange between the *Post-Dispatch* and the New York headquarters of the *Associated Press*. Last Wednesday a news summary of the Associated Press said the offshore oil debate "has been blocking consideration of other important legislation."

Whereupon the *Post-Dispatch* asked the *Associated Press* for a list of bills ready for Senate action and being delayed by presentation of the case against the oil bill. Several messages were exchanged in the course of three days. Finally the *Associated Press* reported that "Hawaiian statehood, reciprocal trade and supplemental appropriations bills" were "expected to clear committees momentarily," but conceded that there was no logjam.

We are pleased to report this correction by the *Associated Press*. For it is bad enough to have Majority Leader Taft and others who know better talking about a logjam that does not exist. But it is infinitely worse when news facilities—on which the people must depend for accurate information—fall for such patent propaganda.

If any further evidence is needed that a lot of hokum has been pumped out to the country about "delay" to "the Eisenhower program," it can be found in the leading item in the current *Newsweek's* Periscope. *Newsweek* says that G.O.P. leaders are worrying because they have done so little to advance Administration bills and that Hawaiian statehood is being moved up on the agenda, in effect, to make this situation look better.

Since the G.O.P.-controlled Senate committees have no bills of consequence ready to pass, the majority leadership actually owes the opponents of offshore oil give-away a vote of appreciation for using time that otherwise would have been almost en-

tirely wasted. But the greatest debt of all to the 25 Senators is the one owed by the American people.

This fight already has a sure place in history. And what is lost now can be won back in the future.

May 7

Ecuadorism

It is gratifying to see the concern that newspapers in the United States are showing for the plight of two newspapers in Guayaquil, Ecuador. Editorials are appearing quite generally in the American press deploring the closing of *La Nacion* and *La Hora* and the imposition of prison sentences on some of the principal figures. Properly enough the Inter-American Press Association, through its Freedom of the Press Committee, headed by *Chicago Tribune* correspondent Jules Dubois, has intervened in the case.

How many of these same newspapers which so promptly deplored the repressions in Ecuador are equally concerned, we wonder, about the threat which Senator McCarthy poses for all the American press in his summons of Editor James A. Wechsler of the *New York Post* to a secret investigation in Washington?

The *Washington Post* has had a strong editorial denouncing the Wisconsin Sena-

tor's latest foray as "the very definition of tyranny." The *Louisville Courier-Journal* describes it as "a clear attempt to silence press criticism" and calls on the American Society of Newspaper Editors to "condemn the performance with all the vigor their united power can command."

It seems clear, however, after looking at a considerable number of newspapers, that the *Washington Post* and the *Louisville Courier-Journal* are exceptions to a general rule of silence on McCarthy's move into the area of a free press. There are papers which grew indignant about President Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra of Ecuador only to be perfectly satisfied apparently at dictatorial techniques in a senatorial committee in Washington.

All of which is a reminder that several year ago, Jenkin Lloyd Jones of the *Tulsa Tribune* gave the newspaper world a new word when he coined "Afghanistanism" to describe the practice of all too many newspapers in dealing with problems in distant places as a coverup for failure to come to grips with issues in their own communities. It is time for a new term—one that will cover the practice of many American newspapers in vigorously deploring violations of a free press elsewhere only to shut their eyes to the faults and omissions of the press here at home. So, as a specialized companion of "Afghanistanism," we offer "Ecuadorism."

Santa Rosa Press Democrat

William A. Townes Has Made Great Contribution to Region

by Ulla Bauers

The announcement that William A. Townes had resigned as editor and general manager of *The Press Democrat*, to those of us who have had the privilege of working for and with him, to those of us who believe a free and responsible press is fundamental to a democratic society and a progressive community, is a loss that is more than personal.

The Press Democrat, during the tenure of Mr. Townes, has been marked by a growth in all departments; a growth that marked that of the region itself. And in many respects the policies of this paper

under Mr. Townes have been directly responsible for the accelerated progress of the area.

But Mr. Townes' leadership brought results more impressive, more subtle than retail trade statistics, circulation figures and advertising lineage. By expanding the coverage of *The Press Democrat*, Mr. Townes gave great impetus to the trend away from provincialism. Residents of Ukiah and Petaluma, perhaps unconsciously, found that their problems were not unlike those of Santa Rosa and Lakeport. They learned that the well-being of

any one area can not be separated from the rest of the community.

That policy, correlated with local emphasis on world affairs, has led readers of this region to become a little more aware that what happens in England can have a great influence on the Redwood Empire; that regardless of nationality, people the world over are alike in that we feel the same when we are hungry; that a bullet which rips through a Greek's chest is just as deadly as one which kills a Redwood Empire soldier; that a Belgian longs for peace and security just as does a Sebastopol resident.

Not until there is complete understanding of that fact can there be a lasting peace. To the extent that Mr. Townes has instilled that idea in the residents of this area, to that extent he has contributed to a peaceful world.

Mr. Townes brought to the *Press Democrat* a measure of integrity that was more than sanctimony. His integrity was rooted in the canons of his profession. His was an integrity of purpose. He did not deviate, for personal gain or satisfaction or at the behest of powerful voices, from the ideal of a newspaper whose fundamental purpose is to inform, explain and entertain.

He used the *Press Democrat* like a mirror, holding it before the community, exposing its dark corners as well as the brighter ones. He did not hesitate to criticize when criticism was due. He gave unstinting praise to those whose works deserved praise. He placed *The Press Democrat* at the head of every campaign which was designed to improve this area economically, culturally, politically or morally. He gave full play to those ideas and statements with which he did not agree, leaving to the reader the choice, with profound belief that a well-informed public would make the right choice.

His concern for using all the resources at his command to bring the truth to the public, regardless of its effect, gave this community an opportunity to gain knowledge which is not present in many an area of greater size and with journals having far greater resources.

For his pains he often became the target of bitter criticism, unfounded charges, and of antagonism from those whom he sought to aid.

Whether Mr. Townes has left an indelible mark on the Redwood Empire is a question not easily answered. But it is easy to note that he has left his mark on the profession of journalism, not only through singular and imaginative innovations in the *Press Democrat*, but by his quiet demeanor, which was able to inspire the young journalists on whom he placed great responsibility.

They gave freely of energy and talents because Mr. Townes had developed an atmosphere that stimulated initiative and nurtured that same integrity and devotion to duty that so characterized Mr. Townes himself.

Not that there were not often differences

of opinion between staff members and Mr. Townes—differences which were argued with fervor, sometimes breaking into the open through the letters to the editor column. But they were differences which resulted from the individualism which Mr. Townes well knew is a vital part of effective journalism. No "yes men" developed on the *Press Democrat*. Mr. Townes never demanded more than respect for his opinions and co-operation toward one goal—a better newspaper—to better serve.

Certainly those traits which Mr. Townes developed, including co-operation with anyone who is concerned with bringing responsible and effective journalism to the public, will not quickly be forgotten.

Boston Globe, May 6.

Korean Horror Stories Exaggerated?

U. S. Correspondents Disagree About Alleged Red Atrocities

by Claudia Parker

TOKYO (ONA)—News correspondents who covered the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war at Panmunjom are engaged in spirited debate over the emphasis which the press in America generally gave the Communist atrocities as reported by many returning Allied captives.

Reporters for such publications as the *Christian Science Monitor*, *New York Times*, *Baltimore Sun*, *Time Magazine*, *London Times*, *U. S. News and World Report* and some others played down the atrocity reports as they were mainly unsubstantiated and it was felt they could do little to benefit the United Nations cause at this time.

Even some of the reporters who wrote atrocity stories after brief interviews with released prisoners now feel that possibly undue stress was placed upon this subject.

British military authorities in Korea, on the third day of the exchange at Panmunjom, ordered repatriated British soldiers to refrain from telling of any atrocity incidents in interviews with the press. This order was bitterly denounced by some reporters, but others were inclined to feel that American officials ought to have im-

posed a similar ban until such a time as prisoners' stories could be thoroughly evaluated.

This cautious attitude was not impelled by any desire to appease or spare the feelings of the Communists. Rather, it was believed that a more cautious approach would preclude the possibility of later discovering that any number of reported incidents could not be substantiated, thus creating a propaganda boomerang helpful to the Communists.

* * *

Among correspondents, criticisms of the atrocity stories are mainly these:

(1) Interviews with repatriated prisoners were too brief and conducted under conditions which made it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a rounded account of their experiences in the hands of the Communists.

(2) Most of the "atrocity" incidents reported by former prisoners were actually instances of hardship and privation, not deliberate brutality. Such incidents are common in war, particularly when the enemies are Orientals who themselves are accustomed to primitive conditions and

cannot be expected to care for their prisoners better than they do for their own soldiers.

(3) Genuine atrocity stories turned out to be second and third hand accounts, but seldom reported as such.

(4) In reporting atrocities, there was a widespread failure by correspondents to differentiate between the Chinese and North Koreans who were lumped together in most newspaper stories simply as "Communists."

In fact, the perpetrators of reported brutalities, in almost every case, were North Koreans and almost every atrocity report dated back to the early days of the war, before the Chinese Communists entered it.

* * *

The Chinese seem to have been far cleverer—and in the long run much more dangerous—in their handling of American and other U.N. prisoners. From what could be learned from the small number of prisoners returned to us, the Chinese, as distinct from the North Koreans, treated their captives well and concentrated on winning them over. The unfortunate conclusion reached here has been that the Chinese have been having moderate success, helped along by the inevitable tensions and frustrations of prison camp life.

Most of the more responsible correspondents emphasized the Chinese indoctrination campaign among war prisoners, as related by the returnees, and tried to give their readers an insight into the devilishly subtle methods employed by the Communists to capture their prisoners' political allegiance. This, they felt, was the most significant lesson to be learned from the exchange.

* * *

Such reporters were in the minority at Panmunjom and "Freedom Village." The impact of their stories was largely lost in the avalanche of atrocity stories, particularly those turned out by most of the major press services. The correspondents at "Freedom Village" of one highly regarded American newspaper was outraged when he discovered that his stories were being rewritten by his editors back home in order to stress the atrocities, though he had cabled his home office his conviction that they were being blown up out of proportion.

Book Reviews

The Editor's Own Story

by Louis M. Lyons

WHERE MAIN STREET MEETS THE RIVER. By Hodding Carter. 339 pp. New York: Rinehart & Co. \$4.

For almost half his forty-six years, Hodding Carter has been a militant editor in the Deep South. Product of a notably violent district of southern Louisiana, he learned early to pack a gun to protect his right to have his say in his paper. The gun was less necessary after a happy transplant to Greenville, Miss. But the change in his editorial target was only from the forces of Huey Long to those of Bilbo. Through the zestful years he has fixed his sights against every blight he saw threatening the South and has enlisted in every civilizing force.

Educated in the North, and a devoted summer resident of Maine, where he writes his novels, he has often undertaken, as in this book, to interpret the South to the North. He says he tells the South what is wrong with it and tells outsiders what is right with it. This has won him wide renown as one of the voices of the New South. But what he voices chiefly in this book is his own deep satisfaction with the lines his life has taken—the struggle, adventure, purpose and joys of newspapering in a small town on the Mississippi.

Much of his book reports on the impact of racial conflicts on his southern community, and of the South's progress in its basic problem. Hodding Carter is eloquent over this progress. He recognizes the difficulties remaining, though with less urgency than his impatient friends North, whom he likes to confront with the discriminations of their own region.

Beneath the controversies of editorial tempest runs the quiet life of the Mississippi delta, a special region of its own that Mr. Carter loves and lovingly portrays. He has clearly found a good life as Greenville's editor and has enjoyed every minute of it. There he is by way of becoming a Southern William Allen White, mellowing as

he mulls over the issues of his local world and relates them to the big world that has beckoned him, during the war and since, to adventure on almost every continent.

Only in undertone runs the story of struggle that he and his wife, Betty, have shared. They started their first paper together in Hammond, La., with nothing but their own hands, in the slough of depression in 1932. This was after he had lost his job and been told he'd never make a newspaper man. Their courage led that rare character, Will Percy of Greenville, Miss., to back them in their second venture—a daily paper in Greenville, which already had a daily. But the Carters won through by writing the news and fighting for what they believed. Then after five years' absence in war came a new struggle to regain control of their paper. This time the confidence of friends raised the \$100,000 they needed against a ninety-day deadline and bound them irrevocably to Greenville.

Here Mr. Carter has found as much fun on the local school committee, fighting off fanatics, as he did in jousting with the Army brass in North Africa as publisher of *Stars and Stripes*. He has entered with vigor into every local improvement and with gusto into every political fight. Life crackles with action in the pages of the *The Delta Democrat-Times* and its editor breathes the full flavor of it. He has packed this account of his newspaper life with his own exuberance. In all of it, Betty Carter has been a full partner and major force. In dedicating the book to her "and all the other Bettys," Hodding Carter seems to be giving his own prescription for success and making a love story of his book. Knowing them, I guess that is the way it was—and is.

The New York Times Book Review, May 31.

Mr. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard.

Reviews ---

Olmstead to Raymond to Schlesinger

THE COTTON KINGDOM. By Frederick Law Olmstead; edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 626 pp. \$6.75.

This extraordinarily beautiful book is an historian's contribution (and a publisher's) to the replenishing of our history. It is a reprinting in magnificent form of a book one hundred years old that remains the classic, first-hand report on the South just before the Civil War.

Olmstead was the great pioneer of landscape architecture. But before he began that career he turned in one of the great all-time performances of reporting on America. Henry J. Raymond, editor of the *New York Times*, engaged young Olmstead to make a trip through the South, then the topic of furious agitation in the North, and report his observations for the *Times*. This was 1852. During the next three years, Olmstead made three Southern journeys and his dispatches developed into a book that still stands as the most informed, factual and readable account of

that region in the decade that was shaping toward the Civil War. Olmstead in his day was the kind of shrewdly observant traveler that William O. Douglas is in our time, as practical and vivid a reporter of what he saw, and with as keen an eye for color and human interest. He had a sense of humor too, and an ear for dialogue. He traveled largely by horseback in the back country and put up where night found him. The accommodations were often primitive and the riding rough. When and how he found time to write his brilliantly detailed accounts on every aspect of Southern life is the one mystery in the otherwise complete disclosure of his fascinating narrative. It is a tribute to the journalism of the mid-19th century that Olmstead's reporting for Raymond is as good reading today as it was in 1853 and has met the test of history. Arthur Schlesinger's introduction tells enough about young Olmstead to convince a reader that one way to produce the highest journalism is to catch an architect just before he has found his own groove.

Justice Douglas Reports On Southeast Asia

NORTH FROM MALAYA by William O. Douglas. Doubleday & Co., New York. 352 pp. \$3.95.

This is the latest and the most notable of the contributions to our understanding of the crucible of Asia, that result from the Summer explorations of that redoubtable traveler, Justice Douglas. He would have made a great reporter. He goes and sees for himself, gets the feel of the situation on the ground, interviews all sides, adds up the score with shrewd insight and candor, and writes vividly of what he has learned.

He has gone to the peoples whose ferment for freedom makes one of the great facts of our time. He seeks to understand and to make the reader see the meaning of these vast upheavals of the submerged populations of the East. He has a keen sense of color and human interest; he

plainly enjoys people. His own great humanness shines through his account of the people he has met and the conditions of their life.

He reports these many seething revolutions, wars and strivings against a background of traditional American principles of independence and democracy. He discloses the corrupt causes of the Huks' revolt and the background of imperial repressions to the war in Indo-China. He states with vigor and urgency his convictions of the role which America's traditions should cause her to play in the emerging consciousness of Asian aspirations.

This book covers Malaya, Burma, Indo-China, the Philippines, Formosa and Korea. It is an exciting story and invaluable background of the current news.

News From Indo China

As a result of this censorship, the news from Vietnam is to be mistrusted. All news is put in the most favorable light possible for the French and for Bao Dai. All news is slanted against the power and strength of the Viet Minh. One who reads the American press without knowing the geography of Vietnam will commonly think the French are enjoying tremendous victories. But in the winter of 1952 many of the stories about the "victories" were grossly misleading. They were often instances where the Viet Minh suddenly appeared far to the rear of the French. The French dropped paratroopers into the troubled spot and often contacted the guerrillas and captured or killed some of them. But I have personal knowledge of instances described as French "victories" in which the guerrillas escaped entirely or suffered only minor losses. The French "victories" were more often than not French defeats. One has to look at Vietnam from the inside and see censorship in operation to understand the treachery of the news that reaches the world.

—from *North from Malaya*, by William O. Douglas

Principles and Politics

If the price of French support in Europe is the underwriting of French policies in Vietnam, we must still adhere to our principles of freedom and justice and refuse to align ourselves with the repressive policies which the French have long imposed on the Vietnamese. If we trade our principles for this support or that support around the world, we become merely another great power engaged in exploiting one people for the benefit of another. That role leads only to political bankruptcy and bitterness. That role sacrifices our position of moral leadership. In that role we lose stature. Instead of showing the peoples of Asia an alternative to Communism, we in effect make Communism seem inevitable to them.

The so-called practical politicians may say that this course is daydreaming, that America must always stand fast to her allies, that the world of affairs is a hard-headed world where expediency must rule. *But as Jesus, Gandhi, and other great souls have shown, there is no more powerful voice in the world than the voice of con-*

Reviews ---

science. The present-day struggle is for the balance of political power in the world. That struggle can be won only by ideas. And there are no more potent ideas at work in all the world than America's standards of freedom, justice, and equality. The Communist creed is cheap and tawdry by comparison.

There is no other way for America to maintain her moral leadership than to be faithful abroad as well as at home to her principles. If the voice of America is always heard on the side of the weak and the oppressed, if America is against exploitation whoever the exploiter and the exploited are, then America becomes strong in the hearts of people the world around. Then Soviet Russia has powerful competition at the political level. Then Soviet Russia has competition so powerful that the purveyors of the Communist creed will go begging.

—from *North from Malaya*, by William O. Douglas

OUTSPOKEN: 150 YEARS OF THE NEWS AND COURIER. By Herbert Ravel Sass. University of South Carolina Press. 120 pp. \$3.

This attractively printed and interestingly illustrated little book contains an

historical sketch of the uniquely individual newspaper of old Charleston and biographical articles of nine editors who gave it its distinctive character and flavor. *Outspoken* describes the paper and its editorial personalities, whose attitudes and policies appear to have changed as little in these 150 years as Charleston itself. Both are rare exhibits of Americana and Mr. Sass is a devoted chronicler.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA GAZETTE, 1732-1775. By Henning Cohen. University of South Carolina Press. 273 pp. \$6.

This is a documentary history of a colonial newspaper and the culture it mirrored with its notices in South Carolina in the generation before the Revolution. Intended for the specialist in colonial history, it is a mine of detail of all that a newspaper published in that period. The material is conveniently classified: theatre, sports, teachers, artists, club life, gardens, poets. The original newspaper notices of services, sales, enterprises and events are faithfully reproduced—also the verses and essays that saved editorial labors in a day before boiler plate. An item for the antiquarian or a source for the historical student. —L. M. Lyons

William P. Vogel joined the staff of the Lincoln Project of the Defense Department in Bedford, Mass. in May, as editorial director.

William B. Dickinson, chief Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *Bulletin* reports both the marriage and college graduation of his son, William Dickinson III, who has been United Press correspondent at University of Kansas and expects to continue in newspaper work after service in the army. Young Bill married Miss Betty Landree, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Roy G. Landree of Mission, Kansas, who is preparing to be a biological technician.

1941

The San Francisco *Chronicle* closed its Washington Bureau May 1. Their correspondent, Vance Johnson, has now had two bureaus close down on him, but he had a choice of other Washington posts and has not yet reported his choice.

1942

Victor O. Jones, night managing editor of the Boston *Globe*, was a marshall of his 25 year class at Harvard Commencement and shared in the gift to Harvard of "\$260,000 and Nathan Pusey." Classmate Pusey succeeds James B. Conant as president of Harvard. Jones' class dedicated another \$10,000 to a scholarship to bear Mr. Conant's name. Being a Commencement marshall involves wearing a top hat, which Mr. Jones does with distinction.

Robert Lasch arrives at work an hour earlier than his colleagues on the editorial page of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* this Summer because the family car has to conform to the earlier schedule of Christopher Lasch, Harvard '54, copy boy on the *Post-Dispatch* this Summer.

1943

Millard Browne became editor, in April, of the editorial page of the Buffalo *Evening News* where he has written editorials for eight years.

William A. Townes, serving on the Selecting Committee for Nieman Fellowships, interviewed Far West candidates in San Francisco and Albuquerque before joining the committee in St. Louis for its interviews held there and in New York. Townes resigned as editor of the Los Angeles *News* April 15 after two and a

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, entertained the Selecting Committee for Nieman Fellowships at his home in Collinsville, Ill., the evening of June 4. He outfitted each with a package of Sedum from his garden and a therapeutic shoe-tie, guaranteed to prevent callouses on the instep. This is unpatented and a prescription can be obtained from Ralph McGill, Atlanta *Constitution*, or William M. Pinkerton, Harvard News Office. The committee had lunch with Dilliard, Robert Lasch (1942) of the editorial page, Donald Grant (1942) editorial title page editor, Daniel Fitzpatrick, cartoonist, and other members of the *Post-Dispatch* staff.

Dilliard was chosen by Brandeis University to deliver their third annual Louis Dembitz Brandeis Memorial Lecture, April 17.

Edwin A. Lahey has had an assignment of some months in South Africa for the Chicago *Daily News*, reporting on the background of the Malan election.

1940

Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) *Delta Democrat-Times*, is the first Nieman Fellow to publish an autobiography. (See under Reviews.) Carter declined a full-time post as assistant director of the Voice of America but accepted appointment as adviser to Dr. Robert Johnson, its head.

half months of trying to make it what he thought it could be.

Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the *Scranton Times*, got a handsome dividend on his year of study of European coal mining, in a share of the William the Silent Award for Journalism, \$1,000. The other winners were Anne O'Hare McCormick of the *New York Times* and David M. Nichol of the *Chicago Daily News*. Donohoe wrote a story on the Dutch coal mining industry as an incident in his travel on a Reid Fellowship in 1952. The prize is normally \$2,500 but the judges came out in a three-way tie and awarded each \$1,000. Prince Bernhard made the awards in Washington at the end of March.

1944

Fred Maguire, associate professor of journalism at Ohio State University, ran the annual sessions of the Ohio Pen and Pencil Club at the University May 23-24 without a deficit, reportedly without precedent in the annals of these editorial gatherings.

1945

Upon the demise of *Quick*, **David Botter** moved his desk across the hall to join the staff of *Look*.

One of the tallest members of the graduating class at Harvard in June was Carl Wagner, son of **Charles Wagner**, Sunday editor of the *New York Mirror*.

1947

Jack Foisie had a tour of duty in Korea for the *San Francisco Chronicle* in May.

Francis P. Locke, associate editor of the *Dayton Evening News*, has been appointed a director of the Harvard Alumni Association. Phil has performed prodigious feats of recruitment of mid-west students for Harvard who are both star students and athletes. He also spoke wisely at a panel of his 20th class reunion on the subject: Can Communism be controlled in this country without sacrificing our fundamental liberties? Locke's answer: Yes. It is the only way it can be controlled, for only a free people can control their destiny. (His paper too late for this issue will be published next issue.)

First report of a retired Nieman Fellow comes from **Robert C. Miller**, war correspondent and roving reporter of the *United Press*. His letter suggests the

story of the retired editor who explained his newspaper success as due to his having worked hard all his life, never smoked, drank, gambled or dissipated, and then had a rich uncle die and leave him his money. Miller responds to a letter addressed to him as U.P. State manager at Phoenix:

"Sorry to disappoint you on Phoenix. I was just over there on a little temporary duty for UP. Have just finished another similar stint in the Los Angeles bureau, and am again "retired," using Pittsburg, Calif. as a base of operations for my fishing, boating and sundry occupations. Just got back from the north coast where we did some abalone fishing, and am going south next week for a few days at LaJolla and then a couple of weeks visiting friends at La Paz, in Baja, California, before returning north for the opening of the high Sierra trout season. Probably will do some vacation relief work for UP in Hawaii later this summer, but right now my main interest is divided between local agricultural problems on the place here, and gold mining on my claims in Trinity County in northern California. May see you one of these days if I get East.

Regards,
Bob

1948

Rebecca Gross, editor of the *Lock Haven (Pa.) Express*, was one of the group of touring editors who spent a week in Mos-

cow. In a report to *The Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Miss Gross comments candidly both on her Russian impressions and their reception at home. These are excerpts:

"It appears, from some of the comments that were made on the reports filed by some of the members of our party, that not every editor of American newspapers and magazines wanted a simple factual report of what a delegation of Americans can see and do in a seven-day visit to Moscow. In some quarters we were criticized and condemned as simpletons and dupes for reporting the plain truth about the amazing Moscow subway, an architectural propaganda structure.

"My mail, written from various parts of the United States and from several foreign countries, as the result of publication of five articles over my by-line distributed by the Associated Press, and an interview I gave Charles Kline of *U. S. News & World Report*, in London, included letters scolding me for not describing the Russians in Moscow as obviously starving and rebellious, and letters berating me for not painting Moscow as something a little ahead of New York City.

"It seems to me that American newspaper and magazine editors, and American readers of the news, are making a great mistake when they ask any observer to do anything but tell them exactly what he saw. If they demand that he should bolster their own preconceived ideas, on pain of being accused of treason or stupidity, or both, are they not taking a step in the direction of the policies exemplified for so many years by Communist newspapers, which publish nothing that does not conform to the party "line"?

"I hope there is no developing tendency in the American press or the American public to require reports on the Russians to conform to the "line" that they are necessarily ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed and dissatisfied. Such a trend would remind me of the insistence of the Russians on news reports portraying Americans as downtrodden victims of Wall Street, suffering slaves eager for the liberating day when Communism may triumph over the "contradictions" of capitalism.

"Our seven days in Moscow certainly were not sufficient to permit us to get the whole truth about Russia . . . The reports our American delegation brought

Washington Nieman Dinners

Nieman Fellows in Washington held a very successful season of monthly dinners through the Winter and Spring. Among their speakers were Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Secretary of Interior McKay, Senator Hickenlooper, Justice Frankfurter, Prof. Archibald Cox of Harvard law school, while he was chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, and Pres. Conant of Harvard when as high commissioner to Germany he accompanied Chancellor Adenauer to this country. Prof. Frederick Merk, Professor Aurther M. Schlesinger and Louis M. Lyons, from Harvard, with their wives, were guests at a special Christmas season meeting.

out of Moscow are of value, chiefly, in my opinion, because they can help thoughtful American citizens to come to a more accurate understanding of Russian society as it exists in Moscow. The seven-day observations of ten westerners cannot be the whole answer—but we shall never get a whole, reliable, objective answer unless the American press and the American public are willing to set aside their emotional preconceptions so they can see clearly the facts that can be established, piece by piece.”

1949

Christopher Rand is returning to the Far East for the *New Yorker*, after spending several months in Salisbury, Conn. His new tour will take him to India, Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Lawrence G. Weiss is on the New York *Times* Sunday staff working on the *Review of the Week*. Weiss had been assistant to Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin until Jan. 20.

George Weller returned in June to his Rome post for the *Chicago Daily News* after a home stay, that included covering the UN and attending the Wellesley graduation and marriage of his daughter, Anne, an honors graduate.

Alan Barth of the editorial page of the *Washington Post*, had the distinction of appearing with Tom Paine, Vera Micheles Dean, Clarence Streit, Bert Andrews and Theodore White on the list of authors purged from the State Department overseas libraries in Germany. His *Loyalty of Free Men* came under either the “controversial” or “et cetera” category of banned books in the State Department directive.

F. Tillman Durdin, correspondent of the New York *Times* in Southeast Asia, had a relief from the Indo-China War this Spring on a home leave. With Mrs. Durdin he visited Cambridge and gave a Nieman seminar talk, April 19. The Durdins were returning by way of Europe to make a circuit of the globe.

1950

Dwight Sargent, editor of the *Portland Press-Herald* (Me.) is chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers for this year and is planning their Boston-Cambridge program for October 15-16-17.

William German, news editor of the

San Francisco *Chronicle*, reports a son, Stephen, born in February.

A son, John Richard, was born to Mary and Donald Gonzales, June 6 in Washington where Mr. Gonzales covers the State Department for the *United Press*.

Sigma Delta Chi's award for Washington correspondence was made to Clark Mollenhoff for a series of articles which led to opening of the Internal Revenue Department's Alcohol Tax Unit records to public scrutiny. Clark represents the Des Moines *Register and Tribune* and the Minneapolis *Star and Tribune*.

Probably the most complete coverage anywhere of the historic Dartmouth Commencement at which the President made his “Don't join the book burners” address was in the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle*,—Melvin Wax, managing editor. This was a part of a 52-page issue that included a special supplement telling the story of Claremont, making undoubtedly the biggest paper published in New England on Monday, June 15.

1951

Finishing his first year on the *Washington Post*, Simeon Booker was surprised by a presentation of a five foot gold trophy and the citation of “Newsmen's News-

Editor & Publisher, June 13

Chicago News Exposes Life In City Slums

CHICAGO—“On March 27 a rat crawled into a baby's crib at 628 W. Barber and chewed the child to death.”

That lead marked the beginning of a sensational series of *Chicago Daily News* articles, exposing the city's slums and hammering home the fact that landlords get “penthouse prices for ratholes.”

The first article, published June 10, states “this is the documented story of men who are enriching themselves from Chicago's slums, their methods and the blight they lay over a city. It is the story, too, of how they get away with it.”

Daily News reporters, aided by title experts, have traced hundreds of obscure titles of slum property to 20 men or firms who are “among Chicago's biggest slum makers.” The *Daily News* found these men charging \$90 to \$100 a month for three or four rooms. Their names were given later.

man” of the year by the Capital Press Club, composed of his former colleagues of the Negro Press. Justice Felix Frankfurter was the speaker at the award banquet.

Roy Fisher, city hall reporter on the *Chicago Daily News*, headed a staff team in a vigorous exposure of Chicago slum conditions. See scrapbook clipping on it.

1952

From the Ottawa press gallery, Shane MacKay of the Winnipeg *Free Press* sends in his claim to having the last Nieman baby of the 1952 group. Sheila McDiarmid arrived last December 20.

Robert Crandall, formerly Sunday editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, moved over to the *Times* last Winter to serve on its foreign news desk.

1953

At the end of his Nieman Fellowship, Watson S. Sims, formerly of the Chattanooga bureau of the *Associated Press*, was moved into the New York bureau. One of his first assignments was the Rosenberg execution.

Calvin Mayne was married to Nancy Marth in Rochester, May 23, and went on a honeymoon to Bermuda before returning to his job on the Rochester *Times-Union*.

A team of eight *Daily News* reporters and three photographers worked for more than two months to get the facts. The team, directed by Roy M. Fisher, blanketed the city. They spent days going over building department and court records, tracing titles and checking financial histories.

Accompanying the first article was a full page of pictures, showing how people live in slum areas, giving the address of each home pictured.

Working with Mr. Fisher were Nelson Fitch, Robert Gruenberg, Robert Johnston, James McCartney, Jay McMullen, Robert Seaver and John Justin Smith. Photographers on the “slum team” were William Deluga, Elliott Robinson and Joseph Zack.

Roy Fisher was a Nieman Fellow in 1951.

New York Herald Tribune, May 21

Sen. McCarthy's Haste

by Ned Russell

WASHINGTON.—After studying the full text of what Mr. Clement Attlee said in the House of Commons last week, one wonders what the resultant explosion on Capitol Hill was all about. In particular, it is difficult to reconcile Mr. Attlee's speech with the vitriolic reply to it made by Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, R., Wis. For it is clear that Sen. McCarthy was replying to—and attacking—not what Mr. Attlee actually said but to a garbled version of what he said.

It is perhaps significant that Sen. McCarthy chose for the premise of his attack the Chicago *Tribune* account of Mr. Attlee's speech published in the *Tribune's* sister paper, the Washington *Times-Herald*. He ignored the less exciting and less flamboyant accounts published in other newspapers. And, despite the fact that several different versions of the speech were published in this country, he chose to reply immediately, rather than wait for the full text, which became available late last week.

Thus, it may be useful to quote three paragraphs of the *Times-Herald* account, which Sen. McCarthy cited specifically as the basis for his speech, and compare them with the relevant passages in Mr. Attlee's actual text.

* * *

First, Sen. McCarthy quoted a paragraph from the *Times-Herald* story ostensibly summarizing Mr. Attlee's speech: "Attlee found fault with the American people, the American Constitution, the American system of government and the American government itself, past and present."

Nowhere in Mr. Attlee's speech did he find "fault with the American people." In discussing what he called "some facts" about the American Constitution "which do not always seem to be apprehended," the former Labor Prime Minister explained the constitutional division of power between the Administration and Congress.

This, surely, is not a subject of real debate.

Secondly, Sen. McCarthy quoted the

Times-Herald dispatch as quoting Mr. Attlee as saying: "One of the facts of the world situation is that the American Constitution was framed for an isolationist state. The Americans do not want to have anything to do with Europe."

The first sentence of this quotation is correct. But then Mr. Attlee added: "Americans *did not* want to have anything to do with Europe." The verb tense, thus, changes the whole meaning of the passage.

* * *

Finally, Sen. McCarthy quoted this sentence from the newspaper dispatch: "Attlee said that he welcomed Churchill's proposal Monday for an immediate meeting of heads of state, but he doubted the wisdom of President Eisenhower's attendance."

Actually, Mr. Attlee, in indorsing the Prime Minister's call for a meeting of the heads of the "leading powers," diverged slightly from Sir Winston's attitude by underlining the need for the "most careful preparation" for such a conference. In

this passage, he was in complete agreement with Secretary of State Dulles.

Mr. Attlee went on: "We want to be sure what we want, and that applies not only to this country but to the United States of America." Then, reverting to the problem of "the peculiar constitutional position of America," he said: "It would be possible for President Eisenhower to attend a conference and, on his return to the United States, to be thrown over, as President Wilson was after the discussions at Versailles. It is, therefore, essential that whoever goes to this conference should go with full authority. We need full cooperation in searching out these ideas." . . .

In other words, Mr. Attlee did not "doubt the wisdom" of President Eisenhower attending a big power meeting. Instead, he appealed for "full cooperation" in preparing for such a meeting so that the President might be confident that any decisions he agreed to would not be "thrown over" on his return to Washington.

Altogether, Mr. Attlee's speech was a typically quiet, somewhat urbane discourse on the state of the world. It did not call for a retort from an American Senator of the sort delivered by Sen. McCarthy.

New York Times Editorial, June 8, 1953

"Books in San Antonio"

San Antonio, Tex., has been in the throes of a movement intended, so its sponsors say, to put down subversives and restrain subversive influences. The public library was taken as a good place to begin. The former acting city manager, being replaced, suggested it might be a good idea to burn some books. This proposal was not adopted, perhaps because even in late May or early June, it is too warm in San Antonio to make a bonfire seem fun. Mayor Jack White said the City Council might "consider branding all Communist-written volumes in their library as such." In this case, of course, a reader picking up such a book would put it right down again, just as he or she would if the book had been branded salacious. . . .

Some San Antonians may have considered what books to burn or brand, but one lady, organizer of the San Antonio Minute Women had solved this problem by draw-

ing up a list of about 600 titles. These included Prof. Einstein's *Theory of Relativity*, Louis Untermeyer's *Treasury of American and British Poetry*, Dorothy Canfield Fisher's *Fables for Parents* and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The last named book was in the list because Rockwell Kent had illustrated it and not because any suspicion of subversive intention attached to Mr. Chaucer. Mr. Chaucer has either been cleared by the proper Congressional committee or has just been overlooked. It appears, also, that not all the authors mentioned are charged by the Minute Women with being Communists. Maybe they are just charged with not being Minute Women.

San Antonio has no larger quota of foolish citizens per thousand persons old enough to vote and able to walk than other cities. The book-branding move is being opposed. There seems to be a feeling

around city hall that there are "more important matters" to consider.

What is important, of course, is to see to it that the foolish and the ignorant do not fasten upon San Antonio or any other

community a Nazi-style or Communist-style censorship. Among the enemies of democracy are not only those who plot against it; there are also those who make it ridiculous.

display the left-wing journal "New Statesman and Nation" and the French provide several opposition publications.

Among the authors banned by the State Department was the late Richard E. Lauterback, former *Life* magazine correspondent whose book *These Are The Russians* has been banned.

The following writers on China are proscribed:

Edgar Snow, former member of the staff of the *Saturday Evening Post*; Theodore White, formerly of *Time* magazine; Anna Lee Jacoby, now Mrs. Clifton Fadiman; Lawrence K. Rosinger, formerly associated with the Foreign Policy Association, and Owen Lattimore, professor on leave from the Johns Hopkins University.

Others included Howard Fast, left-wing writer whose earlier historical works such as *Citizen Tom Paine* had been on Amerika Haus shelves; Langston Hughes, poet and essayist; John Abt, former special attorney for the Justice and Agriculture Departments, and Paul B. Anderson, European secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association.

Senator McCarthy's two traveling investigators, Roy Marcus Cohn and Gerard Schine, recently toured Germany checking books on the shelves of Amerika Haus libraries. Examination today of Berlin's handsome Amerika Haus confirmed that all books of the authors listed in the foregoing had been removed. However, in an apparent oversight the catalogue card of one volume remained, although the book itself had been removed. This was a book of fiction entitled *Return to the Vineyard* by Walter Duranty and Mary Loos.

New York Times, June 11

U. S. Purges Libraries It Runs In Germany

by Walter Sullivan

BERLIN, June 10—Books written by about a score of American authors, including such prominent political analysts as Vera Micheles Dean, editor of Foreign Policy Association Publications, and Walter Duranty, have been removed from the shelves of all Amerika Haus libraries in Germany.

At least five of the other authors whose books were removed at one time or another had written books about China critical of the Kuomintang, the Nationalist Chinese political organization.

Several others had refused to tell Congressional committees whether they had once been Communists, or had otherwise been uncooperative.

Such a one, for example, was Dashiell Hammett, writer of best-selling mystery stories whose works in recent days have been removed from Amerika Haus shelves.

There are forty such libraries in Berlin and West Germany under the direction of the United States Information Service.

They were visited last year by an estimated 15,000,000 persons. Four of the libraries are due to close July 1.

There are also 104 German-controlled libraries with books on loan from the State Department. These have been told to return all books by authors on the State Department's "blacklist."

These and other recent developments in Germany have done much to undo the herculean efforts of United States occupation forces in the post-war years to present American democracy to the German people as a magnet to draw them away from totalitarian attitudes.

One such development was the report that State Department investigators were questioning all who attended the recent farewell party in Bonn for Theodore Kagan, former chief of the information division in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. Kagan was forced to resign after

having been recalled to testify before the Senate Investigations subcommittee headed by Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin.

Among those who attended were Dr. James B. Conant, the High Commissioner. Published reports from Bonn asserted that some of those who were known to have been present were being asked to furnish lists of names of others seen there. So far as is known here, these reports have not been denied.

Until recently the Amerika Haus libraries, which are to be found in all West German cities, were monuments to American freedom of thought.

Aim Was to Fight Nazism

In his final report as High Commissioner last July John J. McCloy stated that one of the basic tasks of these libraries was to combat the intellectual stagnation of the Nazi period, "counteracting the effect of twelve years of isolation and one-sided information."

The British and French information services continue to present to the Germans a broad cross section of opinion from their own countries. The British

"Don't Join the Book Burners"

President Eisenhower at Dartmouth, June 14

"Don't join the book burners. Don't think you are going to conceal faults by concealing evidence that they ever existed. Don't be afraid to go in your library and read every book as long as any document does not offend our own ideas of decency. That should be the only censorship.

"How will we defeat communism unless we know what it is? What it teaches—why does it have such an appeal for

men? Why are so many people swearing allegiance to it?

"Now we have got to fight it with something better. Not try to conceal the thinking of our own people. They are part of America and even if they think ideas that are contrary to ours they have a right to have them, a right to record them, and a right to have them in places where they are accessible to others. It is unquestioned or it is not America."

New York Times, June 16

Some Books Literally Burned After Inquiry, Dulles Reports

by C. P. Trussell

WASHINGTON, June 15—John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, disclosed today that there had been an actual, though small-scale, literal burning of books after Congressional investigations as his department had moved to rid the shelves of its Information Service libraries overseas of works by Communist authors.

Secretary Dulles set the number of books burned at eleven. He did not recall their titles, he said, nor would he identify the place or places of the burnings.

From other sources it was learned that books had been set afire some weeks ago at Sydney, Australia, and at Singapore, and that when word of these actions had been received in Washington a directive had been sent out hurriedly to all libraries that such burnings be stopped forthwith.

The small number of burned volumes among the 2,000,000 in 285 American libraries seeking to tell the American story throughout the world in the "cold war" did not appear to matter, as questions flew at Mr. Dulles at his news conference this afternoon.

In the immediate background was President Eisenhower's address to Dartmouth College graduates yesterday in which he urged them to not "join the book-burners." Instead, he suggested in effect that they read and learn what communism really

was and fight it with full understanding.

The questions were pressed upon the Secretary of State today to a point where, apparently irked, he changed abruptly the course of his news conference.

Numerous inquiries had been based upon earlier developments at the Capitol, where Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin and chairman of the Senate Investigations subcommittee, had put Dr. James B. Conant, United States High Commissioner for Germany, under an oral lashing, largely on account of books found by his inquiry panel in overseas libraries.

Mr. Dulles indicated that he had accepted the President's "book-burning" words in their most precise literal sense. He said he did not know just how many books had been removed from overseas library shelves.

Asked whether he could find out how many, he suggested that it would be quite a costly operation to check on each of the 285 libraries scattered throughout the free world. He added that, under reorganization plans now before Congress, the overseas information services probably would be transformed soon into an independent operation. He did not attempt to hide his welcome of relief from this responsibility.

The Secretary was asked whether he

would commend the President's advice to those who operated the overseas libraries. He said he would.

Asked whether this constituted a change of State Department policy, he said it did not. What it does mean, he implied, is the application of more common sense than has prevailed in directives issued from the department in the heat of the McCarthy investigation. Many overseas librarians had been left in doubt, he indicated, as to what to exclude from the shelves.

As though to emphasize his position, Mr. Dulles later faced newsreel and television cameras to say:

"I would commend the President's remarks at Dartmouth College to those responsible for the operation of our overseas libraries. Now there have been questions as to whether the policy with respect to the use of Communist literature in this * * * information program is in conflict with the President's statement. I do not think so. What is required is a little more common sense in applying information policy.

"I think you are dealing with a problem which is very difficult to cover specifically by a directive which will always be understood by the recipient; that you have to leave a considerable measure of discretion to what we hope would be the good judgment of the people that carry it out.

"My own feeling is that the books which are of essentially a propaganda nature designed to sell communism and be persuasive in support of communism should not be books on which we should expend the rather meager funds which are designed for quite a contrary purpose."

Sen. McCarthy Questions Pres. Conant On "Book Burning"

Text of exchange from Boston Globe, June 16.

WASHINGTON, June 15—Here are questions and answers in Senator McCarthy's examination of Dr. James B. Conant before the Senate Appropriations Committee today:

Q—Our committee recently investigated the fact that 30,000 books by Communist authors are on the shelves of libraries run by the Information Service. I am not speaking of books available to employees of the High Commissioner's Office, which I understand they must read to know what they are fighting. I refer to books on shelves which carry our stamp of approval. Do you favor leaving them there or taking them off?

A—If I had the responsibility I should have to examine each case—see whether that book would do more good than harm.

Q—Every Communist has the task of furthering the Commie cause. Would you favor having books by Communist authors on our shelves? Would you favor using any of this \$21,000,000 to buy books by Communist authors?

A—The answer is no.

Q—What about 30,000 books by Commie authors? Are you in favor of removing works of Commie authors from the shelves?

A—You mean by Communist authors under Communist discipline?

Q—Either by proven Communists or by persons who use the Fifth Amendment.

A—I would not favor having books by Communist party members on the shelves. If they are there I'd take them off.

Q—You'd not call that bookburning, would you?

A—Well, I wouldn't suppose you would burn them.

McCarthy asked if Conant proposed to destroy or store the books.

A—That seems a minor administrative problem. They might be sold as excess property to second-hand dealers to recover what we could for the taxpayers.

Q—You'd sell them so the people in the United States could read them?

A—They are perfectly capable of reading books by Communists or anyone else and coming to their own conclusions.

Q—Would you sell them to colleges?

A—I haven't any objection to their being put in college libraries. I assume that Harvard now has all the books published in America.

Q—I wouldn't be surprised, either.

A—While I see no objection to Harvard having all the books published, I feel the situation would be entirely different in libraries maintained abroad by the government. They shouldn't buy those of Communist party members.

Conant was asked what would be his advice to Germans and replied he could tell them to make their own decision.

Conant was asked if he went to a farewell party for Theodore Kaghan and said that he did. Who financed it? Conant replied that he paid his own share and assumed the others did.

Q—Let's take the Kaghan case. We called your attention to the fact he lived with a Commie. He signed petitions for a Commie candidate. He wrote plays produced by Commie fronts. He belonged to fronts. We suggested he be got rid of. He was still there two months later. Then we put him on public exhibition. We picked him up by the scruff of his neck and brought him over here and questioned him. Do you regret that?

A—I do. I think he was in process of resigning for his own reasons.

Q—That is not true. He was resigning because he was exposed.

A—When I arrived Kaghan was a name to me. I was told he was going to resign before the year was out.

Q—Who told you that?

A—Kaghan himself I think. He was cleared you understand. No question had been raised he was undesirable.

Q—Is there any question now that he was undesirable; that he shouldn't have been discharged instantly?

A—I've not gone over the evidence.

Q—Do you think Lowell Clucas is a good man for the job?

A—Yes.

Q—Are you going to keep him if we give you \$21,000,000?

A—Yes.

Q—That gives us an idea of the kind of information we can expect for \$21,000,000. He is one of the cases I gave to the Tydings Committee three years ago. May I have the chair's attention? He's the same type of individual as Kaghan. I may say if he is the type you are going to have running the information program, the committee should have that in mind. I'll submit to the committee a more detailed picture. I'm very happy to have your answer.

A—Well, he had full clearance.

Q—Full clearance under the Acheson program. Hiss had full clearance. Kaghan had full clearance. Every traitor we've exposed had full clearance.

A—There are a good many cases where they didn't give full clearance.

Q—Last year Humelsine said that beside Clubb and Vincent only three didn't get full clearance. It's completely meaningless. Kaghan had full clearance. Keeping in mind Kaghan's record as submitted by himself. He lived with Commie, etc., he attended Communist party meetings. Do you think clearance by the Acheson team qualified him, made him the right man to run the information program?

A—The Kaghan case, as I get it, was that he went to these things 20 years ago.

Q—It was not 20 years ago. He signed a Communist pledge after the Hitler-Stalin pact. I'm tired of having people say they were Communists but they've reformed. The presumption is you're the same unless you can prove you've reformed.

A—I think he proved it by what he did. We've letters from Germans and other evidence he was a very effective person against Communism. There is no evidence I have casting any question on his loyalty in the period he was with the High Commissioner in Germany Office.

Q—Shouldn't you examine the evidence before you clear him? Don't you think you should go into the case? Otherwise

we can't trust you to pick the right man to succeed him. Don't you realize that his superior in Austria said he was overfriendly to the Communist cause?

A—I've not seen that report. The evidence available to me showed he had a record that he was an effective agent against Communism. We are speaking of something past. The man is out. The case is closed.

Q—The case is not closed because we've found his twin Clucas is still there. Is he the type of individual you would select to run the information program?

A—On evidence of the High Commissioner of Germany records I'd say yes. If you're talking of High Commissioner of Germany Office record I'd say yes. If you're talking simply of his ability in fighting Communism I'd say yes.

Q—I think if you feel we should have men like Kaghan and Clucas running the information program I don't think the Senate should give you a penny. They've done infinite damage. Until now I haven't blamed you for the past. I blame the Truman-Acheson team. But if you insist in keeping on men of the Kaghan and Clucas stripe, it indicates to me that any money spent there will be wasted.

Q—Did you oppose removal of Charles Thayer?

A—I didn't know Charles Thayer. I had nothing to do with him.

Q—Did you know of his removal on security grounds?

A—He discussed it with me in an interview.

Q—We've heard disturbing rumors of huge parties thrown partly at Government expense. Do you know anything it?

A—I was not aware of it.

Q—Was it partly paid for at the cost of the High Commissioner in Germany Office?

A—I'm sure it wasn't.

Q—We've been running a paper in Berlin at a cost of \$3,000,000 a year. I can see a reason for running it after the war. I see no reason now.

A—You've been slightly misinformed. The paper is the *Neue Zeitung* published in Frankfurt and Berlin. The figure covers the entire operation. It has been stated here erroneously that it was planned to make it a weekly. It's my desire to keep it a daily. The situation is such that

until treaties are ratified we shouldn't give the Germans the feeling we are losing interest.

Q—How about subsidization of the German Press? Isn't that a very dangerous practice? Don't favored papers get lots of help?

A—The word subsidy is not applicable to the situation as I found it. There's a Reichsmark revolving fund, with a committee of publishers formed to pass on loans to papers. We wanted to get free German papers going.

Q—We've testimony that they picked sizeable number of Communist editors and that the most heavily subsidized is run as of today by a Communist editor.

A—I should question that evidence until I've had a chance to run it down. I challenge the correctness of the statement. It's not the picture I get today.

Q—We've had Theodore Kagan before us. I don't criticize you. Someone in your organization should be reading that testimony and inform you of it.

A—We don't yet have a copy apparently.

Q—Is it proposed to continue helping German papers?

A—We don't propose to finance any in the budget except *Neuse Zeitung*. These papers are financed out of the revolving fund. It's not a cost to the American taxpayer.

Q—Don't you think it's dangerous to have an agency decide which papers will get aid; that it gives too much control of the press?

A—In the long run I think it would. It began under my predecessors. There are commitments. It's not American money.

Q—Who succeeded Kagan?

A—No one.

Q—Have you any objection to the committee exposing books by Communist authors?

A—I certainly have no objections to committees investigating anything and to make recommendations to the Administration.

Q—Don't you consider it book burning or a vicious thing if we remove books of Commie authors?

A—Let's define what are Commie authors. I agree that books by Communist party members shouldn't be on the shelves. If you can remove them without too much publicity it would be much better for our relations with the country in which we are operating.

Q—It's been going on for years and nothing was done until we exposed it. Do you object to public exposure?

A—I regret public exposure. It would have been much better if reports could have been made and they could be removed quietly.

Q—You're asking \$21,000,000 for a program and you object to public disclosure?

A—I object to nothing Congressional committees do.

Q—I'm not trying to cross examine you but I'd like an answer. I gather you have reservations as to public exposure. You object to our publicly exposing Commie authors?

A—I regret you felt it necessary to do it publicly. It's not for me to object or not to object.

Q—Do you find anything to criticize in the operation of High Commissioner's Office in Germany?

A—That's a pretty big order to pick things out of that sort.

Q—The people repudiated the old administration and it's assumed you are one of the new men. We want to know what changes are made, if any?

A—We have reduced the budget 25 percent. I think the place has been improved

under the plan approved by Johnson to streamline.

Q—Do you consider yourself an authority on the Communist party movement?

A—No.

Q—Don't you think a person in your position should be?

A—I know something about it but I don't consider myself an authority.

McCarthy noted that at the morning session Conant had said that it was a mistake to publicly expose Communist party authors.

A—I say that I regret the publicity that attended the removal of the books from the libraries in Germany.

McCarthy said that in relation to Kagan that Conant said he would not have discharged him on the basis of any evidence he had.

Q—Doesn't that show we had to grab him by the scruff of the neck and let the people know of the record? How could we have gotten rid of him except through public exhibition?

A—I was not in favor of putting on an exhibition.

Q—We'll have more of them. This is the only way we can force you to clean house.

A—You may have evidence. If you have evidence persons are a security risk I'd say you should bring it to the proper attention.

Q—You say if you'd had your way you'd have kept Kagan. With the information I've given, would you still have kept him?

A—I certainly wouldn't have discharged him.

Q—Did you feel the State Department made a mistake in asking him to resign?

A—Maybe they had evidence not available to me. I wouldn't like to criticize.

Christian Science Monitor, June 16

State of the Nation

Open Letter About 'Book Burning'

by Roscoe Drummond

Chief, Washington News Bureau, *The Christian Science Monitor*

This communication is addressed, in deep concern, to all Americans who do not want to see their liberties thrown away on the false theory that somehow such actions will help preserve liberty.

This communication is addressed to all Americans who see or are willing to see that a free nation cannot successfully fight tyranny by practicing even the beginnings of tyranny.

The harsh, shameful fact is that today the book burners are busy in the Department of State.

Therefore, this communication is also addressed to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in the conviction that he cannot conceivably be familiar with the facts or he would not tolerate what has been going on.

It is addressed to Mr. Dulles because his is the direct responsibility to put an end to this thoughtless, fear-ridden, mass-scale book purging which now is stalking America's overseas libraries.

It is addressed to Mr. Dulles in the hope that he will take time to read President Eisenhower's Dartmouth commencement speech and will see that the Chief Executive has, in effect, issued a directive to every federal official under his authority when he said: "Don't join the book burners!"

* * *

"Don't join the book burners!" said the President of the United States, but the harsh, shameful fact is that the United States under the presidency of General Eisenhower, has joined the book burners. It is conceivable that General Eisenhower doesn't know about it yet because so much has to flow across his desk. But he cannot fail to know about it for long.

And, then, what is he going to do about it? What is he going to do to make good his words: "Don't join the book burners!"

What are the President and the Secretary going to do:

About the fact that in Bombay the United States Information Service took

from its shelves "Washington Witch-hunt" by Bert Andrews, the Republican New York *Herald Tribune's* able, conservative Washington bureau chief who actively assisted Senator Richard Nixon and the House Committee on Un-American Activities in unearthing the information which convicted Alger Hiss?

About the fact that this same American embassy has banished from its library service books like "The Loyalty of Free Men" by Alan Barth, "The Rising Wind" by the anti-Communist Negro leader Walter White, "Union Now" by Clarence Streit, "Mission to Moscow" by former Ambassador Joseph Davies, the works of Thomas Paine and the Lynds' famous volumes, "Middletown" and "Middletown in Transition"?

About the fact that in the 40 USIS libraries in Berlin and West Germany—where Commissioner John J. McCloy said American libraries were needed to counteract the effect of 12 years of Nazi-dominated "isolation and one-sided information"—now have withdrawn books by Walter Duranty, Vera Dean, Edgar Snow, formerly of *Life Magazine*, and Paul B. Anderson, European secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association?

* * *

Yes, these and other USIS libraries abroad have banned these and other books in various countries where America is seeking to stand for freedom of the mind, for freedom of dissent, for freedom to look at all ideas as the best way of finding the nearest-right ideas.

And they have also banned some books, including novels, by some identified Communist writers, and some suspected Communist writers.

On this latter point a Senate Foreign Relations Sub-committee, headed by Senator Bourke Hickenlooper (R) of Iowa, which has just completed its report on the United States information activities after

months of firsthand investigation and hearings says:

"An adequate cross section of American literature should be provided for a better understanding of American life and culture, but the writings of Communists or Communist sympathizers should not be tolerated in any manner which would indicate their acceptance by the American people."

This recommendation means that United States Government libraries should not join the book burners, but Communist works should be properly identified.

And what does President Eisenhower say on this point? In his Dartmouth speech he said:

"Don't think you are going to conceal faults by concealing evidence that they ever existed. Don't be afraid to go in your library and read every book as long as any document does not offend your ideas of decency. . . . How can we defeat communism unless we know what it is? What it teaches? Why does it have such an appeal for men?"

* * *

But how can patrons of the USIS libraries read books which have been wrenched from the shelves by a timid, frightened, pusillanimous directive from Washington?

The directive ordered the banning of all reading matter "by controversial figures, Communists, fellow travelers, et cetera."

Ambassador James B. Conant asked the State Department a question which no author of such a directive could possibly answer: "Please define 'et cetera.'"

This directive doesn't make sense. To call for the banning of books by anybody who is a "controversial figure" is to call for the banning of any author, whether it be Dwight Eisenhower, Joseph McCarthy, or Patrick Henry. They are all "controversial figures."

This directive doesn't even make nonsense, but it does make a havoc of the principles of American liberty and freedom, and says to the Communist-harassed peoples around the world: "Look, we can ban books, too!"

Wittingly or not, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is the responsible federal official. It is within his power to rectify a grievous mistake.

It is a mistake which shouldn't be long tolerated.

Journalism Is Everybody's Business

by Armand E. Singer

Journalism is everybody's business. How it operates can, or should be, pretty common knowledge. That is my excuse, and the basis of my expectation of forgiveness, for the following observations about it.

The journalist plays a very important role in modern civilization. He is worth saving. Let us consider for a moment in what consists his importance. First of all, he is really *not* a specialist. This is the age of specialization. We train doctors who can snatch a man from death's clutches, rebuild him, give him back to society, but know so little of that society back to which they return him. We graduate engineers who can raise fabulous dams, chemists who can regroup and combine molecules to make artificially the most complex organic compounds, who are on the verge of creating in a test tube chlorophyll itself, but who know next to nothing about human nature and who are not fit to vote intelligently in a municipal election. In an age of specialized technicians, I say, the journalist stands out as the general student of human nature.

And fortunately so, for the journalist is modern society's greatest educator. School teachers influence the very young, professors leave their mark on the fortunate few that attend college; but who shall inform the multitudes beyond high school or college age for the rest of their lives? At a time when the average person reads so little in the way of serious books, attends but a rare lecture, the journalist represents almost his only contact with education and information. Of course, he has television and the radio and the magazines. But the educational side of these media is largely in the hands of journalists or ex-journalists. He has motion pictures (God bless them) to falsify his view of life—cowboys, Indians, musical-comedy ingénues, and Latin lovers, in that order of descending importance, are indeed food for a pleasantly wasted evening—but bold is the observer who would qualify many of them as educational.

The newspaperman has assumed the role of seer and pundit (to his misfortune and discredit, sometimes) once played by priest, poet, and statesman. The day when a writer such as Virgil looked upon himself as a diviner of great truths, even the day when Victor Hugo, 1850 years later, could see himself in somewhat the same light, is gone. The clergy I would judge are losing their preëminent hold on man's social opinions, however hard they strive to maintain the weight of their secular pronouncements. And the few politicians who still qualify for the name of statesmen seem to need a newspaper or radio man's interpretation to make sense to the general public. The business men, the scientists, and the military leaders, all greatly respected because they get things done, are on the whole a rather inarticulate lot,

whose utterances are likely to be ghostwritten by newspapermen anyway. To a considerable extent, we Americans are ruled by the ex-lawyers who enact legislation and the journalists who mold our opinions about it.

These are days of controlled news. Abroad, most information comes via government handouts, a nasty practice that is invading the United States as well. The reporter represents about our last source of free information. On his skill in ferreting out the truth depends the picture we get of the modern world of big government, big business, and big labor. He is the one capable of straining fact from fiction, or so we hope. To be sure, we must shun the stereotype of the fearless newshawk, Hildy Johnson of *The Front Page*, who would abandon his wife for a story in the 5-star final, send his mother to the penitentiary rather than withhold a scintilla of evidence, secrete Hitler in his garage to get a story before the police take him away. Yet, behind the romanticized façade there is in any reporter worth his salt a prober into the hidden and behind the curtained. The world needs him.

If the journalist is worth saving, American journalism is too. These are parlous times for news gatherers. Large areas of the world have partially, even totally, controlled presses. An American reader might not expect to get the truth from *Pravda* in Moscow. But he would have to be *en garde* as well in Mexico, Argentina, South Africa, Egypt, Iran, or the Philippines. Large areas have an irresponsible press. France, for instance, enjoys reasonable freedom, but it assumes little responsibility. Almost all the world suffers from what I may call "the party press," the system of having a special paper to represent each important political group. Such newspapers often practice a policy of editing the news, slanting it, vilifying the opposition, that would make the average U. S. paper even in the midst of a presidential election seem in comparison the soul of veracity.

There have been at one time or another great newspapers throughout the Western world. Today, all too many of them are gone. There are a few in France and Germany. The London *Times* still carries on. But most have succumbed to financial or totalitarian pressures. Recently I met a woman formerly on the staff of the great Argentinian daily, *La Prensa*. Pathetically and with intense hatred of the Perón government, she described the paper's last days. She showed me a four page section from its final run, never issued since it contained a story about the dismissal of some railway workers. Perón objected to its revelations. He abandoned his tactics of harassment—temporary bans, newsprint limitations, etc.—in favor of mass strength. A squad of toughs seized the plant, ejected the staff; she, a dignified

woman of forty-five or fifty, was one of those beaten up. Thus died one of the few really fine Latin American, I might say world, newspapers. Its story could be duplicated a hundred times over in Europe, in the Near and Far East, in South Africa.

We in the United States have inherited a tradition of journalism from Western Europe and England. Having the tradition, it behooves us to measure up to it. In our favor are some fine newspapers like the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*, the "good grey" *Christian Science Monitor*—if I may transfer an epithet—, many a solidly edited small town daily; magazines like the *American Scholar*, the *New Yorker*, *Time* (for all its shortcomings), *Life*, which developed a century-old idea from periodicals like the *Illustrated London News*, and turned it from a mere record of the day into true pictorial art, the *Atlantic*, and *Harper's*, and many others. Because of such publications, American journalism is worth saving.

To say "worth saving" is to say that it is in danger. There is more than one kind of danger. I should not wish to imply that 1953 in the U.S.A. is the counterpart of 1950 in Argentina, or the late 1930's in Germany, or 1953 in the Union of South Africa. Except for such endemic diseases as the one-publisher town and current ones as the rising cost of newsprint and declining revenues, the American press seems to be a pretty healthy animal. Furthermore, as a reasonably educated individual I am getting as tired as I trust are most of you with the constant harping on crises and impending dooms momentarily to strike us if we are to believe the prophecies of sepulchral-voiced and shrill-minded radio announcers and Cassandra's of their ilk. One test of an education is to provide one with a sense of relativity necessary to realize that things are rarely as bad as they seem (of course, sometimes, they are worse). No, American journalism is not about to disappear from the face of the earth. However, in a larger sense, standards rise and fall, institutions atrophy. The press would be a *rara avis* if it were not subject to the same laws as any other institution. It is in its standards, I should say, that the danger lies. The same factors and aims which gave rise to humanism and caused it to flourish apply singularly well to journalism.

The humanism of the Renaissance in its broadest sense was a strengthened interest in the here-and-now, in the rich panoply of man's life and art and activities now on earth, rather than later in heaven; it was an affirmation of the belief that "the proper study of mankind is man," that nothing man can say or do is foreign to the interests of his fellows, that the least of men, being human, are meaningful, therefore worthy of contemplation. This credo gave birth to modern journalism. There were no newspapers during the long centuries of medieval anonymity. Since newspapers presuppose interest in the daily doings of men, they would have been an anachronism then. If one excepts the *Acta*

Diurna, a sort of Congressional Digest of proceedings of the Roman senate, instituted by Julius Caesar, and posted on bulletin boards for all to see, the first "newspapers" came some 1500 years later in the form of MS newssheets issued in several German cities in the 15th Century. Then, in 1556, the Venetian government posted written newssheets (*notize scritte*) for which the readers paid a small fee (*gazetta*), so popular that they were finally printed. The word for the "small fee," of course, is the origin of the word *gazzetta* (whence *gazette*), used even today for "newspaper." In England we find as early as 1561 a *Newes out of Kent*, something like the mimeographed news letters—financial tip sheets and so on—sent to subscribers even today. There were many of these "letters" during the next fifty years, each one ordinarily issued but once: *Newe Newes, Containing a Short Rehersal of Stukely's and Morice's Rebellion* (1579), or *Newes from Spaine and Holland* (1593), for example. The first sheet appearing periodically seems to have been the *Avisa Relation oder Zeitung*, first printed in 1609. It was soon followed by the Antwerp *Nieuwe Tijdingen* (1616). The earliest English specimen was the *Weekly Newes from Italy, Germany, . . .*, edited by Bourne and Archer, which made its debut, May, 1622. It soon merged with a competing publication set up by Nathaniel Butters. And there were others. They were not the modern paper as we know it, but they did reveal a European-wide desire to know ever more quickly about the doings of the men of their day. It could perhaps be argued that newspapers came when they did, not because of the influence of humanistic beliefs, but because the invention of printing made them possible. Indeed this is partly so, but Gutenberg's press is the result of his times more than vice-versa. A press was needed; had he not invented it (if I may paraphrase a famous observation of Voltaire), someone else would have had to. It is interesting in this respect to note that his priority to the claim of the first movable type is contested. Like the steam engine and the aeroplane and the atom bomb of later days, it was an invention that was in the wind. Like the newspaper it came because it had to.

The humanists as a group set themselves high standards. There were no professional journalists during the Renaissance. The modern newspaper as an important political and social force goes back only to the early 18th Century. Nevertheless I have taken the humanists' standards to symbolize what I feel should be those of the journalists of today, whose roots are the humanists' roots and whose origin lies in their predecessors' ideals. What were these standards and how can they apply to modern journalism?

The best of the humanists were tolerant internationalists. It is strange that the Renaissance eventually led to nationalism and all its attendant evils when in itself it worshipped human art and attainment regardless of their provenience. I am a firm internationalist, not only as a teacher of foreign

languages but because I believe it a necessary condition for man's survival; therefore, I see the strong need for journalism to take up the cudgel in behalf of internationalism. No profession is better qualified to do so or in a better position to believe in a world outlook, for none keeps its ear so close to the world's events, travels more over this globe, or sees more of it. And here in the United States, internationalism is sorely needed: we are a country never more than two steps away from a complacent isolationism which affirms that we are not our brother's keeper in the face of all evidence to the contrary.

I have already spoken of the Renaissance love for man as man, not the common man necessarily, or the forgotten man of depression days, but the human, flesh-and-blood, sinful, fallible, lovable, hateful, weak, and noble man—the bread and butter, the sum and substance of much of the journalist's world.

The humanist was an artist. He appreciated fine writing, took pride in his knowledge of the great classics of antiquity, modeled himself on their perfection. He was almost too proud in the eyes of some critics. *Time* magazine recently took Gnostic Renaissance humanism to task for deluding men into thinking themselves like gods. It is a sin of which many a modern journalist in his own small way has been guilty. But if a similar pride could counteract some of the sloppy writing in modern newspapers, it would be a calculated risk well worth taking.

Poor writing by journalists has often been excused on the grounds that the deadline is a hard taskmaster. There simply is not enough time for polishing one's prose. There is some justification for this excuse, but the fact is that good writing and journalism can coexist. Many a novelist got his start as a newswriter or continued as one. Among the French, the quality of whose newspaper writing has been consistently high, it is common for writers to contribute to the papers. The great 19th Century Spanish novelist, Pérez-Galdós, was a reporter for many years. Dickens did his stint, as has Ernest Hemingway in our time. Both they and their papers gained from the experience.

One thing which newswriting, particularly in sports, does have is a verve, a raciness, that suggests enthusiasm. In this, too, however unconsciously, it is echoing an ideal of the Renaissance. That age of *joie de vivre*, of derring-do, the day of the buccaneer, was not noted for dust-dry scholarship. The humanists, most of them, caught the spirit of the time, and brought to their work a love of life and joyousness that gave a sparkle to two whole centuries of the Western world. They had vigor and enthusiasm, those humanists. Now when the news handout is many a Washington reporter's way of getting the news, he could profitably heed both humanist and sports writer. In a larger sense, journalism simply cannot afford to lose its belligerence. A good press has always been a fighting press. But now, more than ever,

it must stand up and be counted. Two generations ago, the muckrakers exposed what they considered the sins of big business and big city politics. Today the octopus seems to have grown extra tentacles. There are more vested interests, with far greater financial and propagandistic means at their disposal, far more insidious mass techniques for persuasion. I know that we always have with us the pessimists who "view with alarm" this or that minor and atypical fact.

But there *are* serious portents in the air. It is not without significance that in the past few years several government agreements with foreign powers have been made without the knowledge and consent of Congress, that government records are more and more of a closed book to public and reporters alike, that recently in New England, a city's public tax files were withheld from reporters. Just recently, in Raleigh, North Carolina, the State Legislature passed a bill legalizing closed hearings for the appropriations committee, a step taken specifically to exclude reporters. In the New York case of the margarine heir from whose trial reporters were barred, the possible danger of setting a precedent for private trials was obscured by the salacious aspects of the case. Most of the newspapers that objected were more interested in fattening sales by stuffing the public with juicy tidbits than in preserving the fundamental right of the press to access to the news.

All the foregoing is, I believe, important for the journalist. But there are two things even more fundamental, the two poles of the journalistic axis: truth and ethics. The first of these is part and parcel of the whole humanistic tradition from which journalism developed. Humanistic scholars and scientists were our first modern research men. Their ideals are by and large those of the 20th Century, however crude they may have been in their execution. A passion for truth, a desire to observe minutely and accurately, a painstaking attention to detail animated their best efforts. Journalists are scarcely scientists or scholars, but accuracy as an ideal can well guide them all. The humanists, in a word, loved truth. It scarcely needs saying that a newsman must too. And yet, pick up the average paper. Read a story about some event which you know well. How accurate are the details? How many of the statements are slightly or completely garbled? How many essential facts, which if present would change the impression gained by the reader, are missing? If my own small experience with several stories that have appeared about me is valid testimony, someone should be fired.

Ethics may be even more fundamental today than truth. Subscribing to truth is a little like being against sin. Everyone agrees with you. Even the communists at their worst always make a pretense of veracity, since they well know that the public expects it as the necessary condition of following them. What is missing is a sense of ethics that would preclude their making a mockery out of truth. No-

where are the pressures of venality stronger, the surface rewards for unethical practices more easily achieved, than in journalism. How easy to apply pressure to slant or suppress news, to relegate an unfavorable story about a prominent figure to the back pages, should it appear at all. A paper must have advertising, and advertiser Blank threatens to withdraw his profitable trade to the other paper. Or the paper may apply its own pressure: if Mr. Jones wants his ads run in the morning paper, he will have to take space in the less desirable evening paper as well, instead of in the more profitable opposition evening paper. A recent court case was fought over this very issue. Does the sports editor lash out against the bribery scandals in basketball, does he probe into the subsidizing of athletes under the flimsiest of subterfuges, or let sleeping dogs lie? Sports are popular; why attempt to tarnish their glory? But subsidization is neither a passing nor a minor evil. One of the larger southern schools this year publicly admitted paying out \$125,000 to 110 players (\$106,700 of this figure went to 93 football players, 86 of them receiving \$1200 each, 7 getting \$500—which sounds like the whole squad including the water boy). The institution in question expressed pride that, contrary to a popular notion, it paid out even more—\$156,705—in scholarships to 424 undergraduate non-athletes.

The sportswriter's field is far from being the only one where ethics is losing its luster. The very necessity for maintaining circulation as a source of income has given more than one paper some queer bedfellows. Take, for example, the anti-vivisection campaigns which were the pride and joy of the late William Randolph Hearst. As a prop for sagging circulation, what is so good as to needle the public with pictures and text of vicious, sadistic scientists torturing dogs by running their tails through meat grinders and noting the ensuing canine protests on a tape recorder? Not for a minute do I imagine that dogs actually love being inoculated with tuberculosis germs or having their livers removed, or whatever the current project happens to be, no matter how painlessly these operations may be carried out. I do impugn Mr. Hearst's motives in regaling the public with descriptions of the act. A perennial favorite with Michigan papers is a set of articles exposing how easy it is for a straying wife or over-anxious heir presumptive to have husband or father unjustly committed to an insane asylum. A more innocent form of the old game, and one that I have followed with considerable amusement, is the sort of thing specialized in by *Life* magazine. Their typical variety of reader inciter is well illustrated by a recent story about force feeding of French geese to make that Gallic delicacy, *pâté de foie gras*. Horribly unpleasant pictures showed the goose having corn meal shot down its throat mechanically with a feeding gun until it was bloated, a rubber band being slipped over its neck to keep the contents of its stomach intact. Three weeks later came the inevitable indignant

letters from decent-minded readers, rising automatically to the bait. The final stage occurred another three weeks later when a knowledgeable raiser of geese wrote in to explain that actually the geese do not mind the treatment at all. Result: (1) *Life* gets the reputation for championing the cause of the S.P.C.A. without ever actually leaving the neutral corner; (2) honesty is preserved by having the opposition represented in the person of the goose raiser; (3) the rest of the public pay no attention to the "biased" producer and continue to buy *Life*, secure in their faith that they have a champion for the good cause.

There are many other, if less spectacular violations of ethics. What of the all-too-common practice of the sensational headline that is not borne out by the text beneath it? Is the cause of truth well served by correcting one's own willfully erroneous headline in paragraph six and last of the text (page thirteen)? Is the practice much if any above that of the big city newsboys who entreat you to "Read all about it" in mentioning various colossal stories which, on your purchasing the paper, turn out not to be there?—What of "cheesecake"—semi-nude Hollywood starlets, *et al.*, pictured on the occasion of their being chosen by G.I.'s in Korea as "The Girl We'd Most Like to Settle North of the Thirty-eighth Parallel With"? It may be a titillating treat for the eye, but its value as news leaves something to be desired.

The journalist must not only seek out and expose evil wherever he may find it—all the great papers have been muckrakers and crusaders at heart—but he must constantly search within himself to keep fresh and renewable his own ethical standards. The humanist of 400 years ago had a simple test: conduct must fit that of the gentleman as he was then defined. So simple a solution doubtless will not suffice today: it might prove too difficult to define (or to find) a gentleman. But a writer should have no trouble in satisfying his conscience on that score, at least in theory, however difficult it might prove to be in practice, given the pressures of modern daily living.

These then are some of the ways in which the journalist might emulate the humanist. The 400 years that separate them make some of my comparisons strained, I well know. Yet the ideals of both are strikingly similar; perhaps the greatest difference between them is basically the 400 years themselves. The journalist, a man of good will like his predecessor, whose descendant in a very real sense he is, can well heed the humanist's high ethical code and deep devotion to literary excellence, his feeling for man as an individual, his scholarly accuracy and respect for truth. Ethics and devotion to truth, though they may be somewhat relative, in a larger sense are no respecters of time or place. They are eternal, and they are required of all men in all professions, certainly that of journalism.

Mr. Singer is assistant professor of Romance Languages at West Virginia University.

The Historical Pattern of Press Freedom

by Frederick S. Siebert

The functions and control of the mass media of communication in any organized society are inextricably bound up with the basic theories, both political and economic, which underlie that society. The functions which the mass media perform, the purposes for which they exist, and the controls which are imposed upon them are all, by and large, determined by the fundamental political and economic principles which provide the foundations for the society in which these media operate. The purposes of motion pictures in Russia, of newspapers in Argentina and of radio in the United States are conditioned by the philosophies which support the prevailing social structure in each of these countries.

Three distinguishable theories of the function and purpose of the mass media form the basis for the communication patterns of modern society. The oldest, the Authoritarian Theory, has had the widest acceptance historically. The libertarian philosophy of freedom of expression, developed in the late 18th and 19th centuries, is the foundation of our modern American mass communications system. Marxist philosophy has supplied the third theory, which operates in communist countries. A fourth, that of social responsibility of the managers of the mass media, has been developed in the 20th century, and it remains to be seen whether its innovations can be grafted on to the libertarian doctrine. Each of these four theoretical bases for the function and purposes of the mass media will be discussed briefly.

Authoritarian theory of purpose of mass media

Although some of the mass media such as radio and television broadcasting are products of the 20th century, the older forms such as pamphlets, books, newspapers, and periodicals have experienced a long historical development. The first use of the early printed media of general circulation occurred soon after the invention of printing during the religious and political controversies of the Reformation. In England Henry VIII made shrewd use of the printed word in carrying out his religious and political purposes.

The functions and purposes of the press were simple and clear to the Tudor monarchs of the 16th century, as they were to contemporary rulers on the European continent. The function of the printed media was to support and advance the policies of government as determined by the political machinery then in operation. This theory, identified in England as the Tudor-Stuart theory of the function of the press, was a natural complement to the basic political philosophy of the 16th and 17th centuries. The Crown,

assisted by its advisors, determined basic policies; the subjects supported these policies. Whenever a serious conflict arose between Crown and subject, the only way out was an assassination or a revolution. In such a context the press was an instrument for implementing government policy.

Both Tudor and Stuart monarchs maintained that the printing press in theory belonged to the office of king and as such owed a duty to support the royal program. In practice, the 16th and 17th century monarchs permitted private ownership of the printing press as a special privilege for which the private owner in return owed an obligation to the Crown. A mutually acceptable partnership was established under which the government granted and protected the monopolistic position of the privileged printers who in return for this grant and protection obligated themselves to support government policies.

This system of press function and control flourished in England for almost 200 years or until shortly after the political Revolution of 1688. Its abandonment was not caused by any inherent defects in the system itself but by the changed political and economic basis of the society within which it functioned. The development of religious freedom, the growth in political democracy as represented by the increased power of Parliament, the expansion of free trade, and the acceptance of the principles of laissez faire economics, all provided a climate in which the old Tudor-Stuart theory of the function of the press no longer could flourish.

This first and earliest concept of the function and purposes of the mass media is the one which has had the widest and longest acceptance throughout the world. It has formed the basis for the press systems of many nations and continues to operate today in many sections of the globe. Under this concept the press operates to support the existing centers of power in the state, and while it functions as a private economic enterprise, it owes its privilege of existence as a private enterprise to those centers of power.

Libertarian theory

During the 18th century a competing theory of the function of the press arose, first in England and then on the American continent. The libertarian concept of the relation of the mass media to society can trace its lineage back to beginnings in the 17th century, particularly in England during the Commonwealth when the Levellers proposed a system in which the press should be independent of the center of civil authority. The main impetus for the new concept, however, grew out of the philosophy of the "en-

lightenment" of the 18th century. Man was considered to be a rational being, endowed with certain inherent natural rights. Among these rights was the pursuit of truth, and any power which interfered with this pursuit, even though it emanated from either civil or religious authority, should be curtailed.

John Milton laid the groundwork for this rationalistic philosophy in his eloquent plea for the abolition of government licensing of printed matter. John Locke later in the 17th century added to the groundswell with his theory of individual liberty. The French philosophers of the 18th century integrated and popularized the libertarian principles, which later found expression in the Declaration of Independence and the American constitutional provisions for freedom of speech, press, and religion.

The purpose and function of the press, under the libertarian or rationalistic theory, is to participate in the search for truth by presenting all manner of evidence uncontrolled by outside authority. Man was essentially a rational animal endowed with the ability to determine the truth when presented with conflicting evidence and a choice of alternatives. The press was no longer an instrument for effecting government policy but an avenue for conveying information and argument by which those policies might be tested and evaluated by the mass of the people. To do this it must be free from government control. Milton, Erskine, and Jefferson all believed in the efficacy of the "self-righting" process as the only safe procedure in the continuing search for truth.

The rationalistic interpretation of the purpose of the mass media was embedded in the structure of the society of which it was a part. Political democracy, religious toleration, economic freedom were all intertwined with the new concept of the function of the press. It was to be a "fourth estate," providing that check on government which no government itself can provide. As the base of political power was widened by the extension of political democracy, the duties of the press as a source of information for the electorate and as a watchdog over government operations increased.

A further refinement of our modern democratic theory of the function of the press was added by John Stuart Mill in the 19th century. He recognized that in a political democracy a majority can be just as tyrannical over a minority as a Tudor monarch. He elaborated the principle that the smallest minority should have as great a freedom of expression as the most powerful majority. In addition he gave emphasis to the dignity and intellectual inviolability of the individual.

These were the principles which found expression in our federal and state constitutions where the functions of the press were enshrined. Social utility of the press was not to be defined in terms of supporting majority policies but in informing, and in exposing, even erroneously and viciously,

those activities, especially of government, which affected the public welfare.

For almost 200 years, the authoritarian and the libertarian theories operated side by side in different parts of the world. England and the United States were the outstanding exponents of the system of a press free from government interference. Other countries paid lip service to the ideal, but very few were able over any extended period of time to maintain the system in practice.

Communist theory

In the 20th century a third system based on the philosophy of Karl Marx made its appearance. Here again the function of the mass media in a communist society was determined by the political and economic philosophy of that society. The purpose of the communist revolution in Russia was the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The function of the mass media was to contribute to the success of that revolution and later to maintain and extend the socialist system. As stated in the Stalin constitution of 1925 the purpose of the press is "to strengthen the communist social order." All instruments of communication are of course socialized and under direct control of the existing hierarchy of power in the state. The function of the press is not to aid in the search for truth since the truth has already been determined by communist ideology. No tampering with the fundamental Marxist system is tolerated. Self-criticism and castigations for failure to achieve established goals are not only permitted but actively encouraged. As powerful instruments for the accomplishment of social policy, the mass media are carefully and expertly managed by loyal and orthodox party members. Under Soviet theory the stakes are too high and the masses too fickle to trust the future of state policies to such bourgeois concepts as "search for truth," "rational man," and "minority rights."

Even the Tudor and Stuart monarchs of 16th and 17th century England did not maintain such tight control over the mass media as the modern communists. In Elizabethan England the control system was a partnership, with the press in private hands conditioned upon royal approval. Under Soviet theory, no partnership agreement is necessary; the state owns, directs, and operates the mass media as instruments for accomplishing social policies.

According to Lenin the Soviet system rested on a balance of coercion and persuasion, and this formula, says Alex Inkeles (*Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 1950, p. vii) is the master key to the understanding of Soviet society. Persuasion, to the Communist, means "organized, systematic concerted campaigns to change the attitudes and influence the actions of large social groups." The various media of mass communication, the press, the radio, motion pictures, are instruments to be utilized for the successful completion of these campaigns.

Social Responsibility (Hutchins Commission) theory

A fourth concept of the function of the mass media has made its appearance in mid-century America. For purposes of identification and brevity, I have called this the Hutchins Commission theory although it is drawn largely from the work of Professor William E. Hocking, *Freedom of the Press: a framework of principle* (1947) supplemented by other publications issued by the Commission on Freedom of the Press under the chairmanship of Robert M. Hutchins.

By the end of the first quarter of the present century, a number of criticisms of the functioning of the mass media were being voiced. These media were now enlarged by the appearance of the motion picture and radio broadcasting. The newspaper had changed in character over a century from a political organ into a mass circulated emporium of information and entertainment. The radio was entering more homes than any mass media had heretofore penetrated. There had taken place, according to the Hutchins commission, a "communications revolution."

It was seriously questioned whether the principles of Milton, of Erskine, of Jefferson, and Mill, "the search for truth," the "conflict of the market place of information and ideas" and the "self-righting process" were operative in the complex social pattern of modern America.

This communications revolution has been described in the following words:

"Literacy, the electorate, and the population have increased to such a point that the political community to be served by the press includes all but a tiny fraction of the millions of the American people. The press has been transformed into an enormous and complicated piece of machinery. As a necessary accompaniment, it has become big business. There is a marked reduction in the number of units of the press relative to the total population. Although in small communities we can still see a newspaper plant and product that resemble their Colonial prototypes, these are no longer the most characteristic of the most influential agencies of communication. The right of free public expression has therefore lost its earlier reality. Protection against government is not now enough to guarantee that a man who has something to say shall have a chance to say it. The owners and managers of the press determine which persons, which facts, which versions of the facts, and which ideas shall reach the public." (*A Free and Responsible Press*, 13-14.)

Professor Hocking makes a further distinction. He is willing to grant the efficacy of the libertarian principles in the realm of individual speech, but he questions that the same principles can long continue to apply to the managers of the mass media. The importance and prevalence of the mass media in our society impose on them an obligation of social responsibility. As long as such an obligation is recognized by these institutions and made the basis for opera-

tional policies, the libertarian system will continue to fulfill the needs of society. But on the other hand, according to the Hutchins Commission, if the media themselves do not assume such an obligation, then it may be necessary for some other agency to undertake to see that the essential functions of mass communication are performed.

The theory of social responsibility was not originated by the Hutchins Commission. For many years enlightened managers of mass media have insisted that the instruments of communication must perform a public service to justify their acceptance by the public. With the reduction in direct competition many operators have recognized the obligation to provide its public with accurate and authoritative information and comment. Like much of big business the mass media have recognized their dependence on the wishes and needs of the audience and have contrived many ingenious tools for determining those wishes and needs.

Operation of the Libertarian theory

The purposes and functions of the press under the libertarian doctrine were hotly debated throughout the 18th century. Such stalwart conservatives as Dr. Samuel Johnson doubted that a theory of press liberty could ever work successfully in a stabilized society. The great English judges of that century recognized that freedom in any society is not absolute but must be regulated against its own excesses. Sir William Blackstone set the pattern by formalizing the judicial concept of freedom of expression to mean freedom from licensing but subject to restrictions after publication as set down by the courts and legislatures. Lord Mansfield, the great English jurist, contended until the end of his days that publications which injured the government could be punished and that judges rather than juries were more competent to determine when that injury took place.

In the United States the libertarian concept was more readily accepted as a basis for operation of the mass media. The early colonists had resented the control of newspapers by representatives of the English government. The spirit of liberty found a congenial breeding ground among the individualists who had emigrated to the new country. The adherence of a large part of the press to the revolutionary cause and its contribution to the success of the revolt justified the political philosophers' faith in the right-mindedness of both the publishers and the populace. During the stamp tax controversy of 1765 the colony of New Jersey recognized the contribution of the press by including its freedom from governmental supervision as one of its resolves (November 30, 1765). The principle of press freedom was first stated in terms of civil rights in the Virginia Bill of Rights in June, 1776, and subsequently appeared in eleven state bills adopted prior to the drafting of the federal constitution.

The first amendment to the federal constitution accepted

in 1791 recognized the libertarian doctrine of the function of the press in a democracy. The press, which was then the only important medium of mass communication, was given a preferred status vis-a-vis the government and its officials. Alexander Hamilton had argued that such a protection was unnecessary since the federal government possessed only such powers as were specifically delegated to it by the states, and since no such power to regulate the press was expressly granted, no positive protection was needed. Madison and others argued that a constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression was necessary to curtail any implied powers which the federal government might be inclined to assert.

The first test of the libertarian doctrine under the new constitution occurred within a few years when the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798 was adopted for the protection of the Federalist party against internal and external attacks. Editors of influential democratic newspapers were jailed under the statute for vituperative attacks on President John Adams. The law expired with the death of the Federalist administration and Jefferson pardoned and refunded fines to those individuals who had been prosecuted for sedition.

Thomas Jefferson was one of the most aggressive of the exponents of libertarian principles as related to the mass media. In his early years he was convinced that a government which could not stand up under published criticism did not deserve to survive. In his later years as president he was subjected to a barrage of abuse from opposition newspapers, and although he recoiled under what he considered unjustified criticisms, he never completely lost faith in the "self-righting" process and the ultimate rationality of the mass of the people.

The principle of a free press was subjected to severe stresses during the growth of anti-slavery sentiment after the 1830's when both Southern and Northern states sought to suppress discussion of this controversial issue. During the Civil War Lincoln found it necessary for a time to suppress civil rights in several Northern communities where pro-Southern agitation was threatening to interfere with the war effort. Aside from these aberrations, the American system of uncontrolled public discussion of controversial public issues expanded throughout the 19th century.

Not until the first world war was this country faced with the serious problem of determining the bounds of freedom of expression. The problem of determining those limits is one which has never been satisfactorily solved. Milton avoided the general issue but indicated that the freedom to propagandize for "Popery, and open superstition" could lawfully be curtailed. The English jurists, Mansfield and Blackstone, argued that Parliament, the center of power under the British Constitution, could establish such restraints as it saw fit. In America Jefferson maintained his faith in freedom of expression up to the point of open rebellion.

The problem of setting definite bounds to the libertarian doctrine was faced by the Supreme Court of the United States under the wartime controls imposed by Congress. Congress evidently felt that it had powers to place restraints on the mass media particularly in a state of war. It had long been recognized that words can be the springs to action and that where a direct connection between the impetus of the expression and the evil or damage which organized society seeks to avoid can be established, the state is justified in imposing penalties. The Supreme Court began with the theory that if there was a *reasonable tendency* for the words to induce the disloyal action, the publication of such words could be penalized. Justices Holmes and Brandeis argued that such a reasonable tendency did not present a sufficiently direct association with future or possible acts to warrant punishment. They devised a formula of *clear and present danger* as expressed in the following: "The question in every case is whether the words are used in circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

Between the two world wars this doctrine received the support of the majority of the Supreme Court. In a series of important decisions the judges gave preferred status to the guarantees of freedom of expression and extended their supervision over legislative enactments by the individual states through the 14th amendment.

Since World War II this country has faced the novel situation of a "cold" war with communism. The problem posed was to what extent should we permit communist agitation for the violent overthrow of our democratic form of government. At what point should controls be placed on this type of advocacy? Obviously to wait until such revolution actually materialized might be too late. Just as obvious was the libertarian tradition permitting free and open discussion of all public issues without undue concern for the effects of such discussion on the health of society, trusting instead to the ultimate soundness of decisions determined through the open and competitive market place of thought and ideas.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court indicate that in the present situation of active ideological warfare the gravity of the threat to existing institutions justifies restraints on advocacy at a point somewhat more removed in probability from actual accomplishment than that indicated by the clear and present danger test.

My years of study of the historical development of the patterns of press freedom have led me to two definite conclusions on the problem of the relation of the press to society.

The first is: the extent of government control of the press in any age depends on the nature of the relationship of the

government to those subject to that government. In other words, the more democracy, the less control.

The second conclusion is: the area of freedom contracts and the enforcement of restraints increases as the stresses on the stability of the government and the structure of society increase.

Much of today's disturbances in the realm of freedom of discussion and of the press can be explained in terms of these two propositions. The current pressures toward conformity, in opinion and discussion, the attempts to expose and brand non-conforming opinion, the persistent effort of both government and non-government groups to establish a

"unified front" are all evidences of the stresses produced by the threat of world communism.

The problem is how to face that threat and at the same time preserve our traditional liberties. In spite of what might appear to be current set-backs, I am confident on the basis of historical perspective that we can resolve this issue.

Prof. Siebert is director of the School of Journalism and Communications, University of Illinois. This is from an address at the University of Iowa, May 18, on receiving the research award of Kappa Tau Alpha, national honorary scholastic journalism fraternity.

FIRST TEN YEARS OF A NEWSPAPER

The Chicago Sun-Times Observes a Birthday

by Marshall Field

It is many years since I have felt like celebrating with any enthusiasm the day that marks the passing of another year in my life. But the birthday of a newspaper is a very different thing.

For each year, the right kind of a newspaper can celebrate a solidifying of its appeal to its readers, a sense of participation in some constructive accomplishment for its city, an injustice set right, a lie or misconception exposed. And if at each birthday this can be the case, it need have no realization of inevitable mortality such as in individual must have.

Obviously no one newspaper is ever going to satisfy the dreams and hopes of everybody. Probably more people think they could run a newspaper than think they could run anything else, except possibly other people's children.

No new newspaper can in the nature of things ever accomplish all its founder or staff might desire. But it can and must have a sense of direction, and an ideal of effort, to find and portray the truth. It can and must show the indignation that will eventually be shared by its readers, at injustice to anybody, no matter how unprotected, and at venality and corruption.

Sooner or later these ideals will take cohesive shape, and win the respect of every decent citizen. It must never have a personal axe to grind, and yet must take on personality, a personality contributed by the enthusiasm and devotion to these ideals of every single member of its staff.

The essence of this democracy is that it is dynamic. Nor I pray will ever have it otherwise, else it will cease to be democracy. From year to year, from month to month, from day to day, the goal and aspirations and the accomplishments of the people of this great country and of the world will change. The right of the people to change if

they agree upon a course of action must never be disputed, and the right of any man or any group to be heard, the right of every reporter to tell the facts, must be one that every newspaper man must cherish and uphold with all his might.

While this has been so much taken for granted in this country, the experience in so many countries abroad point so sharply to the need for eternal vigilance. Temporize with these rights ever so little, under no matter how specious an argument, and you have opened up a hole in the dike, that may never be closed.

There have been, and of course there will be many heated and bitter arguments as to which path to take towards ends desired by everybody.

The motive of some who would choose one path will be impugned by those who would take another path. But surely if all paths are fairly and honestly explored the American people will make up their minds which path throughout their history, and I see no reason to lose faith that they always will. I do not for a moment believe that any newspaper that believes in suppression of news, or in unfair presentation of opinion because it may differ from its own, will long survive.

Events during the past ten years have made the continuing production of any newspaper very tough, as you all know. It has tried the ingenuity and determination of all of us to the very utmost many times. Sometimes we have seemed to get unlucky breaks, sometimes the seasons for some of our actions must have seemed strange to many of you. But perhaps another name for luck would be the state of a world which produces circumstances over which we have no control. And we have had many lucky breaks

too, not the least of which was to find such a paper as *The Times* to join with, whose leadership and ideals were so compatible with our own.

Particularly we can have no regrets today, when we start our eleventh year with the most solid foundation in our history are showing instead of the red ones. More than ever before, advertisers are becoming aware of the pull they get from our kind of readers. And yet during all the worst time we had, I think I can say without any equivocation, we have never temporized with our original ideals, or put out a paper that we needed to be ashamed to have any member of any family read. I think our ideals have become more solidified. I think they are becoming more and more understood, and public confidence in us has gained.

... With *this team* the paper cannot fail to progress from year to year, and exert an ever growing influence on the future of this city, this state and this great country. May its editorial page continue to ring clearly and courageously through the years to come. There is so much to be done.

Nieman Fellowships

(Continued from Page Two.)

tion. He has covered various news beats and desk jobs before becoming assistant city editor.

He plans to study problems of public education.

Harold M. Schmeck, Jr., 30, reporter on the Rochester *Times-Union*. Native of Tonawanda, N. Y., Schmeck served in the Army Air Force, then entered Cornell and was graduated in 1948. After a year editing the Cornell Alumni News he worked on the Danville, Ill., *Commercial News* until 1950, when he joined the staff of the Rochester *Times-Union* and has recently specialized in science reporting.

He plans to study in science and medicine for background for science reporting.

Henry L. Trewitt, 26, courthouse reporter, Chattanooga *Times*. A native of Tennessee, Trewitt was graduated from the University of New Mexico in 1949, and while still in college was for a time Los Alamos bureau chief of the Santa Fe *New Mexican*. Since 1950 he has been on the Chattanooga *Times*.

He plans to study local government and U. S. political history.

Wayne Whitt, 29, reporter on the Nashville *Tennessean*. Born in Athens, Alabama, Whitt is a graduate of the University of Alabama, 1945. He served a year with the United Press in Columbus, Ohio, Cleveland and Charleston, W. Va., before joining the staff of the *Tennessean* in 1946.

He plans to study local and county government and some regional problems of the South.

Donald L. Zylstra, 35, managing editor, Redwood *Journal-Press-Dispatch*, Ukiah, Calif. Native of Lynden, Wash., he was graduated at the University of Washington in 1941. After teaching school, working in an aircraft plant and commanding a minesweeper in the war, he began newspaper work in 1945 on the weekly Lynden *Tribune* and managed two other weeklies before becoming managing editor of the Ukiah paper in 1951. It is now a tri-weekly. In his seven years running community papers, he has three times won state-wide awards, including the 1952 California Newspaper Publishers Award for "outstanding disinterested community service."

He plans to study special problems of the economy and resources of the West.

The Fellows for 1953-54 were chosen by the following Selecting Committee: Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta *Constitution*; Paul Miller, executive vice president, The Gannett Newspapers; William A. Townes, Los Angeles, Calif.; David W. Bailey, secretary to the Harvard governing boards; William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard News Office; and Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.