Nieman Reports

April, 1954

THE GREAT SECRECY CASE

Kenneth E. Wilson

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.

Elmer Davis Speaks His Mind

BUT WE WERE BORN FREE, by Elmer Davis. Bobbs, Merrill, Indianapolis. 229 pp. $2.75.

(Reviewed in a broadcast on WGBH-FM, Boston, Mar 11.)

Sen. McCarthy is on the other line on Fulton Lewis' program, as I broadcast. So getting ahead of the Republican Party in its reply to Stevenson, and demonstrating his own one-man party that Sen. Flanders was just describing.

For any who are listening I think an appropriate observance of this McCarthy night on the radio would be a few remarks from Elmer Davis' new book, *But We Were Born Free.*

These are not new words of Elmer Davis. They are familiar words, and they have steadied some "through the perilous night," which is the title of the first half of his book. The rest is under five headings: Improving on the Founding Fathers; News and the Whole Truth; History in Doublethink; Grandeurs and Miseries of Old Age; and Are we worth saving? And if so, why?

He has delivered these words before on various notable occasions. But they are the essence of the dry sense he uses characteristically in dealing with events of the day. These events on too many days have been revealed only after Mr. Davis has applied his own sound chemical tests to expose the gloss McCarthy has spread over them.

All Mr. Davis' pages make seasoned sense.

I can only pause here and there for a sentence or two.

The attack on the historic freedoms of Americans, he says in an early page, is worse now than any he can recall. He goes back to the 1950 attack on Anna Rosenberg, assistant secretary of defense. "That venture," he observes, "soon proved to be a sinking ship; the rats jumped overboard, biting each other as they went."

He has to get soon to McCarthy.

"I regret I have to mention McCarthy,' he says. "I regret he exists. But he does exist and not to mention him would be as if people in a malarial country refused to mention the anopheles mosquito. There is a quinine that can neutralize his venom. It is called courage. It does not seem to be widely distributed in the upper ranks of our government.

"There is a theory that McCarthy was made by the newspapers, which is true only in limited degree. He has a remarkable gift for turning up with stories that would be important if true, and a remarkable agility in evasive action. As fast as one of his phonies is exposed, he hits the front page with another which won't be exposed till tomorrow. And how many people read the second-day story?"

"It does seem that now it has been demonstrated that nothing McCarthy says can be accepted as true without corroboration, the newspapers might be more careful in the way they deal with his 'exposures?' One or two newspapers have worked out methods for handling the news about him that might keep the reader from being misled; but this practice has not spread widely; for it conflicts with the doctrine that if a senator says it, it is news, whether there is any truth in it or not. . . . He has cashed in heavily on fear. . . .

"They tell us there is something to be afraid of—Communism. But they are not afraid of it where it exists, in Russia. These anti-freedom crusaders show no interest in Russia at all. As George Kennan once put it, they think Communism is something invented in this country about 1945. . . . They have a strange conception of Communism. It is merely opinions different from their own. They are after people who think for themselves and whose thinking does not agree with theirs."

The rest of the book is really about the importance of going on thinking for ourselves and to have the courage which he finds rare in high places, to hold to the American right to think and say what you think. He says it with crackling pungency.

He takes on the American Society of Newspaper Editors whose committee argued that since McCarthy's attack had failed to intimidate Editor James Wechsler it was no attack on freedom of the press at all. "This amounts to saying that attempted rape is no crime if the girl is lucky enough to fight off her assailant," he observes.

To those who say McCarthy has brought the evils of communism to public attention, Elmer Davis says, "This amounts to saying that nothing brings the danger of fire more to the attention of the public than turning in false alarms all over town. I cannot recall that his 'exposures' before he became chairman, ever got a single communist. Since then he seems to have caught a few minnows but no big fish. No wonder. He was not after communist fish. He was after people whose opinions disagree with his; and whom he has smeared by all sorts of distortions and misrepresentations."

He goes through McCarthy's circuses, and his financial record, his so-called

(Continued on last page.)

NiemanReports

VOL. VIII, NO. 2 APRIL, 1954

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 Strohmeyer, 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.

The Great Secrecy Case

Was It Suppression or Service in San Francisco's Kidnaping

by Kenneth E. Wilson

The San Francisco press kept a big crime story secret for 61 hours in January and thereby came in for the most lavish slice of official praise that has been cut in a long time.

The story was the Leonard Moskovitz kidnaping. Not a line was printed nor a word broadcast from the afternoon of January 16, when the first sketchy details were known, until 4 a.m. January 19 when the kidnapers were captured and the victim was found alive and unharmed.

For NOT printing the news, for the "grand conspiracy of silence," as the State Attorney General put it, praise was heaped on the press—all of which was dutifully printed.

Here's the background:

Shortly after 5 p.m. Saturday, January 16, Maurice Moskovitz got a special delivery letter from his son, Leonard, 36-year-old San Francisco real estate operator.

It said:

"Dear Dad

"I am being held prisoner by some men they want $500,000. I won't be turned loose until its paid . . . Get it for them right away or you won't see me again. Do not let police or authorities know or they'll kill me now if it comes out in the newspapers."

The first police radio broadcast, later withdrawn as secrecy was imposed, was issued at 6:32 p.m. A half hour before that, reporters and photographers had been tipped on the story and were dispatched to the Moskovitz home. But no one was talking. Later, Police Captain James English telephoned the papers and asked that the story be withheld.

Faced with Leonard Moskovitz' statement, "They'll kill me now if it comes out in the newspapers," the editors pledged cooperation.

Actually, the news had been suppressed at the source. Police began giving reporters the facts only after their papers had promised to keep the secret. In this light, the five local papers—San Francisco *Chronicle* (independent), *Examiner* (Hearst), *Call-Bulletin* (Hearst), *News* (Scripps-Howard) and Oakland *Tribune* (independent) — were joined in an "involuntary" voluntary agreement to sit on the story. The wire services, radio and television stations, which depend to a large degree on the newspapers for their news, went along with the agreement.

To some extent the secret did get out, even though nothing was printed or broadcast. Hundreds of police, newspaper, radio, television and wire service people and telephone company employees knew about the story. They told their wives, who told their neighbors, who told their friends, ad infinitum. On January 18 (Monday) the cops were getting calls that Lennie Moskovitz had been seen in a restaurant, that he was in a certain hotel, etc.

As soon as they agreed to suppress the story, editors faced a new decision: How long can we sit on this thing?

The spread of the secret by word of mouth could only grow. There was a very real threat that a competitor might break the pledge on some pretext or other. Newspapering in San Francisco is highly competitive.

A more basic consideration was the very reason newspapers are in business: to sell newspapers. Let's face it. You get a good story, you ride it hard every edition—to sell newspapers. As the hours passed and edition after edition rolled off the presses, the news making the banner lines seemed increasingly pale stuff compared to the story waiting to be told.

Out-of-town newspapers were not informed of the news blackout and couldn't be bound by it. There was always the chance one of them might break the story.

In a *Chronicle* sidebar on how the press kept the secret, Reporter Edd Johnson eventually told how the veil of secrecy was nearly punctured.

In one case, a friend of a Salt Lake City publisher was in town and heard about the story. He called the Salt Lake paper and queries went out to the Associated Press and papers in Los Angeles, San Diego and Chicago with which the publisher has news-exchange agreements.

This message was sent to the Chicago *Tribune*:

"We tipped that some wealthy real estate operator in San Francisco kidnaped Saturday, being held for $500,000 ransom. You aware? Anything being developed your end? Seems many people in Salt Lake know about it. No stories?"

Chicago *Tribune* Press Service Editor Steve Harrison replied "We're checking San Francisco." He called the *Chronicle* and was told of the blackout.

The Los Angeles and San Diego papers got on the story, too. They called San Francisco newspapers, were told of

---

Kenneth E. Wilson, on the San Francisco *Chronicle* copy desk, was earlier managing editor of the Santa Rosa *Press Democrat.* He was a Nieman Fellow, 1952-3.

the secrecy arrangement and agreed to go along with it.

In San Francisco's United Press office, a message started coming on the state wire, which serves 69 newspapers. It began:

"SX CLIENT ASKS STORY SX REAL ESTATE OPERATOR KIDNAPED AND HELD . . . "

An alert teletype operator hit the "break" button.

"Who's sending?" he messaged.

The answer was: "Los Angeles."

"Lay off that," San Francisco ordered.

L.A. answered: "??????"

Holding his finger on the "break" key, the teletype operator called a wire editor who telephoned Los Angeles UP and explained the situation.

Near the end of the second day of the news blackout, the third of three ransom notes written by Lennie was delivered to his father. This one was a real shocker—the threat of mutilation would have been banner line copy under any normal situation.

Moskovitz wrote of his kidnapers.

"I swear to God they mean business. Some of them wanted to send you my testicles to put pressure on you and they will do so if there is any further stalling.

" . .. .. After you get my testicles, if you stall, they will send you my penis, meaning the whole deal is over and that I am dead."

At the *Chronicle* there was considerable concern on how best to handle this note in good taste.

It was finally decided to use nine short dashes and five short dashes in place of the words, both in the engraving of the letter and the text that appeared in type. Other papers, when they finally went to press with the story, used plain dashes or parenthetically explained a deletion that referred to a "shocking mutilation." AP Wirephoto eventually transmitted a picture of the letter as written, calling editors' attention to the words.

After this kidnap note the blackout went into its third day and newspaper executives were getting jumpy. They guessed as many as 30,000 people in the Bay Area might now be in on the secret. There was a feeling that a break —somehow, somewhere—was near. And, probably more important, doubts were increasing about the effectiveness of newspaper secrecy as a police weapon in solving the case.

It was at this point that Police Chief Michael Gaffey was invited to the *Chronicle* office for a conference. *Chronicle executives wanted to find out from the chief what* he thought about the case in general and, particularly, did he think the news blackout was helping police to track down the kidnapers.

During an hour-long midnight meeting, the chief expressed mixed feelings about the secrecy policy. But, he said, he wanted to talk to the district attorney and others before making a decision to lift the blackout. He said he would phone back if the authorities could agree that secrecy had now served its purpose and the story should be released.

There was no phone call.

Within three hours (by 4 a.m. Tuesday, January 19) the kidnapers were caught, Moskovitz was freed and the story was out.

The morning *Chronicle* and *Examiner* were first on the streets with extras. Because of the hour the distribution problem was difficult. Earlier editions were pulled off the racks in favor of the extras and the sale was only slightly better than on a normal day.

All the papers were in good shape for the story when it broke. They had been covering the kidnaping as if they were going to press with every edition. Thousands of words were written and set in type. Pages of pictures and sidebars were made up, molded, ripped up and made over. Stories were new leaded and added to, countless times. As one development succeeded another, a lot of type and art never saw the light of day. (See accompanying cuts of *Chronicle* pages that were "set and hold" for January 18 and 19 editions.)

After the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* were out with the first word, the afternoons pretty well cleaned up the story. They had the "Moskovitz Tells His Story" stuff and fresh art. All this served to whet the readers' appetite and the next day the mornings had an excellent sale.

The secret was kept and the story had a happy ending. For this the press found itself in a hero's role.

Attorney General Edmund G. Brown said:

" . . . .The public should know that the newspapers of San Francisco worked hand in hand . . . with the police and District Attorney and willingly abdicated their right to print the news (to serve the ends of justice)."

Mayor Elmer Robinson said:

". . . by keeping the entire affair secret, locally and nationally, they (press) undoubtedly saved the life of the victim, and in this way . . . further earned the respect and confidence of the American people."

Police Chief Gaffey said:

" . . . up to the time they were nabbed, the kidnapers thought they were getting away with it. The press deserves a large share of credit for solving this crime."

Maurice Moskovitz, father of the victim, said:

"They—the newspapers and the radio and television—kept the secret. They saved our son."

Leonard Moskovitz, the victim, who was in something less than an objective position, had this to say of his period of captivity:

"Every time a newscast would start or one of them (the

kidnapers) went out for papers I'd get pins and needles. Afterwards, with nothing mentioned about kidnaping, it was like a reprieve, and I began to breathe again."

Despite these utterances, however, there's ample evidence that newspaper secrecy wasn't nearly so important in cracking the case as was efficient work by the telephone company. It was through the telephone company that a call was traced and one of the kidnapers was caught in a public phone booth.

The *Chronicle* had this to say editorially:

" . . . we have strong reservations against taking any bows. It would be easy, but we think fallacious, to take it as certain that secrecy was the principal factor in solving the case.

"Suppression of information is certainly not our business; it is the opposite of the proper function of a free press."

At least one reader didn't hold to this view. She wrote the editor of the *Chronicle*:

(The police) in requesting the newspapers to hold the story . . . were not 'suppressing' the news but delaying it for a few hours or a few days. Eventually it would reach the public.

"Your editorial seems to place 'Freedom of the Press' in the same arbitrary category as 'The Divine Right of Kings.' Like the invocation of the Fifth Amendment—it can be overdone!"

All this points up some interesting questions.

Did the newspapers, by sitting on the story, protect Moskovitz? Maybe. And maybe not. If they did protect Moskovitz, didn't they also protect the criminals? The kidnapers, incidentally, used as a hideout a small house in a San Francisco residential district. Wouldn't the curiosity of their neighbors have been kindled if they had known of a kidnaping? Maybe. And maybe not.

How would the newspapers have looked if the cops had found Moskovitz dead and a cold trail behind the kidnapers?

And what about future kidnapers? Are they going to be fooled by another news blackout?

On the other hand, there's this argument: California has a "Little Lindbergh Law" which prescribes life in prison for kidnaping, death if the victim is harmed. Doesn't this tend to make kidnapers more desperate? They're in big trouble if caught, whether they let their victim go free or kill him. Knowing this, shouldn't every measure be taken to protect the victim? And isn't it a fair assumption that kidnapers are pretty desperate characters, whatever the law?

Besides, who was hurt by the suppression of the news in this case? What outrage was perpetrated?

This is the debate that has enlivened San Francisco newsroom bull sessions since the first hours of the great silence.


EXTRA

San Francisco Chronicle

THE VOICE OF THE WEST

S. F. KIDNAPING--

$500,000 NOTE!

New Flood Peril; Roads Are Blocked

C-46 Dips In Bay—But Lands Safely

Big 4 Agree On Site for Berlin Talks

Most Stores Stay Open Late Tonight

Chinese Want Party for All At New Year's

The Index

ROBT. BURNS

2 for 27c

The front page that never went to press. The San Francisco Chronicle held this page in secret readiness for a break in the kidnapping. Space under head on the right was reserved for a bulletin. Planned for Jan. 18, the page was never used. The break came next day.

Editorial in San Francisco *Chronicle*, Jan. 21

Secrecy Isn't Our Business

The kidnaping of Leonard Moskovitz is an extraordinary chapter in the history of San Francisco crimes because of the unprecedented secrecy that kept it from public knowledge until after it had been solved, the victim safely delivered and the kidnapers caught.

While this newspaper of course had a voluntary part in the successful preservation of the secret for 61 hours, and while this performance of the press and radio sets some kind of record in the competitive news business, we have strong reservations against taking any bows. It would be easy, but we think fallacious, to take it as certain that secrecy was the principal factor in solving the case.

The crime was solved, first and foremost, by excellent police work, intelligently directed. Upward of 600 police were employed in placing the net that caught the kidnapers. We heartily congratualte Chief Michael Gaffey, Captain James English and all hands for a job well done. We also congratulate the operators of the telephone company who

kept a vigil over the phone-monitoring systems: their alertness in guiding the police to a pay phone booth from which they had traced a call by Kidnaper Joseph Lear as he was pressing his ransom demand put the case on ice.

The second important element in the pursuit of this crime was the action of the Moskovitz family in going to the police immediately after their suspicions had been aroused Saturday afternoon by Leonard's failure to keep his business appointments. This gave the law enforcement authorities their chance to get on top of the case and stay there. It is a good example to be followed by any family confronting a mysterious disappearance of one of its members.

The unprecedented part played by the newspapers and radio in maintaining what amounted to a conspiracy of silence came about as a result of a note, in Leonard's own hand, received from the kidnapers, which said: "Do not let the police or authorities know, or they'll kill me if it comes out in the newspapers." By this time the police, of course, had already been notified that Leonard Moskovitz was missing. Faced with a kidnaping, the police and the Moskovitz family clung to the belief that it would be vitally important to give the kidnapers no hint that the authorities were at work. Captain English asked for and got assent for the suppression of the news.

Suppression of information is certainly not our business; it is the opposite of the proper function of a free press. There are of course occasions when the public interest requires the suppression of news—news adversely affecting military security is an obvious example—but the fewer instances of suppression there are, the better off the American people are.

The decision to withhold news of the only major kidnaping that has ever taken place in San Francisco, and one involving the second largest ransom ever demanded by kidnapers in this country, was, therefore, not a simple decision to make. We made it, and we presume our competitors made it, only because the police felt the safety of the victim was at stake.

Yet it is not now possible to say that the safety of the victim was necessarily promoted by suppression of the news. Possibly yes; possibly no. It worked the other way in the last big kidnaping case in Northern California, that of young Marc de Tristan, in 1940. Two lumbermen who had happened to see the news stories and pictures about the de Tristan kidnaping recognized the child as he was being abducted into the mountains, and this happenstance led to his recovery.

Publicity can greatly enlarge the power of the police by making an alert crime detector out of every newspaper-reading citizen; in general, publicity is the criminal's worst enemy. The police have the best of reasons to know this, and they will accordingly be well advised to avoid considering the voluntary co-operation given them by the press and radio in this extraordinary situation as something to be used as a precedent to be frequently invoked in the future.


KIDNAP PHOTO STORY

Moskovitz Wrote The Ransom Note

Kidnap Victim and Twin--- Identical and Inseparable

Background of Family-Father's Public Service

This page appeared in the first Jan. 19 extra of the San Francisco **Chronicle**, then gave way to a later extra.

It's News to Me

Shortly after the questioning of Harold Jackson and Joseph Lear in the D. A.'s office had ended Tuesday morning, the two kidnapers of Leonard Moskovitz were taken to a restaurant downstairs for breakfast. Jackson snarled objections on being photographed, reached out, picked up a sugar container and was about to throw it at one of the cameramen when Inspector George Dyer clamped down on his arms.

"You could get 30 days for that, bud," the inspector said.

—in Dick Friendlich column,
San Francisco *Chronicle*, Jan. 31

Who Should Train Our Newspapermen?

by Keen Rafferty

Ask editors what they think about the teaching of journalism in American colleges and you get so wide a variety of answers that it is apparent that, actually, they know little about it. This is too bad.

Ask an M.D. about a college medical curriculum and he's glib. So it is for a lawyer, a pharmacist, a dentist, an engineer. True, doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, dentists and engineers, among others must be licensed to practice, and to be licensed they must, in most cases and most states, all have completed a prescribed course of training in a university.

You cannot license newspapermen. Licensing means state supervision over requirements, and to have state supervision over requirements for the practice of newspaper work would be to abrogate a precious privilege of the press and the people—that is, their freedom.

Long ago the barbers were the surgeons, and later the lawyers were men who "read" in the offices of an established practitioner. My Uncle Joe, of Robinson, Ill., was an excellent lawyer, and early in this century served in the Congress from our district. His learning in the law came from having read with an established firm there. As a young man he ran the errands, much as a copy-boy now does in a newspaper office. He studied the big law books on the shelves, and after a while began to help prepare minor briefs, much as the youngster in a newspaper office may today begin by doing an occasional obituary.

There was a traveling dentist who used to come to Robinson, setting up a stand on a corner of the square and probing and pulling teeth at 25 or 50 cents each. The druggist had learned, in those days, by watching some experienced person mix and dispense. The engineers often had some good mathematics background, but many of them had come up from the creek beds or the gravel pits; they could build bridges, but they weren't always sure what was the principle that made a curved span strong.

Not so today. If Uncle Joe were still living, and were now 18 and wanted to be a lawyer, he would have to go away to college and complete his five or six years or so, and then take a state examination. After that he would enter into the long apprenticeship, if the term may be used, watching covertly from behind his shingle for the first client to appear.

All these changes have come about because the professions involved wanted them to. While it was legislation that set up the machinery for college training, examination, and licensing, it was the doctors who decided that the legislation must be had in order to establish and support high standards in medicine; and similarly, in the other fields, it was the lawyers, the pharmacists, the dentists, the engineers who decided that, in their professions, school-training standards must be established.

Of course, newspaper editors understand all this. But there is a large proportion of them who cannot or will not see that it is possible that the newspaperman can also, in time, become a trained professional person, and that the newspaper would benefit thereby. There are still itinerant newspapermen in this country, men who go canoeing anywhere on a river of cheap alcohol from job to job, practicing on news jobs across the country, and no more competent in their difficult and responsible task than was the oldtime traveling dentist.

Hundreds of enlightened editors are thinking about college training for newspaper work. Some of them are on boards doing investigations along with journalism professors; some of them are writing in trade and professional journals about the problem—and it is a problem. They are too aware of the low caliber of the people in many an American newspaper office, and of the hack nature of some of the products on the street. They are, certainly, not going to countenance any plan for legislated standards or for licensing, but they are at the same time using their voluntary influence to bring about shame on the part of those in dereliction, and thus to push more and more editors and publishers into setting up their own standards.

The surprising thing, to a college journalism teacher, is that the college programs in newspaper work are so little understood by so many others. Younger men in the newsrooms now tend more and more to be journalism-school products, and they do comprehend; but some of the older hands, which means those in executive jobs, have all kinds of wild ideas.

"You can't teach the stuff, anyway." This statement pops up repeatedly. Sometimes it's "I don't see how newspaper work can be taught," or "What is there that you could teach in class that couldn't be taught better in the newsroom?"

I have just set down on paper a list of these pattern statements that editors, some of them famous and of high capability, have made to me during 11 years of college journalism teaching. The one that journalism can't be

---

Prof. Rafferty is head of the Department of Journalism, University of New Mexico.

taught is perhaps heard most often, but running a close second is another: "Journalism graduates think they already know all about newspaper work."

Let us see what the editors have to say. Here is the list:

Journalism graduates think they already know all about newspaper work.

The are afraid to get their hands dirty (this largely from editors of weeklies).

They make dull writers; too much out of a mold.

They don't know enough about the business end.

They think the newspaper is a commercial venture.

They want too much money.

It is better to start on a newspaper at 18 and not go to college.

Everything a journalism student learns in four years in college he can learn in three months on a newspaper.

I didn't go to college and I am a good newspaperman; therefore going to college has nothing to do with being a good newspaperman.

Newspapermen are born, not made.

I don't see how the stuff can be taught.

Journalism students start as freshmen and, for four years, except for wasted summers, study journalism from about 9 a.m. to about 4:30 p.m. daily, except for wasted Saturdays and Sundays.

Newspapermen work harder than college students.

Journalism professors are people who never worked on a newspaper.

They are people who never worked on newspapers long enough to find out what it is all about.

They are people who failed in newspaper work.

They are "starry-eyed idealists."

They are anti-publisher cynics.

They live in an "ivory tower."

The "journalism course" (they mean curriculum) puts too much emphasis on technical matters.

The "journalism course" doesn't put enough emphasis on technical matters.

The "journalism course" doesn't involve enough liberal-arts matter.

Well, so it goes. May of these statements—indeed, most of them—contain some truth. Young people have a habit, at about age 21 or 22, of thinking that they know it all. Journalism graduates are no exception. Some of them realize they have almost everything yet to learn, while others are certain that they have got it all figured out. This is true in any business or profession. Ask the elderly doctor, or the lawyer who has just taken in a young associate.

College training can be too academic as far as writing is concerned, and good journalism professors have to watch young men and women to see that they do not fall into habits of artificial and pedantic writing. And some journalism professors are charlatans, who cannot handle a lead any better than they can understand the art of teaching.

But to have fixed ideas about college journalism programs, to think of education as somehow a dangerous thing, is to be foolish or egotistic or, often, jealous. Nearly all the newspapermen who are dubious about college journalism training are persons who didn't have it themselves, and who draw a picture of what it takes to make an editor, in which they are the proud centerpiece.

Criticism from editors certainly will help improve journalism schools, but condemnation will not. If our schools of journalism have faults, then editors should exert pressure to correct them. But they should at the same time exert pressure to see that journalism schools are supported and allowed to develop to the point where they can eventually train nearly all newspapermen, as they are almost certain to do anyway in time. It was the doctors and lawyers who insisted that schools be set up to do the training, and that the training be done with high standards; why is it that editors should often take the other tack, almost as if they were afraid of education, of standards, and of brains in the newsroom?

Part of this attitude is due to the general contrariness of the genus newspaperman. He is afraid of patterns, although he thinks of journalism schools in patterns; he is justifiably determined that he will not be dominated by this or that idea or conviction, so that he may maintain his fair approach to the news. But his own lack of education, or sometimes his own suspicion of professional-education programs as a whole, lures him into a camp which hastily condemns.

College journalism must be taught realistically, but on an idealistic basis. The journalism professor must be an idealist, who loves the newspaper business and who hopes to see it become better through production of honorable and thoughtful and sympathetic young newsmen and women.

What might be the educational experience of a typical boy entering college with the hope of graduating "in journalism?"

As a freshman, he will take practically no journalism. There may be a course that meets an hour or two a week, but it seldom has much bearing on what is ahead of him. As a freshman he will usually take English, a foreign language, some mathematics or a laboratory science, and one or two courses in the social sciences—history, government, economics, say.

As a sophomore, he will be permitted to take one course,

lasting nine months and meeting a few hours a week, in newswriting and reporting. But at the same time, under the liberal arts program in which he must enroll, he will be taking more foreign language, more English, more social science, more laboratory science. Even in the newswriting course, he is actually in a part of the general liberal education effort, for he is learning constantly how better to express himself, and how to do it to reach millions of Americans—that is, how to do it democratically, or "sociologically," if you will.

As a junior, he begins to get deeper into newspaper work. He will take, perhaps, a course in the history of journalism and one in more difficult reportorial writing, and nine months of copy-editing, headline-writing, and makeup, perhaps with some cursory study of type uses. But even here, his college work will also be in the basic fields: he will be listening to lectures in, and writing examinations on, more advanced courses in the social sciences, or the true sciences, like zöology or physics. He must contine to take numerous similar courses, scattered through the liberal-arts college. He may by now have chosen some anthropology, English literature, in French or Spanish or German. A good university offers incredible riches in knowledge, and the journalism student cannot graduate without having had a broad sampling, and some specialization.

Meantime, remember that the content of the journalism courses themselves is a part of the broader picture. A course in the history of journalism is a course in a part of American history, and a course in the work of the copy desk should be instructive in expression and in history and current events, in some degree as is work on the copy desk of any good newspaper.

For the senior, the story is much the same. The journalism student may be taking law of the press, editorial writing, and a course in community newspaper management, but he will, in the main, be deep in the old fields of learning, perhaps now doing some small research problem on his own, but certainly finishing off his knowledge in the sciences, the social sciences, sociology, geography, say), and perhaps more advanced English or foreign language or mathematics, biology, chemistry, geology, physics, psychology.

When he graduates, he will have spent one-fifth or one-fourth of his time in journalism classes and newsrooms, and the rest in the old-line disciplines; but even that one-fifth or one-fourth, if it is rightly taught, will have been heavy with general education.

Can this man really be a dullard, given five or ten years in which to work toward a newsroom maturity? Can it matter to him if, in the work he loves, he has to get his hands dirty occasionally to see page-one come out clean and right? Will he enter newspaper work because he plans upon riches in money?

Could such a fellow learn as much by starting to work for a newspaper at 18? He would be the rare bird, the very rare bird.

Take a look at journalism graduates across America. Many of them are young, because our journalism schools are young. Those schools now are about where medical schools may have been 100 years ago, or law schools 50 years ago. Examine the rising young men and women on America's great newspapers who have come out of college journalism programs. Could their teachers have been such failures, could they have been such stupids as some misguided editors still seem to think? Has not their "idealism" made the young newspaperman a better human being? Could the journalism graduate have done what he has, had it not been for the hard 14-hour days he put in as a student?

I recently asked a young woman graduate how she liked her job on one of this country's finest newspapers. Was it tough to keep up with that fast company?

"Actually, it's fairly easy," she said, "after what I went through in college—after four years of long hard days of lectures, studies, examinations, endless reading, and besides that helping to edit the student newspaper and holding campus committeeships."

Journalism schools can and are producing far better newspaper material than the old hard-knock university did. Those graduates will be far better prepared to run our papers 20 or 30 years from now than were those bright but often ignorant youngsters who entered the newsroom back in the 1910's or 1920's. They have broad knowledge not the cosmic ignorance that afflicts many of us old-timers, and they believe in the newspaper as a tremendous human responsibility of theirs. They come out of good journalism schools loving our profession, and determined, somehow, to make it better. It can stand it.

INFORMATION---Do the American People Really Want It?

The head of the Associated Press raises the question and gives his answer.

by Frank J. Starzel

It is our job in the Associated Press to inform, not to reform. It is our function to deliver to the media of information we serve, the best rounded information that we can obtain. It is our purpose to present this in language readily understood and susceptible of clear understanding. We do not have, we can not have and should not have any interest whatever in the effect of solid news and information on any idea, plan or aspiration. We would be performing a great disservice if we endeavored by distortion to sugar-coat so-called bad news. We would fail in our solemn duty if we allowed sound news judgment to be influenced by friendships, by personal interests, or even by superficial considerations of patriotism.

In a democratic system of government there is no worthier cause or higher purpose than reliable information to the people whose responsibilty it is to make decisions. On this issue there never is any place for compromise or equivocation.

So much for the underlying philosophy of newsgathering. Now let us examine some interesting phenomena which are a part and parcel of this picture. There are some indications that at least a portion of the American people are not wholeheartedly in sympathy with this hard-hitting and free-wheeling type of untrammelled factual reporting. Some would improve upon the system by bending it here and there in the hope of giving it what they regard as more efficiency.

There seem always with us those who believe that as a nation we could go further and faster if the democratic processes could be speeded up. They would cut off some "frills and furbelows"—which happen to represent certain human rights in our system.

Because it has an important bearing on the process of information, just toy for a moment with this possibility. As a nation we would set up our objectives, political, economic and social. We will assume that these objectives are conceived only for the good of the nation and its citizens. We would then drive toward these goals, brooking no interference or delay. As part of the process, we would see to it that the citizens were informed only about those factors which would hasten the conviction that the nation's objectives must be obtained. This would be truly jet-propelled national unity toward Utopia—and also probably destruction.

If you doubt that this can be done so simply, let me remind you that a character named Adolf Hitler once did it by the simple device of progressively denying the German people well-rounded information and feeding them instead a ruthlessly efficient diet of emotional propaganda.

I do not represent that we have in this country individuals or groups, large or small, seriously advocating such a drastic course even to achieve benign and laudatory purposes near it. We hear expressions of curious and naive misconceptions about the functions of media of information: newspapers, magazines, radio stations, television stations and the like.

For example, we are asked "Why do you keep correspondents in Moscow or other cities behind the iron curtain since all they can send out is communist progaganda? Why do newspapers print this stuff or radio stations broadcast it?" This conception of values coincides closely with those of the Soviet rulers. The Soviet press and radio carefully avoided any reference to President Eisenhower's proposals on atomic energy until the Kremlin made up its mind as to what, how and when its subjects should be given the information. This is a much more efficient way of doing business. The people get to know exactly what they should know for their "own good" and that of the government. There is none of this folderol about what is being said on the other side or on a dozen other sides. It is a nice clean-cut operation that avoids any necessity of thinking by any one except the big boss. It also works only under a dictatorship.

There are questions about behind-the-iron-curtain news that deserve a serious answer. No one knows better than the professional reporter the obstacles to presenting anything approaching the complete picture of what is happening in the Soviet sphere. Censorship at the source of the news and censorship of outgoing copy are stringent with only occasional periods of slight relaxation. Sharp limitations are put upon the movements and activities of resident correspondents in Moscow. They aren't permitted at all in most other iron curtain capitals.

This is from an address that **Mr. Starzel,** general manager of the Associated Press, gave to the City Club Forum in Cleveland, Feb. 27.

But here is the point to stress. The Soviet authorities can easily prevent the exportation of any information which the government desires not to reach the outside world. But they cannot and do not force correspondents to transmit untrue or distorted information. The Moscow correspondents are experienced hands, wise in the ways of propagandizing governments. They may be duped occasionally but not very often. Even the master censors of the Soviet cannot forever hide some of the truths about their countries.

The communists are adept propagandists. The Soviet has developed to a fine art the correlating of official decisions and actions with propaganda values. This does not alter the fact that if free people elsewhere are to be informed they must know what the Russians are doing and saying, to the extent that this is possible. It is strictly an ostrich attitude for any one to take the position that somehow the communist plot will be frustrated if the free peoples of the world are deprived of information concerning it.

To use the words of a writer who was roundly criticized for her report on a visit to Russia:

> I hope there is no developing tendency in the American press or the American public to require reports on 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 instance of the Russians on news reports portraying Americans as downtrodden victims of Wall Street.

There is nothing particularly novel about the superficial notion that suppression or distortion of information is a means that can be justified by the end sought. Some of you will recall the ill-fated ventures in this direction in our own country during the first World War.

Many of you will remember that nearly thirty years ago during an era of frequent bank failures many people felt then that if newspapers and other sources of public information declared a boycott of such news, there would be no bank failures, or similarly, that news of economic reverses generally breeds a depression .

This is the classic and common confusion over cause and effect and vice versa.

The irresponsible spreading of false and misleading rumors can never be condoned whether they relate to a financial institution or to a political party or to an individual. That was never the question in the late 1920's and early 1930's. The issue was purely and simply whether the people should be deprived of accurate information respecting business conditions. To a limited degree in some communities a course deliberately blacking out legitimate news actually was pursued, to the everlasting discredit of those responsible. What was the result? It did not end the rumors anywhere that it was tried. It did not dispel hysteria. To the contrary, the general public was willing and ready to believe almost anything in those areas because the normal sources of trustworthy information were no longer dispensing it on this particular subject.

Every experienced observer knows the dire results of news suppression. Even where the iron hand of the dictator seeks to block it, mankind endeavors to fulfill its fundamental need for information. If the instruments of mass communication fail the people, even in small matters, the news still spreads by word of mouth, by private communication and like means. The difference is that in each telling the facts become more and more distorted and magnified until they bear no resemblance to the truth which was all that the people wanted and needed in the first instance.

The heat of an important political campaign probably produces the loudest and most strident rendition of the Anvil Chorus against newsmen, individually and collectively. With the retrospect of 18 months, it is somewhat amusing to recall the charges and counter-charges hurled against news media during the summer and fall of 1952. Please understand that we deem it of vital importance that all news reporting at all times be subjected to sharp scrutiny. We lay no claims to infallibility. Probably better than most we know the difficulties and intricacies of presenting a balanced account. We also are well aware of the pressures constantly being brought upon us for the sole purpose of leading us into distortions. There are no holds barred and no adherence to any "golden rule" in this field. When the smoke cleared after the 1952 political battle, there was no sound evidence that the candidates had not been fairly presented to the country through the instruments of mass communications. It was possible to pick a flaw here and there and, with the benefit of hindsight, show that crystal balls occasionally become murky. But issues are not decided on the basis of one headline or one dispatch or one newscast. Fair judgment can be rendered only by taking into account the whole broad panorama.

There was evidence of news suppression and distortion in a few scattered cases but even in these isolated instances, it was plain that the people in the affected communities did have access to a reasonably full diet of information through a variety of media. It cannot be emphasized too often that all the various forms of news dissemination must be considered as a part of our system. Here are the checks and balances as well as the means and the vehicle for achieving that optimum of full enlightenment essential to intelligent society. Just as we cannot yet satisfy the human body by a capsule diet, we cannot satisfy the human mind by capsulized information.

One of the really amusing experiences of the 1952 campaign arose from a picture. An alert photographer for a Michigan newspaper found Adlai Stevenson sitting on a

platform with his legs crossed in a manner that exposed the sole of one shoe. The sole of that shoe had a large well-worn spot right to the interlining. It was a marvelous picture, one of those "unusual" shots about which every photographer dreams. Of course is was widely published.

There followed a bombardment of protests, from rabid partisans on both sides. Collectively we were accused of distributing the picture with these ulterior purposes:

One, we were deliberately "sensationalizing" a commonplace situation in an attempt to "humanize" the candidate.

Two, we were deliberately attempting to injure Mr. Stevenson's chances of election by implying somehow that lack of attention to his footwear reflected lack of capacity for the office he was seeking.

We thought it was just an interesting picture. I never heard what Mr. Stevenson thought. But I imagine that he thought too that it was just a good picture. It also won the 1952 Pulitzer Prize for outstanding news photography.

News concerning communist infiltration and its exposure in all of its ramifications is consistently a red-hot subject. There are those on both sides who see bias and prejudice in any report of a development in this hotly controverted area.

Newsmen adhere to the principle that any person accused, formally or informally, is entitled to state his side of the question. The fairness of this is generally accepted. Yet, for some reason linked with the near-hysteria of our times, a segment of the public appears to feel that it does not apply when an individual of whatever station is charged with left-wing tendencies or sympathies. When a newsman undertakes to permit such an individual to give his answer to the charge or insinuation, the reporter puts himself in danger of being labelled a left-winger himself. This has happened far too often in recent years to consider it unusual or merely the rantings of a lunatic fringe.

And let it not be said either that this sort of tactic is limited to a single side of the fence. On the other side of this ideological battleground there are individuals and groups taking an equally extreme position. To them any news development which they interpret as favorable to the anti-leftist view immediately becomes anathema and the objective reporter becomes, in their distorted view, a tool of the right-wing. Their favorite claim is that newsmen are being terrorized by threats of a "smear." As an example, a columnist-commentator stated in a recent public address that the chairman of a Senate committee theatened the Associated Press reporter assigned to the committee hearings if the reporter did not slant his copy as the senator desired. The columnist-commentator asserted that our reporter, because of fear and regard for his four children, decided to tag along with the senator. The whole statement was false. The senator neither threatened nor intimidated the reporter; the reporter didn't accede to any demand or threat; the reporter doesn't have four children, he has seven.

Incidentally, the columnist-commentator, when challenged, took refuge in silence—which probably was the best he could offer.

Newsmen are not intimidated by any high-handed antagonists. Neither do they allow their good judgment and balanced perspective to be influenced by the pressure tactics being used with great frequency and force. There are time-tested methods for separating the chaff from the wheat in this enterprise. A reporter doesn't last long in these high-pressure days if he isn't able to stick to the fundamentals of his job irrespective of the number of dead cats flying around his head.

I would like briefly to have you take a look with me at another manifestation of this misconception concerning public information, I refer to the school of thought which seems to hold that news media should devote themselves to the upbuilding of projects and institutions because they are important to the country or the world or have a potential importance.

Not long ago a group idealistically interested in the United Nations, was responsible for a propaganda effort directed against information media in the mistaken notion that they could thereby enhance the prestige of this international organization. The argument ran something like this: In reporting news of the United Nations, press and radio emphasized the areas of conflict and discord and played down the solid achievements. The facts were then as they are now that the news media place relative emphasis according to relative importance. It is quite true that they stress the essential and sometimes rather dramatic conflicts and failures of the UN to accomplish what had been expected of it, perhaps too optimistically. It is also true that, while reporting the successes of UN in certain enterprises, they wisely refrain from over-emphasis as to their significance.

I am certain that the officials most vitally interested in the United Nations and in the best position to judge the effects agree that we could perform no greater disservice than to magnify achievements or to minimize failures. This great institution will stand or fall on the merits of those achievements and accomplishments, not on any misguided, sympathetic rendering of the record.

Here is another aspect of news control or suppression. A number of organized groups of lawyers and attorneys are advancing proposals to impose additional restrictions on reporting criminal cases. The form of these efforts varies in different jurisdictions. All of them move toward approximately the same goal. I do not doubt the good faith and high motives of the advocates of these restrictions. I do suggest that in endeavoring to cure what they

regard as evils, they propose to create an even greater evil, specifically a black-out of information to which the public is entitled. This would rise to plague them in the end.

In criminal proceedings, before and during trial, the news reporter acts as the eyes and ears of the general public. This is the avenue by which the people, in whose name justice is administered, are enabled to decide for themselves whether justice is being meted out. These proceedings are not a private affair involving only the court, the accused, the jurors and a handful of spectators who have the time and disposition to attend the trial. Similarly, the public has some rights in the pre-trial stages. And I might add that the accused has some rights which also could be transgressed behind a curtain of legal secrecy. Publicity is the guardian on both sides.

To state the proposition fairly, the advocates of these restrictions contend they are aiming only at abuses in the reporting of crime news. They allege that a fair trial is jeopardized by the publication of confessions or statements, identification of the accused's previous criminal record and the advance disclosure of evidence which is to be produced at the trial.

The proposal in this field by the New York State Bar Association can be cited as reasonably typical. It would write into the New York statues a prohibition against the disclosure by the prosecutor or defense counsel, police officer or court official or anyone else connected with the case of any material or any information which deemed prejudicial to a fair trial, except upon authority of the court itself. The language of the bar association's resolution is so broad that it could be used as an excuse by officials and attorneys to refuse any information whatever about any criminal proceedings. This would effectively deprive the public of a fundamental right and without guaranteeing the accomplishment of the objective.

The proposed remedy is revealing in that it recognizes the alleged abuses in reporting stem largely from the activities of attorneys themselves. Both the bar associations and the courts already have ample remedies to deal with such situations if they will exercise their authority. I can

The full glare of publicity is frequently as important to the legal profession as it is to the public. I recall a case of a corrupt judge whose depredations harassed and gravely injured over a period of years a steady stream of attorneys and their clients. The attorneys did their best to deal with the situation but were effectively frustrated by restrictions of their own making. It was not until a fearless news reporter began following the judge's trail that justice removed her blindfolds and took a good hard look at the scales in her hands. The judge was removed from office.

We cannot fairly appraise the phenomenon I have attempted to describe without examining some of its obvious causes. In the United States we are in an era of great decisions. Whether we want it or not, whether it was thrust upon us or we sought it, we cannot escape the fact that the future and fortunes of a large part of the world either depend upon or will be affected by our decisions. I express no views on internationalism versus isolationism and do not argue the case for either but merely point out the situation.

The decisions which have been made in the past and must be made in the weeks, months and years ahead are of vital importance. It is entirely appropriate that the people take an intense interest in the controversies which the necessity for these decisions inevitably entails. All of this conforms to the tradition and philosophy of democratic peoples.

It perhaps also is inevitable that dealing with such highly controversial issues there is aroused a measure of emotionalism. It may be difficult on occasion to establish a boundary where intensity of interest ends and emotionalism begins. There can not be much doubt however, that it is emotionalism if not fanaticism when an individual chooses to close his eyes and ears to facts and information simply because these do not fit preconceived notions or conclusions. It is emotionalism or fanaticism that seeks to deprive other people of factual information.

The very intensity of the debate emphasizes the importance of sound information. Emotionalism is no basis for deciding anything of consequence. Fear, distrust and suspicion are the weapons of the conspirator with ulterior motives; they are not the instruments of democratic action. It has often been observed we need have no fear that we will lose fundamental rights through a frontal assault. The real danger is the negative approach, the public's failure to demand its rights or to exercise them. I have no fear now that the instruments of mass communication will be diverted from their proper and dedicated course by whatever emotionalism, fanaticism and bigotry might be abroad. It is only when the people blindly lose perspective that there is any real jeopardy. If the people want a forthright, honest press and radio they will have it. If, God forbid, they should ever want a venal or subservient press and radio they probably would get that also.

The signs and portents do not point to any imminent calamity even though there are enough danger signs to justify seriously exposing them to public view. For my part I still have stout confidence that the American tradition of essentially sound judgment and common sense will prevail.

Reporting in the Far East: II

by Christopher Rand

Mr. Rand's reflections on the difficulties of American newspapermen in adapting to the different mind and mood of the East come from years of reporting on China for the New York Herald Tribune. He is now covering other parts of Asia for the New Yorker.

Ill-founded disrespect of persons is a weakness, along with ill-founded respect of them. The power of the press gets into this too, especially in the tendency of reporters to bully policemen, customs inspectors and the like by threatening to "expose" them if they don't give special favors. One evening in Hongkong I was seeing off a reporter friend on a boat, and I tried to go aboard without a pass for a last farewell, but was stopped by a policeman. My friend and I, being well in our cups, berated this man and told him what we would write about his oppression of us, though he stood his ground. Some time later an older colleague who had been on the scene pointed out to me how wretchedly we had embarrassed the cop in his duty, and in the few years since then I have decided it is wrong for a reporter to use, or threaten to use, his access to print for any kind of personal polemics, even in self defense.

In less personal matters, too, I think the crusading or bellicose tradition of U. S. journalism goes badly with foreign reporting. One of the ablest of our reporters in China used to specialize in exposés. There was much corruption among the Nationalists in the late 1940s and this man went to work on it, baring the malpractices of high Chinese in detail, and I think irrefutably. But he touched on little else, I gathered from an imcomplete reading of his stories, and gave little indication of what was happening to China as a whole. If my impression was correct— it may easily not have been—, I should say he had not quite crossed the gap between work in America and work abroad.

In America the American reporters are spread thick; between them they supposedly cover everything of note many times over, and it is fitting to have some of them confined to narrow specialties. Besides, press crusading is a historical requirement of our politics. There was not such requirement in Chinese politics, though, and the American reporters were spread thin there—we were kept busy just watching the general scene. By role, it seems, a foreign correspondent is a commentator or annalist, not a crusader. Experienced men say that to be a good reporter at home one needs facility in digging, in piling up evidence—needs to be a sort of detective. This doesn't seem true of foreign reporting, or didn't in China. What you needed there was judgment and a broad interest in the field. You needed to know that various officials were grafting, and you needed to say so at the right times and in perspective, but it seems you didn't have to make a sensation of it, as it was only a detail in the chaos of the times. The standings of high Chinese politicians were ephemeral anyway, and hardly worth assailing. If one developed too much interest in the assault it hurt one's objectivity.

Besides the question of perspective there was that of taste—of whether our reporters should presume to expose China's faults in such detail. We were eager to find and describe what we considered mistakes in the Nationalist way of doing things—no one was more so than I, I fear—but in looking back I think we were ill mannered. The reader might imagine his reaction should the Chinese press dutifully bare the evils of Chicago in the same way.

What I saw later at the Korean War led me to think that our crusading tradition had gone rather sour as a whole—that the crusaders had become more eager to put on an act than to right wrongs. Or perhaps they had fallen into mere hostility for its own sake. Korea drew reporters of all kinds from all quarters—a great many young ones, of course, as they were looked on as the cannon-fodder of the trade, but also a mixed bag of older foreign reporters, Washington reporters, police reporters and so on. This gave us all a chance to see how the other halves worked. It seemed to me that some reporters out from the States were happiest when they had a devil to chase—when they could see a story in terms of someone's malfeasance. At one point in the war, I remember, a medium-high American officer was relieved of his command for what, so far as I could tell, was incompetence and non-performance on a blatant scale, but some of the homeside boys took this up and made him a martyr, ranting in paragraph after paragraph about the sins of the "top brass." It seemed plain that these particular sins, whether or not they existed, had given the reporters a chance to work out in a familiar, time-tested way. I thought it was a perversion, or stylization, of the old spirit. I thought there was an air of needless controversy—professional hostility—about those reporters that seemed to shed light on the all-around cat-throwing now prevalent in Washington—though I know little of this matter and have doubtless generalized on it too much.

Our perfunctory muckraking, or imitation of crusading, if it is fair to use these terms, gets into our foreign reporting a good deal. This may have something to do with the ill temper we have developed against other countries since the war. We do not like the Chinese Reds and we do not like the Chinese Nationalists. In Indochina we do not like the colonial power, the French, and we do not like the anti-colonial force, the Vietminh (or in other words we don't like the Communist force, the Vietminh, and don't like the anti-Communist force, the French). In addition we have little but scorn for the compromise we have inspired in Indochina, the Bao Dai government. In effect we like no movement or party there, and this seems to be our tendency in most countries. Since we are also vocal and judgematical about our dislikes, one can hardly imagine a worse tack for us to be on diplomatically.

Our press couldn't have understood China, of course, just by an effort of good will and a reform of our habits. There was also the outside task of interpreting between East and West. Perhaps this was impossible to do well. Language alone was a formidable bar. In China many of our reporters could speak a bit of working Chinese—enough for ordering meals and being superficially polite—, but almost none could hold an abstract conversation or read a newspaper. We stood automatically part from the people we were expertizing on, and we had to try bridging the gap by the means available, none of them too good.

The use of paid interpreters was a good device in the war, when alliance against the Japanese made Chinese intellectuals glad to serve with, or under, Americans. After VJ Day this relationship failed, I thought. The interpreters of foreign correspondents play a humiliating part in general. Their salaries are only a fraction of what their bosses get; they do the dirty work and are trusted with little responsibility; they have almost no chance of rising to the top; they are a secondary caste. With postwar nationalism running strong, it seemed, few well-integrated young Chinese cared to debase themselves in such a role—unless, of course, they had political reasons for wanting to influence the news. So we reporters sometimes got the weaker and more twisted production of the Westernized universities, places whose effect on Chinese minds was often unsettling.

I think many of our interpreters were unhappy working for us—at least they rarely got into the spririt of it. Sometimes they deliberately mistranslated the statements of Chinese we were interviewing. They told us what they thought we wanted to hear. Or, to keep us quiet, they put off our questions with fantastic explanations of things. I once crossed South China with a young interpreter who repeatedly made me (and himself) miss trains and meals by giving wrong answers about schedules; he was too embarrassed to enquire. I was new to China then, and rudely inquisitive, and I gave him a bad time with idle questions. Chinese name-seals, or chops—columns of stone a few inches long—often come in pairs for gift purposes, and such pairs could be seen, handsomely boxed, in the shop-windows of any Chinese town. I once asked the interpreter why they came this way instead of singly, and he answered solemnly that they had to be cut in two so they would fit into the box. This man gave out exceptional doses of misinformation, but he wasn't unique. On another trip in China I once noticed that all the eggs being peddled at wayside stops were duck eggs—not a chicken egg anywhere. Why was this, I asked the young interpreter traveling with us. "There is bad malaria in this section," he answered after some thought, and I don't think with humorous intent. "The mosquitos could sting chicken eggs, but they are harmless with duck eggs because the shells are so thick."

It would be arrogant to blame the interpreters for saying these things. To be identified with a blunt, idiotic foreigner who was tramping through their country and asking coarse questions must have struck them as a calamity needing drastic counter-measures. Duck eggs in China often bespeak a worse living standard than chicken eggs, because ducks are more ready to eat human excrement, and an interpreter might not care to go into this. As for seals coming in pairs, I have never truly learned the reason for this, though I have asked many people; perhaps it is that most Chinese have two names, perhaps there is a vague mixture of reasons that an interpreter couldn't bother to sort out for a foreigner. Anyway, these interpreters, though paid to do otherwise, were always ready to give misinformation on small or large matters.

The Chinese friends of nearly all Americans came from the more Westernized slice of the population: the English-speaking officials, traders and professional men from port cities like Shanghai, many of them returned students from the U. S. This was inevitable because of the language problems, and because the Westernized clothes and manners of such Chinese were not repellent to a newcomer, or vice versa. It had a bad effect, though, on the press. Many of our reporters took these Westernized friends as true spokesmen of Chinese thought, a subject that some of them probably didn't understand well. The leading example, perhaps, was T. V. Soong, whom some Americans deemed an oracle on China, but who was rated a virtual Westerner himself by many Chinese. It was as though a British reporter had come to America, had talked with only the keenest Anglophiles in the banks and drawing rooms of the Atlantic Seaboard, and had thought he had thereby taken the country's pulse.

The idea that the Chinese wanted America to take a strong hand in their affairs got impetus from this relationship. Mr. Soong and others like him told Americans constantly that the Chinese were praying for such a strong

hand. I don't know whether they really thought this was their countrymen's sentiment; but it seems likely it was their own at least; the only hope most of them could see was to have the Nationalists stay in power with American help; if the Reds got in it was plain that Westernized Chinese would have a rough time, and this has since happened. I think it is questionable, though, that most Chinese wanted Western pressure then. I suspect they were tired of the West and would just as soon be rid of it—perhaps to receive it again later on their own terms, perhaps not. Under the circumstances I believe our continued pouring of force into China was indelicate, however pleasing to the Westernized ones. It was indelicate because our information was lopsided, and the indelicacy made it easier for the Reds to brand us as "imperialists" in China. They would have tried so to brand us anyway, I feel sure, and would have no doubt succeeded, but it seems too bad we helped them.

Many Westerners who had spent a long time in China were useful to us reporters, though some were not, these being constitutionally biased, unintellectual, anti-Chinese, or subject to the limitation set forth above. The useful ones could be delightful. I remember an old Catholic bishop in a small Chinese city. He had seen many regimes come and go in his diocese—Japanese, Communists, Puppets, Nationalists; he was familiar with the leaders there, and their personalities; and he got constant reports from his priests on their parishes, which he knew intimately. One could call on the bishop at eleven in the morning, be served the white wine of his mission, and hear local affairs explained subtly and in detail. One could get similar help elsewhere. Good foreign experts—consuls, professors, businessmen—were to be found in most Chinese provinces or cities, and a reporter who traveled much came to know them. The relationship grew better with time. The longer a reporter stayed in China the more the old hands would tell him, and the more he could appreciate what they said.

It worked the other way too, though, for the longer an old hand stayed in China the more Chinese he became, and the less apt to declare himself. Some old timers would evade one's more downright questions entirely—would raise their hands beside their faces, palms forward, as if in resignation to the mystery of life, and gaze at the ceiling and murmur "Who can say?" To interview them one had to adopt their pace, which was the slow pace of China, not eager. Like everything else in that country it worked against the hurry-up, spot-news methods of our press. As one continued in China one found oneself less and less in tune with these methods, and the final tendency was to get out of the reporting game there. It was not uncommon for my senior colleagues to do so, or to wish they could.

One of the best aids we had in China was personal observation, which was done by riding through the country in buses, wandering in alleys, consorting with soldiers and waiters, drinking with generals, sleeping in small hotels, and watching what people did all the while. For fun and education there was nothing like it. Floating from province to province, one learned where the peasants were in rags and where they were well clothed; which troops were disciplined and which oppressive; what the merchants were buying; what the students were saying; and so on. One couldn't begin to learn these things by sitting at a desk.

By observation in the late '40s it was easy to see how the Nationalists had cut themselves off from the people. One winter's night I and a friend, a young editor on a quick trip from the States, were riding through Peking in pedicabs, the three-wheeled bicycle rickshaws the Japanese had promoted. We reached a corner and were halted there for some reason by two policemen, and they started capriciously beating one of our drivers out of hand, and kept it up till we stopped them. Their performance, though not extraordinary for those times, amazed my friend, and it told him things about China that words could not have conveyed.

Again, one heard much about Chinese mistreatment of the border peoples around them, but none of this was so real to me as a sight I saw one nightfall on the edge of the Tibetan plateau: a bent old Tibetan woman trudging along and leading a horse on which sat a Chinese soldier taking his ease.

It is no wonder that travel is limited in Red countries.

To work from observation in reporting is to go from the particular to the general, to use induction. You see a thing happen, and think about it. In time you see other things happen that are like it or different, and you think about them too and combine them with the first. Thus you create an image of the matter you are studying—say the condition of China—, which you keep remodeling as you go along—adding, subtracting, changing. Meanwhile you keep going back to the particular again, using the large image to enlighten your stories about the subject's different aspects. Then the stories are not at random but in a pattern, however dim.

I don't know how to relate induction with intuition—the "immediate perception of truth without reasoning or analysis," the dictionary calls it—, but I am sure the latter has its use in reporting too. One looks at something awhile, or walks around in a place, and its meaning becomes clearer without conscious use of logic on one's part. It is an occult process that can't be described in words. Besides, to speak overlong of "intuition"—and perhaps even "induction"—may offend hard-boiled readers. I can only say I have learned to seek help from these things and have often gotten it.

How firmly should a reporter cling to his native viewpoint and prejudices?

I have known Americans to decry the water buffalo and call it ugly without reservation. They were right, I suppose, by the standards we use on movie queens or even cows, but I think they were wrong in claiming grounds for judging. Buffaloes have their nature, and it is best appreciated by the impartial eye. The old Chinese landscapists made a point of impartiality, and I doubt if anyone who examines buffaloes in their paintings can think them ugly.

Judged by our American standards, again, the Chinese are traditionally unpatriotic, unkind to animals, undemocratic in politics, dishonest in bookkeeping, physically uncourageous, and disdainful of individual rights (the Reds are trying to change come of these traits). A reporter who clings to the home prejudices will judge the Chinese unfavorably because of these things, and many of us have done it. By showing their deficiencies in filling our ideal we have made them seem less than men, and we haven't noted the many virtues they have outside that ideal. We have misled our readers and encouraged our national wish to make others imitate us.

This has pained our allies, who must please us to get our help. In the late 1940s the Chiang government nationalized the cotton industry. It had to do this. Cotton was vital to China's economy—the people needed clothes, the mill workers had to be employed, and cloth had to be sold to mop up inflationary money. Private capital had run the mills badly—its mood was speculative then, rather than productive—, and besides there was no Chinese tradition that such industry should be in private hands. Yet the government delayed the move till the last moment, doing itself real harm, because it knew our prejudices in the matter. The night the decision was announced the Nationalist information minister, an expert on U. S. opinion, was badly worried about what our press would say, and I feel sure the job would have been done more promptly and effectively if that press hadn't existed.

Our self-centeredness makes it hard to explain ourselves to others. Not long after VJ Day we changed our minds about Japan—decided she should be no longer weakened, but strengthened as a bulwark against Russia. To us this seemed a plainly sound course, because we had begun thinking of the Japanese, sentimentally, as "good" people rather than "bad" ones. But the Chinese didn't see it that way. They had a long perspective on history and they regarded Japan as a recently hostile force that would become hostile again when she could. They began muttering about Japanese resurgence, and the Reds began using it as a line in anti-American propaganda. We didn't notice this for some time—for which our press was partly to blame—and when we did we tried to combat it in a typically subjective way. We fed the Chinese with SCAP propaganda designed for American taxpayers, telling them why money should be spent to build up Japan as a wall of "democracy." The Chinese didn't care for this argument—they couldn't see Japan as democratic, nor could they see why the money shouldn't be spent on them instead. The anti-American campaign about Japan grew worse, and we floundered in meeting it. We declared we were helping Japan just economically—not militarily—, but this meant little to the Chinese because they knew Japanese trade had been half the trouble, along with Japanese arms, and they expected it to be half the trouble again. We vowed we were not rearming Japan and would not rearm her in the future, but the Chinese, with their longer view, refused to believe this (rightly, it turned out). In the campaign we talked as if to ourselves and were insensitive to Chinese views, brushing them aside as ignorant—we could delude ourselves in this because the Chinese press, characteristically, got many details of our Japanese aid wrong. It seems to me our own reporters should have punctured the delusion, but I fear most of us were ourselves bound by the subjective American bias.

The cure for this fault, I believe, is for a reporter to be as detached as he can, not judging anything by preconceived values, neither the looks of a buffalo nor the wisdom of a Chinese idea. To reach such a state the reporter must learn to float free and almost de-nationalize himself. It is an attitude that has been much studied by Asiatic sages —Buddhists, Taoists, and others. The Buddhists say the pairs of opposites so common in human thought must be done away with—there must be no "good" compared with "bad," no "we" compared with "they." The Taoists believe a man should empty himself of notions and let impressions come in unhindered. Christ said the same thing, more or less, in "Judge not that ye be not judged." A reporter who can practise these teachings, I believe, will be more able than most to recognize truth and convey it. He needn't constantly declare that others are right or wrong. He need only open his senses, float from place to place and say, as best he can, what the people there are up to. His readers can make the judgments if they must.

Yet I feel a reporter who reached this stage would be in for a bad time with readers and editors both. If he denationalized himself, subdued his American prejudices, he would be accused of being "more Chinese than the Chinese," "more Afghan than the Afghans" or something like that, and would be rushed home so he could see again what America was like—be re-indoctrinated. If he learned detachment his readers would think him cold and negative, unmoral. They would be disappointed not to be stirred up one way or another about things, and the reporter would be lucky to survive. So reporters are probably no more to blame than the man in the street, who above all values his dream world and wants others to help maintain it. Reporting, indeed, may not get better till everything else does.

The UNESCO'S Two-Point Indictment of the Major News Services

by Lawrence Fernsworth

It must have come as something of a shock to United States newspaper editors and agencies to read the UNESCO report issued February 16, on "News Agencies—Their Structure and Operation" which taxed the three leading American agencies, as part of a total of six world agencies, with bias in the presentation of international news. What the report said was that these agencies were "not truly international minded." What it obviously meant was that they did not give that fair and balanced presentation of news to which readers were entitled in order to formulate judgments on the true state of affairs as regards the comity of nations.

That this is what it meant was shown by certain sepcifications. The first was that the agencies "will inevitably judge the present news from the viewpoint of the country from which they are citizens." Most readers would find this acceptable within moderate limits so long as the news report isn't turned into outright propaganda and gives a fair break to all nations concerned.

The second specification is far more serious insofar as it refers to a malady which must be cured before the symptoms thereof are abated. This is the "free-for-all" struggle among the agencies for the sale of news which, the report rightly says, runs counter to the trend toward increased international cooperation in the political, military, economic, educational, scientific and cultural matters. It might have gone further and said that this "free-for-all" struggle runs counter to the presentation of facts in proper perspective. The "free-for-all" struggle, indeed, has been a struggle for headlines, and the rule, which has few variations, is to judge the news that comes over the cables, on the basis of headlineworthiness.

During quite a few years of assessing the headlineworthiness of agency news at first instance, and in having first-hand contact with the rivalry between the American agencies to get their story in first by a matter of minutes or, if need be, of seconds, and to obtain preference for one agency's story as against that of a rival. I have acquired some intimate knowledge of how this works out. I have just been using a word—story—which points to one of the grave defects of the presentation of news in American newspapers. The theory that every news report is a story or it isn't worth printing results in the distortion of the facts of a particular event so as to make a story out of it whether or not it is really such. During the years that I was a staff correspondent of the London *Times* in Europe a news report was simply called a "message." Personally I would prefer to call it just what it is and should be—a report. That of course reduces the chances for headlines with a punch. I have written such headlines too—in large numbers.

One of the products of the "free-for-all" struggle in the presentation of international news to the American people is the creation of a state of mind that sees the events of the world in distorted outline. Sometimes I have thought the practice came dangerously near to psychological warfare on the American people. Let the intelligent and truth-seeking man ask himself: "Why is it that in Western Europe and in England, where the people are far nearer to scenes of international perils than we are, they still have a calm reasoned attitude toward the passing events and refuse to get excited about them as we would like them to get?" The answer must lie in the more tempered presentation of news by the press; the majority of papers, whatever their political complexion, use Reuters and Agence France-Presse formerly Havas.)

While in Spain where some excellent journalism prevailed in the pre-war years I used to get my first knowledge of world happenings from the Spanish newspapers, to be supplemented with the later arrival of the English and American papers. Most important Spanish papers then used Havas. The Havas reports of American events were like a precís, a rapid-fire running account of the political and other events in the United States, without color fluff, and certainly not headline conscious. It was about as disinterested as anything could be. When the American papers arrived I usually saw that I had already obtained from the Havas reports an accurate, uncolored account of what was happening in my own country. I am not saying this to suggest that American papers ought to imitate that day's Havas—far from it. I am merely saying it to show that it is possible to tell people what goes on in the world without twisting every news report into a story.

One of the main difficulties with American managing editors and the news editors working with them, is psychological. We have traditional theories about the presentation of news and we incline to sneer at anything that doesn't follow the old rules. We sneer at the style of news

---

Lawrence Fernsworth has had many years of foreign news service experience. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1944, now represents New England newspapers in Washington.

presentation in the foreign press; the French type of report which begins at the beginning instead of in the middle; which doesn't rehash at wearisome length the antecedents to the report in question; which notwithstanding knows how to present marvelously constructed, almost conversational headlines devoid of the stilted journalese that appear in our own newspaper columns. Or they sneer at the easy-reading, informative "label heads," of a paper like the London *Times* for no better reason than that using "label heads" isn't done. Because of these fixed ideas they never examine the question whether "label heads" may not often hit off a news report more aptly than the predicating type, or whether an easy-reading, conversational head will not capture the reader's attention more quickly than headlines, often so forced that they seem like Chinese puzzles.

The fact is that the outlook of our press in news presentation is parochial in the extreme. Our editors for the most part refuse to admit that there is anything to be learned from the foreign press because they know that the American press is the best in the world—so best, in fact, that there's hardly room for improvement. Ghandi used to say that, in the field of scholarship, the persons who most stubbornly refused to accept new ideas were the scholars themselves. And it has long seemed to me that in the field of journalism, the persons who are hardest to convince that there is anything new to be learned about journalism, are the newspapermen. American journalism will not begin to improve until it can divest itself of such hidebound parochialism.

This returns me to the theme of the UNESCO strictures on agency news presentation. There is never a day when the "free-for-all" struggle does not result in the presentation of news in the American press that is quite out of balance, if it is not actually twisted. If it were not for the fact that on a certain day an especially glaring example of this sort of thing came to my attention, I would not be writing this piece.

On the morning of February 15, being in Boston, I went out into the street and observed as I passed by the newsstands, that every Boston morning paper had screaming headlines on the style of this one which I quote from the *Daily Record*: "Reds Upset Big 4 Talk"; and this from the *Herald*: "Soviet Breaks Up Big 4 Talks." The other papers varied the wording; some said the Reds caused the collapse of the conference, that Molotov walked out on it, and so on. This seemed like startling news. So I bought the New York *Times* which I read by preference, especially when in Boston, to find out about it. But in vain did I look for any such story. The leading page one story on the Berlin conference had the following top headline:

MOLOTOV BLOCKS AN AUSTRIAN PACT BY OLD PROVISOS.

Accepts Move to Finish Treaty Before Talks End Thursday, But Demands His Changes.

Dulles Charges 'Fraud.'

Asserts U. S. Will Not Be Party to Russian Plan—Ministers Agree on Final Session.

These headlines presented a far different picture than what I had been led to believe. If the ministers had previously agreed on a final session, then obviously no one was breaking up the conference, or walking out on it. I started reading the story by Clifton Daniel—who usually writes in such tempered vein and with a good sense of perspective—to find out more about what had happened. It could be that the copyreader had missed a salient fact in writing his heads.

The first paragraph, under Berlin date, read: "Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov agreed today that the Austrian state treaty might be signed Thursday, the last day of the four power conference here, but he evoked impossible conditions."

I read through five paragraphs before I found anything about the "sensation" on which the Boston papers had based their headlines. This is what I found at the end of the fifth paragraph, in nine words: "By agreement they (the ministers) will have their final sitting Thursday." That was all there was too it and all the space it was worth. The ministers had made a previous agreement to end the conference. Whoever happened to be in the chair would announce this agreement as a routine matter. The man in the chair happened to be Molotov and he made an announcement that might have been made by Eden or Dulles or Bidault. And this was distorted in a news report—the A.P.'s I regret to say—so as to make it appear he had broken up the conference.

Turning to the A.P. story I found this under Berlin date: "Russia chose to break off the Big Four ministers conference in Berlin on Thursday rather than grant independence to Austria.

"The West, through U. S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, had challenged Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov to sign an Austrian treaty by 3 p.m. Thursday (Berlin time) or else admit that further talk is useless."

After this lurid and misleading opening the A.P. approximated the truth at the end of the fourth paragraph when its report said: "As chairman he (Molotov) announced that the Berlin conference would end Thursday after 23 working days in which there was no progress on any of the points on the agenda."

Yet in the extended New York *Times* report I find not a word about any challenge on the part of Mr. Dulles, either as a condition to calling off the conference or otherwise. What the *Times* said on this point was to quote Dulles to

the effect "that for years the Western Allies had indicated their willingness to accept the Soviet provisions for the Austrian treaty, but on each occasion the Soviet Union had thought up new excuses for delay. Finally he declared the U. S. could not accept Mr. Molotov's plans to impose neutralization on Austria and keep her occupied."

Up to this point it seemed to me that the real news of the day's session was the Austrian question and that the New York *Times* had given a comprehensive picture of what had happened; I waited until the arrival of the London *Times* of even date to see how it had handled the story. That *Times* does not depend on page one headlines; its leading news "messages" are on an inside page called "the main page," and are set off with often striking and pithy label-type heads. This was the wording of a three-deck headline: "LAST HOPE IN BERLIN—Korea Question—Conference Still Possible." I think the London *Times'* story is worth quoting at some length because of the comprehensive picture it gave; its story brought out the important point that the Soviet proposal was linked with the question of Trieste which I failed to find in the accounts over here; it was also characterized by its moderate tone which allowed the reader to read what had happened without getting his temperature up.

Under the Berlin date the story started out: "Mr. Dulles formally proposed today that wherever a clause in the Austrian treaty was in dispute the four ministers should accept the Soviet version. He also proposed that they should sign the treaty in this form Thursday afternoon. Mr. Eden and Monsieur Bidault supported him.

"No one can doubt the readiness of the western powers to accept the present draft treaty and withdraw their troops from Austria. Indeed little doubt remained after yesterday's meeting when Mr. Eden and M. Bidault offered to accept the Soviet version of the outstanding clauses. Mr. Dulles' proposal is therefore a legitimate method of underlining that it is the Soviet government which is holding up the Austrian treaty.

"But this brings the treaty no closer, for Mr. Molotov argued today that the draft no longer faced the facts. He insisted that the troops of the four powers should remain in Austria after the signature of the treaty and that Austria should be prevented from joining foreign alliances.

"He also wanted Trieste referred to the security council. Failure to carry out the Trieste provisions of the treaty made it necessary for him to move carefully before agreeing to the Austrian treaty. With his amendments, however, it could be signed Thursday.

* * * *

"At the end of today's meeting Mr. Molotov who was in the chair, announced that Thursday would be the last day of the conference and that Western members concurred. Thus at least there will be no final phase with the Soviet and Western delegates each trying to blame the other for ending the conference. They had at any rate reached an agreement that they disagree."

So ran about the first third of an extensive report.

From a perusal of the available news sources, and a comparison of the reports in our own Times and the English one with the A.P. report, I am obliged to conclude that the A.P. in this instance did fall under the UNESCO strictures concerning the "free-for-all" struggle, and that in doing so it presented a grossly distorted picture whereof the following two distortions are outstanding:

1—An agreement to adjourn which had as one of its purposes to avoid recriminations as to who ended the conference, twisted into an opposite sense so as to make out Russia had staged another walkout.

2—Nowhere does it appear that "The West through Secretary Dulles challenged" Molotov, and so on. He made a proposal with which his two western colleagues agreed, but there is a considerable difference between a proposal and a challenge.

The A.P. did indeed send out a headlineworthy story. But how newsworthy was it?

One might go further and show that the other agencies, U.P. and I.N.S., both of which also fell under the UNESCO strictures, are doing exactly the same sort of thing in their free-for-all- struggle to beat one another. In this instance the A.P. seems to have beat its competitors to the draw in the matter of headlineworthiness. The Boston Hearst paper, which favors the I.N.S., chose the A.P. story as did most papers all over the country. The U.P. did not go so far as the A.P. in declaring that Molotov had wrecked the conference, although it did make a play for headlines as the following opening paragraphs of its story show:

Berlin date: "Russia wrecked the last shred of hope for an Austrian treaty Sunday, and the Big 4 Foreign Ministers agreed tentatively to end their futile conference Thursday.

"Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov blandly agreed to a western proposal to sign the treaty Thursday at 3 p.m. Then he swung his knockout punch—an announcement he would sign only if the treaty provided for the indefinite occupation of Austria and end its permanent neutralization.

"To complete the shambles Molotov tossed in a demand that the U.N. Security Council investigate the British and U.S. in Trieste. He charged they violated the Italian peace treaty.

"Secretary of State Dulles told Molotov the U.S. would not "be a party to such a fraud" as imposing on Austria the burdens demanded by the Soviets.

"That was the end of the West's earlier acceptance, in a concerted move to ram through an Austrian treaty, of the Soviet version of the only five disputed articles in the draft."

Without comment, let this be compared with the cer-

tainly more newsworthy report in the New York *Times,* as well as that in its London contemporary.

At least it did not evoke such scare headlines as the A.P. report; the St. Paul *Pioneer-Press* page one headlines over it ran: "Soviet Demands Kill Hope for Austrian Pact." — "Big 4 Will End Talks Thursday."

The free-for-all struggle is a kind of game with its own set of rules. As long as this kind of game continues neither the A.P. nor any of the other agencies can be singled out for individual condemnation. What has to be condemned is the system which does not consider the rights of the reader to be fairly informed. In a responsible press this question has to take precedence over the question of how many papers can be sold on the strength of the headlines that a story invites. Fundamentally the issue is: What constitutes a responsible press?"

This type of story contributes to form—indeed to inflame —public opinion at the time when the western world and our own national leaders are striving for the lessening of world tensions—a theme in some recent addresses of both President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles. This A.P. story like many another was printed by the papers all over the country—such responsible papers, for example as the Washington *Post* (inside and without startling headlines) and the Milwaukee *Journal.* The Boston *Herald,* which features New York *Times* service, found the *Times* story too tame for the headlines and used the A.P. doubtless with an eye to matching its competitors.

Such is the results of some research in connection with the UNESCO finding that the services "inevitably judge and present news from the viewpoint of the country of which they are citizens," and that their "free-for-all struggle" for the sale of news runs counter to international cooperation. It is something for editors and also their readers to think about seriously.

"Fish or Cut Bait"

The "Quick Idea" system of foreign news coverage.

by Charles E. Higbie

Under the impact of recent studies of the flow of foreign news from Europe to the United States which hinted that the average small newspaper reader received about as large a dose of facts about foreign events as a flexible parity candidate would get votes in North Dakota, I decided to move into the flow-of-news research field myself.

Reflecting that all the copy counted in the IPI project probably represented what Mr. Davis and Mr. Sevareid would term "two-D" retailing of facts anyway, I resolved to jump from the dead pan into the background. If readers live on a dearth of factual news about the world, what about the backgrounding to go without the facts? I decided to become a researcher on the flow-of-comment on foreign news. Congressmen seemed convinced that their constituents have opinions about foreign affairs. Where do the opinions come from?

Tearing a piece of wire copy off the machine signed by "Foreign News Editor" of Y news service, I focused on the flow of comment.

It started smoothly enough, aimed directly at the Kansas City milkman's wife.

"On three separate occasions lately the United States has put on display a 'new look' foreign policy."

Good enough, I said to myself, but the "Foreign News Editor" will probably kick it away in the next paragraph by using some awful term which will frighten the reader into thinking that foreign affairs might be a pretty complicated business. My eyes eased along to find out more about the displays of the "new look." I read:

"The first came during the Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty nations, where Secretary of State Dulles warned that either Western Europe ratified the European Army plan quickly or the United States would be forced into 'agonizing' reappraisal of its own foreign policy."

Not bad at all I had to admit. Although our report referred to "reappraisal" near the end of the paragraph he had resisted any attempt to appear high-brow about the tense of "ratified" and had used good old Kansas City back-bay preferential. Very cunning I conceded.

Two more occasions when the "new look" had been displayed were then ticked off without using language any more complicated than a description of threats by General Taylor to "unleash" his forces against South Korea and by the U. S. to "retaliate directly" on Red China. But the writer sooner or later would be forced to summarize. How would he do this in a way which would enable all the Flash Gordon readers in Kankakee to sense the "new look" at a glance?

But Wambo, he did it in 9½ TTS lines, almost before you could say John Foster Dulles. I quote:

Mr. Higbie is assistant professor of journalism at the University of Wisconsin.

"Taken altogether, the various actions constitute clear-cut warning of a stiffening U. S. attitude which serves notice on its Allies to fish or cut bait and on potential enemies that the United States of 1954 cannot be compared to the United States of 1950, which sent its first weak forces to the defense of South Korea."

I relaxed and let the comment flow.

Readers were given hints as to what was basically troubling our allies. The French were troubled by "their state of paralysis." A more complete diagnosis was included about Britain as follows:

"The warning on Red China will send a new shiver of apprehension through the British House of Commons where, with peace only half achieved in Korea, the members already are looking hopefully toward a vast expansion of trade with Red Chinese."

Clearly the writer was warming to the subject, knocking off the complicating details by presentation of individuals fishing, frozen into corpse-like paralysis, and shivering in anticipation of not getting a cut in the Chinese trade. How will he look if he ever has to move into a paragraph of pure abstraction; one in which he can neither fish nor cut bait, I wondered. I found myself awaiting the test. It came only two paragraphs later.

"But, along with the firming of the American attitude toward both Allied and potential trouble-makers, also have been new and concrete efforts towards world peace."

What more could the old K. C. milkman ask for? It was awesome in simplicity of both idea and grammar. You could close your eyes and imagine that the immortal milkman had said it himself.

The piece ran rapidly to its end, accounting for the "con crete efforts towards world peace" as follows.

"It has been years since the world had felt a surge of hope such as that experienced when President Eisenhower issued his surprise invitation to Russia to cooperate in a world-wide effort to develop atomic power for peace.

"Preliminary talks on the proposal already are under way between the two great atomic powers.

"In the forthcoming four-power talks at Berlin, it is said the Western Allies will be prepared to offer a complete and concrete plan for European security.

"In both cases, Russia will have an opportunity to prove her oft-proclaimed peaceful intent."

So far so good, I decided. But to have this fine piece of "folk" copy on the wire doesn't mean it is used, necessarily, by editors that preside on our small newspapers. I decided on a non-random, non-weighted, dynamic content sample.

Going to the file of state daily newspapers in our reading room, I pulled down with a random gesture the eight state papers on file which subscribe to the wire service from which the above foreign policy backgrounder was taken.

Six of the eight had used the piece. Underlining the general success of this method of getting insight on our foreign policy across, was the fact that only on one newspaper had editors presumed to alter one word on the wire service version. The exception was one journal in which the one word "would" had been added before "ratify" to water-down the folksy second paragraph.

Generally reassured about the flow-of-comment around the nation I still had time during the afternoon to read further in the definitive IPI report.

I reached page 66 which concluded:

"Papers in small towns, as a general rule, publish little foreign news. One solution open to them may lie in more extensive use of the foreign news round-up column in which international news is condensed into summaries of leading foreign events. This system does not provide comprehensive coverage, but it does get the gist of the news across in little space, and it provides the reader with at least a quick idea of what is going on in the world."

Only one thing really bothers me nowadays. How do you translate "fish or cut bait" into French?

April 15 Deadline for Nieman Applications

Candidates for Nieman Fellowship applications have until April 15 to file completed applications with the Nieman Foundation at 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge. Application forms will be sent on request to the Foundation. Announcement will be made in early June of the Nieman Fellows appointed for the college year that opens at Harvard in September.

The Harvard Corporation appointed the following to serve as selecting committee for Nieman Fellowships for 1954: Sevellon Brown 3d, editor, Providence *Journal and Bulletin;* Carroll Binder, editorial page editor, Minneapolis *Tribune;* Harry Montgomery, traffic manager, Associated Press; David W. Bailey, secretary, Harvard governing boards; William M. Pinkerton, director, Harvard News Office, and Louis M. Lyons, curator, Nieman Fellowships. This committee will select the Nieman Fellows for the 1954-55 college year from the applications received by April 15.

"Weekly Editing---Not All It's Cracked Up To Be"

by Henry M. Keezing

So help me, if I read another story or book or book review about the life of a weekly newspaper editor, in terms of quaint characters, antiquated machinery and all the rest of the folderol and pap that the general public is being fed —then I'll just about have to scream out in protest.

If ever a profession has been bandied about in nonsensical terms, in unrealistic generalities and completely unproportioned misconceptions, then it's my profession—editing a weekly newspaper.

This, then, is to serve warning on authors who are preparing more such "delightful" stories. We'll have no more of that.

The most recent offender I have seen was a review of Earl Chapin's "Long Wednesdays", reviewed by Prof. Roscoe Ellard in *Editor & Publisher*. If you missed that one, then we'll fill you in. There are the usual cute stories about cats: cats getting their tails caught in printing presses; cats jumping out of windows. Also, there is the usual collection of typographical errors. Ex., "He crossed the bride when he came to it."

How disgustingly typical this review (and undoubtedly the book) are of the stereotyped picture being painted of the weekly editor.

You're all familiar with this picture. The editor is never pictured on his own merits, he's taken in relation to those about him. There are certain basic ingredients for this formula. There's the forgetful, elderly woman, a country correspondent who thinks it's big news when the first pussy-willow blossoms. There's the bookkeeper, a standard fixture for umpty-eight years with the paper, who knows everybody's business. Thene there's the editor himself, mixing his days between selling advertising, interviewing salesmen, running the linotype machine, the printing press, and occasionally dashing off a smashing editorial.

The net result of all this is that the American public has come to accept weekly newspaper editors as synonymous with "cute busybodys."

Does that one make you wince? It does me. I'm neither "cute" nor a "busybody." Im tired of being so classified.

The fact of the matter is that the contemporary weekly editor is a conscientious journalist. His job is one which entails every fundamental of the writing profession. The difference between him and his fellow daily newspaper writers can be summed up in one word—diversity.

While the man who works for a daily is a specialist, the weekly newspaper editor must spread his talents out over a wide area. Nevertheless, the weekly editor is aware, keenly so, of his responsibility.

Fundamentally, the weekly editor is responsible for transmitting information, through print, to a mass of readers. He is as responsible for every word in his newspaper as is a diemaker for his product. If one part(or word) is out of line, then trouble will result.

The weekly editor is as aware of changes, modifications and technical advances in his profession as is a doctor in his. The editor must master the fundamentals of brief, factual reporting. He must be capable doing makeup. He must be able to write headlines. He must know the value of the news he handles, the importance of his editorials, the worth of his pictures.

He must have the fullest conception of deadlines, of printing limitations and possibilities. He must be able to write a coherent lead to a story. He must know how to edit another's writing.

In the setup of weekly newspapers throughout the country today, the editor who must simultaneously work in advertising and bookkeeping, printing and circulation, is becoming more and more of an oddity.

The myth of the kindly old editor, enmeshed in his faulty machinery and his haphazard existence probably has some legitimate origin. It is carried over today in the "big brother" attitude a community has for its respected editor.

The weekly editor's newspaper, more so than any other publication today, is "personal." It goes into the home for a full week. Its writer is well known to its readers. As a result, a competent journalist gains in the stature and respect of his readers. Little wonder, then, that people turn to the editor with their "stories." These stories are any stories, be it a suspected bank swindle or the story of the first pussy-willow.

But the myth has blossomed because this factor has grown completely out of proportion. True, the weekly editor must graciously accept the stories about Aunt Bessie's cow mothering six calves. He must accept as part of his job the gag the boys played on old Joey Smith, the shoe merchant, when they hid his overcoat in the church steeple. He must accept, and even enjoy, this phase of his work.

Henry Keezing is editor of the Thomaston (Conn.) *Express,* a tabloid weekly with 1,700 circulation. Probably youngest newspaper editor in New England, he went right from graduation in journalism at Boston University in 1952 to Thomaston, and won a State award for the best spot news picture last year.

But to the active, professional-minded weekly editor, these "small-town" and "juvenile" incidents are relegated to their proper perspective. They are neither fundamental to his work week, nor should they be the important thought in the later recollections of his life.

Weekly newspapering today has been thoroughly enlivened by competition. With practically no exceptions, weeklies must compete, sometimes viciously, with metropolitan dailies which enter their towns. The competition is not limited to news, but extends to advertising, cutting at the home paper's life-blood.

Under these conditions it becomes foolish to contend that the weeklies are willing to stand pat, to do as they always have done. The provocative influence of competition has tended to make the weeklies more keenly eager to do a better job.

Time and again, in the writings of Henry Beetle Hough, William Allen White, and others who spread the lore of the weekly, is a strong tendency to sublimate the journalistic aspects of a weekly editor's life to his personal life.

Personal contacts, anecdoes, minor incidents are a part of the weekly editor's life, just as they are part of the life of a carpenter, taxi driver or clergyman. They are NOT the key part of his work.

If I were to write a book about weekly newspapering, passage after passage would follow this pattern: A story of a man keen to ferret out the news; of how that man would strive to learn all possible about the subject, always objectively; of how he would later write that story, submitting clean, neat, accurate copy; of his editing, proofreading, headline writing; of how he would judge the value of his story, and how he would utilize the story in planning make-up.

Perhaps such writing, dry stuff indeed, would never sell, never be popular. But if nothing else, it would paint a much more realistic picture of the important part of a weekly editor's activities than the one which has been painted, no, charcoal sketched, for the American public to date.

The Time Machine---Miracle or Monster?

by Richard H. Costa

Back in the waning years of the last century, a young writer named H. G. Wells dreamed up a conveyance which could whisk its occupants off into the future. Even today the idea of a machine that breaks down the barriers of time sounds pretty wonderful.

Three years ago, anesthetized by what I liked to think of as the newspaper's equivalent of the Wellsian Time Machine, I wrote a series of articles for our paper observance of National Newspaper Week.

> There is (I wrote) a miracle taking place in your city every day of the week.
>
> It is one of those every-day miracles—taken as much for granted as the auto.
>
> In its unnoticed way, this miracle, to be with us, has to win a pretty hard battle from a tough foe known as "time." But your paper boy—on schedule in the morning—proclaims the daily victory, the miracle of your newspaper.

Today I could never honestly begin an eulogy of newspaper work in this vein. Does anyone now actively engaged in the production of a newspaper still regard the battle against Time as anything but no-contest? If he does, let him ask himself this: If every editorial worker on the paper were suddenly taken ill, could the paper still be published on time?

Of course I'm not saying the product of stop-gap emergency measures would look like the old paper he knows so well. But I am saying that the machines—the ones that grind out reams of words, columns of type, pages of matrices—would see to it that his paper, such as it was, would be on newsstands and front porches in the morning.

There is an insidious irony in this Machine-makes-Man-masters-over-Time relationship. Wells sensed it when at one point in his story he has the Time Traveller search for his machine only to find it removed and his retreat back to the present cut off.

Have *our* machines, while cutting off retreat, sealed off advance too? Do these inanimate gadgets so dominate newspaper journalism that it is we, the editorial workers supposedly equipped with vision and judgment and feeling, who are now *their* slaves?

While I am not yet ready to concede the machines as complete a victory over us as they've achieved over Time, I am frankly afraid we may be losing the battle simply because we do not recognize the chameleon quality of our adversary.

Richard H. Costa is telegraph editor of the Utica Daily *Press;* also associated editor of the *Quill* magazine. From 1947-51 he taught journalism at Syracuse University.

I am ready, therefore, to submit evidences recognizable on their own terms of machine-over-newspaperman dominance:

(1) Our harnessing of creative youngsters to a mechanical routine most high school kids could manage; (2) our servitude to that great invention, the telephone, so that instead of relying on our eyes in conjunction with our ears we're depending more and more on our ears alone; (3) our readiness and willingness to bow to the luxuries of the machines and put out yesterday's paper today; (4) our increasing reluctance to meet headon the one enemy no machine can grapple with—our most formidable foe of all—dullness.

Take the experience of breaking in a wide-eyed, frisky, just-graduated-from-journalism school yearling to a copy desk ritual by handing him a pair of shears, a paste-pot, a long list of investment securities and expecting him to work off all the wonderful excess energy nature will take from him soon enough. That's a nightmare being lived on the medium-sized daily newspaper every day.

Where the rim used to be a haven for patriarchal reporters, their youthful fires simmering, to serve their papers with distinction still, it is now a place where cubs grow old before their time under a routine many a clerk would shun. Once a hub of encyclopedic knowledge where the lost art of conversation yet flourished, the copy desk has declined into a paste-up service for slide-rule editors.

The vet reporter, fearing the deadly monotony of the rim, stays on the beat. Surely here the newspaper is still personal, unmechanized. Yet, looking at the city desk on our medium-sized paper, what do we see? What, above all, do we hear? The telephone.

Someday I hope a weatherbeaten beat-reporter strapped down in a desk-telephone straitjacket will measure the incalculable harm being done our city reporting through excess coverage-by-dial. On our paper, we're still trying to dig out from under a shooting story one of our bureau men had to take over the phone from a hurried trooper 63 miles away and phone in another 20 miles to us in time for our suburban edition. The case goes to trial soon—the victim died—and some of the muddled statements we used, though attributed, may yet haunt us.

If the new economy of our smaller dailies dictates more dial reporting and less on-the-scene, we might just as well drop the by-lines and precede our stories with "as told on the phone to . . ."

So far, I have indicated that both news finding and news preparation, because of our worship of the time machines, have been reduced to formula. The effects of this decline from personalized journalism are inescapable: each day's paper looks like yesterday's and we wallow in a sameness that would rather do a thing exactly as it was done yesterday or even a year ago or not do it at all.

I work in a one-newspaper city. Publishing morning and afternoon editions under two names is purely an expedient. They are components of a single operation. Each borrows freely from the other in everything from stories (which often appear identically, with head and time adjustments, in successive editions of morning and afternoon papers or vice-versa) to personnel. The city hall reporter, for example, nominally works on the day side but also covers common council, school board, etc. for the night paper. Though there can be little real difference between the papers, the attempts to contrive a kind of non-resemblance between the sisters are ingenious. They range from contrast type-face and layout to the kind of audience pitched to; one is urban, one rural.

I am not taking exception to this reasoning. Minds far better than mine have worked out the formulas. All I am am saying is that such planning, astute as it may be *actually contributes* to the deadly sameness which I believe is the real antagonist. When editors come to depend on mechanics to give their paper personality; when they, for example, assiduously map their pages each day to conform to a pattern that will make them *look* different from the sister paper, they are really losing the battle in the interests of winning a skirmish. Machines improve the gloss of your paper; ideas alone give it personality.

This fall, along with the World Series, came another National Newspaper Week. Something in the atmosphere of that week—a hangover, no doubt from three years ago—found me stopping between the wire room and my desk. All night I had been running. For the first time I slowed down and pondered what is happening to me and others in harried newsrooms all over the country. I looked helplessly at the stack of uncut dispatches in my hand. I glanced toward the ceiling where a snake-like conveyor coils the length of the room and finally plunges down two floors to a boxed receptacle in the composing room. Then my ears picked up sounds—familiar, unremitting sounds. . . . A faint gasp of compressed air as a printer released it to start a copy tube on its journey back to me. . . . The jangle of the tube thrashing inside the steel snake's belly. . . . A last cough as it breaks out of the trap-door in the serpent's mouth and falls harshly to rest.

I reached automatically for the tube, shook out its contents, returned it on the other half of its inexorable flights. I wondered . . . . Am I nothing but a slightly animated appendage to this conveyor belt that arches over my head? While learning our part in the process better and better, have we not grown every bit as mechanical as the tube inside the coiling snake? Are we no more than accessories to this routinized gadgetry that churns out, no more miraculously than inevitably, a daily newspaper?

Newspaper Headlines

"Reflections of a Mere Reader"

by Jerome D. Greene

The selection, the length, and the typographical display of news items and their location on the front or inside pages of a newspaper are determined, one may assume, by an appraisal of reader interest, based on experience and calculated to produce maximum circulation. Daily journalism is a business, run essentially for profit though not necessarily without professional ideals. It involves heavy expenses of editing, reporting, news-gathering agencies, and business management, as well as manufacturing costs. Business considerations must therefore largely determine the contents and appearance of a newspaper and the policy of the editorial, news, and business departments.

Ideal conceptions of what a newspaper ought to be must therefore yield to what is practically and financially possible. Solvency as a minimum, and income beyond that requirement to meet a desirable standard of quality, must be the aim of every newspaper. Such is the premise on which the following observations are based.

For a layman, a mere reader of newspapers, to question the judgment of publishers as to where their interest lies would be the summit of audacity. Yet one may be rash enough to raise some questions of newspaper policy in the hope of enlightenment.

To any reader who has a broad interest in the news of the day many papers seem to select some fatal calamity, scandal, or even a sensational triviality and give the item a headline spread in huge type across the top of the front page, relegating items of local, national, or international importance to subordinate position and display. The theory of course is that a scare-head sells more papers. This is undoubtely true provided the intensity of the "scare" is not impaired by the familiarity that breeds contempt. The assumption is that the public is more interested in a drowning accident or in the death of one or more people in a dwelling-house fire than in other important but less dramatic news. Now the fatal accidents are tragedies, the pathos and "human interest' 'of which one would never wish to minimize; but heartless and deplorable as an apathetic attitude toward them seems, the fact is that they are of almost daily occurence and that their emotional impact in competition with the interest of other news is inevitably diminished if it is felt at all.

This is not to say that fatal accidents and other sensational items do not belong on the front page, perhaps even with fairly conspicuous headlines; but would not the lure of the front page be enhanced if the advantage of prominent display were shared with items that would be of greater interest to discriminating readers?

The excessive and undiscriminating use of the boldest type in newspaper headlines suggests that such use, by making common something that once had a special significance and value depreciates that value just as currency is depreciated by unrestricted issuance. Every one has heard of the book every word of which the author regarded as so important that he printed the whole book in italics.

Scare-heads over news items that do not rate them have some analogy with the proverbial cry of "Wolf!", this in the sense that they proclaim as a breath-taking sensation something which, for many readers, iteration has deprived of sensation.

The questions raised by the forgoing observations and the implied criticism can doubtless be ascribed to the negligible minority of "highbrow" readers; but it is to this very point that the rash writer of these lines has directed his questions. Is that minority negligible in promoting circulation?

If the doubts and queries expressed above should be so fortunate as to receive an indulgent hearing from a hard-boiled newspaper man, one would next be tempted to put a greater strain on his forbearance by saying that to many readers the continuous use of sensational headlines reflects discredit on the taste and intelligence of the reading public. To such a complaint the charge of "high-brow" is likely to be the conclusive answer; but that answer would seem to involve a serious admission: that it is no part of a newspaper's function to cater to cultivated taste or to improve the intelligence of the public.

Does not such an admission imply a low and unjust estimate of a newspaper's potential influence? Is it not

---

Although **Jerome D. Greene** describes his reflections as of "a mere reader," his readership covers a very long and varied career: secretary to Pres. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, later of the Harvard corporation; secretary of the Rockefeller Foundation, and of the Reparations Commission at the Paris Peace Conference; member of the banking firm of Lee Higginson; director of the Harvard Tercentenary. He was the first chairman of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism. His daily reading includes Boston newspapers.

within an editor's power to accustom the public to a treatment of the day's news in such a way as to indicate typographically and by the space used the relative value of various items and thus arouse interest not otherwise evoked? One wonders whether newspapers do not underrate both their own potential influence and the taste and intelligence of the public, and whether circulation would necessarily be lost if both estimates were raised.

In a community where there is an intense and often a desperate competition for survival between several newspapers, sensational headlines seem to be the favored weapon in their armory, like the attempt of angry disputants to out-shout each other. Is there a chance that this tactic has been played out and that a more restrained and rational arrangements of front-pages along with adequate coverage would win new friends without losing too many of the old?

Bread Loaf Writers' Conference

Theodore Morrison's experience with Nieman Fellows at Harvard suggests that many newspapermen would like to study the craft of writing to increase their skill at it, but find small chance to do so under pressure of the job.

Mr. Morrison is director of the two weeks' Summer course for writers offered at the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference in the Green Mountains, a dozen miles north of Middlebury College. It is one of the Summer Schools of Middlebury. It affords an exceptional chance to combine professional improvement in writing with an outdoor vacation. Bread Loaf is on the edge of extensive National Forest tracts well up in the mountains.

The 29th annual writers' conference comes August 18 to September 1. Its work is in lectures, seminars and private conference on individual writing.

The conference staff this Summer will be, besides Mr. Morrison: in non-fiction—Fletcher Pratt, columnist, military historian and biographer, and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard; in fiction—Saul Bellow, winner of the national book award this year for his *The Adventures of Augie March;* William Sloane, author and trade editor, Funk & Wagnalls Co.; Rachel Mackenzie, short story writer; and Eric Swenson, trade editor, W. W. Norton & Co.; in verse—John Ciardi, poet in charge of the creative writing program of Rutgers University, and Richard Wilbur, poet. Speakers at evening sessions of the conference will include Robert Frost, Lincoln Barnett, author of the *Life* Magazine series, "The World We Live In," and Willy Ley, writer on rockets and space travel. For catalogues, costs and information, write Summer Schools Office, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont.

To Meet the Reader's Needs

by Floyd Taylor

Criticism of the press by men who are enthusiastic believers in democracy is healthy and can be beneficial to both newspapers and their readers. At a minimum it is a recognition of the importance of the press and the emphasis it gives to the need for a *free* press—in every sense of the word free—can be highly useful.

Unfortunately, however, it seems to me that a good deal of the criticism of newspapers we have heard in the last few years has been superficial criticism. I realize that some of it has come from university sources and—frequently—from men of good will and great ability. For that reason it seems all the more strange that so much of it has ignored the newspaper reader. It purports not to ignore him. It purports to consider the faults of the press in relation to the actual needs of the newspaper reader—but the reader's need have been assumed instead of being based on careful research. A fictitious reader—a theoretical reader—is first created by the critics and then they complain that the newspapers do not give him what he needs.

In this process no attention is paid to what actual readers of newspapers want or what they will accept. It seems to me an obvious point that what actual readers will accept must be the basis for any sane comments on newspapers.

If a publisher prints a paper that his readers will not accept, the paper soon goes out of business. Papers of great reputation have disappeared from the American scene because they failed to interest enough readers. I can't see any advantage to anyone in producing a paper that is highly regarded by a few people but so little regarded by the public as a whole that it can't remain in business. Even a newspaper that is called mediocre by critics of the press can do more for the welfare of a community than no newspaper at all.

For that reason, I believe that a publisher—no matter how ethical and high minded he may be—has an obligation to conduct his business so that his newspaper can survive. That may seem to be an elementary matter—perhaps almost a childish one in that it is so obvious—but it is a matter ignored by a good many people who would like to reform newspapers.

Beyond the matter of survival, however, it seems to me also obvious that a truly prosperous newspaper is much more valuable to any community than one that is barely getting by. Unless a newspaper takes in a considerable amount of money, it can't hire and keep editors of ability, it can't retain reporters of real quality, and it can't pay—through the press services—for its share of sound coverage

of the news of the nation and the world. Profitable newspapers are needed for community welfare.

It has been suggested that newspapers might be subsidized or endowed so that they would have the funds to do a first rate job without thought of the profit and loss sheet or the balance in the bank. It is conceivable that a few newspapers in the country might be supported in this fashion but the cost of subsidizing or endowing very many would be astronomical—and beyond the range of possibility.

Even if it were not beyond the range of possibility, there would be exceedingly strong objections. A subsidy creates evils that are not found in the press that pays its own way. The man who has a profitable newspaper can afford to be independent of pressures. The man who runs a subsidized paper always is subservient to the source of the subsidy. If the government is the source —as in the case of some newspapers in a number of countries—the editor is subservient to government officials and to their selfish interests. If a party organization is the source, he is subservient to party leaders and their selfish interests. There is no conceivable way in which a newspaper can be as free when subsidized as it is when it gets its money from readers and advertisers. Either advertisers or groups of readers may try to put pressure on an editor but the pressure never will be as direct or compelling as the pressure exerted by those who control a subsidy.

The endowment idea is not quite as bad as the subsidy idea but also has its drawbacks—serious drawbacks. The spur of the necessity to succeed seems to create better newspapers and magazines than are created by freedom from worry over money. We have had newspapers virtually endowed by wealthy individuals—and have had magazines of the same sort—but none of them, so far as I know, ever gave as much to the community as newspapers and magazines that paid their own way. With all its faults, the press of this country certainly is superior to the press of the rest of the world and that superiority is based on money taken in through circulation and advertising rather than money from a Santa Claus of any kind.

It is not enough, however, when we think in terms of community responsibility, for a newspaper to make money. The only valid points in that connection—from the viewpoint of the community interest—are that a paper must take in money to survive and that it must take in a good deal of money to do a good job. Therefore, I want to return to the comments of the critics of newspapers and discuss in more detail one or two of the things they have to say.

Much of the criticism reads to me as if it were based on the assumption that all newspaper readers are college professors.

At any rate the assumption of newspaper critics often seems to be that newspaper readers are avid for information on all the hard problems of world affairs, national affairs, state affairs, and local affairs. To make them well informed, the critics seem to believe, it merely is necessary to print enough learned articles on such subjects. The theory is that if newspapers in a state print enough scholarly material on the need for reform of the state constitution the readers will become interested and will bring reform about.

Assumptions of this kind never would be made if critics studied newspapers and newspaper readers at the same time —which seems to me to be the only valid way for a critic of the press to function. The newspaper and the reader are inseparable. The best newspaper is not the one that seems best to a man sitting in an ivory tower but the one that best serves its readers—and to serve readers well a newspaper editor must know what they are like.

One present source of great value is the Continuing Study of Newspaper Readership conducted by the Advertising Research Foundation. In addition, there are the surveys made privately for many individual newspapers by various research organizations. The colleges and universities, in some regions of the country also, have made studies that are highly useful.

I don't intend to discuss in any detail the findings of the Continuing Study or of any other research project. I am sure that most of you are familiar with them in a general way. I do want to make the point, however, that not one of these studies indicates that newspaper readers—considered as a whole—have a tremendous thirst for more newspaper articles on the major problems of our democracy —either on the local, the national, or the international level.

The argument might well be made, in fact, that most newspapers already print more on such subjects than their readers want. The readership of such material is low. It is a sad and alarming fact that newspaper readers do not give enough attention to articles that are important in relation to the welfare of our democracy to produce a well informed electorate. Women, especially, tend to pass by the heavier material in news columns. Most of them will turn to a lively local story with a strong flavor of human interest in preference to almost any story on national or international politics. Yet we know it is highly important, if we are thinking in terms of human welfare, to interest women voters in the information they must have before they can vote intelligently.

We find that the average reader is reading less than fifteen per cent of the total news content of his paper and that he is skipping much of the news that he must read and understand if he is to justify his right to vote.

In this situation the selfish editor—the editor who has no interest in the welfare of his community—can say to himself—well, they don't want the more significant news—so

I'll give them less of it. I'll buy a skimpier and cheaper news report than I get now.

There is another answer—a far better one—that is being adopted by more and more newspapers as the needs of the newspaper reader are more clearly understood. This answer is to study the newspaper reader in order to give him the news of great consequence in a form that will be attractive to him, in a form that he can readily understand, in a form that will meet his needs.

No matter how fine the editor's aspirations may be he will not meet his responsibilities unless his technique is so sound that he can give his readers news and interpretation and opinion in a form that they can use—in a form that is easy to read.

He can approach this task in many different ways and he should use them all. He can make up his paper so that it is easy to handle. He can avoid jumps from page one on a good many major stories—if not all. He can take especial care to avoid jumps from page one to inside columns of inside pages—columns near the fold. He can departmentalize news. He can take a tip from the advertisers—who have found that the high single column ad—which so much resembles the average news story in its physical appearance—is not attractive to readers. Instead of using vertical make-up he can use more and more horizontal make-up—squaring off stories. On stories of major importance he can strive harder for bright headlines that catch the eye instead of dull headlines that discourage the reader. He can give more attention to pictures and other illustrative material in connection with the heavier types of news and thus use the tremendous appeal that pictures have for readers to induce them to learn more about the world in which they live. He can devote more attention to the special interests of women and, especially, more attention to relating the news of the world to the problems of the home—so that women will realize that what happens in Washington and Harrisburg—and even in Nanking and London—affects their daily lives. He can give more stress than most newspapers do now to the relation of national and foreign news to the local scene. Many national stories, of course, are so directly tied to local affairs that they can be made local by good reporters.

In every way possible he can strive to make the important news also interesting news. At times he will find serious obstacles in his way.

If I were to prepare a general criticism of the press my greatest interest would be in failure in writing technique—in the failure of so many reporters and editors to produce clear writing. The major fault of the press in handling news that affects community welfare is that the writing is not good enough. A second fault is that problems are not related closely enough to the life of the reader. The real failure of the press is not failure to print news of significance but failure to print it in a form that the reader will readily understand and in a form that will interest him.

When this problem is broken down some of the answers are quickly apparent. Enough studies of writing for mass audiences have been made so that we know what the reader can take and what he can't. Even if such studies had not been made, we could learn much by examining the work of almost any writer who ever has won great popularity. We need to avoid long and complex sentences—as Mark Twain avoided them. We want a variety in length of sentences—just as Mark Twain used a variety—but we want the average length in words to be fairly low. We want to avoid complex words—just as Dickens avoided them—and to use words of Anglo-Saxon derivation—the short and simple words—in preference to complicated words with Latin roots. We don't want to give up use of the complex word when it is the only word available for precise expression—for all sound writers, including Dickens, used complex words on occasion. We do want to prefer the short and simple word to the long and complex one when the meaning is the same.

If we do all this we will get better readership for the articles that the people of the community must read if they are to be well informed enough to make democracy work. In studies made in both Birmingham, Alabama, and Utica, New York, editors have found that the best read stories of major importance are the most clearly written stories. The political writer whose style is clear has a much wider audience than the political writer who produces murky copy by writing long and complex sentences, by using ten dollar words, and by failing to relate anything that he writes about to human beings.

What I have been trying to say, in essence, is this: When you think about your community responsibilities, think less about the volume of news you print on such subjects as government than you do about the techniques used in preparing that news. Volume is less important than sound presentation. Ten columns of poorly prepared news on your local school system may not be read by as many people as half a column of clearly written news. Your readers have many distractions and you must compete for their attention with all manner of things.

If you want to produce a sound newspaper, study both your paper and your readers. No matter how fine your motives may be, you need sound techinque in presentation of news to meet the needs of your community.

This is from an address by **Floyd Taylor,** given, as director of the American Press Institute, before the Pennsylvania Press Conference at State College, Pa., May 14, 1948,—as timely now.

FM OFFSETS LOCAL PRESS IN KNOXVILLE

FM radio provides some communities with an alternative to the point of view of the local newspaper. Particularly in college communities, where informed people are available for commentary, this has proved a welcome alternative to those who are unsatisfied by the local paper. Knoxville, Tennessee, is such a community. On February 18, Dr. Leroy P. Graf of the University of Tennessee broadcast the following criticism of the editorial page of the Knoxville News-Sentinel of February 16, over FM Station WUCT. It is an interesting example of the potential of an FM program to balance a one-sided local press. There is also a morning paper in Knoxville. Prof. Graf's reference to that is the one sentence that he doesn't read it. The community he serves would appreciate the pungency of that criticism.

Faculty Platform

by Leroy P. Graf

It has been some time since I have complained about the calibre of our local press. I'm afraid the time has come once again to suggest that too frequently we who live in Knoxville are poorly served by the fourth estate. I particularly have in mind the editorial observations which are offered to those of us who turn to that page for some suggestive guidance in evaluating the current scene. My comments are, of necessity, confined to my experience with the evening paper, since I am not a regular reader of the morning paper. This evening I propose to examine the editorial columns for one evening this week to establish with evidence what I regard as some of the editorial shortcomings of our paper. Now I'll admit this particular evening was inordinately poor as an editorial performance, but the elements revealed that evening crop up often enough to set the tone of editorial policy.

The lead editorial bore the heading "Are Memories So Short" and dealt with the petition now being circulated by the Citizens for TVA in behalf of Gordon Clapp's continuing as chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The paper's quarrel with Mr. Clapp seems to be his leadership in the move to remove the TVA headquarters from Knoxville to Muscle Shoals. Now I certainly do not endorse Mr. Clapp on this point. I want very much to have the Authority headquarters here in Knoxville, convinced as I am that the TVA personnel is a valuable group to have in our community. The truth is, I am delighted that thus far Mr. Clapp has been unsuccessful. At the same time, I recognize that he is only trying to do what is called for in the act setting up TVA and what is now being complied with by the most transparent of subterfuges. Evidently the editor doesn't want Mr. Clapp to carry out the will of Congress as expressed in the act and, up to this time, unchanged by amending legislation. But the fact is, this question of the location of TVA headquarters is a relatively small matter compared with the well-being of the Authority and the achievement of its goals, matters with which Mr. Clapp has ably and selflessly concerned himself for nearly two decades. Why shouldn't we expect our newspaper to have the vision to see and the integrity to stand for a man who has acted in the interest of the TVA program over the years; whose removal at this time when he is still vigorous and rendering fine service can only be justified on the ground of political expediency or antagonism to TVA? Certainly a paper which claims to support the program of the Authority can only abhor the injection of the political spoils consideration into the selection of a TVA Director, and certainly it cannot want someone in the post of director who is not in sympathy with the TVA program. But you may say, perhaps the editors don't agree with you about Mr. Clapp? Aren't they at liberty to say so without being attacked for not sharing your opinion? Most assuredly they have every right to disagree with me. But I contend that they have no moral right to deal in half-truths, or even downright misrepresentation. For example, in referring to the arrangements for the construction of a headquarters building at Muscle Shoals, the editorial describes the original negotiation as a "deal"—a word having rather distasteful overtones—and goes on to describe it as "similar to that made for the Memorial Hotel of notorious memory in Nashville." Now this is a low blow. The fact is, there can be no real comparison of the two situations—certainly none that is fair, for by now the Memorial Hotel arrangement has been pretty clearly identified with political favoritism, even corruption. No such imputation has ever been sustained with respect to the arrangement for the lease of the Muscle Shoals building. Whether the terms were the best which could have been obtained for the Authority is a question which has been raised, but it has not been seriously suggested that Mr. Clapp or any member of the TVA Board was improperly influenced. For the editorial even in-

directly to intimate this is an instance of misrepresentation.

The second editorial deals with the British boy, aged 19, who wants to stay in the Boy Scouts, even though he is a Communist. I hold no brief for this boy. I think he's off on the wrong track. I can only wonder how soon he'll find it out. I'm certain the current hullabaloo over the issue will prolong rather than shorten his sojourn among the Communists, and there is always the chance that he never will recover his balance. Here I suggest, is one of the human tragedies of our time—a boy who has taken the wrong turn. What does our editor bring to the story? He offers little more than a pharisaical sneer at the boy and uses this as another occasion to make clear the low opinion he has of Communists and their nefarious activities. This we did not need to be told. All in all, he has neither helped us better to understand the situation nor has he offered any constructive observations.

A third editorial takes cognizance of Glen Taylor's declaration of his intention to enter the Democratic Senatorial primary in Idaho next summer. The editorial makes no contribution beyond what has appeared in the news story reporting the event. To justify itself an editorial should, I feel, go beyond mere reporting, though apparently it is enough in the eyes of the editor of our paper if it simply beats a dead horse by reminding the reader of the pathetically unsuccessful Progressive ticket of the 1948 campaign.

The shortest among this spate of short editorials was only two sentences in length, yet in some ways it was the most inexcusable. Because it is so short I would like to read it to you. Headed "Some Race!" it observes:

> Chester Bowles, former ambassador to India, says India and Red China "are in a race" to show the peoples of Asia which can provide the better standard of living. That may be the way it looks to a veteran New Dealer, but we don't see how two people or two nations can be in any kind of race when they're running toward each other.

Here we have an example of a dangerous kind of thinking to which too large a segment of our press is prone. I'm never quite sure whether the people who promote this particular line actually believe it or whether they are knowingly dealing in half-truths and distortions. The line is that India has sold out to Communism; that if she doesn't have an open Communist regime, she might as well have, since her leaders follow the Communist line. This is a patently false charge. India, without question, has a strong Communist movement. Beyond this, on a number of occasions Nehru and the Indian leadership have not taken a point of view identical with ours. But there is no reason to believe that the Indian government is a Communist government, nor yet following the Communist line. Perhaps it is oversimplification, but it appears that India does not think that the choice is either or between Russian Communism and Western Free-Enterprise Democracy. She still thinks there is a middle-way which she can follow. She may be wrong. Perhaps the chips are down and there is no place in our world for the independent nation in international affairs. If she is proved wrong by the course of events, she won't be the first nation who thought she could ride out an international storm. It seems to me the United States took somewhat the same view toward both World Wars until we were proved wrong. And just as some of us can't see how the Indians can be so blind to their own ultimate self-interest; so the European democracies found it hard to see how the United States could fail to appreciate the full implications for her of the Kaiser's power in 1914 and of the Fascist menace represented by Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy during the 1930's. When the editorial glibly remarks that India and Red China are running toward each other, it intentionally conveys the idea that these Asiatic nations are of a piece and that, Communist. Taken literally, the statement is meaningless. If the editor intends to say that India is moving toward Communism, he certainly didn't mean to say that Red China, already Communist, is running toward India—not yet Communist—for then he would be suggesting that Red China was becoming less Communistic. One can only conclude that this editorial is merely a smart crack designed to tar India in the eyes of the unthinking reader with the Communist brush.

In all fairness I must point out that although in my estimation the shortest of these editorials is the least commendable, the longest is far and away the best. Headed "Sales Wanted" it discusses the significance not only for the consumer but also for the dairy industry of the recent reduction by Agriculture Secretary Benson of the parity price support on dairy products. Whether you agree with its point of view or not—and I confess I don't all along the way—here is an editorial which seriously considers the implications of an important decision affecting our economy. This is neither smart-alecky nor ill-tempered writing.

But lest we conclude on a note of sweetness and light, I would remind you of the last of these editorial efforts. This one concerned the President's recent nomination of Charles A. Lindbergh to be a brigadier general in the Air Reserve. This event is used as the occasion to belabor the New Deal. Reminding the readers that we used to call him Colonel Lindbergh the editorial goes on to say, "Then the New Deal clobbered him, calling him a 'Copperhead' —and Charles A. Lindbergh resigned his reserve commission in the Air Force." A little later the editorial refers to Lindbergh as having been "smeared as thoroughly as any man of his era. . . ." I don't recall all of the details of the charges and countercharges, but certainly the impres-

sion I got from the newspapers of the time— and no one has ever suggested that the American press of the late 1930's was a passive tool in the hands of the New Dealers —far from it! The press as a whole maintained a critical independence, nay even hostility, toward the New Deal— I repeat, from the newspapers I gathered that Lindbergh regarded rather more sympathetically than did most Americans the efforts of Adolph Hitler to redress Gemany's grievances and to establish the nation of the master race. He too publicly gave encouragement to the Fascist "wave of the future," to quote the title of one of his wife's books. If he was done an injustice by the New Deal, perhaps it is comparable to the injustice which super-patriots do, even today, to those who are too far out of step with the prevailing sentiment of the times. To use the new Lindbergh honor as a billy-stick to belabor the defunct New Deal suggests a kind of unhealthy preoccupation with past grudges. You'd almost think the editorial policy of this chain of papers was being determined by embittered oldsters rather than by relatively young men.

And yet there is a final cheery thought. Below the Lindbergh editorial in which words and phrases like "great American," "patriotism" and "valuable services to the nation" were tossed about, there was space for a brief three line insert. In those last three lines of the column appeared the brief and perhaps painfully penetrating observation: "Charles A. Lindbergh writes so well he has been named a brigadier general in the Air Forces."

Dr. Graf is professor of history at the University of Tennessee. He speaks weekly on the program of "Faculty Platform" of FM Radio Station WUTC, in Knoxville.

Letters

Harvard Needs No Defense

I'm glad I wasn't introduced to Harvard through the medium of Calvin Mayne's article in the January *Nieman Reports*. It might have persuaded me that the Nieman program is nothing more than an exercise in academic gloss and that Harvard itself is just a comfortable retreat for starry-eyed political astronomers. Mayne found at Harvard "a daring radicalism, at times bordering on Marxism," but he generously dismissed it with the thought that it was due to mere star-gazing, "simply an exploration," as he put it, "of the outer reaches of American political thought."

I don't know where Mayne found this phenomenon. I don't doubt that he made up a lot of ground in his Nieman year at Harvard. He probably touched on some 10 or 15 courses. Does that qualify him, assuming his previous experience does, for the generalization that he spotted " a daring radicalism" or of the observation that, in spite of it, he uncovered "no *important* tendencies toward Communism?" (Italics mine.) I wonder if Mayne appreciates the distinction between "daring radicalism"—an unsavory term in his context—and unfettered academic inquiry.

It's encouraging to find so many of this year's Nieman Fellows disturbed at the gratuitousness of Mayne's remarks. I haven't found a single Nieman—or any other Harvard student, for that matter—who complains of daring radicalism, or who confuses the study of political theory with the dangerous practice, "bordering on Marxism," that Mayne sees in an exploration "of the outer reaches of American thought." For my part, and with the explicit limitation that I've attended eight courses so far, most of them in political theory, I must say I've uncovered *no* Communism at Harvard and no one I can accuse of vague political meanderings.

What disturbs me as much as Mayne's observation is his eagerness to make it, to make such a cavalier appraisal of such a difficult problem. The same issue of *Nieman Reports* contains some sobering remarks by Harvard's President Pusey who, out of intimate acquaintance with the problem, hazards the thought that no one can name a single Communist among Harvard's 3000 faculty members. Mayne's observation seems far more sweeping and far less qualified.

I realize the article you published was taken from a report made by Mayne to his editors in the Gannett chain. I'm sure he didn't reveal his findings just to reinforce some old attitudes. I'm afraid he was posing a defense for Harvard and Harvard needs no defense. Nor does it need this kind of well-meaning, inexpert explanation. Like every university, its story needs to be told to the public, with knowledge and sophistication in every field, but particularly in the field of political attitudes. The one effort it can do without is the journalistic imposition that so many of us try to avoid: superficial generalization, the kind of thing that comes so irresponsibly to a typewriter trained in speed.

Mayne was saying he'd found "radicalism" at Harvard but, he implied, we must not get excited, things aren't as bad as all that. Inadvertently, the seed of doubt is sown, like a juicy bit of gossip tossed out in all candor at a cocktail party. With less innocence, Joe McCarthy can remark: "At least I don't *think* he's a Communist." The motives are so different but the doubt that lingers is the same. The common problem seems to be the eagerness itself. Everybody, these days, is an expert.

But I've taken heart. There are Niemans this year boning up on everything from Soviet imperialism to the anthropology of Southeast Asia. There isn't one who notes "a daring radicalism" at Harvard. And there isn't one who sees a tiny, bearded man, holding aloft a little box (or perhaps a book) that ticks, and peering out from behind every lecture platform.

Alvin Davis

Alvin Davis is on leave from the New York *Post* as a Nieman Fellow this year.

Nieman Scrapbook

The Press on Censorship

by Frank K. Kelly

Consultant, American Book Publishers Council

The Council's review of censorship battles in the United States during 1953 was widely used by newspapers and stimulated a number of editorials on book censorship, nearly all of them on the anti-censorship side.

Material from this year-end summary appeared in *Time* magazine, the New York *Times,* Boston *Herald,* Chicago *Sun-Times,* Minneapolis *Tribune,* Omaha *World-Herald, Christian Science Monitor,* Seattle *Times,* Detroit *Free Press,* Youngstown *Vindicator,* Kansas City *Star,* Boston *Globe,* Decatur (Ill.) *Herald,* York (Pa.) *Gazette & Daily,* Los Angeles *News* Memphis *Commercial Appeal,* and other publications in various parts of the country.

The San Antonio *News* commented: "The censors won no skirmishes here, and this newspaper is proud of the Council's leading comment on the press: 'In San Antonio, the *News* and the *Express* were in the forefront of the battle against book-branding.' And we'll be there again at any time this ugly issue might unfortunately rise to threaten basic freedoms here in the future."

Discussing the Council's report, the Boston *Globe* said: "A little courage and optimism should convince all Americans that no one need fear the printed word. Certainly, as far as adults are concerned, the most effective censorship in the long run is that of the individual reader's common sense and taste."

"In almost every incident, public opinion forced public officials to back away from book burning under the excuse of protecting public morals," the Chicago *Sun-Times* said.

The Portland *Oregonian* declared: "In their pre occupation with the work of the censors . . . citizens have overlooked the great success of the counter movement. A survey by the American Book Publishers Council is encouraging. It shows pretty clearly that the score for 1953 was very much in favor of those who believe in America's traditional freedom to speak and read as it wants."

The Decatur *Herald* said: "Today most Americans are awake to the value of free enterprise of the mind, ready to fight book censorship as they fought for the liberty which censorship refutes."

"The best way to guarantee vast readership of a book is to try to ban it," said the Rochester (N. Y.) *Democrat & Chronicle.* "The campaigns backfire right at the start."

"Book censorship ideas haven't proved popular," said the St. Paul *Dispatch,* citing the cases reviewed in the Council's report. "The idea of censoring books for the public's benefit is losing force . . . The idea that anyone—librarian, police officer, or public official can set himself up as judge of what the public may or may not read if it wishes is taking quite a licking in the nation today."

The Houston (Texas) *Chronicle,* however, voiced a critical opinion: "The nation's publishers attack what they term censorship in an eight-page statement from the American Book Publishers Council, Inc. Censorship is dangerous, of course. But there must be some control over published material despite the anguished wails of the reactionary 'liberals' who would defend the rights of every one except the anti-communists, to print anything regardless of how anti-American or salacious it may be.

And the Columbus (Ohio) *Dispatch* expressed the fear that publishers of paper-bound books, "possibly feeling that the battle against local censors has been won," might expose too much feminine skin on the covers of their books.

"Cover art on some of the new paperbacks reveal as much feminine epidermis as before and the poses are more provocative," the *Dispatch* said. "We have a feeling that until there is more self-discipline n the book industry, more sense of responsibility toward a predominantly decent and clean-minded public, local censorship efforts will continue to break out in many places and may, in the end, bring a real censorship that will be a genuine threat to free expression."

Two other newspapers also discussed developments in the book industry. The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* said a "civil war" existed in the book publishing field, with paper-back publishers . . . no longer content to bring out only the books which the hard-back publishers have sent all the way around the course, including Hollywood . . . Since the old-line publishers are not in the trade merely because of an irrestible love of beautiful words, they are beginning to cast about for saving expedients. And that brings back the old question of why every book, good, bad or indifferent, should be brought out in expensive form. Europe has long published the best books in paper covers. American publishers once did so. The writer will be happier in paper at least so long as glutting the market with trash does not set off the law of diminishing returns. The publisher should be happy to have his business saved. And all of us ought to be happy to have the pleasure of reading saved from transformation into a luxury beyond our means." The Grand Rapids (Michigan) *Press* said: "Admittedly there are still too many bad books being published in the paper-backs—and too many good books with lurid covers. But on the whole the advent of the 'pocket-book' has been a welcomed development in book publishing, one that has made millions of persons book buyers and readers, which must be counted a healthy condition for the country."

New Hampshire Governor Opposes Censorship Movement

Governor Hugh Gregg of New Hampshire declared in an interview distributed by the Associated Press on January 7 that he "was very much opposed to censorship boards" and said he did not favor state supervision over literature. He said it should be a matter for individual action.

Soon afterward, the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle* launched a seres of articles on the history of book-banning, the dangers of censorship, and the unclear nature of laws on "obscenity." One article, published January 18, said Police Chief William C. Nobbs of Claremont felt that control over young people's reading might best be exercised by parents in the home. Another police chief, Clarence Wright of Lebanon, expressed doubt about using the blacklist

circulated by the National Organization for Decent Literature, saying that he could only "suggest" to store owners that some books on their newsstands were not approved by the people who drew up the list.

The same article described a December meeting of a group of Claremont clergymen, and said the view was offered at this meeting that "censorship was irritating to the American spirit, and therefore if there is any other effective method of providing at least a partial solution to the problem, it would probably be best to try that alternative first."

The *Eagle* pointed out that Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* had been banned in Concord, N. H., in the nineteenth century, and analyzed the present New Hampshire law on "obscenity," pointing out the various interpretations that might be placed on its meaning.

Washington *Post* and P.T.A. Oppose Censorship Plan in Montgomery County, Maryland

In an editorial published January 27, the Washington *Post* denounced the textbook review proposal offered in January by William F. Bullis, member of the school board of Montgomery County, Maryland. The *Post* called the plan "a sure-fire formula for wrecking a school system."

"The proposal . . . calls for establishing a reading room with at least two copies of all textbooks in use or under consideration," the *Post* pointed out, "so that they can be examined and criticized by organizations primarily concerned with un-American activities.' "

The *Post* declared: "The reasoning behind such proposals—which have bedeviled school systems in a score of American communities—is that so-called 'patriotic' groups are somehow more patriotic than boards of education and professional school personnel. They are not. Moreover, they have nothing to bring to an appraisal of textbooks save their prejudices. A textbook is a teaching tool; teachers are the persons best qualified to judge it, just as surgeons are the persons best qualified to judge the efficiency of surgical instruments."

On February 2, the Montgomery County Council of Parent-Teacher Associations urged the County Board of Education to reject the Bullis proposal, declaring that the plan implied " a distrust of the professional competence, the patriotism, or both," of the administrative and teaching staff of the schools. The P-TA group said "such censorship" of books by groups and persons not assigned the responsibility for text selection would be harmful to the county school system.

The proposal has also been opposed by School Superintendent Forbes H. Norris and several civic organizations.

The County Board of Education set a public hearing on the proposal for February 11 in Rockville, Maryland.

Indiana Commissioner Denounces Story "Which Helps Children Learn to Play Hooky"

On January 14, the United Press reported from Indianapolis that Mrs. Thomas J. While, prominent member of the Indiana Textbook Commission who recently attacked *Robin Hood* as communistic, had denounced another story which in her opinion "helps our children learn to play hooky."

In a letter to the Indianapolis *Star,* Mrs. White objected to a story by Sherwood Anderson in a book called *Adventures for Readers—Book I,* which was recently approved by the Indiana commission for use in the public schools. She thought the book containing this story was not appropriate for school children.

"The Senate committee investigating juvenile delinquency in Washington (D. C.) found that playing hooky was the usual first step in a criminal career," Mrs. White declared.

Mrs. White also criticized other stories in the same book, including one by Irwin Shaw, whch she said "tells how to steal a boat." She objected to *The Highwayman* by Alfred Noyes because "the hero is a robber and the villain's the law."

Indiana's School Superintendent Wilbur Young said the book was "one of the top three" chosen last December by his teacher-advisers. He declared all three were "excellent choics."

Asked for further comment. Mrs. White said: "This is a local problem strictly; it's no one's affair outside of Indianapolis."

In Chicago, however, the *Sun-Times* sought the views of teachers and librarians on the stories attacked by Mrs. White.

The *Sun-Times* reported January 16: "Janette Anderson, teacher at Bradwell School, said the book was very popular with her class. 'So far, I haven't had a case of truancy and nobody has stolen a boat,' she added.

"Lucile Pannell, Elmhurst author and lecturer in the field of children's literature, commented: 'If you look for evil, you can find it almost anywhere. It all depends on your own state of mind.'

"Mildred Batchelder, executive secretary of the American Library Association's division of libraries for children and young people, cited the ALA's stand against censorship. She said: 'In a democracy, we have to help young people develop a set of values, and then trust them to make their own judgments. Censorship defeats this purpose.' "

The Louisville *Times* said in an editorial January 15: "It comes down to this, Mrs. White. Kids who read books, even Sherwood Anderson's, are usually too busy with their literary pursuits to find time to play hooky. The truants, on the other hand, are too busy with their truancy to read books."

In an editorial published January 14, the Terre Haute (Indiana) *Tribune* asked: "How would the good woman tell the Biblical story of Cain and Abel, the story of Mary Magdalene, the good and bad thieves, Joseph and his coat, the tale of Potiphar's wife . . . and finally the tragedy on Calvary and the massacre by Herod? And leaving school books aside, what will be done with the daily newspaper? And what will be the penalty for reading *Ali-Baba and the Forty Thieves; Tom Sawyer; Huck Finn,* and *Penrod?"*

Bulletin of the American Book Publishers Council, February 9, 1954.

Some Mighty Famous Careers Wax Despite Deadly Diabetes

by Frank Carey

(Editor's Note: What is it like to fight for your life every day, year after year, entirely dependent on a hypodermic syringe filled with insulin? Thousands of diabetics could tell you. Here is their story, highlighting the opening of National Diabetes Detection Week, during which tests will be conducted free in many communities.)

Washington (AP) — Thirteen-year-old Billy Garrett, Rome, Ga., has two ambitions. He wants to be a doctor specializing in diabetes and a Little League baseball coach.

He has prime qualifications in both fields. He's both a diabetic and a hotshot ballplayer.

Billy has had diabetes since he was 9 and has had to have insulin jabbed into him every morning since then. Unless science comes up with some new development, he'll probably have to do this for the rest of his life.

Despite this and other rigorous requirements of living with diabetes—literally fighting for his life against it—Billy has played three years of Little League ball. A star first baseman and a leading hitter, he played last summer on an all-star team that won the state Little League championship.

Billy is one of many who have proved that diabetes—a serious disease requiring strict adherence to a low-sugar diet, and, in most cases, insulin "shots"—need not bench anyone from a useful life.

Among diabetics who have shown that the disease doesn't mean taking a back seat are:

United States Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D.-N.M.), Capt. Bill Talbert and Hamilton (Ham) Richardson of the United States Davis Cup tennis team, Baseball Star Bill (Swish) Nicholson, Dr. Randall G. Sprague of the Mayo Clinic and Mrs. Claire Vernon Rider, head of the personnel department of the J. C. Penney Company, national department store chain.

Among other diabetics who achieved fame were Authors H. G. Wells and Hugh Walpole, Actress Sarah Bernhardt; Clemenceau, the French statesmen, and Dr. George R. Minot, cowinner of a Nobel Prize for the discovery of the value of liver extract in pernicious anemia.

Most diabetics are inclined to shrug when you mention courage in connection with their daily routine. But try to think of a better word in summing up what Billy Garrett has to do every day of his life.

Every morning before breakfast he bares an arm or leg for a hypodermic shot of insulin. He and his mother have to weigh his food on a special scale—even an extra slice of bread might throw off his delicate dietary balance. He must have just enough food—of the proper kinds—lest he suffer a shock reaction from the insulin he has to take to burn up excess sugar in his system.

Despite such precautions, Billy has suffered "blackouts" in his classes and on the athletic field.

Although Billy's case is tougher than many met among diabetics from the standpoint of requiring precisely weighed food and a rather intricate measurement of two kinds of insulin, not all diabetics take their condition so philosophically.

Diabetics who feel sorry for themselves get little sympathy from Mrs. Rider, the personnel director who is herself a diabetic. She tees off with a little lecture if she detects any signs of self-pity about the needle routine.

"Look," she tells such people. "You don't seem to realize that diabetes is often the hallmark of the well-adjusted person. Until you stop feeling sorry for yourself, you're no good to any employer—or even to yourself! I'm looking for an 8-hour-day stenographer not a 24-hour-day diabetic!"

Some diabetics can control their disease by diet and exercise alone, but many—including all who first get it in childhood—require ready access to their needle—as well as equipment to test for sugar in their urine.

This doesn't present too much of a problem to people in ordinary occupations, but consider Bill Talbert, the tennis plague. He has traveled more than 500,000 miles in 29 different countries in the 23 years since his diabetes first was diagnosed. He has given himself almost 12,000 insulin injections on planes, trains and ships and in automobiles.

"Swish" Nicholson illustrates the fact that a person can have diabetes without being aware of it until he learns about certain warning signals.

These include excessive thirst, excessive urination and a sharp loss of weight, even with an excessive appetite.

Nicholson had been a power hitter with the Chicago Cubs, but he was slipping badly when the Cubs traded him to the Phillies in 1948.

"I had diabetes for quite a while and didn't know it," Nicholson told me. "It gradually sapped my strength until I was in the last stages."

Late in the 1950 season, with the Phillies and the Dodgers neck-and-neck down the pennant stretch, Bill decided to get a checkup for his "loss of weight and strength."

The team physician supplied the answer to his batting slump—diabetes, detectable by a simple test for sugar in the urine or blood.

Put on a diet and an insulin routine, Nicholson snapped out of it to some extent, but by that time he already was getting old for a ballplayer. Even so, this last summer—he still batted a fairly respectable .206 as a pinch hitter for the Phillies. Then he called it quits.

Sometimes even doctors can miss diabetes unless they are alert to all the warning signals.

Senator Anderson's case is to the point. The former secretary of agriculture told me that in 1940 when he was running for

Congress for the first time, he experienced a "numbness in my arms, particularly in my right hand."

"I received differing reports from physicians and suggestions that I had arthritis, neuritis and possibly other things," he said. " I was told that I had some difficulties with my spine as well and that I must never ride a horse again."

Anderson ignored the warning against horseback riding, took hot baths and rubdowns at a turkish bath. In about two weeks the numbness in his arms disappeared.

Later Anderson told his experience to another doctor, who took a blood sugar test for diabetes and found that Anderson had it. This doctor figured that horseback riding tended to "burn up" the excess of sugar sometimes appearing in Anderson's blood and causing the numbness in his arms.

Davis Cup Captain Talbert has never had an insulin shock while playing, and his diabetic teammate "Ham" Richardson had has only a few—none since he learned to spike soft drinks with a lump of sugar during matches.

Talbert once suffered a diabetic coma—just the opposite of an insulin shock, due to having too much sugar in his blood—while watching a sports carnival in New Orleans.

Richardson virtually blacked out from an insulin reaction one morning about a year ago when he was scheduled to start from New Orleans for Australia with his team.

Ham's father and mother revived him with a solution of sugar, bustled him into an automobile and fed him sandwiches all the way to the airport.

On a mantlepiece in Richardson's Baton Rouge home, a silver spoon reposes among "Ham's" trophy cups.

It's the spoon Richardson's dad used to stir sugar into a soft drink for his son between sets of the Sugar Bowl Tennis Tournament in New Orleans in 1950.

In case you may have forgotten, a diabetic named Hamilton Richardson won that tournament.

Indianapolis *Star,* Nov. 15.

UNESCO Suggests World News Unit

Report Proposes U. N. Center or a Great Cooperative—Critical of Agencies

Special to the New York *Times.*

United Nations, N. Y., Feb. 16—The six leading world news agencies are "not truly international," the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization declared in a report today.

UNESCO suggested two possibile ways of putting "the spreading of news on an international basis":

One idea would be to create a telegraphic news agency attached to the United Nations and staffed by specialists from all member states. The other would be to establish a world cooperative agency in which newspapers and broadcasting stations would be shareholders.

UNESCO raised these prospects in a 232-page report, entitled "News Agencies: Their Structure and Operation," made public today here and in Paris. Some parts of the report had previously been disclosed in Paris dispatches.

Not Truly International

UNESCO contended that the six "world" news agencies were not truly international since their financial support, directors and most of their staff members were drawn from four countries: from the United States in the cases of the Associated Press, the United Press and International News Service, or from Britain, France and the Soviet Union in the case of Reuters, Agence France-Presse and Tass.

Referring to the personnel of such agencies, UNESCO said: "However impartial they may be, however strictly they may comply with the professional code of ethics, they will inevitably judge and present news from the viewpoint of the country of which they are citizens."

Moreover, it declared, the current trend among news agencies toward a "free-for-all struggle" for the sale of news runs counter to the trend toward increased international cooperation in political, military, economic, educational, scientific and cultural matters.

The report conceded that the creation of a news agency attached to the United Nations would run into opposition from those who would refuse to use a service even indirectly under Government control.

Opposition also could be expected, UNESCO said, from "certain agencies" to the idea of a world cooperative in which the organization itself would be the property of newspapers and radio stations. Under such a plan the contributions of newspapers would be assessed on the basis of circulation and both the capital and the administrative and writing staffs would be international. Existing major news services would serve as useful competition of the new cooperative, UNESCO said.

Tass Only Source for 30%

In analyzing the present activities of the six top agencies, the report said that 30.8 per cent of the world's population—a total of 745,000,000 persons—were dependent for news almost entirely on the Soviet Union's Government-run news agency, Tass. Either directly or by links with national news agencies, Tass blankets the Soviet Union, Communist China, North Korea, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Albania.

In these countries information is a *"political instrument,"* UNESCO observed, and the only news that gets into print or is broadcast is that which agrees with government policy. Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia subscribe to one or two Western wire services, but these seem to be used as information sources and news reports from them rarely appear anywhere publicly, the report said. It explained that the data on Tass had been pierced together from a "few" available sources, since the Soviet Union did not supply any.

The report estimated that there were 31,000,000 persons who were not supplied by one of the world agencies or by national agencies. In these areas—mainly in Asia, Africa and the Pacific—the inhabitants generally are "very ill informed on outside events," UNESCO reported.

New York *Times,*
February 17

The Great Turning

Editorials in three Administration Newspapers mark the Republican crisis over McCarthy.

The Times Turns Thunderer

N. Y. Times, Feb. 26

Surrender to McCarthy

I am here today to defend an officer of the United States Army, Brig. Gen Ralph W. Zwicker, a native of Madison, Wis., and a graduate of the United States Military Academy, who was humiliated at a hearing before this committee on Feb, 18, 1954, *because he was carrying out my orders.*

I am here because I feel that the integrity of the entire Army is involved. The prestige and morale of our armed forces are too important to the security of the nation to be weakened by attacks on our military personnel.

Peress is not the issue here. The issue is the treatment given a distingusihed combat soldier who followed official orders.

These are the opening paragraphs of the statement Secretary of the Army Stevens was to have made at the hearing scheduled for yesterday morning but canceled after the Eisenhower Administration had surrendered lock, stock and barrel to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

The issue here is not whether a Congressional committee has the right to investigate actions within an Executive department. Of course it has, and of course Secretary Stevens acted properly in originally agreeing to appear before Mr. McCarthy. That is not where legislative transgression of Executive power enters. It enters when the Legislative branch attempts to interfere with the legal and proper actions of subordinate executive officers carrying out their assigned functions. If there are objections to the way they do their duty, there is just one person in each agency who is responsible, and that is the head of the agency. One of the great failures of this and previous Administrations is the failure to insist that the interrogations of Congress be directed where they ought to be directed: to the responsible head of the agency, not to subordinates.

This is the statement that Secretary Stevens ought to have made. It is a national disgrace that he failed to make it and that, instead, he capitulated—perhaps unwittingly but certainly unwisely—to Mr. McCarthy in order to preserve a fictitious harmony within the Republican party. What has happened in this case is the abject surrender of the Executive branch to the unwarranted interference of a demagogue who in the present instance does represent the Legislative branch—and for whom the Legislative branch must be responsible.

But if the Senate has to take responsibility for Mr. McCarthy, the President of the United States has to take the responsibility for Mr. Stevens. Let us recall that as recently as Sunday Secretary Stevens announced that the commanding general of Camp Kilmer had suffered "humiliating treatment"—as indeed he had—at the hands of Senator McCarthy "only because he had carried out actions which were his official duty and executed an order he had received from higher headquarters which he was required to execute." And then, three days later, the same Secretary delivers to the same Senator everything the latter asks, including the body of the commanding general of Camp Kilmer. If Secretary Stevens undertook this incredible reversal under his own steam, he ought to be requested to resign. If he undertook it at the direction of the White House, he would be warranted in resigning of his own accord.

Neither is the issue whether an obscure dentist named Peress should have been promoted and given an honorable discharge when he refused to answer questions about Communist affiliation. We think the Army handled this case badly, and it is obvious that the Army thinks so too. Steps have been taken to tighten procedure and that is all to the good. But this question sinks into unimportance compared to the question of a Senator pillorying a distinguished Army officer because the orders under which the officer acted are displeasing to the Senator.

This fight ought to have been fought on the basic issue of whether or not the Executive branch of this Government, including the Army, is being run by President Eisenhower or by Senator McCarthy. The Administration has attempted to appease a man who cannot and will not be appeased. We do not believe that the American people are so blind that they will fail to see what has happened here. What has happened is a domestic Munich, and all the pious platitudes in the world will not hide that fact.

N. Y. Herald Tribune, Feb. 25

The Army's Defeat

What happened yesterday afternoon on Capitol Hill must be set down in the light of facts now visible as a sorry betrayal of interests which every American shares. Under severe party pressure, the Secretary of the Army surrendered to a Senator who had humiliated and bullied an Army general and who had spread the most infamous insinuations touching the Army's very loyalty and patriotism.

The whole matter is the more disturbing because Secretary Stevens had previously taken a stand which was dignified, necessary and right. He had expressed the resentment he understandably felt at the treatment meted out to General Zwicker by Senator McCarthy in closed hearings; he had announced that he would not allow General Zwicker to appear again despite the Senator's orders but that he would himself take the stand to give public testimony. Thus was the sense of morale and authority within the Army to be preserved. Thus was there to be called a halt to the usurpation of the executive realm which Senator McCarthy has advanced insidiously. And then what happened?

Tuesday Senator McCarthy turned from the scheduled confrontation of him-

self and Secretary Stevens to go off on one of the diversions that form so regular a weapon in his armory. Removing from the jurisdiction of the Velde committee a controversial and unproven case, already under investigation by the Army, Senator McCarthy spread it on the public record so that (as he put it) Secretary Stevens might have "a true picture" of the way the Army is "coddling Communists." In the wake of these shabby dramatics Secretary Stevens retreated completely from his earlier position; and in the "memorandum of agreement" signed yesterday consented that General Zwicker should be called. His own testimony, of course, is now eliminated.

Perhaps in the two-hour conference Senator McCarthy gave private assurances that next time he would treat General Zwicker more fairly (on Monday in Philadelphia he boasted that he should have been tougher); very probably, as a matter of fact, this whole case will be let lie when Secretary Stevens sends his report to Congress and General Zwicker will not appear again. But does that make the retreat look any better? Senator McCarthy will be off on a dozen new tasks, fortified by this latest victory over the institution which, above all others, should stand secure against his depredations.

At stake in this controversy has been the very serious issue of a free country's ability to preserve in their integrity the institutions and the constitutional procedures by which it lives. A steady process of encroachment and intimidation has been put on foot by Senator McCarthy. Again and again it has seemed that he has so plainly over-reached himself as to be set for a decisive check. Again and again, for want of perception or nerve at the crucial moment, he was let go unopposed, to escape the consequences of his own rashness and build new strength for the future. His assault on the Army was a supreme test of the ability of men in high office to meet a threat which in other parts of the world has been fatal to liberty itself.

They have failed to meet that test. When will the occasion be presented again in terms so plain that virtually the whole people can see it and understand its meaning?

Washington Post, Feb. 26

Walking With the Devil

No honorable Administration can ignore the wave of public retching in response to the Stevens-McCarthy fiasco. The issue reaches far beyond the explanation of Secretary Stevens' surrender or the details of the Peress case. What is wrong cannot be cured by Mr. Stevens' apologia or an "agreement" to curb Senator McCarthy. Such an agreement would be about as reliable as an agreement with Hitler; indeed, it would resemble the glowing optimism of Neville Chamberlain at Munich, that it is possible to be reasonable with a fanatic. The question now is simply whether President Eisenhower will grasp his responsibility to speak out on behalf of that most fundamental of all American institutions, the country's self-respect.

The performance of Secretary Stevens is quite incidental in this larger problem. Mr. Stevens was weak when he should have been strong; and he failed to fulfill his own duty to champion the dignity of the military service. The issue is certainly not communism in Government, for no right-thinking person believes that Communists belong in Government. The reprehensible bullying of General Zwicker was symbolic of the evil. Actually, the atrocious treatment of a high Army officer at the hands of Senator McCarthy only dramatized what has been going on for a long time. The inquisition of Reed Harris last spring and the travesties by Cohn and Schine have been fully as revolting as the current case.

The real and inescapable issue is McCarthyism and the Administration's relation to it. The present case is merely the newest manifestation of a plague that has engulfed the country like a prairie fire. McCarthyism has humiliated the United States before its friends and debased its prestige before the world. Worst of all, it has begun to corrode every American institution.

Who now dares, without threat of smear, proclaim the traditional doctrine that a man is innocent until proved guilty? The inquisitor is now the prosecutor, judge and jury. The confusion and distortion over security risks in Government is the direct result of this corrosion. The Foreign Service has been sacrificed upon the altar of the false god, McCarthy. Now it is the military service. McCarthyism has succeeded in deflecting our attention from the real enemy in Communist imperialism to the suspicion of our neighbors. This is the way Germany, and particularly the German army, went under Hitler.

It is said that President Eisenhower, though personally repulsed by this gangrenous infection, is advised that he must not tangle frontally with McCarthy unless he is sure he can win. In other words, the question of right or wrong is secondary. It is also said that the Republican Party needs McCarthy to win the elections this fall. Again, no question of right or wrong. This is a self-consuming doctrine.

President Eisenhower has had previous experience with a similar situation. That was in 1942 when, as General Eisenhower, he made an arrangement of convenience —reluctantly, without question—with the French collaborationist Admiral Darlan. At that time President Roosevelt cited what he said was a Balkan proverb that "you are permitted in time of great danger to walk with the Devil until you have crossed the bridge." Such an arrangement was defensible at the time because American and Allied lives were at stake. There is no such defense today. American institutions are at stake in quite a different context, and an alliance with the Devil is the way not only to defile these institutions but to lose the Eisenhower Administration's own soul.

The control of Senator McCarthy, it is true, is first of all a congressional responsibility. But it is hopeless to leave the matter there. There is only one man in the country with the stature and voice to speak out in clarion tones for the things decent Americans believe in. That is President Eisenhower himself. The bridge is here, and there can be no turning back. Nor can the monster be banished by a slap on the wrist.

Either the President must disavow, in

the most unequivocal terms, McCarthyism and everything it stands for, or he and his Administration will be regarded by the public as having joined hands with it. We are confident that the President's every instinct is to do what is right. Now is the time, and perhaps his last chance, to do it and win the enduring respect of the country. For if he should elect to walk with the Devil, he will lose the support of millions of independent, fair-minded Americans of both parties who elected him as a spokesman of moderation; and he will walk alone.

Victory for Justice

The Supreme Court has reversed the courts of California in a case which is at once obscure and extremely interesting. Its interest lies, in part, in the significant Federal question which it raised regarding the admnistration of the naturalization laws and, in part, in the character of the counsel petitioning the Supreme Court in regard to it.

The case involved a petition for naturalization filed in California by Arthur Jost, a native of Canada who entered the United States at the age of eight and has lived here ever since. He is a member and an official of the Mennonite Brethren Church and a conscientious objector to any form of service in the armed forces, even noncombatant service. The Nationality Act of 1940 makes available to those who can show "by clear and convincing evidence" that they are "opposed to the bearing of arms or the performance of noncombatant services in the armed forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief" a special oath of allegiance which omits the customary pledge to bear arms.

When Mr. Jost came before a California county judge for a final hearing on his petition, he encountered, apparently, a strong distaste for pacifism coupled with a doubt that Mennonite teaching genuinely forbade him to serve in the armed forces as a noncombatant. As regards the first point, Congress has clearly indicated its willingness to admit bona fide conscientious objectors to citizenship; as regards the second, all the evidence indicated unmistakably that Jost himself was conscientiously opposed to noncombatant service even though some members of his church found themselves able to undertake such service.

"The judge's quarrel," said the brief filed with the Supreme Court in behalf of the petitioner, "is not really with Jost but with the Mennonites and the scriptural authenticity of the doctrine of nonresistance." The complaint seemed thoroughly justified. The county judge's opinion seemed an expression of his own prejudices, counsel for petitioner made this eloquent plea:

> We live in a troubled time when wisdom is diluted by fear, when views slowly built by the experience and suffering of long ages are rent like a temple by an earthquake. And so a matter, inherently simple, has to be brought here for assurance that the perplexities of our generation shall not undo the solution which past generations have so painfully evolved for these very problems.

Counsel for the petitioner was headed by Dean Acheson. This was, appropriately, his first case since he ended his service as Secretary of State. The Department of Justice, although it initially opposed the petition, confessed error and joined counsel for the petitioner in urging the Supreme Court to reverse and remand the case. The outcome confers credit on both sides—and upon American traditions of justice.

Washington *Post* February 8, 1954

A Spokesman for Freedom

Dean McGeorge Bundy of Harvard is an unusually effective spokesman for free inquiry at our colleges and universities. Judging by his affirmation of academic freedom at the annual dinner meeting of the Harvard Club of St. Louis Thursday night, this alert and articulate political scientist would be a match and more for some more widely-known debater from the side that would suppress ideas and set up a reign of fear among teachers.

Dean Bundy, who was a close friend of the late distinguished Republican leader Henry L. Stimson, does not take the defensive. He tells the facts unhesitatingly about political opinion and dissent at Harvard. He points out that the Furry case is a virtually isolated instance on a staff of 2800. Thus putting the case of the Fifth Amendment invoker into perspective, the educator shows the great contribution that the Harvard faculty has made to the free way of life in its three centuries—and is making today in its exposition of Communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

As our oldest University, Harvard has, as Dean Bundy says, a special obligation to hold firm against the political tramplers of freedom to inquire and expound. What Harvard does will influence many other institutions. The insistence of its faculty, officers and governing boards that they will handle their own problems is one of the best countersigns of our times.

—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*
Feb. 19, 1953

Let Reader Beware

As this editorial explains, the New York Times, *with other leading papers—*Christian Science Monitor, *Washington* Post, *New York* Post, *New York* Herald Tribune—*found it necessary to go back over the facts in the Fort Monmouth case and straighten out their readers on the reports they had carried from Sen. McCarthy's statements of his closed-door, one-man hearings. Their conclusion: Let the reader beware.*

Fort Monmouth Case

This newspaper's study of the Fort Monmouth security investigations, summarized by Peter Khiss, must leave any impartial reader with a sense of uneasiness, if not dismay. Senator McCarthy's shameless scramble for publicity has never been exposed more clearly than in the Monmouth case. But the Army's Security Screening Board is also open to censure for being arbitrary, unreasonable and lacking in loyalty to its employes.

An atmosphere has been created in the United States that leads to this type of undemocratic persecution, and for that Senator McCarthy is partly to blame. Certainly, he has become the symbol and has provided the name—McCarthyism—for the sort of phony crusade that Fort Monmouth represents.

The Army had been investigating its Monmouth workers for months before

Mr. McCarthy came along. Army investigators found no spies and neither has Senator McCarthy, yet the Sentator was given sensational headlines last October on supposed espionage and communism at Monmouth. His charges have thus far proved false or exaggerated, but they were published at the time. It has taken weeks of reportorial effort to get at the true facts and publish them, but meanwhile Mr. McCarthy has had his publicity and Fort Monmouth has had its morale shaken badly, and it will doubtless lose valuable scientists who do not need to take suspicions and insults.

For the newspapers Fort Monmouth has been a lesson that will not quickly be forgotten, but the reading public should understand that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ignore charges by Senator McCarthy just because they are usually proved exaggerated or false. The remedy lies with the reader. If the Senator should hit upon something genuine there will be corroboration, but until there is the intelligent reader should refuse to accept a McCarthy charge as valid. Perhaps the Fort Monmouth case will prove valuable in the end as a typical example of McCarthyism that could be exposed.

New York *Times*, Jan. 14.

Uncle Sam's Ulcer: A Fable for Our Time

Once upon a time there was a man named Uncle Sam. As a boy, he had always been carefree and healthy. But when he grew up and went out into the world he began to have his problems, as pretty nearly everyone does.

After a while, Sam began to feel internal aches and pains. At first he wouldn't pay any attention to them. "I'm just imagining things," he kept telling himself, or, "It must be that red herring I had for dinner." When well-meaning friends warned him that a stomach ache isn't anything to fool around with he'd either laugh at them, or get indignant.

But as time went on, the aches and pains got worse. Finally, after a particularly bad bout, Sam got scared and saw a doctor.

"You've got a bad ulcer," the doctor told him after an examination. "It's what we call Subversive Tumor. It isn't malignant yet, but if you don't get at it right away, there's no telling what might happen."

So Sam went to work on his disease. The doctor put him on a Loyalty Program diet, which was a nuisance and slowed him down a little, but made feel better in the long run. He also took some medicine called Smith Act. It was bitter stuff, but it worked. Gradually the aches and pains subsided.

After several years of this, the doctor looked him over again and said: "Okay —you've gotten on top of it. The ulcer's just about disappeared, and if you take reasonable care of yourself you shouldn't have any more trouble. But remember—you've got to watch your step. In the job you're doing, you're susceptible to Subversive Tumor, and you always will be. Be careful of your diet, and keep alert for any telltale symptoms. If you do that, you'll be all right."

This might have been the end of the matter except that Sam couldn't get it out out of his head. He'd had a bad scare—the worse because he'd let it go so long—and he stayed frightened even after the doctor gave him a clean bill.

Sam kept brooding over the disease he had had. He thought about it when he was alone, and talked about it when he was with other people, almost incessantly. He reviewed his symptoms, reproached himself for being so stupid in the beginning, tried to fix the blame for his trouble on former companions—over and over and over again.

He also went a lot further than the doctor had advised. He not only kept on taking Smith Act in small amounts, but began to swallow large doses of a patent medicine called McCarthyism. He considered trying still other drugs—one labeled Legalized Wire Tapping, another Modified Fifth Amendment.

None of this—neither the worrying nor the self-doctoring—made Sam feel any better; in fact, they made him feel worse. But he just couldn't seem to quit.

One day on the street he met the doctor, who was shocked to see how shaky Sam looked. They went together to the doctor's office, where the physician questioned Sam, and then gave him a talking-to.

"I told you to watch out for a recurrence of Subversive Tumor, and you certainly should, the doctor said. "But I didn't tell you to worry yourself into the grave. And all this patent medicine you've been gulping—Good Lord, man, do you realize what that stuff can do to your system if you keep it up? Now for heaven's sake, use your head. Stop stewing about what you've been through, take sensible precautions, and get on with your work."

It's too early yet to tell the end of this tale, because Sam hasn't made up his mind how to act. But it's not too early to spell out the moral:

Political Hypochondria can be as bad for a man (or a nation) as Subversive Tumor.

—Providence *Journal*, Dec. 28

Press Freedom Implies Responsibility

While it is customary for newspapers to be charitable about the transgressions of their journalistic contemporaries, there are degrees of irresponsibility that are hard to overlook. This was forcibly illustrated the other day in the treatment accorded by the Boston *Post* to the talk given by President Nathan Pusey of Harvard Friday night at a meeting of the New England Assn. of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Dr. Pusey in his talk decried the assaults of publicity-cadging politicians on the reputations of Harvard and other great universities. He said that not one of these detractors "can or will come forward to name a single Communist" on his faculty. And he mentioned, quite incidentally, that out of the 3,000 Harvard teachers who have contributed so vastly to American arts and sciences, a thorough inquiry last spring disclosed only four who "had been or might have been members of the Communist party."

The *Post's* front-page headline on this speech was an 8-column banner reading, "Pusey Admits Four at Harvard Linked to Reds." This was not only ingeniously misleading; it also was not even news, since the four persons Dr. Pusey referred to had been duly publicized more than six months ago. By inflating an incidental

remark and taking it completely out of context, the *Post* gave a precise illustration of the very technique Dr. Pusey was deploring.

As any newspaperman knows, the problem of writing a headline that fits the available space is tricky enough in itself. The difficulty is considerably compounded when the writer of the headline is required to be irresponsible and misleading as well. We would suggest to our Boston contemporary that honest headlines and honest stories are quicker and easier to write—and, incidentally, give better substance to the claim that the press possesses maturity to match its freedom.

Berkshire *Eagle,* Dec. 7

The Quest for Truth

by John B. Knox

I remember the day when newsmen were suspicious of anybody and everybody in public relations.

We still feel the same way about some people—but not you who represent our colleges.

There's one word we link with you folks and the institutions you represent: INTEGRITY.

Thoughtful newsmen not only believe you, but believe in the institutions you represent.

There may be times when our sense of what's news is different, but we respect what you're trying to do.

We know that your institutions need you, and we need you, too.

In a real sense, you are our colleagues, and we are yours. And this goes beyond mere collaboration . It reaches into fundamental functions. For colleges and news media are partners in a common enterprise: education.

Your institutions symbolize the great hope of mankind: that man, the finite, the limited, can escape from the circle in which all other creatures are chained—the closed, functional cricle of more biological survival.

We have begun that escape through speech and the printed word, which are our tools of communication and thinking. We have begun that escape through recorded experience and reasearch. Through a growing body of knowledge and wisdom. Through passing this knowledge on to others.

For too many of us, the quest for truth closes with the classroom door. Only the mass media of information—newspapers, radio, television—then can bring postgraduate knowledge to the mass of the people. You know our handicaps. We must amuse, we must give thrills, and we must give gossip—along with something that's important.

We know that much of what is significant is cherished and heightened in your institutions:

The sense of wonder and curiosity, awareness of beauty and of the universe around us, the speeding of the quest for the elusive truth that leads us beyond the finite circle of an instinct-ridden existence towards the doors of infinity.

John B. Knox of the New England bureau of the Associated Press gave this talk to the New England district, American College Public Relations meeting, Dec. 3, 1953.

Continuing Vitality

Please change my mailing address for *Nieman Reports.* I think the enclosed editorial from the Providence *Journal* merits wide circulation and it occurred to me that *Nieman Reports* might want to reprint it. (See Scrapbook.)

I would also like to take this opportunity to tell you how much I have enjoyed reading *Nieman Reports* in the last six years and to wish you continuing vitality during the coming years. Your intelligent critiques of journalism have served me well, both as a newspaperman and a citizen.

Melvin L. Bergheim
Newport Naval Station, R. I.

Valuable

I am apologetic at having sent this subscription check so late. For some reason the original bill seems to have eluded me. I greatly appreciate your having continued to send *Nieman Reports,* as it is one of the most valuable publications that reaches my desk.

Mildred Adams
340 East 72d St., New York

Seldes Claims Boycott of His Book

George Seldes has written an angry protest against the review of his book, *Tell the Truth and Run,* in our issue of January. He declares that his book has been the victim of a boycott in the press: what he describes as "a non-conspiracy of silence." He complains that of 300 big city newspapers that received review copies, only three ran reviews, that no New York newspaper has reviewed it (up to March 1) and no magazine except *The New Yorker.* He describes *The New Yorker* review as "an excellent one." It is reprinted here.

Tell the Truth and Run

An account of the author's forty years in journalism and his lonely career as a critic of the American press. After apprenticing on the Pittsburgh *Leader,* Mr. Seldes became a war correspondent in 1918; he was one of the first in Germany after the armistice, and one of the four who wangled the celebrated interview in which Hindenburg wept and said, "The American infantry in the Argonne won the war." He covered the early Weimar Republic for the Chicago *Tribune* and then went to Russia. He was ultimately thrown out of the country for his outspokenness, and a few years later he was thrown out of Italy by Mussolini. The book describes his subsequent activities in Mexico and in Spain during the civil war and ends wth the story of his iconoclastic newsletter, *In Fact.* Mr. Seldes is an explosive writer and a man of untrammelled opinions. What he has to say about newspaper venality and hypocrisy is mostly a repetition of charges he has made in other books but his personal experiences, especially his dealings with his old boss Colonel McCormick, make animated reading.

—*The New Yorker,*
Oct. 31, 1953

Mr. Brown's Retirement

Sevellon Brown is one of those rare and fortunate individuals who have been able to create a distinguished newspaper. The Providence *Journal* has been an important paper for many years, but Mr. Brown made it one of the leading papers of the country. More than that, he endowed it with a character, courage and independence which few newspapers have been able to achieve. Although he worked in the shadow of the New York press, he refused to retreat from his conviction that his duty was to publish a cosmopolitan journal. He has insisted upon a full report on national and international news —along with the local digging which his monopoly made imperative. His newspaper has a conscience, a voice and a passion for facts.

This week Mr. Brown retired as publisher of the Providence *Journal* and *Evening Bulletin,* with which he has been associated since 1919 when he became Washington correspondent of the *Journal.* He was later managing editor, editor, and finally publisher. Now he may spend more time on his related work, which also has represented a sizable contribution to American newspaperdom. Because of his interest in the greatest amount of news freedom, he has been extremely active in newspaper organizations. He was one of the founders of the American Press Institute at Columbia University and of the International Press Institute. He may retire in full knowledge that few men in this century have done more to raise the standards of American journalism.

Washington *Post,*
Feb. 5.

A Great Publisher Decides to Retire

Sevellon Brown, until his retirement the other day publisher of the Providence *Journal-Bulletin,* created the American Press Institute at Columbia University. At the Institute's inaugural in 1946 it was said of him: "Sevellon Brown, as creator of this institute, will take his place along with journalistic immortals for his important contribution to the profession he loves so deeply."

Mr. Brown has done many other things to etch his fame. He helped organize the North American Newspaper Alliance to provide more background for spot news; he helped organize the Associated Press Managing Editors' Association; for years he was a member of the advisory council to the Pulitzer Prize Board; he personally launched the letters-to-Italy campaign credited with swinging the 1947 Italian election away from communism.

His greatest monument, however, is the Providence *Journal-Bulletin,* a newspaper enterprise he developed into one of the finest in the country. Mr. Brown was not satisfied with keeping up with the times. He led the times. In his news columns he insisted on accurate and thorough reporting, for his editorial pages he demanded not only intelligence and good writing, but courage and integrity above and beyond the call of routine duty. The impact of his aggressive conscience was felt throughout all New England and across the nation, his sense of public responsibility was a model.

Sevellon Brown, from the vantage point of what we hope will be a long and pleasurable retirement, can look out upon a newspaper tradition he built so well it will not soon fall. He has indeed become a "journalistic immortal."

Portland (Me.) *Press Herald*
Feb. 8

Nieman Institute

June 23-24-25

Nieman Fellows planning to attend the triennial Institute and reunion are requested to inform the Nieman office as soon as possible what dormitory room reservations they wish to make for which nights and for how many members of the family.

Nieman Notes

1940

Oscar Buttedahl sold his Meridian (Idaho) *Times* in January. He and his wife had published it since 1948 and won awards three successive years for the best weekly newspaper in Idaho. He has been president of the State Press Association.

1941

John H. Crider has moved from *Life* magazine to *Barron's Weekly.*

1942

Harry Ashmore, exeecutive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette,* has completed a study on segregation and public education which the Chapel Hill Press will publish in May—an attempt to appraise the effects of the elimination of segregation in the public schools.

1943

William A. Townes, after a year of looking for a paper to buy, settled down in December as assistant city editor of the Detroit *Free Press.*

Frank K. Kelly, since completing the Flow of News study for the International Press Institute, has been consultant for the American Book Publishers Council. One of his chores is getting out their monthly bulletin on censorship. His annual report found the response reported in this issue.

1947

Fletcher Martin of the Chicago *Sun-Times,* published a book in January, *Our Great Americans.*

1948

Mr. and Mrs. **Robert M. Shaplen** announce the birth of a son, Peter Lucas, on Dec. 12 in New York, where Bob Shaplen is doing profiles and articles for *The New Yorker* and getting out another book.

Immediately after her New Year's Eve accident, **Rebecca Gross** began plans to walk again with new legs and get back into the full swing of her activity as editor of the Lock Haven *Express.* Progress reports to friends show that she is getting on with it. The great concern of Lock Haven over Becky's accident and the editorial expressions for her expressed all around her State made a great testimonial

to her years of devoted service to her community through her newspaper.

"Tell them all that I am getting along fine," she wrote as she started for a course of training at the Kessler Institute in West Orange, N. J. "I guess anyone who learned to ride a horse passably and to take a few ski slides without breaking a leg should be able to get on with the modern gadgets that will help put me back in circulation."

George Weller, correspondent in Rome of the Chicago *Daily News,* has been elected president of the Foreign Press Association.

1950

Robert H. Fleming, long on the staff of the Milwaukee *Journal,* moved to Chicago in January as chief of the midwest bureau of *Newsweek* magazine.

1951

Mr. and Mrs. **Dana Adams Schmidt** announce the birth of a son, Dana, Jr., on Jan. 22 in Washington where Dana Schmidt is in the New York *Times* bureau.

1953

Calvin Mayne of the Rochester *Times-Union* had an article on Rochester in the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* of March 6. The Associated Harvard Clubs will meet there, May 14-15-16.

Mr. and Mrs. **Willim Steif** announce a daughter, Barbara Lee, born Feb. 20 in San Francisco where Bill Steif is now assistant news editor of the *News.*

Mr. and Mrs. **Donald Janson** announce a daughter, Deborah, born December 19. Don Janson is on the copy desk of the Milwaukee *Journal.*

Arthur Barschdorf has left the Hammond (Ind.) *Times* to become director of public information for the Minnesota Power & Light Company.

Robert E. Lee has moved over from his Washington beat for United Press to the Washington bureau of the Ridder papers.

John Strohmeyer, pursuing his investigations for the Providence *Journal,* developed a series on an exploitation of Eastport, Maine, that proved just as interesting in Maine as Rhode Island. The Portland *Press-Herald* ran the whole series.

Watson S. Sims, in the New York bureau of the Associated Press, has published the first Round Robin report of his 1953 group. His own assignments have included the New York newspaper strike and the final phase of the Rosenberg spy case.

1954

The Nieman Fellows had a seminar with Adlai Stevenson on his visit to Harvard to deliver the Godkin lectures.

Joseph Givando

1917—1953

Givando Hard Fighter for Freedom of Press

America lost one of its most colorful young newspaperman Monday with the death in Fort Dodge, Iowa, of Joseph Givando, 36, managing editor of the Fort Dodge *Messenger.*

Givando, a member of the Denver *Post* staff from Dec. 19, 1950, to Oct. 17, 1953, was a stalwart fighter for the freedom of the press and more than once battled to defend the right of the public to get the news without bias.

Even as word of his death reached Denver, *Editor & Publisher* magazine reported that Givando was fighting a policy announced by Mayor Marvin B. Vedvig of Fort Dodge, under which all news from the city hall would clear through him.

"Read It In The Paper"

"We'll print the news as we dig it out," Givando reported in his newspaper, "and the mayor, like everybody else, will have to buy a paper to read it."

In a similar fight against censorship and bias, Givando resigned from the Colorado Springs *Free Press* in December, 1950, and came to the *Post.*

Givando was born at Lead, S. D., Jan. 25, 1917, and attended grade and high school there. He was graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1939 and enlisted in the U. S. air force.

He was mustered out of the air force in 1946 with the rank of first lieutenant after serving at various stations in this country.

Givando returned to Lead to become editor of the Lead *Daily Call* for one year, then worked for newspapers in Minnesota and Chicago.

On Sept. 7, 1947, he joined the editorial staff of the *Rocky Mountain News* and was assigned to Colorado Springs as staff writer there. He resigned July 9, 1948, to become managing editor of the *Free Press.*

As managing editor he brought the *Free Press* from a morning tabloid to a full size daily, later expanding it to both morning and afternoon. The morning edition was later discontinued.

In Colorado Springs, he assisted in formation of the Pike's Peak Press Club and was one of its charter members.

On Dec. 10, 1950, Givando resigned as editor of the *Free Press,* charging that the Chamber of Commerce and the International Typographical Assn., then owner of the newspaper, were attempting to censor the news.

He came to the *Post* as a staff writer Dec. 19, 1950.

Nieman Fellow

On June 22, 1951, Givando was named one of 12 American newspapermen to receive a Lucius W. Nieman fellowship at Harvard University.

Granted leave to accept by Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the *Post,* Givando was at Harvard under the fellowship from October 1951, until the summer of 1952, when he returned to the *Post.*

He was made an editorial writer shortly after his return.

He resigned Oct. 17, 1953, to become managing editor of Fort Dodge *Messenger,* and moved there with his wife and family.

Fellow newspapermen at Fort Dodge said he collapsed at his home about 4:30 a.m. Monday and died five minutes later.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Florence Givando; three children, Martha, 9; Catherine, 6; and Stephen, 4; his mother, Mrs. Clara Givando, and a sister, Mrs. James Burns, both of Rapid City, S. D., and a brother, Erman, of Cleveland, Ohio.

Services for Givando will be in Fort Dodge at 3:30 p.m. Tuesday. Cremation will follow at Des Moines, Iowa.

Denver *Post,* Jan. 12.

Book Reviews

American Classic

by Lawrence Fernsworth

THE JOURNALS OF LEWIS AND CLARK. Edited by Bernard de Voto; Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1953.

The Journals of Lewis and Clark will prove a welcome companion volume to Bernard de Voto's *The Course of Empire,* wherein he unfolded the story of adventure and courage on the part of these men and their company as they blazed new trails into the unpenetrated Northwest and so made it possible for the United States to make effective its claims to a vast new territory.

The virtue of this edition of the Journal which Mr. de Voto has edited, annotated and truncated, lies in the fact that the original reports of the two explorers are now assembled in a unified volume and in easily readable sequence. What this means to the reader who had been drawn to this part of the story of America's growth is that he can take the original journal down from the shelf and pass a comfortable and instructive evening reading the day-to-day accounts of the saga just as they came from the hands of the explorers. If the punctuation and spelling, the capitalization or want of it, are as rugged as was the adventure, that fact is an added element of realism to help the story take on the texture of life. For Mr. de Voto has wisely allowed the explorers to speak their own kind of language in print, rather than polishing it off to conform to the norms of modern editorial requirements.

The editor has based his presentation of the Journal on the seven-volume Thwaites edition—an imposing work which holds the inconvenience of being both difficult of access and overly ponderous for the ordinary reader. He has eliminated a vast amount of material of a technical or needfully repetitious character, all necessary to an exhaustive report to the government, although as literature it would slow down the action and take the edge off the drama.

And so we have a thrilling day-by-day account which the explorers took turns in recording in all sorts of places, under all kinds of conditions and in the very presence of the scenes that were being described.

One of the explorers' most challenging adventures came a few weeks after they had set out from St. Louis, on May 14, 1804 to explore the Missouri River and the unknown beyond it. The mission entrusted to them by President Jefferson was to examine the likelihood of a continuous waterway across the continent to the Pacific. But in what is now South Dakota were tribes of treacherous and tough-acting Sioux, veritable river pirates, who until then had effectively blocked the white man's efforts to explore any farther. They used blandishment and bluff, trickery and deception usually topped off with robbery, and up to this time it had worked. Several exciting pages tell how it failed to work with Lewis and Clark and how the blustering Indians fell back before the white man's determination.

All the way across the plains and over the Rockies and down along the Columbia the white company was constantly matching its wits against that of the Indians. In the main the Indians were ceremonious, outwardly friendly, sly with inclinations to treachery, and almost at every point given to theft. The captains made it a fixed rule, first to be as friendly toward the Indians as possible, and next to let them understand they could not get away with any nonsense. When so much as a robe was stolen the village was searched until its recovery. One cannot help but conclude as he reads through the series of adventures with the Indians, that had it not been for this admixture of amiability and firmness the expedition would never have got through.

The far western Indians were anything but he-men. They and their families usually lived in squalid villages; they were as squalid as their towns; many and lousy, ridden with smallpox and other diseases, sneaky and usually lacking in valor. After the explorers had crossed the Rockies all the vestiges of the noble Red Man's nobility seemed to have been left behind them.

Yet these remnants of a noble race on the decline could give the Yankees lessons in bargaining, whether horsetrading, or swapping their Indian wares and foodstuffs for merchandise. One of the explorers' chief occupations was buying up horses and dogs—horses to serve both as carriers and for food; the dog for food and nothing else but. Yes indeed, dog meat was a favorite food. "Certain I am," wrote Captain Clark, "that it is a healthy strong diet and from habit it has become by no means disagreeable to me. I prefer it to lean venison and elk and it is very far superior to the horse in any state."

On day "while at dinner an Indian fellow very impertinently threw a half starved puppy nearly into the plate of Capt. Lewis by way of derision for our eating dogs and laughed very heartily at his own impertinence. Capt. L. was so provoked at the insolence that he cought the puppy and threw it with great violence at him and struck him in the breast and face, seased his tomahawk, and shewed him by sign that if he repeated his insolence that he would tomahawk him. the fellow withdrew very much mortified and we continued our Dinner without further molestation."

Such are the specimens of the rugged life in the raw that engage the attention on every page of the book and that make of the Journal as it stands an American classic.

The explorers, who had left St. Louis in May, 1804, explored rivers and mountain passes, drew maps, made notes concerning flora, fauna and native human species for a full year and a half before at length they reached the mouth of the Columbia River and established Fort Clatsop. Along the lower Columbia and at the fort by the sea, you can almost feel the drenching Oregon rain, hear the swishing of thick dripping foliage, see the immense fir trees, some with a girth of 36 feet as you read the observant and vivid descriptions.

It was not until somewhat more than two and a half years after the start, Sept. 23, 1806, that the explorer:

"took an early breckfast with Colo. Hunt and Set out descended to the Missi-

ssippi and down that river to St. Louis at which place we arived about 12oClock. we suffered the party to fire off their pieces as a Salute to the Town."

They came back as men from the dead, for they had been given up as lost. But the town welcomed them heartily and the next day "in the evening a dinner & Ball"

On Friday, the 26th, the Journal ends thus: "a fine morning. we commenced wrighting &c."

And so they wrote up their notes and polished up a classic that is a vibrant and too little known epic of American history. It deserves a place on every editorial bookshelf.

Medicine's Gains

by Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.

WONDERS OF MODERN MEDICINE. By Steven M. Spencer. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 276 pp. $4.00.

The "intact human being," to use a grim label sometimes employed at the Harvard Medical School, looks simple on the outside, but is marvelously complicated on the inside.

Most of Mr. Spencer's book is devoted to some of the ways in which modern medicine can come to the rescue when this complicated organism gets into trouble. A lot of it makes exciting and informative reading.

The author, an associate editor of *The Saturday Evening Post* and a former Nieman Fellow (1940), tackles such subjects as heart disorders, tuberculosis, cancer and diabetes, tracing the recent development of treatments which have done wonders against these killers.

The two chapters on the heart and the one on arteriosclerosis are outstanding. Heart surgery has developed from dream to practicability almost within the last decade. Its story, embellished with case histories, is gripping. There is a stranger-than-fiction note of tragedy in the account of the young doctor who developed a new surgical method for saving rheumatic heart victims. He died in 1948, a victim of the very condition he had just helped to defeat. By the time his colleagues decided to try the life-saving operation on its originator, the 34-year-old surgeon was too weak to undergo the operation.

Three excellent chapters are devoted to the war against cancer with emphasis on surgery against cancer of the lung, and chemical agents as temporary aids against other types of malignancy.

Among the other high spots in the book are articles on microbial food poisoning; hepatitis, a virus disease which attacks the liver; glaucoma, a relatively common and serious eye ailment; Q fever and other virus diseases spread through ticks, mites and fleas. Most of the articles appeared first in *The Saturday Evening Post* and have been revised for publication in the book.

The style is brisk, non-technical and colorful, occasionally too much so. One case of pneumonia is described in these words:

"A few winters ago he whipped through a severe attack of pneumonia like a pointer going through the underbrush. . ."

Since medical science has made fantastic progress during the past 10 or 20 years, it is inevitable that the tone of this book should be wholeheartedly optimistic. Occasionally this optimism is too high. In the cancer stories outstanding medical authorities are quoted to the effect that the conquest of cancer may be just around the corner. Unfortunately there are other researchers who feel that this corner may be a long time in the turning.

Another article traces the development of cortisone and sings its praises liberally, but follows this with the admission that the number of arthritics using the drug may be as little as one-third of all people being treated for arthritis.

Gamma globulin's reputation as a polio preventative has suffered considerably since Mr. Spencer's article on the subject was written and, like one or two other chapters in the book, the GG story seems to be a more-than-twice-told tale by now.

Some readers may regret that Mr. Spencer didn't devote more space to some of the outstanding chapters in his book even if it meant sacrificing one or more of the less important articles.

The Public's Business

by Barry Brown

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW: Legal Access to Public Records and Proceedings by Harold L. Cross (405 pp, Columbia University Press, 1953, $5.50).

A publication devoted to newspapering, like *Nieman Reports,* is as certain to hail this book as a reporter would be to welcome an exclusive interview with Malenkov. For what Mr. Cross has done in this most comprehensive work is essentially to compile just about all the legal information available—state and federal statutes, court decisions, official regulations and opinions from attorney-general—on one of the most important and least understood questions that confronts the newspaperman in his day-to-day operations: When is public business the public's business?

Mr. Cross' answer is that access of the public—and of the press, as steward of the public interest—to public records and proceedings is less well established in law than it should be. What is more alarming, the trend at all levels of government in recent years has been markedly toward greater secrecy and increasing abridgement of freedom of the press at the source of the news.

This book is basically a lawyer's brief against that trend. Mr. Cross was originally retained by the American Society of Newspaper Editors to study the legal aspects of the problem of closing news channels. *The People's Right to Know* represents his report to the A.S.N.E. The technical nature of the work is reflected in the fact that more than one-third of its pages consist of notes and appendices listing court cases and other legal source material.

A layman is not competent, of course, to judge the book in its capacity as a legal reference work. I can say only that Mr. Cross seems to be both accurate and sound when he touches upon matters about which I have some slight special knowledge—the law concerning public records in Rhode Island ("one of the oldest, most restrictive rules of English common law") and the case in which the Providence *Journal- Bulletin* finally went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court to force open the tax abatement records of a machine government in Pawtucket, R.I.

But if Mr. Cross had written nothing more than a lawyer's brief, it would hardly have been published in book form for general circulation. The fact is that *The People's Right to Know* is also "in its broadest aspect an account of American experiments in one segment of the incompletely defined relationship between government and people." That is the description offered in the foreword by James S. Pope, chairman of the A.S.N.E. Committee on Freedom of Information at the time Mr. Cross was asked to undertake this study.

On that level, the book can be appraised, despite its specialized nature, as lively and interesting. Mr. Cross describes himself as "one who has never dissembled his abiding interest in news-gathering and warm respect for those thus engaged." Much of this feeling for newspapering comes through in his book. Not every lawyer, for example, would be likely to preface a chapter on definitions in the words of Gilbert and Sullivan's Lord Chancellor:

> "The Law is the true embodiment
> Of everything that's excellent.
> It has no kind of fault or flaw
> And I, my lords, embody the Law."

No one who knows Harold Cross will be surprised that his book should contain such touches of style, such breadth of viewpoint and such depth of insight. As a practicing newspaper lawyer of long experience and as lecturer in libel law at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, he has devoted a lifetime to consideration of the role of the press in American society. It is not too much to say, I believe, that he was the ideal man to write this book, and that the book is an ideal piece of work of its sort.

Our Reviewers

Lawrence Fernsworth represents New England newspapers in Washington. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1945. Harold M. Schmeck, Jr., of the Rochester *Times-Union,* Barry Brown of the Providence *Journal,* Charles Eberhardt of New Mexico Newspapers, Inc., Donald L. Zylstra of the *Redwood Journal* (Ukiah, Calif.) are Nieman Fellows this year. Louis M. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

How A "Pro" Writes

by Lawrence Fernsworth

SPARE-TIME ARTICLE WRITING FOR MONEY, by William J. Lederer, W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1954, $3.75.

Naval Commander Lederer not only knows how to write an article, but how to write a book. Indeed his book on article writing is unique among how-to books. Perhaps it would be better to call it a how-come book, i.e.: "How-come I wrote some bang-up articles?" and "How-come I wrote this book and a couple of others?" For this book, and another book, grew out of an article, "Miracle Under the Arctic Sea," a *Saturday Evening Post* winner.

Step-by-step the author takes you through the incubation and growth of this article, to-wit: How it was spotted; how the spade work was done; how the vast amount of material was winnowed and the article organized; how it was finally polished off for publication. At the same time he lifts the curtain to show you other authors, together with editorial-room readers and editors at work. All kinds of laboratory work went into the book just as laboratory work must go into an article—and how!

Lederer wrote 41 leads to his "Miracle" piece before he finally got it in focus, and he gives you a generous sample of them, with annotations. Thus he lets you see how the right start is all-important; how it sets the key and the tempo for all that follows. In fact the article stands or falls by those first few paragraphs, both in the editor's judgment and that of the reader. When an editor picks up a piece by a known author, he will probably decide from the first page and a half whether it clicks.

The uniqueness of the book is that, although it is properly classified as a book of technical instruction, it doesn't seem to get the least bit technical. Its chapters read like so many spirited articles; clearly the author applied his own *principia* of writing in the preparation of it. And so he has produced a book that one wants to read on and on without putting it down.

A person may wonder, however, whether the title, "Spare-time Article Writing for Money" doesn't paint too promising a picture. Writing, like lawyering, is a full-time job that takes all the brain power and nervous energy that a man or a woman has to spare. Mr. Lederer himself makes you see this as he shows you an author at work. No spare-time writer could ever have produced "Miracle Under the Arctic Sea," for example.

The spare-time writer may indeed write successfully about familiar experiences, the things that he knows, like the San Francisco stevedore who wrote a fine book and a magazine article reflecting his kind of world. But doing a professional job of legwork and research on a subject that at the start is out of your world, is quite something else. Still a man who aspires to write has to start somewhere with something. The sooner he acquires a working knowledge of the do's and don'ts, and an eye for the literary guideposts, the better for him. So: "Carry a notebook . . . there are plenty of opportunities . . . subordinate your social life and rearrange your home schedule . . . " All this for a starter. Also do as much homework as you like, but never really start writing a piece for a magazine without first submitting your ideas to an editor and at least finding out whether he is interested. Good ideas are important and come ahead of fine writing.

The book will inspire and encourage the spare-time writer if he is in earnest, and will point the way to the big leagues. But it is also for those who already have crossed the doorsills of the minor or major literary leagues.

The chapters tackle just about every aspect of magazine writing. A few of the varied topics are: What magazines want; research and spadework; techniques; selecting the market; how to submit an article; legal problems; honest and quack literary agents, and finally: When should you quit your job and become a full-time professional writer? That's what you're really heading for in the tough, all-or-nothing game of being a writer.

The book contains a gracious inscription to the 1950 Nieman class members, by name, and the Curator and Mrs. Lyons.

Bowles' Report on India

by Donald L. Zylstra

AMBASSADOR'S REPORT. Chester Bowles. Harper & Brothers, New York, 402 pages. $4.

India's importance as the potential leader of a "third area" in world politics is the concern of *Ambassador's Report.* Chester Bowles stresses the importance of her race to accomplish by democracy the same modernization that Communist China seeks by coercion.

Mr. Bowles rejects both "career" protocol and visionary "do-gooder" methods in his practical approach to his Indian mission. A Yankee forthrightness prompts his middle course.

Bowles replaced white tie diplomacy with enterprising study of India's history, culture and languages. He roamed India repeatedly, viewing firsthand her land reform, hydroelectric development, national elections, education and religions.

Americans concerned with what is next in Asia will find his conclusions merit their study.

To Americans frequently puzzled by India's Nehru, Bowles offers a statesman-like estimate of this man who leads her struggle for permanent independence. As an Asian viewing China, Nehru conceives of her as *Asian* first, usually subordinating consideration of her Communist regime to this concept. In this process Nehru has incurred frequent Western abuse and misunderstanding.

For observers who label India's government pro-Soviet, Bowles cites Nehru's press restrictions, thwarting Communist attempts to dominate India's 1951-1952 general election. A poor way to court Soviet favor, says Bowles. The Indian Premier's visits to doubtful Indian states on the eve of election to prevent their loss to Communists, plus his branding of North Korea as the aggressor in the Korea conflict, go far to satisfy Bowles about Nehru's lack of love for Communism. Bowles warns that no good can come of a facile assumption that " if India isn't for us, she must be against us."

Long experience with colonial exploitation has left India hypersensitive in her relations with the world's leading powers. Suspicion of the motives of Western nations colors her approach to industrialization and the development of her natural resources. "Capitalism" has much to live down in India. It is synonymous with a crushing imperialism, still vividly remembered. Eager to gain aid for technical and cultural advances, India is nevertheless insistent that Western nations attach no strings to such help. Indians retain supervision of all projects supported by foreign funds.

Quick to see the implications of India's "third position" relative to the struggle between Communism and the West, Bowles rejects clumsy Western efforts to enlist India on the side of the West as potentially dangerous.

He warns that permanent progress cannot result from America's tendency to ally herself with discredited Asian leaders who happen to embrace a current Western point of view. We can't afford to ignore forces actually in control in Asia. Bowles is convinced that any successful American policy toward India will derive from understanding the Far East in *Asian* terms—from our recognition of a growing *Asian* viewpoint, in Japan, through Indonesia and India, to the Middle East.

In advocating a "patient, long-range approach" toward India, Bowles urges American recognition of her "independent" foreign policy. He finds it little different from the one pursued by the United States from 1787 until well after World War I.

Indians are most interested in the United States when listening to accounts of early American "struggles"—notably our "revolt against colonialism" and our Civil War as a fight against human enslavement. Racial aspects of this conflict have special significance for Indians, who are disillusioned by the racial discrimination they find in the United States.

Some Americans may find Bowles too willing to overlook Nehru's lack of concern about the Communist menace to India's struggling democracy. There is room for disagreement about the Bowles interpretation of America's India policy needs; little argument will be possible with his able analysis of India's political attitudes and her foreign policy motives. Here his searching evaluation appears in encouraging contrast to the ineptitudes of other United States missions to Asia in the last three decades.

Army Fires Jim Crow

by Charles Eberhardt

BREAKTHROUGH ON THE COLOR FRONT. By Lee Nichols. Random House, New York. $3.50.

Jim Crow has been discharged from the armed forces of the United States, and an alert newsman has dug out the story to make a thorough, straightforward, and very hopeful book.

Lee Nichols, a rewriteman on the night desk in the Washington bureau of the United Press Associations, recognized the profound implications of a casual Pentagon press release. He developed that hint into this story of the end of racial segregation in the military services. He thinks defense department "integration" may turn out to be one of the biggest stories of this century, and his book makes a good case for that judgment.

To find out how far integration has gone, and how it is working, Nichols traveled to bases in both North and South; he talked to Pentagon officials; and studied reports of social scientists who were assigned to keep a watchful, professional eye on the transition. He interviewed combat veterans and new recruits, three star generals and buck privates, Pentagon wheels and Negro sailors. To his report of their responses he adds a brief historical survey of the role of the Negro in the military forces of the U.S., a role as old as the nation.

The swift changes since 1949 followed a limited beginning during World War II when the Negro breached the color front to win the right to attend non-segregated officers candidates schools and then won admission to pilot training.

That beach head was expanded until today it includes virtually every kind of duty in all services, the field of civilian employment at military bases, and the schools provided for children of servicemen.

How are these innovations working? After weighing the evidence, Nichols concludes that the immediate consequences are improved efficiency and morale among

all service personnel, regardless of color. The ultimate consequences could be that "biggest story of the century."

The evidence came from professional soldiers who've seen integration working, even at Biloxi, Miss. Many of them saw the first, and critical, experiment when, in Korea, the pressing necessity of battle forced integration of troops on the line.

Korea, as Nichols puts it, converted the army.

That conversion had repercussions everywhere. It provided clinching answers to the military commanders who were prone to drag their feet to delay the change that Truman and then Eisenhower had made federal policy. And the Korea conversion evoked a strange silence from Congress; even legislators from the deep South hesitated to attack an accomplished fact.

Opposition to using Negroes in integrated units hadn't been without basis. Nichols describes official reports of poor performances of segregated Negro troops in Korea, in World War II, and in World War I. In doing this he performs a service by putting into proper perspective rumors that grew from vague accounts of Negro outfits that faded away when the shooting began.

The author treats this touchy issue, and others like the explosive question of military policy toward the relationships of men and women of different races—with calm and competence.

This is objective reporting as it should be: factual, comprehensive, and balanced; by no means superficial. Only a bigot could read this account of a courageous and successful experiment without feeling grateful to Nichols for putting it down plainly and dispassionately.

Markel Criticises Foreign News

Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York *Times* and head of the International Press Institute, has an article coming out in the ASNE *Bulletin* that strongly urges upon American editors the importance of foreign news and the importance of making it interesting.

In my review of the Institute's study "The Flow of the News" (January *Nieman Reports*) I suggested that its cautious criticism was due to Mr. Markel's "canny approach." His article shows my error.

—Louis M. Lyons

Elmer Davis Speaks His Mind

(Continued from page two)

investigations, to show their hollowness. He goes on into Velde's, Jenner's and McCarran's. He pauses to look over the anxiety of our friends abroad. "Newspapers editorials asked 'Has America gone mad?' In friendly newspapers, the answer was 'No.' But the question had to be asked."

He notes of the comic opera Gouzenko case "It was not clear whether the Jenner committee was acting on its own or as an agency of the Chicago *Tribune,* which had long been conducting a campaign against Canadian Minister of External Affairs, Lester Pearson." He stops to recall the Chicago *Tribune's* patriotic contribution to the last war by printing, three days before Pearl Harbor, the plans by which we would fight a war if we had to fight a war. "Men so indifferent to national interests could easily believe that other men were as indifferent as they are."

He speaks of congressional committee reports of people "identified" as communists. " 'Identified' in congressional idiom means that somebody has said they are communists."

Of McCarthy as a menace, Davis quotes Joseph Alsop: "One of his greatest assets is that his supporters have the true mark of the fanatic. They are not interested in facts. The endless exposures of McCarthy's untruths do not affect them." Mr. Davis says he wouldn't know if McCarthy expects to become President, but it looks that way. "The liberal Republican theory is that he would have a chance of it only if the Eisenhower administration is a failure. The question of who is the top man is now out in the open."

As to what lies ahead of these days of demagogic heresy hunting, Mr. Davis says the freedoms we inherited will endure only if we fight for them.

He devotes a chapter to the Bricker Amendment crusade as a chapter of fear, —fear of the American process.

His chapter on News and the Whole Truth deals with the complex difficulty of showing to readers the whole truth in reporting those congressional investigations that seek to show only half truth or no truth at all, if it fails to prove their point.

His History in Doublethink deals with the distortions of the history of the past twenty years that the ex-communists have tried to give us since their conversion to reaction and heresy hunting.

"How long will these ex-communists abuse the patience of the vast majority which had sense enough never to be communists or sympathizers at all?"

"The arrogance of the ex-communists is not the most dangerous thing. Congressional committees always seem to take the word of an ex-communist, provided he has become a reactionary, against that of a man who never was a communist."

His chapter on The Grandeurs of Old Age is concerned chiefly with youth who see so many afraid to think and act for fear of what may be dug up and flung at them years later to ruin their careers. "Sen. McCarthy has several times damned or tried to damn middle-aged men for what they did or said in college and have long since repudiated."

"We have got to defeat this attack on the freedom of the mind. And I think we can defeat it if enough of us stand up against it. It takes courage for a young man with a family; all the more obligation on those of us who have nothing left to lose."

Elmer Davis wrote that at 64 and he is not an old man. But if he won't say it, let someone else say that all his life he has accepted this obligation, to speak his mind and risk the consequences, to fight for freedom of the mind. I suspect the only old men who will do so are those like him who always have.

His last chapter, "Are we Worth Saving?" is a brilliant essay on freedom and its dangers and enemies that excited a Phi Beta Kappa audience at Harvard commencement two years ago. But its essence is in the last line. "This republic was not established by cowards; and cowards will not preserve it."

Such a book does not need to be reviewed. It needs only to be celebrated; to be read and drunk in and passed around and made a part of the heritage that Elmer Davis speaks. And that is what is happening to it.

—Louis M. Lyons