

NiemanReports

January, 1954

OPENING UP CITY HALL

Avrom N. Romm

The Press and the Bill of Rights

Irving Dilliard

The Answer to Secrecy

Clark Mollenhoff

Reporting in the Far East

Christopher Rand

For Free Minds

Nathan M. Pusey

Freedom and Books

Dan Lacy

Eyeshades in the Ivy

Calvin W. Mayne

Scientists on Science News

Hillier Krieghbaum

**The Business of the Supreme Court: A Nieman Seminar — Book
Reviews — Our Foreign News Coverage — Scrapbook: That Famous
Press Conference — The Mt. Everest Story — Newspaper Strike —
The Independence of Harvard College — Nieman Notes.**

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, elected by former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession.

Our Foreign News

by Louis M. Lyons

THE FLOW OF THE NEWS. A Study by the International Press Institute. Zurich, 1953.

Counting coverage of the Korean War and the United Nations as foreign news, the average American paper prints about four columns of foreign news a day. The news from Korea is about all that gets on the front page. The average reader reads only about 12 inches a day of this news from abroad and gets very little out of this. But he is not conscious of wanting any more and wouldn't want more at the expense of his local news. Or so he says, when asked. The editors, by and large, are satisfied with this. Two-thirds of them say a good job is done on foreign news. This degree of complacency is perhaps about what you'd find in any institution. The one editor in six who is dissatisfied will find a vast amount of suggestive information in this elaborate study of the movement of foreign news into the newspapers of the United States. On him the American public must depend to set the pace in any improvement in information about the parts of the world to which our taxes flow in support of the interests of the United States as the leading world power.

The International Press Institute, headed by Lester Markel of the *New York Times*, made this study with \$250,000 from the Ford Foundation. It is put out rather tentatively as the first stage of a continuing study in foreign news presentation. It was concentrated on daily newspapers in the United States. The work filled a year. Staffs were set up in New York, Zurich and Madras. They had the cooperation of a committee of editors, and of the wire services and a group of foreign correspondents.

Researchers in ten journalism schools

set up a random sample of American dailies—105 papers in the sample—and a system of coding and measuring the foreign news in these. They made daily measurements of the various kinds of news from abroad in one week of each of four months—October, November, December in 1952 and January, 1953. This yielded the total scores on what the wire services supplied, from what sources, and how much of it the papers used. They tried also to get a qualitative value of this by submitting the clips for analysis to 22 foreign correspondents, each appraising the coverage of his own country. Finally the reader was surveyed as to the impact on him, which was "quite low."

The result is a vast compendium of information and appraisals and suggestions. The 70-page appendix is loaded with raw data from which reader or editor can draw his own conclusions. Indeed he will have to, for the report avoids doing the job for him. It appears to lean over backwards to avoid critical findings.

This, I suspect is no accident. It is rather the canny approach of Lester Markel, who inspired the study and who believes in foreign news. He doubtless expects by this cautious suggestion to persuade some editors to venture a little further with it. He had to depend on the cooperation of quite average editors, and depended heavily on the wire services, who certainly weren't going to be taken for a ride in this if they could help it.

The \$250,000 study inevitably suggests comparison with that other \$250,000 spent six years ago on the Hutchins report. That is as far as the comparison goes, except that the resistance of the newspapers to the criticism in the Hutchins report must go far to explain the cautious approach of this effort. The Hutchins Commission

was made up of scholars independent of the newspapers and they aimed at the readers, over the heads of the editors. This job was kept in the hands of newspapermen all the way.

The indeterminate tone of the report is spelled out in the opening of the chapter on "The Value of News."

"How good is the flow of news into the United States? How accurate is the picture it makes of foreign countries? This study has turned up different answers to these questions. . . . A majority of American editors reached in this inquiry believe the American press is doing a good job in the presentation of foreign news. News agency executives are reluctant to assess the job being done by the newspapers; generally however they believe the job is adequate. Foreign correspondents analyzing the picture of their own countries in the American press find that picture either inadequate or unbalanced or both."

That is a masterpiece of objective reporting of the attitudes found. But what does it tell you compared to the response you would get from any out-of-town reader who has experienced the pangs of famine during the first week of strike on the *New York Times*?

"In gathering the arguments the Institute has merely served as a channel for an exchange of views." That is the key to the report. Fair enough. Whether it is worth \$250,000 Mr. Hutchins will have to say. This time it was his role to provide the money. The material is all here for anyone who wants to carry the argument further. Those who do are invited to hire their own hall.

The Associated Press delivers about 22,000 words a day from abroad. This is five times as much as the average client
(Continued on Page 48)

Nieman Reports

VOL. VIII, NO. 1

JANUARY, 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 Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, New York City; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

FOLLOW THROUGH-That Is the Newspaper Answer to Secrecy in Government, Says a Crusading Correspondent

by Clark Mollenhoff

"Things don't happen, somebody makes them happen." That was a favorite quotation of the late Gardner Cowles, sr., who for so long was publisher of the Des Moines *Register and Tribune*.

It is a slogan that is particularly applicable to our problem of maintaining freedom of information in our work with government. We can't be content to report what happened. We can't be satisfied with a glowing little high minded series on the ills of government. We've got to follow through with the same drive and tenacity that characterizes those who would make the government their own private plaything.

My own campaigning against secrecy in public business has been based on these convictions:

1. Secret meetings breed corruption and favoritism.
2. Public officials have no right to treat public business as their private property.
3. Big government is making the secrecy problem more acute, and presents a real threat to democracy if current trends continue.
4. Newspapermen can do something about it if we really cover the news, and are not content to pick up the crumbs that public officials want to give us in handouts.

The real answer to the whole problem is "follow through." When we get a lead that indicates that something is wrong in government we've got to press the problem through to a conclusion.

Freedom to inspect public records is the most important freedom we have. Without this freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and even democracy itself, become meaningless.

What can freedom of speech mean in the political world if one party becomes so entrenched that it can hide its record behind "confidential" labels? It is impossible for a truly informed opposition to exist.

What does freedom of the press mean if locked doors, executive sessions, and confidential records make the facts unavailable? Such secrecy makes the press dependent upon

Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles publications, had his first contacts with government closed doors as a reporter in Des Moines. His methods of opening doors have worked also in Washington, where he received the 1952 Sigma Delta Chi award for Washington correspondence. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1949-50.

He presented this before the Iowa Radio Press Association at the State University of Iowa last September.

the mouthings of partisan politicians, who may be informed, but as often as not shoot from the hip with few facts to back their case.

When secrecy makes it impossible to get information for independent reflection or informed criticism, at that point democracy is operating in a vacuum of misinformation, half information and pure propaganda.

This throttling of democracy is taking place today in all levels of government. It is taking place in the executive sessions of school boards, the confidential reports of city officials, and in the secret sessions of state legislative groups. There are few federal agencies where the press and public are entitled to walk in and inspect original records.

Some of the encroachments upon freedom of the press have been with us for years. Others have come as the federal government has grown in the last twenty years, spreading the veil of secrecy over state and local agencies through grants in aid programs.

Usually the lid is clamped on an agency in the name of justice to the recipients of government aid, or on the theory that closed meetings promote more orderly government. Sometimes it is conscientiously done. Often it is done to hide corruption, favoritism and influence.

Regardless of the reason, we should be against it.

Our general view must always be that the public's business must be public. It should never be necessary for us to prove why we are entitled to examine government records. The burden of proof should always be on the officials to prove clearly and conclusively why we should not have it because of some overriding public interest.

We all recognize the needs of military security, but we also recognize that this argument is far overdone. We also realize that statutory secrecy—as in the case of income tax returns—must be accepted unless we're prepared to crusade for a change in the law. But our main concern is with the arbitrary decisions of public officials who treat records as private property.

We are also concerned with regulatory bodies that write secrecy into their regulations, or even without changing the regulations interpret them as barring the press and the public.

One objection isn't enough—it must be a stubborn resistance that uses every facility available.

Some may ask: "Why all the big fuss about secrecy in government?"

It is a fair question. Many people, even in the field of news and radio, just are not thrown in contact with the basic problem enough to see the full danger. Most public officials will give out information enough if its favorable propaganda you're putting out. When you want facts that may embarrass him, the same official is likely to declare his records unavailable.

My experience indicates that when records are secret there is usually something to hide. In the Truman administration, it was secrecy that bred the corruption in the R.F.C., the maritime commission, the five percenters scandals, and the tax scandals.

The same was true in the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration. Secret contracts on oil leases allowed the Secretary of Interior to engage in a "give away" of naval oil reserves at a fat profit to his personal account.

I will use the R.F.C. as a typical example of the details of how secrecy corrupts.

The deals made by the Truman gang in the R.F.C. were a result of a hush-hush policy that allowed political favorites to pull strings for big loans. These loans were given to favored firms, often without adequate security, and sometimes after a field office had said it was not sound policy for the government to grant the loans.

Until a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator J. William Fulbright went to work, the R.F.C. scandals appeared to have been adequately covered up from the public.

Under the policy at that time, it was impossible to learn even if a firm had filed an application for a loan. Months after the R.F.C. had acted, there was public notice that a loan had been granted but that was all. The R.F.C. would not comment on the amount of security, who represented the borrower, or whether the loan had been recommended by the field office.

The Truman administration did not bring the secrecy to the R.F.C. Jesse Jones, a Texas banker who ran R.F.C., is credited with injecting much of the secrecy in the early days of the agency. He treated it like a private bank, but he apparently watched it like his own money.

No scandals developed under Jones, but the convenient closed door policy was too much of a temptation when the Missouri gang assumed control of the back door of the agency.

The press was helpless to penetrate this agency when rumors of the favoritism went around. It took a congressional inquiry to dig out the story.

It should not be necessary for the press to wait for a congressional inquiry to produce the records of a government board. Congressional committees are too unpredictable to be depended upon to do an impartial or thorough job. The chairman is too often influenced by the way the investigation may hurt his own party.

The R.F.C. case should demonstrate why we should op-

pose secrecy in government even when the agency is administered by honest men.

Congressional Inquiries and Freedom of Information

The controversial subject of congressional investigations has both a pro and con as far as freedom of information is concerned.

First, these inquiries have helped a great deal in opening up channels of information by focusing attention on the corruption.

But, these inquiries are too often prompted by political motives and fail to follow through and really bring the facts into the open as a basis for a changed policy. Many congressmen are just as happy to have the facts buried to everyone except executive agencies, and a congressional committee.

Excessive charges, and even abuse of witnesses before these agencies often frighten government employees to the point where they are afraid to talk to reporters.

The overtones of politics are often so strong in the inquiry that a normally forthright bureaucrat feels justified in trying to hide the records.

I am sympathetic with any senator or congressman who is denied information by an executive agency. Their problem, in this respect, is our problem. I can understand the rage they feel, and the determination they have to break the barriers of secrecy and bring the facts into the open.

It is particularly infuriating when a bureaucrat—or even the President—charges a newspaper or congressional leader with "untruths" for presenting half the facts, but refuses to reveal the other facts with some far-fetched reasoning as to why the records are confidential.

This is not a defense of excesses in congressional hearings. It is merely an explanation that through arbitrary and unjustified secrecy, the executive agencies often ask for the troubles they get from Congress.

There have been some improvements in the freedom of information picture with the Eisenhower administration. But, don't get the idea that a business man's administration will necessarily be any better than the Democrats' over a long period of time.

Eisenhower has removed the security order instituted by Truman in 1951 that gave civilian agencies broad power to use military classification.

Remember that President Eisenhower didn't make the move to lift this censorship until the press pointed a gun at him, and called attention to his campaign promises. I attribute this action more to the good judgment of Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell, than to the interest of the White House aides in open government. The new order may not be perfect but it is less restrictive. In the end it will be the follow through of the press that determines how well it is administered.

I should point out that the cabinet members of the new administration have been little better than the past administration at holding press conferences. Mrs. Hobby had one. She has skillfully avoided Congress on a couple of touchy subjects, and refuses to have any direct contact with the press.

By contrast, Brownell and Humphrey have been available and appear to have a firm belief in the public's right to know what is going on in government.

The true test of the new administration will take time. As more attempted four-percenters show up we will see whether the administration opens up, or covers up the tracks.

I am concerned today about the proportion of the federal budget that is spent behind closed doors. There is the \$43 billion going for the military with a sizable chunk of it going in the so-called "negotiated" contracts.

The Atomic Energy Commission has been pouring out billions for years, with no real public accounting. Scientists and politicians alike are already questioning the wisdom of all the secrecy around our atomic program. Apparently the only people this secrecy is fooling is the American people.

Perhaps military security demands this secrecy. But, right or wrong, it is certain to develop corruption as it always has.

Freedom of information is important, not just as an idealistic theme for news conventions, but as an everyday problem. Newspapermen should resist every effort to hide government business. Insist on the reasons. Document the case. Follow through.

A Campaign that Got Results

For a case study, let me report the conditions as I found them in the Bureau of Internal Revenue:

1. Hearings on federal basic permits to wholesale liquor and beer were secret. Even the application was secret. This secrecy went so far as to cover the names of the attorneys for the applicant, and rulings by the Washington and field office. One little scrap of information was available on the issuance of these valuable licenses: the fact that a license had been issued to a certain firm. It wasn't even possible to find out who the parties in interest were.

2. Compromises of big income tax cases were made in secret. A \$500,000 case would be settled for as little as 10 cents on the dollar with no public explanation. The same was true of compromises of the federal liquor laws. Criminal liability was also settled for a fee, and without explanation.

3. Applications for tax-free status were secret. Tax-exempt organizations were not obliged to file public returns, or justify themselves to the public and about the only way

abuses were ever turned up in this field was by informers.

In the Justice department there was similar secrecy.

The compromise settlements of criminal violations were secret.

Paroles and pardons were granted without a public announcement, and the names of those sponsoring pardons were regarded as confidential.

The discovery that compromise settlements were secret, and that paroles and pardons were granted in a hush-hush atmosphere, was not a new discovery. Congressional hearings on some Chicago gangsters—Guzik, Accardo and other members of the Capone mob—had revealed this corrupting secrecy in 1948.

But, the emphasis was on the paroles, and the headlines played big names and big cash. If anyone noticed how secrecy had made favoritism possible, it was quickly forgotten. Nothing was done about it. There had been no follow through.

The secrecy of the Alcohol Tax Unit hearings had been bothering me for a long time. At first it bothered me only because I resented any regulations that stood in the way of documenting a story from government records.

Later, I came to the conclusion that there was something sinister and unholy about such secrecy. As I probed around the outside gathering facts, I learned that in the case in which I was interested secrecy was covering up:

1. Perjured testimony.

2. The pressure brought against licensing officials.

3. The names of politically prominent attorneys who entered the case when it was apparent an appeal to Washington was going to be necessary to overrule a conscientious field officer.

4. A licensing procedure—granting of a government permit—something that should have been open to the public even if every act was honest.

It took time to arrive at that conclusion, but with it firmly in mind the documentation for the evils came a little easier. Part of it was in my own experience in the Lew Farrell case, which had been in part exposed through the Kefauver committee. Other scraps of it were available in old hearings, and in the income tax scandal hearings of the King subcommittee.

The most comprehensive story on the A.T.U. secrecy was printed in Des Moines in November, 1951. Use of the story by other papers gave impetus to the crusades. Other papers using that story included the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, the Albany *Knickerbocker News* and the Gannett chain, plus our sister paper the Minneapolis *Star and Tribune*.

The facts showed that in addition to the secrecy in the licensing, some A.T.U. officials were using the whole liquor control law quietly to club the liquor industry into big political contributions, or, to force liquor interests to buy

supplies through business in which liquor law officials had an interest. The notable example was James B. E. Olson of New York. Another was Dan Connerty, of Chicago. Connerty has not been fully unveiled by Congress, but he resigned after a couple of stories on his record were printed in Des Moines and Minneapolis.

The stories on A.T.U. secrecy received immediate support in Congress. Commissioner of Internal Revenue John B. Dunlap was also sympathetic, but bureaucracy doesn't change fast, and he had a lot of red tape to unravel.

James A. Pope, the managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, gave me a few words of encouragement and our own editors in Minneapolis and Des Moines said the job of forcing a change seemed worth doing.

Pope was chairman of the freedom of information section for the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I asked for help from him, and I certainly got it.

Commissioner Dunlap had started the ball rolling to investigate the possibility of opening up the A.T.U. That wasn't enough, because I had need for the names of attorneys who had represented a beer wholesaler in an application. I wrote my story, mailed a copy to Pope with a letter explaining why I thought something should be done about it. I also took the problem to Senator Kefauver, Senator Fulbright and Representative Byrnes, of Wisconsin. Their comments helped me jar loose the names, and change the policy on that one small phase.

By February, the Des Moines University of Lawonomy operation had come to my attention. That so-called school obtained tax-exempt status as an educational institution and then used that status to buy up war surplus machine tools and make a \$150,000 killing.

Because of secrecy policies, I couldn't see the application of the Des Moines University of Lawonomy, and could get no official comment from the bureau on the institution. Through unofficial sources, I got enough information to break the first stories. George Mills collaborated with me on later stories, and the whole affair erupted in a congressional investigation.

I wrote James Pope about this, and asked for help in the form of some letters to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury.

In April, he came to Washington for the ASNE convention. I told him my ideas on a full-scale attack on secrecy in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and he was agreeable to the program.

In a letter to him I set out the three fields for work:

1. The A.T.U. hearings.
2. The compromise settlements.
3. The tax-free institutions.

No mention was made of the Justice department problem in that letter, and it wasn't brought up until later in the fall.

From that Washington meeting, we worked like a team. I fired stories aimed at pointing up unjustified secrecy, and Pope fired letters at the Secretary of Treasury, at Dunlap and at members of Congress. Sometimes his letters were diplomatic, sometimes they were blunt demands. The timing was perfect. Things started happening.

In May, the Des Moines University lost its tax-exempt status and Dunlap said the bureau was going to work on plans to bring the whole tax-exempt field into the open.

In June, a Treasury department regulation was issued declaring that all hearings before the A.T.U. must be open, and that all records on the application must be public including any letters from Washington overruling the field.

In August, a Presidential executive order opened the compromise tax settlement of the bureau to public inspection.

It was basically the program we had agreed upon. But as I later learned, each of these successes had to be pinned down more and it is apparent that it will be some months before it is all open.

Dunlap's often-stated assurance of public inspection for tax-free institution records hasn't been written into the regulations yet. It is delayed in the dozens of reviews and debates that accompany any change in big bureaucracy.

There was some fussing over the question of whether the compromise settlements that are public include compromises of liquor tax law violations.

Although the hearings of the A.T.U. were declared open, a bureaucrat at St. Paul insisted on secrecy for the docket that merely states the names of the cases and the dates.

State and Local Problems of Secrecy

As difficult as the job of changing a big federal agency, is the job of pulling the facts out of the tangle of federal-state-local control in such grant-in-aid programs as are administered through our welfare departments.

A few years back, I developed a story of mismanagement in the real estate division of the Polk county welfare department. The department records were secret, but through probate records and other documents it was possible to prove this situation:

When the home of an old age recipient reverted to the county, the son of the head of the county welfare real estate division lived in it free for several years and then bought it at a bargain when the real estate market hit a peak in the post war years.

The story resulted in the head of the real estate division being fired. But, when I asked to review other real estate sales, I was told those sales were confidential on orders from the state board. The state board confirmed this fact, but blamed the secrecy of the Federal Security Agency in Washington. Months after the problem had passed, I learned from federal officials that here was no such secrecy imposed on real estate sales by welfare departments.

I did not follow through that time. By the time I had learned what I needed to know, the work was no longer in my field of coverage.

Honest day-by-day coverage is the best insurance against secrecy.

We cannot expect governmental officials or pressure groups to keep government business out in the open. They will keep it out in the open only as it suits their own purposes. Those purposes are not necessarily in the interests of good clean government.

Freedom of information is our job as newspapermen.

It is a full-time job. It is a tough job.

The press and radio have been asleep on this subject for a good many years. City councils and school boards have held their secret sessions without a peep from local newsmen. County supervisors have gotten by with operations that amounted to treating the government's business as if it were a private enterprise. State legislative groups have closed the door to news coverage. The federal government has pulled the curtain in so many operations it would be impossible to enumerate them all.

They've got by with it as a result of a number of things, including incompetence, laziness and unconcern on the part of newsmen themselves.

We are in no position to complain about the secret actions of public officials if we knew the door was closed and made no verbal protests, wrote no stories about it, and failed to comment on it editorially.

What right have we to scold about executive sessions of a school board if we have been too lazy to attend the meetings, and contented ourselves with a "fill in" from the chairman after it was all over.

By the same token, we might as well have closed the door for a governmental body if we are covering public meetings but are incompetent to comprehend and interpret what is going on before our eyes.

In the past there was too much of an inclination to accept news suppression policies without raising too much fuss unless there was a particularly hot story connected with it.

The fact that an agency "has always done it that way" has been allowed to ride as a full explanation.

Sharp public officials know our weaknesses better than we do. When the pressure is on for some information, they often throw us a few crumbs for which we express thanks, but the secrecy policies remain entrenched. We do not follow through. Hot after tomorrow's headlines, we of the press are too much inclined to forget yesterday's problem until some new lead results in our bumping our noses against the same old closed doors.

Whether we are operating on a city, county, state or federal level, we must take the position with regard to governmental business that we are entitled to all the facts unless it can be proven for good cause why we should not have them.

Harvard's Independence

President Nathan Marsh Pusey of Harvard University has made a temperate, reasoned and dignified reply to Senator McCarthy's inquiry as to his attitude "toward retaining teachers who refuse to state whether they are Communists . . ." The question was offensive on two counts: it amounted to an intrusion by the Senator into an area respecting which he has neither jurisdiction nor competence; and it was couched in terms which, like other references to Harvard by the Senator, were intended as a slur on the university's good name.

Nevertheless, Dr. Pusey said patiently that he is in full agreement with the opinion publicly stated by his predecessor and the Harvard Corporation that a member of the Communist Party is not fit to be on the faculty because he has not the necessary

independence of thought and judgment. He also said that he deplores use of the Fifth Amendment but does not regard use of this constitutional safeguard as a confession of guilt. "I am not aware," said Dr. Pusey, "that there is any person among the 3000 members of the Harvard faculty who is a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. McCarthy wants Harvard to dismiss Dr. Wendell C. Furry, a physicist on the Harvard faculty who took refuge in the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer certain questions put to him by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as well as by Senator McCarthy's subcommittee. Dr. Furry had been severely censured by the corporation and placed on probation for three years. Wisely, Dr. Pusey told the Senator that "since there are con-

fliting reports of what Dr. Furry said before your committee at the private session and since you have not made the complete testimony public, I am quite unable to comment on the significance of his latest refusal to answer questions, nor can I say whether any further action will be taken by us concerning Dr. Furry."

Harvard has an obligation in this situation not only to its own students, faculty and alumni but also to the whole great tradition of academic freedom. It cannot permit its personnel policies to be determined by a senatorial subcommittee; it cannot allow Senator McCarthy to drive a teacher from its faculty. Harvard's independence is the touchstone of its status as an institution of learning.

Washington Post, November 11.

Opening Up City Hall

Press Access Won in Springfield, Mass.

by Avrom N. Romm

A victory for the principle of press freedom was won in Springfield, Massachusetts, late in 1953. After a calm crusade by the Springfield *Union*, supported by the *Daily News*, the City Council on November 23 unanimously passed an ordinance requiring 24-hour advance notice, agenda and public meetings by the 13 boards, committees and commissions created by the city government. Later the council petitioned the General Court in Boston to enact supplementary legislation unlocking the doors of the 15 committees established by state law.

All but five of the 28 standing committees had already opened their meeting doors, largely because of a recent news-editorial presentation and a behind-the-scenes drive by the *Union* to convince the individual committees of the merits of public conduct of the public's business. One of the groups that opened its meetings was the Municipal Hospital's board of trustees. The policy of open board meetings appears to be the exception rather than the rule—even in public hospitals.

What led to the *Union's* campaign was not glaring evidence or even suspicion of star chamber wrongdoing so much as a desire to set standard rules for all committees. Prior to the two-pronged campaign, educational and legislative, only a handful of boards had open meetings, with widely varying rules. Most committees had been sequestered by choice or by failure of the press to cover them.

The local ordinance, which makes law of the new precedent, was sponsored by Councilman William S. Beecher, Jr., and represents the joint effort of Beecher, City Solicitor Charles D. Sloan and this reporter. It reads:

"Boards, commissions, committees, all hearings open to the public. All meetings of every board, commission or committee established or created by the city council, shall be open to the public and the press unless such board, commission or committee, by a two-thirds vote of the members present, votes to go into executive session. 'Executive session' shall mean a discussion or deliberation of those matters which by statute or ordinance cannot be made public and those matters which would adversely affect the public security, the financial interests of the city or the reputation of any employee or citizen thereof, if made public.

"Except in an emergency no meeting of any such board,

commission or committee shall be held unless a notice of such meeting, together with an agenda of tentative matters to be acted upon at such meeting, has been filed with the city clerk at least 24 hours prior to the time of such meeting."

This supplements Article I, Section 8 of the city's present charter, where is found the only other reference to open meetings. The last sentence of this section reads: "All sittings of the mayor and aldermen, and of the common council, shall be public, when they are not engaged in executive business."

While every vote or action by a committee must now be publicly taken, the ordinance allows ample provision for private, informal discussion by boards of such matters as: a specific welfare case, where state law prohibits even publication of the recipient's name; a threatened epidemic, where premature stories might cause unnecessary public alarm; claims or contract negotiations, where the city might suffer financially from, say, disclosure of the city's bargaining position; a rumored violation by a city employee, where it is yet to be decided whether or not to bring formal charges or to invoke disciplinary measures.

Another justifiable occasion for closed committee discussion was not cited in the ordinance but would probably be upheld by any court: the right of the License Commission, Committee on Claims or Planning Board to deliberate privately after a public hearing and before announcing its decision.

Oddly enough, the hardest part of the ordinance to sell was the provision for an agenda and for advance notice to be filed with the city clerk at least 24 hours before a meeting. Very few committees did have their agenda completed that far in advance. But that requirement, first deleted by the Board of Aldermen, was reinstated in spite of a ruling by the city solicitor that the agenda would restrict the actions (not the discussions) of a committee except in an emergency. Intent of the sponsor was to leave the agenda "tentative" until meeting time but the solicitor ruled that the Traffic Commission, for instance, could talk about anything it wants, but could *act* only on agenda items. The aldermen were prevailed on to restore the agenda and advance notice section when the sponsor and the *Union* argued that the open meeting ordinance would be ineffectual unless the public knew in advance that a meeting was scheduled. The section was designed to prevent "quickie" meetings. The exception allowed for unscheduled "emer-

As city hall reporter on the Springfield (Mass.) *Union*, Avrom N. Romm had a key part in the reform he describes that has opened the sessions of public boards.

gency" meetings is well limited by the legal definition of "emergency" as an unexpected occurrence requiring immediate action. Committees cannot thwart the spirit of the ordinance by having numerous impromptu "emergency" meetings unless a genuine emergency arises, such as a pipeline break.

Prior to the open meeting campaign most meetings were closed to the press and the chairmen of these would seldom give an adequate report after the meeting. The handful of committees we were allowed to cover had different "rules." In the Personnel Commission, for instance, remarks of five of the seven members could be attributed to the speaker; not the other two. In all groups, an "off-the-record" injunction meant that a reporter couldn't quote the remark, no matter how the phrase was used or misused. Too often the phrase "off-the-record" was used by a speaker as meaning, "I'm not exactly sure this is true," instead of, "This is a fact but I am not authorized to reveal it publicly." Most of the business done in committee eventually came to the City Council for final action. But six of the seven contract-awarding committees were closed. One of these, the Water Commission, seldom announced its contract awards and this board has the power to award without public bidding. Other groups, such as the Public Health Council and Springfield Housing Authority, can enact rules and regulations that do not require subsequent council approval. Some committees would not, even if asked, issue reports until days after a meeting. One committee that was open allowed this reporter to sit through a stormy, one-hour session and afterwards voted to have the whole meeting "off-the-record!" The city editor ran the full story anyway, including the attempted restraint. But it took months for the board members to see that the after-the-fact injunction was improper. Once points like this were explained privately and highlighted in newspaper stories, most board members understood their responsibilities as servants of the public.

When the writer became full-time City Hall reporter late in 1952, it seemed important to extend the open meeting principle beyond its uncertain foothold. To set precedent that might be broadened later, I was willing to attend on any terms: check everything with the chairman prior to publication, operate on a "trial" basis. Anything to avoid the hollow after-meeting report: "Only routine matters were discussed." These efforts were of no avail. Managing editors of both the *Union* and the *Daily News* sent letters to two of the most important closed committees, the Finance Committee and Board of Supervisors (in charge of street department policy), urging them to open their doors to responsible coverage. Both committees politely declined.

In guarding their psychic perquisite, the distinction of meeting in private, board members gave many reasons. Only one had some validity: that politicians might speak

and vote differently if they were conscious of a reporter's presence. This objection was partly taken care of in the ordinance section that allows private discussion of certain matters. Other, less rational objections voiced privately: "Other reporters seemed able to get enough news." "Do you think we're doing something wrong?" "Why pick on us?"

With a city election coming up, the time appeared ripe to make a public issue of the closed-meeting problem. Among the material included in a series of four frontpage articles that appeared early in September: solicited quotations on the subject by the mayor, mayoral candidates, former mayors and civic leaders; the open meeting situation in Providence (worse than Springfield), Boston and Worcester (far better); a report on the credo, "all the news of government belongs by right to the people," of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' committee headed by James S. Pope of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*.

The timing of the series to coincide with the election campaign probably is what produced such satisfactory results. The mayor, who had a few months earlier—in written response to the request of the managing editors—opposed opening Finance Committee meetings, became, for the public record, a staunch proponent of open meetings. He promptly opened up the Finance Committee and his re-election indicated continuation of the policy even before the ordinance guaranteeing it was passed. Some committees decided that they had never been closed. (Many of them really had barred the press, but we didn't labor the point.) Others, who never had been asked to open their doors, did so when specifically requested.

Councilman Beecher concurrently submitted his ordinance which hit a snag on the agenda provision in the Board of Aldermen. By this time Harold L. Cross' book, *The People's Right to Know*, had come into the newspaper office. An editorial, drawing on facts Cross had gathered, prevailed on the aldermen to quit quibbling and enact the ordinance as drawn.

By the time the ordinance went through its final legislative step, all but five of the 28 committees had voluntarily opened their doors to press and public or, in some cases, to the press only, as representative of the public. The public, unfortunately, hasn't exercised its right to attend, but the ordinance phrase, "the public and the press," serves to prevent a board from barring a particular reporter whose writing doesn't suit its tastes.

Passage of the ordinance opened up two of the remaining five: the Police and Fire Commissions. Of the three left, the Park Commission is still "considering" the *Union's* request to attend; the Board of Public Welfare has voted for the principle of open meetings but is determining its legal position in view of the state law restricting publica-

tion of the names of welfare recipients. The Retirement Board has voted to keep its meetings closed. The state legislation, sponsored by Councilmen Beecher and Gerald F. McCormick, would open these three boards. Passage of the state legislation, coupled with the local law, would insure that future generations of politicians do not revert to the closed door policy that this generation has voluntarily abandoned.

At present, the new policy means extra work for City Hall

reporters. On some nights it takes two reporters to cover concurrent meetings. Some minor boards remain uncovered on occasion. But public officials are learning that reporters are as interested in covering their significant actions as in reporting controversy. And the Springfield newspapers can do a more informed job at City Hall by fomenting public discussion at what James Reston calls the "exploratory stage," by reporting the issues as they develop, not after they become set policy or law.

"Eyeshades in the Ivy --- the Nieman Fellowships"

by Calvin W. Mayne

Rochester *Times-Union*

Vic Jones has been kind enough to ask me to report to Gannett editors on my nine months at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow. It was a remarkable and extremely worthwhile experience for me, but these personal benefits are probably of little interest to you except as a guide in evaluating the program. Therefore I shall attempt especially to give you something of an idea of what the Nieman program is, what it is not, and what benefit it might be to the newspapers you represent. For I hope that as the first Nieman Fellow from the Gannett group, I shall have the pleasure of seeing a large number of others from the group making the Cambridge trek in the years to come.

The Nieman Fellowships were established back in 1937, when Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of the late publisher of the *Milwaukee Journal*, left about \$1,400,000 to Harvard. The purpose of the bequest, she said in her will, was "to promote and elevate standards of journalism in the United States and educate persons deemed especially qualified for journalism."

I am told that authorities at Harvard had considerable difficulty deciding what to do with this unexpected windfall. Some persons suggested the establishment of a journalism school, an idea which President Conant for various reasons rejected. Others suggested that the money be used to sponsor specific bits of research.

The format of the Nieman program, which is pretty much preserved today, was established the following year, 1938. Harvard made it known that working newspapermen were sought to come to Harvard for nine months to wander unimpeded through the rich resources of the University in search of knowledge.

Calvin Mayne held a Nieman Fellowship last year from the *Rochester Times-Union* and gave this report on it by request to the annual Fall conference of the editors of the Gannett Newspapers at Rochester, Oct. 26, 1953.

Harvard was much concerned about the number of applicants, fearing that only a meager number would respond to the opportunity. They needn't have worried—309 newspapermen applied. Nine were selected by Harvard officials, and the Nieman program started with such men as Irving Dilliard of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Ed Lahey of the *Chicago Daily News* and Louis Lyons, then in the *Boston Globe*, in the first class. Archibald MacLeish was in charge of the program at Harvard, before he went to Washington to run the Library of Congress. Louis M. Lyons has been since 1939.

The Nieman program has been an increasingly important part of the Harvard scene ever since. For some years now three newspaper executives have been appointed each year to help Harvard officials select the Nieman Fellows. Paul Miller of the Gannett papers and Ralph McGill of the *Atlanta Constitution* were two of the three newspapermen who so served last year.

With about 100 applications received each year for a dozen places, getting to be a Nieman Fellow is no easy task. That statement is hardly a modest one, but I am trying today to give you something of an accurate review of this procedure. First and most important, I think, the applicant must have a compelling desire to go to Harvard as a Nieman Fellow. This must make itself apparent to the selecting committee, both in the written application and in the personal interview that generally follows at some central location. Variety is not encouraged in one's reason for becoming a Nieman Fellow. Most applicants say they are interested in politics or diplomacy or the affairs of a foreign land or local government or some such common field of study. I myself said I wanted to study local government, which was true since I have been working in that field during most of my three years at the *Times-Union*, but I have been told that there was no novelty in my application. Apparently I convinced the committee that

it might be a good idea to let me come to Harvard for a year.

The same procedure appears to be true with Harry Schmeck, the Rochester *Times-Union* science writer who is a Nieman Fellow this year and the Gannett Group's second. There were three science writers who applied this year for Nieman Fellowships. Paul Miller could perhaps tell better why Harry won—although I must hasten to add that Miller removed himself from the deliberations on Schmeck—but my understanding is that Harry showed good newspaper work in the past, promise of good newspaper work in the future and considerable evidence of a desire to put his time at Harvard to good advantage.

I might add that there is no discrimination as to race, creed, color, politics or sex among the Niemans. My own class of 12 newspapermen included a Negro. There is a woman this year, and there have been many Jews and Catholics among the 195 Niemans who have spent those idyllic months in the Harvard Yard.

Although my main purpose in going to Harvard was to study the workings of local government in the United States, I by no means spent all my time in that pursuit. One's first impulse is to romp through the Harvard catalogue like a little boy in an orchard of green apples. But one soon finds that the bewildering array of classes is likely to result in an intellectual stomach-ache. Sooner or later, I settled down to solid courses in American history under such men as Arthur Schlesinger, Senior and Junior, and Samuel Eliot Morison, that greatest of all colonial historians. I also picked up important chunks of information about Russia, constitutional law, anthropology and other assorted subjects.

I spent a lot of time at Harvard's Littauer Center, trying to make some sense out of the jumble that is local government in the United States. I did some writing there, landing a piece in *Nation's Business* toward the end of the year.

I cite my own Harvard work as pretty much typical of the other Niemans. Most everybody tries to write and sell one or more magazine pieces during the year, and two or three of us succeeded. All of us read a great deal, as well—I suppose I got 50 books under my belt during the year, and found I generally worked a great deal harder than if I had been at my newspaper.

Perhaps the greatest permanent value of the Nieman year lies in the contacts made with other Niemans and with the visiting firemen who constantly turn up at Harvard. My own class contained newspapermen from Oregon to Rhode Island, from California to Georgia. There were two men from the wire services, a foreign correspondent—Keyes Beech of the Chicago *Daily News Service*—and various reporters, copy readers and even a managing editor. Three men from British Commonwealth nations were at

Harvard under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation in a program fortunately continued this year. For all practical purposes Nieman Fellows, these men were from New Zealand, Australia and Canada. Average age of the Niemans was about 30, with 40 the upper limit for application. Most were married.

The Niemans spend a good deal of time together, in their classes, at the Nieman office, in pool halls and on golf courses and at innumerable cocktail parties during the year. Since the Nieman Foundation pays our tuition and fees and gives us our regular newspaper salaries besides, the year has no serious financial difficulties. The opportunities for recreation, both of the indoor and outdoor variety, are abundant in Cambridge, Boston and New England.

The visiting firemen were either newspapermen of almost uniform high caliber or Harvard professors. We heard these gentlemen in either beer-and-cheese seminars or at bi-weekly dinners. A partial list shows their quality, I think—President Conant, George Weller, Scotty Reston, Bernard De Voto, Archibald Cox, Frank Rounds, Kenneth Galbraith, Christopher Rand, Tillman Durdin, Irving Dilliard, Paul Miller, Turner Catledge, Frank Starzel, Cyrus Ching, Eugene Duffield and Joseph Herzberg.

In addition, the Nieman Foundation financed three side trips. These included tours of the United Nations and the New York *Times*, where we had dinner with Arthur Sulzberger and the other greats of that newspaper, and a tour "down to Maine" as New Englanders say to hear Jim Pope of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* expound on freedom of information. We also had a Boston busman's holiday at the *Christian Science Monitor*.

The contact with these men has given me, I think, a pretty good idea of what the basic ingredients of a superior newspaperman are in these days. They add up, it seems to me, in modern times to the same total that marked the careers of great men in journalism since Peter Zenger kicked up a fuss down in New York City. These are qualities of fierce independence, sensitivity to readers' tastes, intelligent use of modern techniques, wide background, and strict attention to honesty and accuracy. One doesn't have to go to Harvard to learn this, of course, but the contact with these distinguished men of journalism has helped me in this regard. It probably helps other Niemans too.

As for Harvard itself, it is of course the oldest of American universities and has a proud place to fill. It has an abiding conservatism as the old and proud guardian of more than three hundred years of American educational tradition. It has also within it a daring radicalism, at times bordering on Marxism but generally simply an exploration of the outer reaches of American political thought. But I found, outside of a negligible number of politically per-

verted professors turned up by Congressional committees, no important tendencies toward Communism, either among Faculty or students.

The Harvard students I found to be about like students everywhere, only wealthier. They lack contact with depression years and so generally accept America as a prosperous nation as a matter of course. They are all of course conscious of impending military service, but they seem to accept that as an inevitable, if unwelcome, part of life. Their chief interests are studies, women, beer, and athletics: the order of interest depends on the student. This puts them about at a par with college students everywhere.

Well, what effect does the Nieman year have on the newspaperman once he has turned his ivy back in for his eyeshade? Some of the Niemans have turned out to be eminently successful in American journalism—men like Hodding Carter, Thomas Sancton, Ernie Hill, Irving Dilliard, Ed Lahey, Victor Jones, Bill Townes, Tillman Durdin and George Weller. These men might have become just as successful without Nieman Fellowships, but few of them have ever said that the year at Harvard failed to assist their advance in some way.

A minority of the Niemans have left the newspaper business and have achieved success in somewhat related fields. Bud Guthrie writes best-selling books, and John Crider does editorials for *Life*, for instance. A few are with *Time* Magazine, and others have drifted into public relations or similar work. Yet I think the number who have departed from newspaper journalism is no larger than the proportion who have done the same *without* being Nieman Fellows.

There is an increasing emphasis at Harvard that the Nieman program is a *newspaper* program, and not just a stepping-stone to some other field, or even to some other newspaper. All of last year's Niemans except one are back with the same employers they had when they left for Har-

vard. I think this is a healthy thing—a Nieman has the right to progress to bigger or better papers, if he chooses, of course, as does any other newspaper man; but the Nieman's employer has something of an investment in him, if only in the inconvenience of replacing him while he is gone. The employer should not lose that investment unless he proves unworthy in other respects.

Many people have asked me since I've returned: "What did you get out of Harvard?" That's a hard one to answer—education is an intangible thing, and one who studies local government and American history will hardly find it paying immediate dividends in bright ideas and little kernels of information ready for immediate dispensing to the newspaper reader.

Rather there is a general quality about the Nieman program which the Nieman, if he chooses, can absorb and then reflect upon his return. The books under his belt, the talks with other newspapermen, the ideas for better things in the future in his personal work and his role on the newspaper—these will all pay off in days to come, I hope.

A Nieman Fellowship gives a reporter a chance to expand his usefulness to his newspaper by bringing a broader range of knowledge and background to his job. If his editor can channel this education into more complete and responsible coverage for the reader, I think the editor can reap a profit from the Nieman program as well.

I hope other editors in the Gannett group will encourage their reporters who may be qualified to apply for Nieman Fellowships. This is necessary, since a newspaperman must have his editors' support in order to apply. Since having a Nieman Fellow doesn't cost a newspaper one penny for the year, there is probably a great deal to gain and not very much to lose. I think there is some prestige for a newspaper involved in having a Nieman at Harvard, or so I've been told. It is a means of obtaining better-educated, more responsible reporters, and certainly this is a goal of all the Gannett newspapers.

The Press and the Bill of Rights

The Challenge of the Second Lovejoy Lecture

by Irving Dilliard

This is but the second year of the Lovejoy lectureship. I am sure that as the years pass, the vast difference between the Lovejoy ideal for freedom of the press and the practice of journalism as it has developed in the United States will become only too evident. Perhaps this annual reminder of Lovejoy's unshakable devotion to untrammelled conscience and an unfettered press will cause some editors and publishers to stop and look where they are taking American journalism. Elijah Lovejoy's steadfast courage in the face of death makes his present-day successors in journalism a generally timid lot indeed.

The name of Elijah Parish Lovejoy was one of the first I came to know in the history of our country. I am sure that I had not yet started to school when I heard it from my mother who had gone to Monticello College, near Alton, Ill., and it was in Alton, as you know, that Lovejoy on November 7, 1837—116 years ago—became the first martyr to freedom of the press in the United States. My mother told me the story of the brave young editor who believed the slaves should be free and who went to his death rather than change his conviction. She told me how he was shot and killed as he defended his printing press from a mob. She told me that this happened only 25 miles from where we lived in the very same county of Madison. It was an exciting story with a very sad ending when I first heard it and as I think about it tonight it is even more thrilling and more moving now.

It is against this background—against this heroic chapter in American history—that I want us to consider some aspects of our journalism today. Let us see how far short we are of Lovejoy's ideal of a fearless and untrammelled press.

This means that I must criticize the profession which is my life work. It means that I must protest when I would much rather praise. But the very least we editors can do,

Irving Dilliard is editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*. This is from the second annual Lovejoy Lecture delivered at Colby College, Nov. 5, 1953. Appointed to the Lovejoy Fellowship for 1953, Dilliard received an honorary LL.D degree at a special convocation at Colby. Former president of Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity, a former Nieman Fellow, past president of the Illinois State Historical Association, Dilliard was also appointed the Louis Demnitz Brandeis lecturer at Brandeis University for 1953.

when we stand in the long shadow of Elijah Parish Lovejoy, is to have an honest look at what we are doing and to ask ourselves whether we are being true to obligations of the free press that we so fervently profess.

Before I go any further let me say as plainly as possible that the American press, despite its failings, is the best press in all the world. I am proud of its best just as I am ashamed of its worst. Brilliant achievements stand out amid disgraceful lapses.

I want to salute a few of those editors who, in my opinion, are a genuine credit to our press.

The light of a free press burns brightly at Louisville where Barry Bingham has gathered an unusually able staff on the *Courier-Journal* and *Times*—Mark Ethridge, James S. Pope, Tom Wallace, Russell Briney, Norman Isaacs and others. Under Eugene Meyer, and encouraged I like to think by the example set by Agnes E. Meyer as tireless exponent of freedom of conscience and plain speaking, the *Washington Post* today gives the national capitol vigorous, constructive editorial leadership. The New York *Times* has had a succession of great editors from Henry Jarvis Raymond to Adolph S. Ochs. Under Arthur Hays Sulzberger, it has many adornments on its staff—names that appear daily in familiar bylines. I should like to single out again for special mention one of its little-known editorial writers, John B. Oakes, who, in his quiet, unassuming way, exemplifies the vital work of the anonymous editorial writer. The Milwaukee *Journal* of Harry J. Grant, J. Donald Ferguson and Lindsay Hoben is courageous and strong; it puts its main trust in pickaxe digging by its own reporters and its editorial page reflects this solid enterprise. The Denver *Post* has come a long way under Palmer Hoyt whose standards for news column objectivity are among the highest in the country. When it comes to integrity in Washington correspondence, Richard L. Strout of the *Christian Science Monitor* stands in the front rank. From the Northwest comes the excellent correspondence of Richard L. Neuberger. Editors and publishers like William T. Evjue of the Madison (Wis.) *Capital Times* and Charles A. Sprague of the Oregon *Statesman* (Salem) are in the best tradition of journalism. David V. Felts, whose vigilant, pungent, informed editorials in the Decatur (Ill.) *Herald* also appear in the other Lindsay newspapers, would distinguish a newspaper with a dozen times the circulation of the one for which he writes. The same can be said for Houstoun War-

ing of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent* and William F. Johnston of the Lewiston (Ida.) *Morning Tribune*, J. W. Gitt of the York (Pa.) *Gazette and Daily*, and John B. Johnson of the Watertown (N.Y.) *Times*. The *Wall Street Journal*, though aimed primarily at the business and financial community, prints a basic news summary far better than that of many standard dailies, and its realistic reports on industry, agriculture, business and national and international affairs are of a very high order. The local editor who turns through the *Wall Street Journal*, as directed by William H. Grimes, is apt to find that this seemingly specialized newspaper has picked up a good news feature of general interest right under the local editor's nose. There are of course other examples of good work, including some in the South which I do not mean to ignore.

All the forces that work to improve journalism are not within journalism itself. The foundation under whose auspices we are meeting is such a force. The Nieman Foundation at Harvard is an educational enterprise which does far more to improve the standards of the press than all too many newspapers. Under the curatorship of Louis M. Lyons, who was for many years an editorial writer on the Boston *Globe*, the Nieman Foundation issues a quarterly publication called *Nieman Reports*. In my opinion *Nieman Reports* is easily the most valuable publication among all those devoted to the press.

The schools of journalism hold out a promise that so far as I have been able to tell is, disappointingly often, not achieved. The position of the journalism teacher, especially in a publicly-supported institution, is not an easy one. If he has opinions and speaks them out vigorously he is almost certain to offend others, including perhaps influential editors and publishers. The choice he often makes is between standing up and standing in and in all too many instances he elects to stand in. But there are rugged men on the journalism faculties, as for example, A. Gayle Waldrop of the University of Colorado.

However much I may criticize the press, there are editors and publishers whom I deeply admire.

At the risk of oversimplification let me state my present criticism of the press in terms of a double standard. That is, the press tends to have one standard when it measures the performance of officials and public figures, and another standard when it comes to measuring its own performance. Indeed many editors and publishers do not think one newspaper has any business criticising another. Or to put it another way, the press holds other institutions up to searching scrutiny but is unwilling to have the same scrutiny applied to itself.

Let me be specific. Just a year ago this country concluded a presidential campaign. Roscoe Drummond, now head of the Washington bureau of the New York *Herald Trib-*

une, was then an esteemed Washington correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*. Describing the news coverage of the campaign—news coverage, mind you, not editorial support—Mr. Drummond wrote in the *Monitor*:

"The Democratic nominee is getting considerably less than an even break in the news columns of the daily newspapers across the country. My own daily observations on this matter lead me to the conclusion that much of the daily press is committing a serious offense against its readers—and one against the canons of responsible journalism—in showing marked one-sidedness in covering the news of this campaign and in slanting much of the news it does cover."

Mr. Drummond, who based his indictment of the press on alternating travels over the country with the two nominees was not alone in his observation. Eric Sevareid, one of the fairest and ablest of radio commentators, said:

"Nearly all the great weekly publications, such as *Time* and *Life*, are not only for Eisenhower in their editorials, but some are unabashedly using their news and picture space to help his cause, by giving him the predominant play, week after week. But they are fairness itself, compared to some big Mid-West and Western dailies where Stevenson is reported as if he were a candidate for County Clerk. Little wonder that Stevenson is concentrating on radio and television to get his arguments across."

Notice that these criticisms do not arise from editorial support for one nominee as against the other. All recognize the right of the newspaper editor to support the candidate of his own choice and to write editorials in that nominee's behalf. But they also take the stand that the news columns ought to be fair to both sides. Mr. Drummond was so deeply disturbed by what he saw in the news columns that he proposed an inquiry into the press' performance in reporting the campaign. He said that such an inquiry was needed for the information of the public and for the information of the press itself.

An inquiry was also proposed by *Editor & Publisher*, the newspaper world's trade weekly, and the proposal was renewed after the election in an editorial entitled "Study Still Needed." Calling for "an impartial, extensive study to reveal the exact degree of fairness or lack of it in this presidential campaign," *Editor & Publisher* said:

"We feel that it is just as important to conduct a study now as it would have been if Mr. Stevenson had won against majority press opposition. The charges of bias in the news columns were widely printed. The people will not forget soon—nor will the press critics. If an impartial study reveals that the news treatment of the campaign was predominantly fair to both candidates, then the fact should be publicized. If not, our editors and publishers should take their medicine to guard against abuses in the future."

To this splendid statement the editor of *Editor & Pub-*

lisher, Robert U. Brown, appended one of the Canons of Journalism of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, namely: "Partisanship in the news columns is subversive of a fundamental principle of the profession."

Let me add just one more appeal for a survey of the performance of the press in the last year's campaign. Speaking at the dedication of the Lovejoy memorial plaque almost a year ago to the day, Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* said:

"I would like to see the American press make an exhaustive study of its own performance during the political campaign, to determine whether Stevenson newspapers slanted their news toward Stevenson and Eisenhower newspapers toward Eisenhower. We have all heard these charges. If the press failed in that way, it would be far better for us to expose the failure ourselves, and try to avoid it for the future, than for the public to expose it and leave the press to a huffy defense of its virtues. Newspaper people are trained observers. It should not be impossible to get a group of journalists or journalism professors to make such a study without fear or favor."

Now it would seem to me that anyone, whether or not he had seen a single newspaper in the 1952 campaign would conclude from these statements by Mr. Drummond, Mr. Severeid, Mr. Brown and Mr. Bingham that a survey should be conducted, if for no other reason than to clear the press of the ugly question as to its fairness.

How do you suppose the press reacted to the idea of a survey of its fairness? Do you think that the press pursued the idea with the same resolution it would have used in demanding an inquiry into the dubious conduct of some public official?

I regret the recital of facts that I must now give in answer to these questions.

Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalists fraternity, took up the challenge just two weeks after the election. Under the leadership of the fraternity's then president, Charles C. Clayton, an editorial writer on the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, a pro-Eisenhower newspaper, a survey resolution was carefully drawn, discussed thoroughly on the floor and adopted overwhelmingly. This resolution took notice of the "numerous and grave charges" of bias. Lee A. Hills, executive editor of the Detroit *Free Press* and incoming president of Sigma Delta Chi, appointed a committee to work out the details of a "thorough and objective analysis" with the help of one of the country's major foundations. Mr. Hills appointed Barry Bingham, Benjamin M. McKelway of the Washington *Star*, Turner Catledge of the New York *Times*, J. Donald Ferguson of the Milwaukee *Journal*, Carson F. Lyman of U. S. *News & World Report* and Dean Earl English of the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

To make a sad story short, this committee decided that

a survey in fulfillment of the resolution was not "feasible." With only Barry Bingham dissenting, the committee declared that it knew of "no formula that would meet the magnitude and complexities of the problem of evaluating the fairness of public information media in their news coverage of the 1952 campaign." The committee did not concern itself with its responsibility in helping positively to clear the good name of the press. It merely washed its hands of the entire unpleasant business. The National Council of Sigma Delta Chi might then have reviewed the problem and sent new instructions to the committee. It might have proposed a limited survey in an effort to meet the committee's objections. With only its chairman, Mr. Clayton, standing firm—and I salute him for his staunchness—the council accepted the committee's report. Among those who agreed that the survey was "not feasible" was Robert U. Brown, editor of *Editor & Publisher*—the same Mr. Brown who proposed a survey before the election and later said that a survey was "still needed."

When the *Guild Reporter* included *Editor & Publisher* in a critical comment entitled, "Sigma Delta Chi Whitewashes One-Party Press Charge," Mr. Brown's editorial page in *Editor & Publisher* said it "felt that such a study is still desirable but concurred in the basic conclusion." Then it polished off the troublemakers with this hot shot:

"If those who are so lavish in their criticism know of any formulae or technique of study that would meet the test, let them come forward with it."

What Editor Brown, Dean English and their colleagues on the SDX committee and council all shut their eyes to was an article in Sigma Delta Chi's own monthly magazine, *The Quill*, issued the preceding month (April 1953). In that article, Kenneth P. Adler presented the case for measurement of bias. The editor of *The Quill*, Carl R. Kesler, in describing the article, said that Mr. Adler "thinks such a study is desirable and technically feasible." His answer to the question, "Can Bias Be Measured?" is an emphatic "yes," backed up by a detailed description of one possible method. As a member of the Committee on Communication at the University of Chicago, he has spent considerable time in developing and testing this method. The committee has offered technical help in any study of the press sponsored by a reputable organization of journalists."

Yet the Sigma Delta Chi committee and council found a survey "not feasible" and the trade publication, *Editor & Publisher*, challenged those "who are so lavish in their 'criticism' to come forward with a 'technique of study!'"

I am a past national president of Sigma Delta Chi—a fraternity of more than 20,000 members. I happen to believe that this record shows that the organization has been grossly misled. I hope its 34th national convention, which meets in St. Louis next week, will review this record carefully and

pass a considered judgment on whether the 1952 convention's instructions were carried out or circumvented.

I turn now to the American Society of Newspaper Editors—The A.S.N.E. in the parlance of the newspaper world—of which I am also a member. Surely we may expect the national organization of the country's editors to apply its own canon against partisanship in the news columns.

Some 400-odd members of the A.S.N.E. met in Washington last April, just after Sigma Delta Chi's officers put the stamp of "not feasible" on the survey proposal. The chief topic among members was politics, including the new national administration, but I detected not the faintest disposition for the A.S.N.E. to take up where Sigma Delta Chi had left off. One session after another passed without a mention of the fact that two of the best-known of the United States Senators—Taft of Ohio and Morse of Oregon—had just added sharp criticisms of the press to protests still piling up from the campaign. Finally on the last day the theme was "the people's right to know" and a major portion of a session was given over to debating the question of Judge Valenti's barring of the press from the Jelke vice trial in New York. The printed program showed four editors, including one of the feminine editors, scheduled to discuss the case, and before the long session was over many others had intervened as anything but friends of the court. But still no mention of "the people's right to know" whether the press was fair or biased in reporting the most discussed presidential campaign in history.

I then hunted up the chairman of the resolutions committee, Felix R. McKnight of the Dallas *Morning News*. From him I learned that the resolutions committee would have no resolutions. Whereupon I asked him how a member might bring up a resolution from the floor. He said it could be done after his report. At the subsequent business meeting Chairman McKnight recommended a review of the system of resolutions and paid tribute to "the democratic process of this society." Then I asked for the floor. On being recognized by the president, Wright Bryan of the Atlanta *Journal*, I introduced this resolution:

"In view of the serious criticism of aspects of the newspaper coverage of the 1952 presidential campaign, from within our profession as well as without, and further in view of the grave charges made against our profession by Senators Robert A. Taft of Ohio and Wayne Morse of Oregon, be it resolved that this society request its incoming president to appoint a committee to study these criticisms and charges, this committee to report by the 1954 convention its conclusions and the facts on which these conclusions are based, as a demonstration of the full belief of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the people's right to know."

I had discussed this resolution with a fellow editor from

Ohio who had said he would be glad to second it. But before he could speak up, William Tugman of the Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard* seconded. I had not spoken to Mr. Tugman. In fact I had not even met him. I was both surprised and pleased. While I did not know what motivated Mr. Tugman's act in seconding, I concluded that he wanted the subject at least discussed by those present who cared to speak on it. But as it turned out no one would get to speak for it and only one would speak against it.

When President Bryan asked "Is there discussion?," Past President Walter M. Harrison of Oklahoma City rose to his feet instantly. Speaking emphatically, he said:

"This is exactly the type of situation that is suggested in the very well-considered recommendation that has been presented by the resolutions committee. The convention has now dwindled down to perhaps 150 out of 450 men. I therefore think that it would not be a fair cross-section of opinion of the vast membership of this Society.

"Now as to the sense of the resolution: As long as there are political campaigns, just as in the last 40 years I have seen these charges brought, just so they will be brought in the next 20 or 30 years. I think it is ancient history. I think the charge should be dead and buried, and I therefore move you as a substitute that the resolution be tabled."

When Past President Harrison concluded, there was a chorus of seconds from the floor. Then President Bryan correctly announced that a motion to table was not debatable. The vote that followed was overwhelmingly in favor of tabling, and the resolution was out of the way—at least for the time being.

I know of no better way to employ this second Lovejoy convocation at Colby College than to challenge the high-handed, arbitrary procedure I have just described. And anyone who wants to check my reporting of the episode will find it set forth in stenographic record form on pages 184-5 of "Problems in Journalism: Proceedings of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, 1953."

The American Society of Newspaper Editors professes to be devoted to the welfare of the nation's press.

Why then should the American Society of Newspaper Editors be unwilling to have a committee assemble criticisms of the press and to make a report on these criticisms for the information of the members of the organization?

The American Society of Newspaper Editors professes to believe in "the people's right to know" and as purported evidence of that belief it has published a book with that title by Prof. Harold L. Cross of Columbia University.

Why then should the American Society of Newspaper Editors be unwilling to give the least help toward informing the people as to the press' role in a most important aspect of the people's practice of self-government?

The American Society of Newspaper Editors professes

to believe in the editor's right to discuss issues freely in his newspaper.

Why then does the American Society of Newspaper Editors shut off a motion, duly made and seconded, without a word of discussion other than the denunciation that was part of the motion to table? Why does it suppress exchange of opinion? Why does it say in effect on this subject none of its members may speak?

I do not believe that the American Society of Newspaper Editors has heard the last of this issue any more than Sigma Delta Chi has heard the last of it. This question of fairness in the news columns in reporting elections of, by and for the people—this vital question is not going to be shelved.

If the editors do not face up to this question, the historians will. If the publishers will not assemble photostatic copies of comparable pages on which informed public opinion can be based, the task will fall to research scholars.

This clear duty may pass from our hands by default, but others will take it up. "The people's right to know" will not be denied—not even by the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Now lest you think I have only criticism for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, let me be as quick to praise four of its members for a statement they have recently issued as members of a committee of the society. They are: J. Russell Wiggins, managing editor of the *Washington Post*; Herbert Brucker, editor of the *Hartford Courant*; William M. Tugman, editor of the *Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard*; and Eugene S. Pulliam, Jr., managing editor of the *Indianapolis News*.

They are the four members of the special committee appointed by Basil Walters of the *Chicago Daily News*, now president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, who recognized a bare-faced invasion of freedom of the press in the star chamber Wechsler hearings conducted by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Government Operations Committee.

The witness who was harrassed behind closed doors, with the press shut on the outside, was James A. Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*. After the hearings Mr. Wechsler called on the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors to appoint a committee to study and comment on the hearings and their implications for freedom of the press in this country. Mr. Wechsler contended that he was summoned and questioned behind closed doors in an attempt to intimidate the press. He demanded that the testimony be made public.

The American press, which had been currently exercised about suppression of journalistic opinion in Ecuador, was very slow to get interested in the Wechsler case here at home; that insistence by some newspapers continued un-

til the testimony was made public; that many who read the transcript of questions and answers were clear in their minds that an attempt had been made to intimidate the press and that it failed only because Mr. Wechsler answered every question, including those about his youthful affiliation with a radical student group when in college—failed in short because Mr. Wechsler refused to be intimidated. How many other editors might have been intimidated in the process, although miles from the hearing room, was not recorded. There were some at least, so I judged from the retreat into Ecuadorism—which I define as "deep concern for freedom of the press in *some other country*."

President Walters, acting on Mr. Wechsler's request, appointed a special committee of 11 editors, ranging geographically from the *Wall Street Journal* to the *Los Angeles Times*. It was, generally speaking, representative of the nation's press. The essence of the committee's report, signed by all members, is that the committee is not in agreement on the crucial issue of whether freedom of the press was invaded. The full committee said that if there was a genuine constitutional question as to whether editors should answer questions relating to their editorial or news judgments, this question "should be raised and settled." It did not attempt to answer the question any more than it would say that the star chamber hearings had been an attempt to throttle free expression.

This was not good enough for the chairman of the committee, Mr. Wiggins, and three of his colleagues, Messrs. Brucker, Tugman, and Pulliam. They produced a four-member protest whose words are most appropriate to be included in a Lovejoy lecture. The full text of their statement is in the October issue of *Nieman Reports* as is the text of the inconclusive report of the full committee. I hope that many of you will read every word of both. Meantime let me quote briefly from the warning sounded by the four members:

"The people suffer some diminution of their right to know fully and comment freely upon their own government whenever a single newspaper, however worthy or unworthy, is subjected by one Senator, however worthy or unworthy, to inconvenience, expense, humiliation, ridicule, abuse, condemnation and reproach, under the auspices of governmental power.

"If the spectacle of such an ordeal raises in the mind of the most timid editorial spectator an apprehension, a fear, a doubt and anxiety as to the safety with which he may report and as to the immunity with which he may legally comment, American freedom to that degree has suffered an impairment.

"We leave to others the debate over how extensive this impairment ought to be before protest is made. We choose to protest at its very commencement.

"We would sooner suffer the criticism of having ex-

claimed too soon, too much and too loudly against an invasion of freedom of the press, than endure the reproach of having stood silently by when government took the first step toward the silencing of the free press of this country.

"Motives of legislators and newspapermen do not alter the principles involved in any proceeding that threatens an extension of legislative power beyond those precincts within which it has been confined by the letter of the Constitution and by the spirit of our free institutions.

"Where such an invasion of freedom occurs, other citizens may speak or remain silent without being identified with the trespass; but the silence of the press is invariably construed, and properly construed, as an indication that no trespass has occurred and its silences inevitably will be summoned to the support of like trespasses in the future.

"In our opinion, therefore, whatever inconvenience results, whatever controversy ensues, we are compelled by every command of duty to brand this and every threat to freedom of the press, from whatever source, as a peril to American freedom."

That closes the quotation from Chairman Wiggins and his three associates on the special committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is a noble as well as far-seeing statement and I salute them for it. The American Society of Newspaper Editors can be proud of its every word. But the lamentable fact remains that only four names out of the 11 on the committee were signed to it. Could it be that some of the seven editors who did not sign had been intimidated? Could it be that some of them had been intimidated and did not know it? I leave the question for you to think about.

This leads me to my concluding thought. This is my conviction that the Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments to the United States Constitution—which sets out the basic liberties of the American people could not be adopted in the United States today. On what do I base this conclusion?

I base it on the fact that no amendment to the Constitution can be adopted without a fighting campaign and I do not find the press today fighting for the causes which the Bill of Rights embodies. If the press does not fight back when the liberties of the people are eroded away—if it does not fight back to protect the Bill of Rights which it now has, I find no reason to believe that the press would lead a national campaign to adopt the Bill of Rights were its list of protections and guaranties introduced in Congress today.

Take, for example, the very first of the historic ten amendments. This is the one which says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people

peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

I think I have demonstrated that there is widespread indifference to freedom of the press and to the responsibilities of the press to its readers. Many newspapers never have an editorial which touches the issue of freedom of religion and the separation of church and state. Freedom of speech is often trespassed without bringing so much as a word of protest from all too many editors.

The right of the people to be secure in their houses and their papers against unreasonable searches and seizures; the guarantee that no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by an oath or an affirmation, particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized—these basic protections are trampled and a large part of the press takes no notice.

In the last decade many of these protections have been chipped away in local, state and federal courts, with the final approval, I regret to say, of the United States Supreme Court. Yet few newspapers give anything more than minimum space to Supreme Court decisions and fewer still print enough of the text of the opinions for their readers to have any notion of what is happening to our civil rights from day to day.

And so I have no choice but to conclude that the Bill of Rights, which I do not hesitate to call the greatest glory of the American people, could not be adopted today because the press would not be for it.

Fortunately, we do not need to propose and ratify the Bill of Rights today. The Bill of Rights is the heart and soul of our Constitution and has been since almost the very birth of the Republic more than a century and a half ago. We do not need to establish the Bill of Rights, we need only to preserve and apply it to our everyday lives.

This weathering away of the Bill of Rights is a dark, grim thought on which to close. Yet I do not apologize for it however much it distresses me. These are times that try men's souls no less than the black days of Tom Paine. Let others speak platitudes elsewhere. When we gather to remember Elijah Parish Lovejoy at Colby College each November let us be as worthy of speaking his name as we can be. Let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts take courage from his courage. He died but his cause triumphed.

The slavery of the body that Lovejoy battled against was long ago outlawed from our land. Our battle now is against slavery over our minds. Editors today are not called on to be assassinated for freedom of the press as Lovejoy was shot down in the street. Today editors are only asked to live for freedom of the press. How, if they have any thought of being true keepers of their precious heritage, can they expect to do less?

Reporting in the Far East

by Christopher Rand

A main vice of reporters in the Far East is the tendency to view the reporting trade, or the Far East, or the two combined, as merely an interesting background for one's personality. This is a form of egotism—perhaps “romanticism” in a sense of that vague word. With Americans it goes back, apparently, to what a friend of mine calls the bower birds—a generation of men who collected Asiatic trinkets as adornments to their nests—who cluttered their studies with gongs, idols, war-clubs, model junks, lacquerware, chinaware and other bric-a-brac. I associate this vogue with Theodore Roosevelt's contemporaries. In those days, I gather, a man who visited Asia and returned with gongs and idols not only got prestige from it but established himself as an expert. It was a cheap way of buying a diploma, and it seems to have worked. Americans who had any link with the mysterious East were deemed authorities on it by themselves and others. The spell could even be inherited. One hears that Franklin Roosevelt thought he knew a good deal about China because an ancestor of his, or distant uncle, had once done some trading round Hongkong. It all went with the Golden Age when we had a small, parochial upper class whose members could approach anyone or anything through personal friendship and correct introductions. When that age was wiped out by our runaway commercialism and mass production, the bower bird, one might say, gave way to the trained seal, a less attractive creature because less amateur. The phrase trained seal can, with a little stretching, apply to anyone who lives by self-laudatory accounts of his adventures while crossing forbidden Tibet or eating bullets in a no-man's-land. Anyone who has spent much time in Asia knows that almost any piece of this literature is a fake; he can tell by internal evidence, by the style; he doesn't have to check the facts. Indeed writers seem to have fewer adventures than other people as a rule. Those interested in doing good work lack the time for them, it seems, and those interested in writing adventure stories lack the fortitude. The bad taste of the latter is usually too flagrant to be harmful and the misinformation too self-centered to cloud much of the waters.

Christopher Rand's observations on reporting in Asia will be resumed in the next issue. Former China correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune*, he is now in the Far East again for the *New Yorker* magazine, making his way through India and Pakistan to Afghanistan. Mr. Rand was a Nieman Fellow in 1948.

But at times a sentimental liking for the picturesque makes trouble. In 1949, for instance, when the Nationalists were nearly through on the Chinese mainland, the world press suddenly began touting a group of Moslems in China's Northwest as the people who would stop the Reds. It is true that the Moslems' boom was much encouraged by Americans engaged in business with them, and true also that anti-Communist reporters and papers were clutching at straws then. But apart from this the Moslems found takers on their romance-appeal. They lived in a dry, barren, remote part of China, on Marco Polo's silk route. They were great cavalymen, and their leaders, a clan named Ma—the Chinese word for horse—were dashing, adamant and tyrannical in an exotic way. Their territory had sheep, deserts, nice rugs and delicious melons. The press went into ecstasies about this set-up—wholly justified ones, I thought—but then it traveled a step further and deduced that because the Moslems were strange and exciting they would therefore stop the Communists. This leap of reasoning didn't prevail. When the Reds got round to them the Moslems collapsed and the bigger Mas fled with much of their region's gold, though by then America had got well into a debauch of wishful thinking about them.

One quirk of romanticism in China was the love of Westerners for the border peoples. China was surrounded, and to some extent infiltrated, by non-Chinese peoples—Mongols, Tibetans, Turks, mountain aborigines and others—who were relatively primitive and were doomed to struggle endlessly against having Chinese culture forced on them by its practitioners, who thought it the best thing in the world. To a man, Westerners took the side of the primitives in the struggle, and I thought I saw more than one reason for this. To begin with, the primitives were under-dogs, a compelling thing with us. Next—and this applied especially to Americans—they were in much the same fix as our Red Indians had been in—getting run over by modern locomotives, guns etc. in alien hands—and I felt sure this called up an expiatory urge in us. Many foreigners, drawn to China by sentimentality, became sentimentally annoyed after arrival by what they deemed the hypocrisies of Chinese politeness, attention to “face,” and general elaboration of manners. Such travelers sighed with relief when they had passed through China and reached simple country inhabited by simple people, and they had more than the usual tendency to admire the primitive.

I can't document the existence of these influences, nor

can I give them proportional weight, but the end fact is that Westerners looked upon the Chinese as villains in the border relationships and on the others as heroes. This colored our reporting and through it our national ideas. I think it had something to do with our wartime liking for the Chinese Reds among other things. While the Reds were in the back country round Yen-an the mantle of simple border nobility tended to fall on them, as a look at Western reports of the time will show. This fact played its part in history.

Personal romanticism is an ill motive for anyone choosing to be a Far East reporter, because it loses its drive as one's hair thins and may give way to cynicism. The saying that reporters have fun because they "meet such interesting people" is true up to a point. Spokesmen of strange oppressed nations come and go through the reporter's hotel room; doors open to him that stay closed to his equals in other trades; he may even have a way with the girls. But these advantages seldom grow with time. As Far East reporters get older they become repositories not only of tropical diseases or alcoholism, but also, if they are sensitive, of a heartbreak peculiar to observers in the East-West borderland, where inhumanity is violent and shows little sign of abating. They reach a dead end, and there are not many escapes because reporting lacks the natural progression of other careers. Some foreign correspondents reach the top of the ladder, more or less, in their thirties. They become staff reporters for good daily papers, and that is that. In the years following this stage a reporter can gain in prestige and usually get some small raises in pay, but he can seldom move up to become vice-president, president, chairman of the board etc., as in a proper industry. To the extent he has become a good reporter he has stopped being a businessman and has disqualified himself for the few lucrative front-office jobs on the paper. Perhaps he can work as an editor or editorial writer, but this isn't really a step up even if it pays better, and it requires an abandonment of his free-and-easy ways. Good reporters who don't like such alternatives—and there are many of these—may find themselves condemned to weary roaming amid dreams of settling down with a country paper somewhere. They are like Lennie and George, the drifting barley-buckers in *Of Mice and Men*, with their wistful talk of the rabbit or chicken farm.

Some Far Eastern reporters are young, enthusiastic and bumptious. Others are middle-aged and tired of the politics and politicians they must write about, having learned that neither will get much better regardless of what is said. The number of "average" reporters between the two is not large. I imagine these proportions have an effect on our news coverage, though I don't know what it is.

II

Romanticism can be lumped with some other reporting vices under the larger head of distractions.

Distractions of all kinds lie in wait for reporters, and they are often subtle and well camouflaged. A few years ago I tried taking up photography in a part-time professional way. I reasoned that my work as a reporter thrust me against strange sights that if preserved on 8-x-10 glossy prints would yield extra money and pleasure. I was right about this; for a year I had a reflex camera, and much help and advice from my friends, and during that time I snapped a few hundred dollars' worth of pictures. I did especially well on a trip to Chinese Turkestan, a desert region in Central Asia where the air was so thin, and the sun so bright, that a blind man could point a well-stopped-down camera in any direction and get results. My series on the Kazakh nomads of Turkestan—with their felt tents, fiery horses and incredible customs—was peddled far and wide, even to obscure European magazines. I had other successes too, but as time went on I discovered that the camera was doing to me what the tarbaby had done to Brer Rabbit. My hands were so full of it I could rarely take notes at crucial moments. Whenever something noteworthy happened at a gathering, I found, I was off in a corner changing the film. When I traveled I was so burdened with responsibility for films, filters, bulb-releases and other tricks that I had scant time for the wool-gathering one must do in the reporting game. Finally, I believe a reporter should be an unobtrusive element in the scenes he covers—should pad about in the background, speak in murmurs and leave all noisy, conspicuous behavior to his victims; yet in photographing groups of personages I always found myself in mid-stage, with eyes focused on me; I can't deny that my clumsiness entered into this, but I believe the problem is there for a deft man too. Anyway, I allowed the photography a fair run through the year, exploring its tarbaby side all the while, and in the end I gave my camera to a Chinese widow.

While I was in the camera phase I had a reporter friend who was doing the same thing, only more thoroughly effectively. He is in a far country now and I haven't seen him for four years, but I hear from him, and I gather that in his case the photography has nearly crowded the text reporting out. He is a real professional, and I feel sure it had to be one or the other with him.

Smuggling and currency speculation were sidelines with our trade in China, though I tended to miss these pitfalls through incompetence with money. U. S. dollars could always be multiplied in the late Nationalist China if one had a green thumb for them, and this was especially true if one traveled. Transport was so scarce that even small portable objects—and money—varied in worth from one Chinese city to another. Each city had its own customs

barriers, but foreign reporters were privileged and immune to these, and some of us used to cram our luggage at every stop with things that could be sold farther on at a profit. The market in Chinese against American dollars was so irregular in that period that a shrewd merchant or speculator could nearly always pay his travel by arbitrage. One reporter I knew, and often envied, was supposed to be doing this; it was said he never spent a dime on expenses, though of course he turned in a bill for them; I don't know if the tale was true, but one look at him would tell you he was not a reporter but a merchant, and would be so known to history if known to it at all.

If the reader detects any disapproval in these remarks he can be sure it has no place there, for I dealt in black markets myself in Asia. What I did not do was try to deal intelligently, after I had learned my lesson. Once I took a musette bag of Chinese Nationalist bills from Shanghai to Peking, where I was going to spend some time, because I was told the Shanghai price, in U. S. dollars, was cheaper. When I got to Peking I learned that the unbroken market trend of the past few months had reversed itself—Nationalist dollars had fallen sharply there, and it would have been better to fill the bag with sand. After that I bought my black-market currencies in dribblets as I needed them.

The rage for curios is another distraction. I once flew with colleagues to a remote but newsworthy town deep in China that also produced a few celebrated lines of crude handicraft—let us say pottery and brassware. Some of us were keen collectors, and when the plane touched ground we were off like colts from the barrier. The rest of the party hardly saw us again in the day or two we spent there; we were buried in the shops, though there was much to be learned in the town through interviews and the like.

Of course no one should try appreciating a country without learning something of its arts—that study should perhaps be the first step. But it is one, I see now, that needn't involve the care and feeding of objects, a pursuit sure to take a reporter's mind from his work.

III

It seems the worst distractions of a reporter come from personal ties—from a wish to be like the neighbors and share their conventions. I have never seen a reason why newsmen should be proper members of society, though I have seen plenty why they shouldn't. One hears that the noted editor O. K. Bovard refused to make friendships with his St. Louis neighbors, at least on their terms, and surely this had good results. Monks have their celibacy. On a different level artists have their bohemianism; I think for a kindred reason. It seems we reporters (in our humble way) should go in at least for a touch of the hobo spirit—of nihilism and disrespect for persons. Many of the officials and others we deal with regard us as they would

cobras, and sometimes we resent this and try to prove them wrong. I think we are mistaken.

During the Japanese War, when I was a small U. S. official, I came to know a Chinese general in Kwangtung Province. He was a delightful man, charming and festive, and he kept us cheered up with wine, dinners and all kinds of gaiety. Later, when I was a reporter, he became mayor of Canton, and when next I visited that city he received me in the old warm way. I stayed there awhile, writing about various things, and one of these was a reign of terror just then clamped, in a spasm of the Nationalists' deepening non-confidence, on Canton's intellectuals. I don't think the mayor had a direct hand in this job—I understand it was done by secret police coming from the outside—but when he heard of the story in a fragmentary way he took it personally, and he has never spoken to me since. This used to trouble me, for I felt his resentment was justified under his code, which put friendship over more abstract things; yet I didn't see how I could have functioned as a reporter without noting that step in the Nationalists' progress. I have decided there wasn't much to be done about it. Having met the mayor as an official I had given him a wrong idea of how I might act as a reporter; had I met him as the latter, I hope, I would have put him on guard. It seems my mistake was in mixing such conflicting roles in one country in so short a time. Perhaps the only sound approach is to abstain somewhat from society.

The power of the press is a snare. Even at home it is used constantly for things like getting reporters let off traffic tickets—I have used it that way myself when I could. This gives the press an interest in good relations with cops and politicians—groups it pretends to judge and keep watch on. Of course it subtracts from our freedom, as the tycoon social life of publishers does from theirs. Overseas the problem is a bit different. Since favors there come from aliens instead of our own people, we reporters are more carefree about the obligations they entail. On the other hand the favors themselves are often bigger.

From 1945 to 1949 the main China base of the world press was in the top floors of Broadway Mansions in Shanghai, a once-fancy skyscraper that had deteriorated in the war, like all big buildings in that city, but was still the best housing there for our needs. It had belonged to the Japanese, and after their surrender it had come under the Chinese alien-property administration, which in turn had lent it to us and the U. S. Army (the Army had the lower dozen floors, we the upper half-dozen). The space was valuable, and in time the Chinese authorities tried to get it back. T. V. Soong, the Nationalist money wizard, began sending emissaries to Shanghai from Nanking, the capital, to see what could be done about this. The answer, it always turned out, was that nothing could be done. Mr. Soong's emissary would offer us other quarters, and good enough

ones for people in our walk of life, but we would point out that these were less convenient than Broadway Mansions and would allow us less efficiency—would make us less free, in effect. I don't remember that we ever said the Nationalists were trying to suppress us, but that was implied. The emissary knew we thought them a corrupt, illiberal lot, and our faces told him we wouldn't be surprised if they hounded us to make our work impossible. So each time the matter was dropped.

I don't think we paid directly for our privilege in Broadway Mansions. We were arrogant toward the Nationalists, and I suppose we took what they gave us and kept on writing the same things about them as before, whether pro or con. But we paid indirectly because our stake in the property drew us into enterprises hostile to our work. We had a reporters' association in Broadway Mansions, whose meetings we were expected to attend, and this spent much time in the juggling of rooms and other hotel business. There was much politics in the allotment of the better rooms, and a maneuver in this line could take up most of an afternoon.

Broadway Mansions had a pent-house that was used for entertaining by Shanghai's mayor, K. C. Wu, from the time he took office till the time we managed to get it away from him, after the middle of '46. Once in control of the pent-house we set up a mess there, and this lost money, inspired bickering about the cook, and generally bred distress till '47 or '48, when it was put on a commercial basis as a nearly public restaurant and night-club. In this new

phase it took on a personality of its own, with habits and aspirations outside those of the reporters who supposedly ran it. It developed a growing clientele of "associate members"—businessmen and the like—, a growing staff and a growing pile of funds. The clientele had to be catered to and the staff was shaped to this end. By the time the Reds took Shanghai in 1949 the mess was running much like other profitable business, and like many businesses then it packed up and fled to British Hongkong. It rented a big house looking down on the harbor, and there it established its bar, restaurant and dance floor in pleasant surroundings. It became the leading after-hours spot in Hongkong, where most places close early, and for a long time at least the working press thought it too noisy and stayed away. Since then it has had its ups and down where the press is concerned—at this writing it has been up for some time. Either way, though, reporters have been under pressure to attend meetings and patronize the place—have even been pressed at times to dress respectably and raise its tone. Sometimes in the down periods some reporters wanted the club closed and forgotten. But this couldn't be done, as it would have been a hardship on the excellent staff, most of whom had come in the migration from Shanghai. For the same reason the club couldn't be cut adrift as a pure commercial venture, because with the "correspondents' club" name it would have lost some of its clientele and perhaps also its license. We reporters had been trapped into becoming appurtenances of the hotel business. Our mistake, apparently, had been in coveting Mayor Wu's pent-house in the first place.

Legal Brief: On the Business of the Supreme Court

October 20, 1953

To the Nieman Fellows

Gentlemen:

The Faculty of the Harvard Law School is looking forward to meeting with you on the afternoon of Wednesday, October 28, 1953, in the Wheeler Room in Holmes Hall, at 4:00 P.M.

The appointment of a new Chief Justice renews popular interest in the Supreme Court and its part in the government of the United States. We thought you might be interested to discuss with us some of the conspicuous issues before the Court this term, and accordingly we send with this letter a short memorandum about some notable pending cases.

We hope you will enjoy the afternoon. We will try to mitigate the rigor of the law with a little beer and cheese.

Sincerely yours,

Archibald Cox

Mark Howe

Arthur Sutherland

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The case arising in the District of Columbia will probably involve the construction of the Fifth Amendment which in part reads as follows:

"No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; * * *."

When the Court ordered these cases reargued, it requested counsel to discuss certain questions concerning the intention of the draftsmen of the Fourteenth Amendment, of the Congress, and the state authorities who approved it. It also requested discussion of the proper order of the Court in case it should hold that segregation violates the Fourteenth Amendment; should it order a change forthwith or gradually; should it prescribe the change in detail itself, or allow the trial courts to work out the change.

"Equal But Separate"

On June 8, 1953 the Supreme Court set down for reargument this fall a group of five cases dealing with the question of segregated public primary schools. These were *Briggs v. Elliott*, arising in South Carolina, which has already had a long career in the courts¹; *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*², involving segregated schools in Topeka; and *Davis v. the County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia*³. To be argued at the same time will be *Bolling v. Sharpe*⁴, raising the question of the constitutional propriety of maintaining segregated public schools in the District of Columbia. In each of these cases, the constitutionality of the segregated schools has been sustained, and in each, a declaration of unconstitutionality is sought. In the fifth case, *Gebhart v. Belton*⁵, which arose in Delaware, the state court ordered a white school to admit a Negro child as there was no prospect of availability of equal separate facilities for a year. The State of Delaware seeks a reversal.

The cases arising under state laws will presumably turn upon the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, the first section of which reads as follows:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Censorship

Other Fourteenth Amendment cases involve an Ohio statute creating a "Department of Education, Division of Film Censorship" which is charged with the duty of censoring motion picture films and is directed to pass and approve only such films as are, in its judgment, "of a moral, educational, or amusing and harmless character." Producers who wished to exhibit certain murderous and sensational pictures of bloodshed and crime failed, in these cases before the state courts, to obtain an order of mandamus requiring the censor to permit exhibitions. The case is entitled *Superior Films v. Department of Education, Div. of Film Censorship*, 159 Ohio State 315, 112 NE2d 311 (April 29, 1953). Appeals were filed by the disappointed plaintiffs and the matters are now in the Supreme Court. The cases are discussed at 22 L.W. 3047 and 3062. The Appellants rely for their success on the case decided by the United States Supreme Court in May, 1952 involving the film "The Miracle" which had been barred in New York as "sacrilegious." This case was *Burstyn v. Wilson*, 343 US 495. The argument for the Ohio exhibitors is that the motion picture is as much a publication as the printed word, and that statutes allowing officials to apply vague and subjective standards for granting licenses to exhibit deny the exhibitors reasonable freedom of expression.

State or Federal

The segregation and Ohio censorship cases show the Supreme Court as a source of claimed protection for the individual against wrong by a state. Other cases point up the function of the Court in defining the extent of permissible legislative activity by the federal government. This may appear in many ways. Some one who feels that the federal government has done him wrong, may claim that the action is entirely outside the powers delegated to the United States by the states—that is to say, that the federal statute in question is unconstitutional. Or perhaps the protesting citizen may not claim that the statute is unconstitutional; but may say that Congress did not intend to go so far as to include his activities in the scope of its statutory condemnation.

On October 12, there were argued before the Court, a group of three cases of the first class mentioned. These involved a statute requiring dealers in gambling machines to register and report to the federal government the details of their sales. District Courts have held that this statute is unconstitutional as applied to machines not shown ever to have been shipped in interstate commerce. The United States Solicitor General has taken the appeal, hoping to show that the power of the federal government to regulate interstate commerce extends to the regulation of such transactions as those here under consideration. The cases are entitled the *United States v. Five Gambling Devices*, the *United States v. Denmark* and the *United States v. Braum*, calendars No. 14, 40, and 41, discussed 22 U.S.L.W. pages 3007 and 3061.

In the second class of such cases, which involves a determination of the meaning of a statute rather than its constitutional validity, is a group concerning organized baseball and the Sherman Act. In 1922, the United States Supreme Court in an opinion by Justice Holmes reported under the name of *Federal Baseball Club v. National League*, 259 U.S. 200, held that organized baseball was not interstate commerce and so the anti-trust laws had no application to its operations. However, some ball players have now returned to the attack in hope of having the previous decision overruled. The cases are *Toolson v. Yankees*, 101 F Supp 93 (1951), affirmed 200 F 2d 198, and *Kowalski v. Chandler*, 202 F 2d 413 (1953). The proceedings in the the United States Supreme Court are discussed 22 U.S.L.W. 3004 and 3096. The players have failed in the lower courts in their efforts to establish causes of action under the anti-trust laws, and seek to have the Court reverse the 1922 holding. Their cases were argued in the week of October 12th. [Decided Nov. 9: same as 1922.]

Another problem of state federal relations which will come before the Court this term involves the power of a state to exclude products of other states unless they are sold

at a price approved by the receiving state. This involves something very much like a protective tariff in favor of local producers. Such a case is *County Board of Arlington, Va. v. State Commission*, decided last January by the Virginia Superior County Appeals. The Virginia court held that the State Milk Commission may properly fix the minimum sale price of milk sold and delivered to consumers in an adjacent Virginia County by District of Columbia distributors. The Commission's order, increasing by one-half cent per quart the retail price for such milk was held below *not* to place an undue burden on interstate commerce. Probable jurisdiction of the appeal was noted October 12, 1953, 22 L.W. 3081, 3090. There are generally a number of such cases arising in each term of the Court. Another, involving a Maryland "use tax" on furniture sold by a Delaware Corporation at its Delaware store and delivered by its trucks to Maryland consumers, is *Miller Bros. v. Maryland*, Md. Court of Appeals, 95 Atl 2d 286; probable jurisdiction noted by the United States Supreme Court, October 12, 1953, 22 L.W. 3082, 3090. In this case, the Maryland officials seized the Delaware seller's station-wagon and held it to ransom for \$356.40, the unpaid balance of taxes claimed. The case will be argued immediately after the Virginia milk case.

A newspaper was denied review by certiorari on October 12, of a decision upholding a license tax imposed by the city of Corona, California, for engaging in business. The *Corona Daily Independent* claimed that its free expression was unduly hampered. Mr. Justice Douglas (Justice Black concurring) wrote a memorandum dissenting from the denial of certiorari, 22 L.W. 3081.

It would clearly be impossible in a brief memorandum like this to describe all the litigation pending before the Supreme Court of the United States at the present term, and even if it were done, it would weary the readers beyond endurance. But, a moment's reflection on the nature of the Supreme Court's task may not be out of place. In a great federal nation like the United States, two problems are continually coming forward. One of these is the delimitation of the spheres of activity of the states and of the nation respectively. How far can the states tax transactions occurring in more than one state? How far can the state impose regulations, price maintenance laws, embargoes because of dangerous quality of foods, etc.: which may have the result of breaking up the United States into a series of little economic Balkan principalities? What will restrain the nation itself from utilizing its great powers so crudely as to oppress the individual citizen beyond reason? How far shall the nation go down into the states, and stand between the states and one of its citizens, preventing the state government from mistreating its own man?

To a surprising extent, in the United States, we allot this task to our courts, particularly to the federal courts,

and we look to the Supreme Court as the standard-bearer. Strangely enough, although we are used to boasting of our government of laws and not of men, we are in the nature of things unable to describe in words the limits of federal and state activity that we wish to have imposed in the interest of our citizens. Lacking these indefinable definitions, we can only hope to have on our Supreme Court judges of experience, wisdom, and balanced temperaments, who can deal sensibly with such concepts as "due process of law," "equal protection of the laws," "freedom of speech and of the press," and "commerce among the several States."

Notes

1. No. 101, 98 F.Supp. 529 (1951), 343 U.S. 350 (1952), 103 F.Supp. 920 (1952), 73 Sup.Ct. 1 (Oct. 8, 1952).
2. No. 8, 98 F. Supp. 797 (1951), 73 Sup. Ct. 1 (Oct. 8, 1952).
3. No. 191, 103 F.Supp. 337 (1952), 73 Sup.Ct. (Oct. 8, 1952).
4. No. 413, Cert. granted Nov. 10, 1952, 21 Law Week 3132.
5. No. 448 Cert. granted Nov. 24, 1952, reported below 91 Atl. 137, 21 Law Week 2112.

Scientists On Science News

by Hillier Kriehbaum

New York University Department of Journalism collaborated with the National Association of Science Writers in a survey of scientists, asking their opinion of science reporting. Most scientists polled found good things to say about present science reporting. Their chief recommendation was to get rid of what they called "too-frequent spectacular or romantic" journalism.

Letters were sent to several hundred persons listed in *American Men of Science* asking their opinions on: 1) the adequacy of present day science reporting, and 2) their recommendations for improvements. Analysis of 113 replies received from two mailings to the random-selected group showed the following breakdown for the first question which was calculated to discover their opinion of science reporting: adequate, 36; adequate in most cases but not in others (such as home-town local papers), 11; some excellent reporting but also some poor to bad, 8; can't rely on it as a source for scientific information, 5; inadequate but improved in recent years, 6; not adequate, 18; no opinion or question misinterpreted, 16.

If one lumps together all those that had something good to say for some reporting (some replies cited exceptions), the total comes to 68 or slightly more than 60 per cent of all replies. A special breakdown of answers from physicians and surgeons showed that less than half held favorable opinions of contemporary reporting.

Twenty-one scientists voiced the plea to get rid of sensa-

tional reporting as the chief recommendation. Other points mentioned repeatedly and the number of times cited: need for more "cooperation" between the reporter and the scientist, 6; avoid stories which are "puffs" or chiefly public relations blurbs, 5; use more illustrations, graphs, charts, 4.

Among doctors of medicine, the idea of checking copy back with the original news source was the most frequent recommendation, being cited six times. Disapproval of sensationalizing or playing up the "spectacular" or "romantic" or "emotional" aspects of a story, the next most frequent proposal, was cited five times. It is noteworthy, too, that whereas fifteen of the entire group expressed the belief that reporters should be better trained in science, only one medical doctor mentioned the need for greater medical knowledge.

While many replies contained references to what was considered overplaying sensational or "spectacular" aspects of stories, others mention that this is apparently a necessary part of journalistic writing and accept it is recognized newspaper procedure. Typical of the comments on the question of sensationalism in reporting science developments are:

Nestor Bohonos, Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Company, Pearl River, N. Y.—"I think it is impossible to make an overall statement regarding present-day science reporting as we have had some very fine articles in the press and some have been otherwise. One basic weakness seems apparent, and that is that the majority of reporters desire something spectacular and they are usually putting in words of extreme optimism or of great alarm when a situation does not justify it."

R. O. Stith, Manager of Public Relations, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio—"It is the policy of Battelle Institute to extend every aid possible to qualified science writers, and this policy arises from more than courtesy alone. We feel that science writers are not only functioning as reporters of legitimate news, but are also furthering science and public welfare through the dissemination of scientific knowledge and the interpretation of scientific progress. Mistakes are made occasionally, but the good done far outshadows the harmful effects of infrequent errors. Especially in the past decade has there been improvement in the accuracy of science reporting. The move toward professionalism in science writing should be continued."

Margaret A. Hayden, Professor Emeritus, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.—"Two causes of unsatisfactory reporting—in a sense, legitimate causes—are the necessity of limiting space, and the aim to catch the interest of the reader. A reporter may omit, or an editorial staff delete, material which leads to unintended misrepresentation. Over-emphasis upon some point believed to be of human application may result in misinformation or misinterpretation."

O. K. Sagen, Chief, Bureau of Statistics, Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill.—“Newspapers tend to overplay anything that can be given a sensational twist and fail to report on the non-sensational items, which in many cases have the most extreme significance. The net result is a lack of balance and the propagation of considerable misinformation. The news angle also tends to concern itself too much with the personalities rather than the subject matter. Also, there is too often an extraordinary emphasis on complete trivia . . . I nevertheless believe that there has been a steady and gratifying improvement in reporting the results of scientific research to the general public.”

Warren W. Coxe, Director, Division of Research, University of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.—“Science reporting has improved tremendously in recent years . . . I have one misgiving, namely, that there is a tendency for scientists to report their work before adequate checking and safeguards are made. This is leading the general public to expect, in some instances, things which, upon further investigation, are found to be impossible. Part of this may be due to the scientists themselves but part inevitably is the fault of the reporting .

Royal W. Davenport, Chief, Technical Coordination Branch, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.—“It seems to me that even our most outstanding magazines are prone to accept doubtful or even unsound views merely because they know certain approaches have reader appeal. Dignified interpretive reporting can be a distinct service to both science and the public, but exploiting science and scientists in order to bolster a story, twisting facts or telling half-truths, will do a great deal of damage and endanger future cooperation between science and the press.”

A Pennsylvania respondent advised: “Just keep the eager beavers out with their advance dope on scientific developments which turn out to be just science fiction and the field of science writing will go along O. K.”

A woman research associate on the Smithsonian Institution staff in Washington, D. C., replied that “science as reported in newspapers is a painful subject: and cited interviews in which she had been misquoted and in which the emphasis had been upon the fact that a woman scientist had wandered to far-away places, instead of what she was doing.

Bernard Frank, Assistant Chief, Division of Forest Influences, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.—“Billions of dollars of public expenditures are involved in water developments and watershed programs, and the costs of water supply deterioration, flood losses and reservoir sedimentation also run into huge sums. Science writers could perform a valuable public service by acquainting the people with the facts as they are now available and by pointing out why and what kinds of addi-

tional scientific investigations are needed to provide a better basis for government activities in these fields.”

Numerous scientists favored efforts for better relations between writers and scientists; some called it “cooperation” in reporting science. Henry F. Smyth, Jr., Executive Secretary, American Industrial Hygiene Association, Pittsburgh, Penn.—“Neither the full-time reporter nor the full-time investigator can do a good job alone. Science editors on newspaper staffs sometimes do an excellent job because they keep in constant touch with many scientists in their areas and consult local experts for facts and perspective.”

M. W. Harding, United Geophysical Company, Pasadena, Calif.—“Many of us who supply, at times, information for news reports are to blame. We do not insist on checking the factual material before it appears. A little more understanding on our part of the desire of the reporter to write an article of interest, or a sensational article, should lead to a little better teamwork with the journalistic profession in producing well-written, interesting, and still correct articles that are acceptable under current news standards.”

Victor S. Webster, Head, Chemistry Department, South Dakota State College, College Station, South Dakota—“I have found most reporters are glad to get any news that a scientist will release. Before offering any criticism of journalists I will have to admit that the cooperation of the scientists is not always good.”

L. N. Leum, Research and Development Department, Atlantic Refining Company, Philadelphia, Penn.—“Practically every newspaper in a city of any size has in its neighborhood a college, university or research department of some company with competent chemists, physicists or other scientists on their staff. These men could be called on to verify the facts of an article before it is published and, hence, avoid errors. Most scientists would be glad to do this, even without a fee, if his name is mentioned in the article as a consultant.”

Francis L. Lederer, Professor and Head of Department of Otolaryngology, University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago—“The time honored reluctance or false modesty on the part of physicians to cooperate in ‘getting the news straight’ boomerangs in that facts are presented in a distorted manner. I would suggest that we work with the press and it has been my experience that they will honor one’s desire for anonymity.”

Charles H. Brooks, Philadelphia, Penn., recommended “the possible establishment of some liaison group between the National Association of Science Writers and some central scientific group to establish some manner by which the scientific societies could recommend to the writers the propriety of some of the articles which are written.”

Robert S. Casey, Research Laboratory, W. A. Sheaffer Pen Company, Fort Madison, Iowa—“I think the greatest possi-

bilities for improvement are with the individual scientists whose work is to be reported, and who have no talent for writing. I have no hesitation in being critical on this point because I am in this category. Even though most of us

can never be taught how to actually write (without splitting infinitives) for the lay public, we should be taught how to communicate to science writers."

—From the October NASW Newsletter.

To Encourage Better Science Reporting

Science Writers Announce Program

The National Association of Science Writers, at a recent meeting, decided that press coverage of science is not keeping up with the growth of science itself. They thereupon undertook a program to encourage broad informed coverage of science. The organization established a permanent headquarters at 353 Fourth Ave., New York, and appointed an administrative secretary, Miss Harriet G. Trowbridge. For the first time in the 17-year-life of the organization of science reporters and editors, they issued a press release, in which their president, Arthur J. Snider, of the Chicago *Daily News*, described their plans.

"Despite the H-bomb and shots to prevent polio, despite developments in science that affect every one of us, much news of science goes unreported," Snider said.

"Many important scientists seldom are visited by an able reporter. Many scientists remain distrustful of the press. Far too few newspapers and other news-reporting agencies are adequately represented by reporters assigned to cover science, not just when an A-bomb explodes but every day, as the first steps toward many great new developments are taken in the laboratories.

"A greater amount of qualified science reporting is needed not only in newspapers but also and just as severely over TV and radio.

"The National Association of Science Writers is undertaking a long-range program to:

"1. Encourage accurate, reliable, responsible and interesting science writing.

"2. Increase the number of science writers, and the number of newspapers, magazines, news agencies and radio and TV outlets employing them.

"3. Point out to editors that much science news is already among the highest-readership news they can use.

"4. Point out to scientists that their cooperation with responsible news-gatherers is essential if the people are to understand the directions in which our civilization is going.

"5. Aid and advise scientific and technical groups.

"6. Enlist support for science.

"Many of our members now feel that public interest in science news is greater than many editors appreciate and that much science news is constructive, cheerful news that helps build readership.

"We want to be as scientific as possible ourselves in meas-

uring these things. We realize, of course, that the amount of interest depends too on the way the news is written, so we want to encourage good work.

"The number of science writers has greatly expanded since 1934. But science is expanding too, a great deal faster. We don't think newspapers, magazines, radio and television can afford to stand still in this crucial area."

A committee to study ways of winning wider publication of science stories has been named, under Hillier Kriehbaum, associate professor of journalism at New York University. It is studying present surveys of science readership, and investigating areas where future surveys are needed.

Included in its program are an up-to-date poll to measure newspaper and magazine science readership; a survey of high-ranking scientists to sound their opinions on present coverage; and a study of the psychological and sociological effects of various kinds of stories about science and medicine.

A study of science and medical readership was made by the organization in collaboration with the department of journalism of New York University, and distributed to newspaper editors, journalism deans and others.

A National Association of Science Writers Newsletter has been established, edited by John Pfeiffer, New York writer.

Other committees are planning widened programs.

The National Association of Science Writers was organized in 1934. It is affiliated with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and has 96 active and 82 associate members.

They meet twice a year during the annual meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Medical Association.

To encourage new writers, the group helped establish the George Westinghouse awards of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, through which the Westinghouse Educational foundation each year has honored the best newspaper and magazine articles on science.

The group helps administer the annual Lasker awards of the Albert and Mary Lasker foundation for outstanding writing on health and medicine.

It helped the American Heart Association establish an annual Howard W. Blakeslee Memorial award to honor Mr.

Blakeslee—science writing pioneer, Pulitzer Prize winner and former National Association of Science Writers president—who died in 1952.

The Howard Blakeslee award is now being given each year to the person who makes the best contribution to public understanding of heart and blood vessel disease—in newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets, radio, TV or movies.

Other committee chairmen are Severino P. Severino of the *Cleveland News*, membership; Pat Grady of the American Cancer Society, Lasker awards; Robert Potter, editor of the publication of the New York County Medical Society, Howard Blakeslee memorial; Victor Cohn of the

Minneapolis *Tribune*, publicity; Jack Geiger of International News Service, extension; John E. Pfeiffer, publications; Lawrence C. Salter of Playtex Park Research Institute, welfare; Volta Torrey of *Popular Science Monthly*, nominations; and Paul F. Ellis of Reuel Estill Co., planning.

John I. Mattill of Massachusetts Institute of Technology is program chairman for the group's December, 1953, meeting in Boston (during the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science). Rennie Taylor of the Associated Press is program chairman for the June, 1954, meeting in San Francisco (during the annual meeting of the American Medical Association).

Freedom and Books

by Dan Lacy

The topic of books and freedom has been very controversial in the past few months. It has been discussed in emotion-laden terms like "bookburner," "Communist propaganda," "censorship," "filthy books" and in tones that make dispassionate thought difficult. I thought it might be useful if we tried to discuss it in as quiet and simple terms as we may.

Our kind of government requires that all men be free to speak and to hear—to write and to read—as they choose. It requires this because it is dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and share equally in the responsibility for public decisions: in other words to the proposition that each man makes up his own mind after a free debate among alternatives. If there is a limitation on the freedom of discussion, then the decision is no longer wholly in the hands of the people, but to that degree in the hands of those who have power to limit the debate. This is not a theoretical point. It is the first step of every dictatorship to prevent the public advocacy of any course of action opposed by the dictator. When anyone seeks to deny the right to present any point of view, however heretical, he is in effect saying: "I know better than the people know. If they hear these arguments they might choose that course. I don't want them to choose it; so I shall stop their hearing about it, for I don't trust their wisdom to decide." To that degree he is seeking to deny the equality of other men, and to take into his own hands their power of decision.

And if every man is to have his equal chance to participate in a free government, he has got to have not only a free chance to discuss but a free chance to learn and to in-

quire. Thomas Jefferson saw a century and a half ago that the corollary of universal suffrage is universal education. And today, when the farthest lands of Asia are more desperately important to us than our nearest neighbors were a generation ago, when the complex doom of the atom hangs over us, and when every day, decisions of the most fateful importance must be made on the basis of unfamiliar facts and situations strange to us, a citizen without the chance to go find out for himself is in the hands of those who want to use him and might as well be disfranchised altogether.

But there is something more than all this, something more important about these freedoms than their political indispensability, for it is also true that our way of life conceived in liberty, and freedom is an end as well as a means of our being. Even if it were not necessary to every decision of our government, indeed even if it were politically utterly futile, still the freedom to speak and be heard, the freedom to inquire and learn is part of the meaning of life itself.

It was for these reasons that our forefathers wrote into the First Amendment to the Constitution that simple and magnificent phrase: "That Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press" and later extended this prohibition to the State governments as well. We have come to think of this as applying primarily to newspapers, but the authors of the amendment, in a day when newspapers hardly existed, were thinking primarily of books and especially of pamphlets. They meant something quite specific: that no law could be passed requiring a man to get permission before printing and distributing whatever he chose.

This, of course, does not free a man from responsibility for what he has published. If it is libelous, he can be sued. If it is obscene, within the definition of statutes reasonably

This is from an address by Dan Lacy, managing director of the American Book Publishers Council, to the Georgia State Library Association, October 24, 1953.

designed to protect the public morals under the police power of the state, he can be prosecuted. But he cannot be stopped by any prior restraint from publishing and distributing anything for which he is prepared to take the responsibility. The Constitution of Georgia put it even more clearly than the Federal Constitution: "No law shall ever be passed to curtail, or restrain the liberty of speech, or of the press; any person may speak, write and publish his sentiments, on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty."

It may be worth our while to examine this particular problem with some care. I think we may divide the sorts of materials against which charges of obscenity are frequently made into three broad classes. One is the outrightly pornographic: the filthy pictures, the leaflets peddled surreptitiously, the under-the-counter stuff. Though I am inclined to be skeptical of the charges of a great increase in this type of material, its publication and dissemination is a clearly illegal industry of considerable size. The second is the obviously salacious: the "girly" magazines and the magazine-format novelettes, which endeavor to stay within the law by confining the undress of their models to what may be seen on the stage or on the beach and by avoiding four-letter words, but which are wholly given over to suggestive salacity, contrived for the purpose. There can be no question that this type of material has grown and presses hard on the margins of the law. The third class are the reprints in inexpensive paper-covered format of realistic novels, originally published in hard covers for bookstore and library circulation, which describe the sexual experiences of their characters with greater candor and report their conversations with greater fidelity than would have been thought permissible a generation ago—though not I may add, with a greater candor or fidelity than was commonplace in the days of Rabelais or Shakespeare or in the novels of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century. It is about this last type that the controversy over censorship has primarily arisen and it is with this type that we shall be concerned here.

So long as it remained in hard covers and sold for \$3.50 or more, the realistic novel encouraged little adverse public attention, even though it might have very large circulation. *The Catcher in the Rye*, to cite an example of a book recently reported as having been attacked before the Georgia Literature Commission, was very successful in the hard-cover edition (selling about 45,000 copies), was purchased by public libraries throughout the United States, was a Book-of-the-Month Club choice with a circulation of some 155,000 copies, and was widely and almost always favorably reviewed as an especially sincere, thoughtful, and sensitive treatment of adolescence. Its inexpensive reprint, soberly covered, I may add, is banned from sale in more than one city. A similar situation confronts many even more distinguished books. Works by authors of the stature of

Hemingway and Faulkner, by writers who have won the National Book Award, the Pulitzer Prize, and even the Nobel Prize, have found themselves banned in a number of cities.

Why is this so; why this outburst of police censorship and censorship board? One reason is, of course, that presence of the deliberately salacious materials to which I have referred, though as a matter of fact censorship efforts are usually devoted less to these than to serious books, and least of all to outright pornography. One reason is that publishers of inexpensive reprints, whose only advertising and only salesman is their cover, in the early and fiercely competitive days of this industry often erred in emphasizing sex, violence, and lurid language on covers to catch the passerby's attention, thus frequently misrepresenting the actual character of the book. But even more important perhaps, was the exposure of contemporary books to large masses of people previously habituated only to carefully industry-censored magazines, movies, and radio programs, and unaccustomed to the greater latitude always enjoyed by books. The sense of shock was somewhat analogous to that which would be encountered if some of the most respected plays of the legitimate theater were filmed unaltered and shown in neighborhood movies. And finally an unquestionable cause was the genuine concern of parents over the easy accessibility to adolescents of books to the adult use of which they would not necessarily object.

The resulting censorship drives have tended to take one of three forms. In the one case a board or commission is established, such as the Georgia Literature Commission (the only one with statewide jurisdiction) or such as the municipal commissions in Canton, Miami, and other cities. The board or commission is given a responsibility to determine what is illegally obscene—or perhaps only what it finds morally objectionable (the language is usually vague)—and has an ill-defined authority through negotiation, pressure, or threat of prosecution to prevent the sale of books to which it objects. In the second form, a police chief or prosecuting attorney gets up lists of books, frequently simply lifted from those prepared by a particular religious denomination, and circulates them to distributors and sellers of reprints, openly or implicitly threatening them with prosecution or police harassment if the listed titles are not withdrawn from sale. In the third form, an unofficial committee, usually sponsored by the National Organization of Decent Literature, a Catholic lay society, visits each dealer, presents a list of books and magazines objected to by that organization, requests him to remove them from sale, promises him a certificate of cooperation if he does, and warns him that lists of cooperating and non-cooperating dealers will be displayed in the parish.

Most of these efforts are carried out by earnest and sincere men and women with the highest motives. But I

think all of them are illegal or potentially illegal, all are ineffective in dealing with the real problem, and all are filled with danger. In two recent decisions, *Bantam vs. Melko* in New Jersey and *New American Library vs. Allen* in Ohio, the courts have enjoined a solicitor and a police chief respectively from making up lists of books and effectively if extralegally, preventing their sale through open or implicit threats of arrests and prosecution. The implication is plain that the courts would probably similarly enjoin a commission which undertook to exercise a *prior restraint* on sale, rather than prosecuting in open court for violations of the law. The private efforts to gain the same end come dangerously close to illegal boycotts.

But these procedures are not only of questionable legality; they are in fact necessarily and inherently ineffective in dealing with genuine pornography. Any procedure that devotes itself to elaborate listings of what is and what is not obscene must be. When you are dealing with genuine pornography the problem is not deciding whether it's obscene; the problem is apprehending and prosecuting the peddler. Whenever you have a commission reading and debating individual titles to decide their obscenity, you have obviously passed beyond the pornographic into an area of taste, where reasonable men might differ. You are beginning to enforce not law, but opinion.

Moreover, when one considers the hundred thousands or more books in print, the ten to twelve thousand annually published, and the tens of thousands of magazines in hundreds of thousands of issues a year, it becomes obvious that any censorship effort can be no more than a capricious attention to occasional titles. Since genuine pornography usually has an ephemeral sale, and since it seems to consist of thousands of almost indistinguishable items, the ponderous methods of banning individual titles can never reach it, for by the time one title is banned a dozen can take its place. Indeed, I sometimes wonder if the net effect of censorship commissions is not to provide a convenient place to which negligent officials can pass the buck and thus avoid their real responsibility for prosecuting criminal purveyors of pornography.

Ineffective though such methods are for eradicating genuine pornography, they are full of danger with respect to legitimate books. I think too often those of us whose primary concern is with books that rarely attract the censor's attention feel that the struggle over moral censorship is a matter in which we are not concerned. This is not so; it has meaning for every book man. In the first place, no censor stops with the obviously pornographic; indeed, if he did, he would have no function. There is hardly a censorship effort that does not swiftly spread to works of genuine literary value. If the Bible and Chaucer and Shakespeare have had their expurgators, if one can hardly list a literary master-piece that has not somewhere and some-

time been banned, do not think that literary expression escapes the censor today. I have mentioned Hemingway and Faulkner and Salinger. One might add Farrell and Freud and de Maupassant and Romaine and a dozen others whose works cannot be purchased in cheap editions in a number of cities today.

In the second place once censors have been placed in such authority that their decisions can in practice be applied without the necessity of action in open court, there is little to prevent their passing from the field of moral into that of political or doctrinal censorship. This is not theory; it happens. In the hearings of the Gathings Committee, established by the 82nd Congress to investigate obscene literature one finds critical references by the committee staff to the attitudes shown in books reviewed toward race relations, toward Communism, toward polygamy, and toward the wealthier classes. The Board of Motion Picture Censors in Memphis, though established to protect public morals, banned the film *Pinky* because of its attitude on race relations; and who can doubt that this rather than the allegations of obscenity led some years ago to the widespread banning of *Strange Fruit*. State censorship boards in the movie field have repeatedly used their powers of moral censorship to ban newsreels as politically biased or inflammatory. *The Miracle* was recently banned in New York as offensive to Catholic doctrine, and similar doctrinal considerations may well have influenced current bans on inexpensive editions of Farrell and of Freud and other writers on psychoanalysis. Lord Acton's observations that "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely" was never more true than in its application to those who are given or who arrogate to themselves the power to determine what is safe for another to read. In the long run every censor tends to become the enforcer of his own personal views, and his eagerness to protect the morals of those whom he undertakes to guard insensibly extends itself to their minds as well.

Finally the techniques of censorship I have described seem to me particularly dangerous because they all have in common the effect of banning the sale of books without any distinct and hence easily enjoined exercise of authority, without the necessity of coming into open court to prove before a disinterested judge or jury the alleged obscenity, and without any real opportunity for the parties most at interest to be heard. This is because they all rely primarily on the acquiescence under pressure of distributors and dealers to achieve their purpose. The dealer normally has little incentive to defend a particular book when the same display space can equally well be used for another. He has every incentive to cooperate with the wishes of the police, the prosecuting authorities, and the censorship boards and to avoid the organized economic pressures of groups of his neighbors. Here is established the pattern of quiet censor-

ship in which it is most difficult to force the issues to open court or for the parties with the most at stake—the author with something to say and the reader with something to learn—to assert their rights.

I hope that in your own communities you will be leaders among those who insist that compulsion be applied only through the due process of law. Once that bulwark is lost, it is lost for us all.

In saying this, I do not want here to ignore a problem which troubles persons of the most earnestly sincere motives, and that is the effect on their children of the vicarious experiences they are exposed to through films, radio, television, magazines, newspapers, and books. As myself the father of three children I share this concern. Most thoughtful parents realize, however, that this is not a problem that can be dealt with by censorship. Books are but the least, unfortunately—in terms of time occupied—of the vicarious experiences that children have. And the total impact of all second-hand experience is probably slight in comparison with what a child encounters in life itself. The introduction of a child to life, with all its real and not to be ignored cruelty and degradation and with all its reach for nobility requires the most thoughtful sharing and guidance—the fullest contribution we can give through books and other media, but especially through ourselves. For my own children, I want to share no part of that responsibility with a body of censors, whether self-elected or duly constituted.

I also do not want to ignore the sincere reply of many people who might say “yes, we agree we don’t like censors, but a lot of stuff that’s published, though it’s not criminal, is pretty shabby. If you don’t want censorship, why don’t publishers get together and set up an industry code like the movies or radio or TV and clean it up themselves.”

Responsible publishers, individually and collectively, have been deeply concerned about their responsibility in their own work. I think most responsible publishers now feel that there has been a serious abuse of good taste in covers of small books. If you examine them in comparison with those of a couple of years ago you will see the results of this conviction in a notable if still imperfect improvement.

But they have not and they will not set up an industry committee or code.

There are two reasons why. The first is practical, but relatively unimportant. That is, that the most offensive material you may buy on newsstands, the deliberate and contrived salacity with no other purpose, is usually produced by publishers who would be unlikely to join such an effort. The second reason is the important one. And that is that if it is wrong for a church committee in a given community to achieve by organized pressure the power to control what others of different persuasion are able to read, if it is wrong for a police force or a censorship board to

have this power in a particular city, how much worse would it be if it were possible for a committee of publishers, not responsible to any public authority, to be able to say not to one city or state but to a whole nation, “You shall read nothing, for we shall publish nothing, that does not conform to a code *we* set up, and we shall see that no independent-minded publisher gives you that opportunity either.” Can anyone who has stopped to think, want this?

The movies have been made safe. I hope the day never comes in this country when books have been made safe: when there will not be room for books, and inexpensive books too, to shock and anger and offend and provoke and argue.

However, the service of freedom through books presents problems far more complex than those of overt censorship itself.

One of these is the increasing reliance of the citizen on second-hand information. The second is the rise of the mass media of communication.

Generally honestly and fairly administered, these mass media do an indispensable job of pumping out current news and ideas, without which our complicated society could not function. But they do not serve the need of the man who wants to dig into something for himself, find out the other side, explore the problem on his own. And more urgently than ever, our society to remain free needs such an opportunity for the inquiring citizen to go find out for himself. It is our one great protection against the one idea, against the pressures of conscious or unconscious propaganda, against the closed mind of conformity.

This means books. It means books, where you have time to develop a thought at length and not in a capsule. It means books, which can deal with complicated sets of facts. It means books, which with no sponsors or advertisers to worry about and no mass market to keep happy can take sides, can present unpopular views, can “think otherwise,” can oppose the stubborn and disagreeable fact to the popular fallacy, can keep going that debate which we need always to keep our minds tough and free.

If books are to serve freedom as they must, it is not enough that they be protected from censorship. The use of books is in their reading, and no man is truly free to read if he has no access to an adequate body of books. Freedom to read must be not so much protected as achieved. An adequate public library system extending throughout the country and giving library service to the tens of millions now without it is a essential to the preservation of freedom today as was a free public school system in Thomas Jefferson’s day.

It is a part of the convictions we all live by that free books and free men go together.

To Defend Our Heritage of Freedom

by Nathan M. Pusey

The President of Harvard deals with attacks that he finds monstrous. He rejects conformity and indoctrination to assert that the free and independent mind is the goal of education. This is from a talk to the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in Boston, Dec. 4.

If there is anything education does not lack today it is critics. We have them outside and we have them inside. I am told there have been times when people in education have suffered from a feeling of public neglect. This is not the way I have known it, or at least know it now. Most of us today would probably admit we attract more outside interest and have more volunteer helpers than we want. For rare is the community where public indignation has not been aroused about this or that teacher, or this or that textbook, or this or that question of educational policy. Far too much of the public confusion and uncertainty and aggressiveness and hostility and just plain nastiness that have recently welled up in such profusion in our national life comes inevitably sooner or later to break over the schools, or other educational institutions, in whatever community, to our very great cost in time and anxiety, and, it seems to me, too often to very little constructive good. This criticism is, of course, unpleasant, but it can also be viewed, if we be patient and see it in a proper philosophical manner, that is with some kind of stoic calm, as a tribute to our importance. For where people care so much, they are certainly not indifferent. And for the most part, it is clear, or at least we must assume, that our critics want to be helpful.

Doubts, uncertainties, and criticisms assail us from outside. They also arise within our own numbers no less insistently, and there is therefore no comfort anywhere. We are dissatisfied with our performance no less than are our critics; we worry and fret and argue about every aspect of what we are doing; but—and this is important—we are dissatisfied, at least in part, and happily, for totally dissimilar reasons.

There are many sorts of questions now being asked by citizens' or parents' groups, by school boards and city councils, or by any of many self-constituted guardians of a community's mores about schools and colleges which have to do with curricular problems, with methods of instruction, with the need for and proper kinds of new physical facilities, with the adequacy or more probably the inadequacy of faculty salaries, and with many other such things. All such questions are usually well meant,

they are frequently helpful, and we are grateful for them and for the kind of attention and concern they bring to us; and in all honesty we would like more of them. But there is another kind of current questioning of an entirely different nature which is harder to get hold of, more difficult to make precise, and so to answer, which we cannot view with equal complacency and which is quite properly very disturbing to us. This is the kind of vague, amorphous and insidious distrust of the whole educational enterprise, which few will openly avow, but which creeps by implication into many current discussions, and which, in affecting the minds of many people who really ought to know better, serves there to bring the honor and integrity and loyalty of the whole educational enterprise into question.

One reads about this sort of thing's occurring in community after community across the United States. So widespread indeed is the phenomenon that almost no school system or college or university has been completely unscathed, but it is also probably true that no educational institution has attracted more of this sort of misgiving than has Harvard,—which I suppose is a kind of tribute, but which I can assure you we would be perfectly happy to do without. I want to talk a little about this kind of misgiving, especially as it attaches to Harvard for I know it best there. It is clearly one of the very present realities in any truthfully topical educational discussion.

The origins of this questioning about Harvard go back at least into the thirties, and probably spring from the very great publicity given to some very few—I would say rather extraordinary, at least definitely atypical—Harvard men of that period. But unfortunately the virus has sprung up with a new virulence again more recently. The point I should like to make here about this distrust of Harvard is simply this, that though there are admittedly bits of evidence to account for its origin and other bits to account for its continuance, the growth in misapprehension and consequent distrust that has followed these is monstrously out of proportion with the facts. My excuse for turning aside to talk about Harvard for a moment here is simply a conviction, which I hope is correct, that at this point we

have a symbolic value which reaches beyond ourselves.

There are now about a hundred thousand citizens of the United States who at some time in their careers attended one or another of the schools that make up Harvard University. It is probably true that some dozens of these flirted with or were indeed actually involved with communism at some time during their careers, though not necessarily while they were students at Harvard. We know at any rate that there was a cell of graduate students and young instructors, about fourteen in number, at Harvard in the late thirties. I suppose there were other such at other universities. It is possible, of course, that some very few of our hundred thousand alumni are still involved in communism. There is almost nothing at least some Harvard men do not get into! But it is an extravagant generalization from a very unsavory, if widely reported and dramatized incidents, and therefore a totally unwarranted conclusion, to imply that because one or two or a few Harvard men went Red some years ago, that now or at any time the whole of this great University's activity should be brought under suspicion.

Some people are always ready to believe the worst, and they do not need much evidence to help them. One or two misguided even malevolent and treacherous individuals are cited, and the achievements of all the rest of the hundred thousand, the founders of industries, heads of corporations, directors of banks, research men, lawyers, judges, cabinet members, legislators, college presidents, doctors, farmers,—substantial citizens in almost every community in the United States—men of unquestioned loyalty, leaders in the war effort, in all the productive activities of our country, in the cultural life of the nation, in city after city—these count for nothing! For example, I discovered recently that in the list of the presidents and directors of the hundred largest industrial corporations of the United States—that is in the small list of leaders most intimately concerned for the growth and development of our productive power in this country—there were no fewer than one hundred seventy-four Harvard men. One hundred seventy-four involved immediately in the leadership, the building, and the operation of our hundred largest industrial corporations. In the field of high elective office, we find among men who studied at Harvard four United States Senators, twenty-five members of the House of Representatives and three governors. Others, many at considerable financial sacrifice, are serving their government in administrative positions of great responsibility or in our embassies abroad. But these, we are supposed to believe, are not typical Harvard men. It is the others, the pitifully small number, the one or two, or small handful of aberrants, who are. How misguided, or how malevolent, can people be? And what is true of Harvard in this matter is true in much the same manner for all the other

colleges and universities and schools and school systems in our country. It is not a very pretty or very reassuring picture.

The attacks on our teachers are even more disturbing than are those on our graduates, and I am sure for others as well as ours. Again let me say there are or have been individuals among us of whom none of us are proud, but among three thousand teachers at Harvard, only four were found last spring at the height of the inquiry at Harvard, who either had been or might have been members of the Communist party. That is to say, about one tenth of one per cent were brought under suspicion. What does this prove about the loyalty of our teachers in general? What *does* it prove? Is it not exactly the opposite of what has sometimes been implied? It is, of course, possible that there is a very secretive individual here or there who has been missed—possible, however unlikely—but to bring the whole teaching profession under suspicion because of a few examples of this kind is a monstrous conclusion to be drawn from such facts. It should indeed be just the opposite.

And here again, what attention has been paid and respect shown by critics of this type, what justice is done to the really typical member of the Harvard faculty, to the two thousand nine hundred and more others who are our true representatives,—including the men who invented the iron lung, those on whose researches in atomic energy and weapons. in radar and sonar, and so on, the late military effort so largely depended; Dr. Cohn and his fractionation of blood and all the lives saved because of his researches; or the people who supplied the knowledge of places and peoples that saved thousands and thousands more lives; or people like Dr. East who years back did the basic research from which hybrid corn came, and his pupil successors who have been and still are perfecting this great gift to the increase of the health of our country and the world; or those responsible for an incredible number of almost magical discoveries in medicine; or the investigators in personality problems and group relations, in business management, and in all the problems and complexity of the law; or Harvard's six Nobel prize winners; and most important perhaps of all, the humanists whose efforts are constantly reminding us of old and bringing us into fresh awareness of new reaches of the human spirit? Are these men, the regular rank and file of the University faculty, busy patiently, honestly, and committedly from day to day about their researches—not to count in the scales against the others, the very, very few, the fraction of one per cent, whose misplaced zealotry may have caused them to stray, at least for a brief time, from a whole-hearted quest for truth? Is there anything more fantastic than to think for a moment that the research efforts—the imagination, and industry and insight—of the

thousands and thousands of trained minds that make up the college and university faculties of this country are concerned for anything other than the discovery of truth, and so ultimately for the fulfillment and increase and enrichment of everything that is good and healthy, rewarding and productive, in the whole of our national life? Where the people of America are at their best—and in every aspect of their activity there—the people engaged in American education are present working to help them; they are of them; their efforts are there strengthening the others to give them increase, and they are bent solely to serve the common weal.

I have said enough to suggest that in my opinion much of the outside criticism currently directed against our educational enterprise is misguided, uninformed, unproductive, unwarranted, and unnecessary. At Harvard, for example, amidst all the recent recrimination and fomented suspicion there is no one who can or will come forward to name a single Communist among our three thousand teachers. And yet some unfriendly critics continue to belabor us with the name of one single teacher who once was a Communist, seeking thereby to create the impression—or perhaps mistakenly believing—that we are a seat for widespread disloyalty. It will be well for everyone, for American education, and for our country as well as for Harvard, when this sort of thing shall have run its course.

* * *

American education has set for itself the goal of developing free men. That is to say, its major purpose is to train people who are able to think for themselves, exercise judgment, and act upon that judgment, and deeply care. This is not easy, and we do it imperfectly, but surely the way to do this is not by indoctrinating or seeking to inoculate some particular point of view. Individuality and variety and free investigation—not conformity—are of the very essence of democratic life and of democratic education.

Today there appear to be a rather large number of people who are frightened because of the freedom American education enjoys. And there are people, including ourselves, who are dissatisfied with the progress we have made. Some in the face of the threat of totalitarianism now appear inclined to feel our schools and colleges should become centers for indoctrination. This surely would be to lose the greatest battle of this century without a fight. Americanism does not mean enforced and circumscribed belief; it cannot mean this. We know that free men are developed not by indoctrination but only by that superla-

tive kind of gifted teaching which can engender fresh thought and living concern.

It would be a sorry thing if in resisting totalitarianism we were to follow the counsels of the frightened and adopt its methods. It is rather for us now to look again at the high purpose we serve, not to absolve our former failures and shortcomings, but to renew our faith in what we are doing, to get a firmer grasp of the goal, and to go ahead.

Our job is to educate free, independent, and vigorous minds capable of analyzing events, of exercising judgment, of distinguishing facts from propaganda, and truth from half-truths and lies, and in the most creative of them at least, of apprehending further reaches of truth. It is also our responsibility to see that these minds are embedded in total persons who will stand with faith and courage, and always, too, in thoughtful concern for others. We must all of us at every level in education work together to do this job. The vast majority of people in this country want us to do this, and not some other task. I would suggest only to any of our critics who may have been confused or wavering on the matter of how the goal is to be won that at least at the level of education with which I am most immediately concerned, the way to achieve the desired end is not by harrassing professors, or by seeking to turn universities into little police states rather than free associations of scholars, or by governing boards' surrendering their responsibilities to the pressures of hysteria or reckless attacks. The way is quite other than this. And I believe the matter is essentially no different at the level of the schools.

American education has a very fine if not entirely unblemished record of achievement behind it. In times of tension and confusion such as the present the obligation upon us all is greater than ever before to hold fast to its central purpose and historic role of serving the truth, working first and always to produce free men and maintaining a spirit of hope. There is now an especially urgent obligation upon our universities to preserve freedom of inquiry and freedom of teaching, but it is no less upon our schools and colleges. Together we must continue to demonstrate and defend our heritage of freedom, support creative thinking for the advance of civilization, and serve as the foundation, the creators and defenders of liberty in a free people, and now, as always, be the leaders in the fight against totalitarianism.

We are indeed today in the public eye. Let us acquit ourselves like free men.

Book Reviews

Soviet Background

by Henry L. Trehwitt

HOW RUSSIA IS RULED. By Merle Fainsod. 500 pp. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. \$7.50.

Time has now made it clear that the great tragedies of modern history include the failure of all efforts to gain relief from the tyranny of Tsardom prior to the Russian revolution of 1917. Had the Tsar-Emperor not failed to heed the evidence that the Russian millions had a bellyful of things other than food, the moderationists of reform might have created something less than the threat that Bolshevism Russia is to free institutions today.

Mr. Fainsod, professor of government at Harvard University and director of political studies at that institution's Russian Research Center, makes this abundantly clear in his scholarly history and analysis of Bolshevism. He has drawn upon his own extensive knowledge of Soviet affairs, official Soviet sources and the facilities of the research center in presenting this documented study of modern Russian rule from its inception to its present second-place position among systems of world power.

Of most immediate import is his frank summation, in which he sees the basic control of the Party preventing the internal collapse that is the object of prayer by Western democracies.

In this regard, he says: "In the light of the available evidence, it would appear that there is very little opportunity for the forces of internal opposition in the Soviet Union to organize and become effective, short of a major crisis of leadership which would give them a free field of action, or of Soviet defeat in war, in the course of which the Party and police controls of the regime break down."

The Bolshevik creation of mutual suspicion and rigid control at all levels, under the aegis of the secret police, and the development of an administrative and military elite that reaps extravagant benefits from success and oblivion with failure, dim the possibility of a successful uprising. And as time brings to adulthood the present-day youth, the more thoroughly

indoctrinated Bolshevik, that likelihood becomes even more remote.

The possibilities that Mr. Fainsod cites above as means of organizing and releasing discontent with significant power are discouraging to the West. The apparent elimination of Mr. Beria as a threat to Party unity reduces Western hopes for a leadership crisis, and the prospect of war as a prerequisite throws a pallor on the strategic value of help from inside Russia.

Yet we are constantly aware that the very factors that made for rigid surface conformity contain elements of constant danger to the Soviet regime. Implicit in Mr. Fainsod's analysis is the thought that fire struck in the proper place at the proper time might have telling effect.

Adventures in Science

by Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN READER.

Edited by the board of editors of the monthly magazine *Scientific American*. Simon and Schuster, New York. 626 pp. \$6.00.

For those who have been late in discovering the magazine from which it comes, this book is opportunity hammering at the door for a second time.

Its subject matter ranges roughly from the Milky Way to the common cold; from the origin of life to the future (if any) of the human race. There are 57 articles all taken from issues of the *Scientific American* from May, 1948 through May, 1953. Some of the material has been revised and slightly condensed.

As the editors make clear in an introduction, the *Reader* is not just a collection of "best" stories from the magazine. It is more nearly an up-to-date briefing, in crisply interesting style, on many of the most important phases of modern science.

For those who have not been subscribers to the *Scientific American* since its reorganization in May, 1948 this volume is the next best thing.

Most of the articles are written by scientists, but there is little trace of the profes-

The author finds the sources of Bolshevism in Russian history, traces its development through the uneasy and sometimes bloody pre-revolutionary years, and recounts the 1917 seizure of power that surprised no one more than the Bolsheviks themselves.

Then he records the development of the great elements of Soviet power—the Party itself, the bureaucracy, the military and secret police—and examines them inside and out. The interaction of power sources, the system of incentives and repression, administration of industry and agriculture, and over all the hand of terror, are explained in detail.

Generally very readable, this is a book of immense importance to the newspaperman who would understand the factors behind much of the copy that crosses his desk every day. For the reader getting his first experience in this field, the going is slow in a few spots, but the effort required for a full understanding is well repaid.

sional jargon which helps discourage non-experts from reading scientific journals. Fortunately the *Reader* is equally free from that major defect of science "popularizers"—reduction past simplicity to absurdity.

The book is divided into 12 parts, each of which covers a broad field of scientific inquiry.

Logically, the first division is "Evolution in Space." Astrophysicist George Gamow, astronomer Fred L. Whipple, of the Harvard Observatory, and others discuss the universe at large, and sketch the best current theories as to how it all started, whither and how fast it is drifting.

Next comes "Structure of the Earth" with special attention to that thin surface scum which geologists call the "crust" and most people think of as "our world."

From the structure of earth to the "Structure of Matter," is the next step. Discussed here are those basic particles which make up the atomic bomb and the kitchen sink. This section introduces the reader to the atomic nucleus, the things that may or may not be in it and the atoms they comprise.

The next division is on "Atomic Energy" in several of its most publicized

aspects. These include atomic power, the hydrogen bomb, radioactive tracers and their use in medicine and biology.

The remaining divisions are:

"Origin of Life"; "Genetics," as applied to both men and molds; "The Virus"; "Stress," concerned with the glandular behavior of the human body; "Animal Behavior," ranging from studies of the army ant to animal experiment in psychology; "Origin of Man"; "The Brain and the Machine," which discusses both the human brain and the fantastic electronic computers which can take over some of its chores; and finally "Sense and Perception."

When read cover to cover *Scientific American Reader* is the supreme adventure

story, but it doesn't have to be read that way. Each of the articles stands alone almost as well.

Perhaps as important as anything else is the fact that the book puts science and the scientist in a truer perspective than we usually get these days. It doesn't give all the answers because nowhere near all the answers have been found. It does show where and how scientists are looking and it removes a lot of the mumbo jumbo which the non-scientist often associates with that search.

Most of the illustrations that went with the original *Scientific American* articles are missing, but you can't have everything—at least not in one volume.

What the Doctor Ordered

by Richard Dudman

DOCTORS, PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT. By James Howard Means, M.D. Atlantic-Little Brown. 206 pp. \$3.50.

Anyone who has paid \$200 for obstetrical services, then got a check from his Blue Shield group for only \$50, and pondered the matter can get some sense of what can be done about it from Dr. Means's discussion of medical economics and medical politics.

The limited health insurance that is the best available to most Americans leaves dominant the "fee-for-service" system, halloved by the American Medical Association, as the most common way of paying the doctor.

In Dr. Means's view, the fee-for-service system is objectionable in that it may tempt the doctor to see the patient more often than is necessary and may keep the doctor away from the patient when he really should go.

"In brief," he says, "I believe that uncontrolled fee-for-service, or the what-the-traffic-will-bear method of charging for medical service, is not in the best interest of either the patient or the doctor. It is a noble business to equalize economic inequalities to some extent by soaking the rich, but it hardly seems a proper function for the medical profession."

How, then, should the payment pass from the patient to the doctor? Dr. Means would collect contributions from the patient on the insurance principle, with government or other aid for the indigent and with employers in some cases paying their

employees' premiums as now is the practice in some health plans. As for the doctor, says Dr. Means, put him on a salary—"The type of work that (Mayo Clinic's) doctors do on a straight salary basis is the best refutation I know of the often-made statement that doctors do better work on fee-for-service than on salary."

After describing in detail some of the more promising comprehensive group health plans now operating (including the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles, the combination of Blue Cross and Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and the Endicott-Johnson Co. plan in upstate New York) and telling some of the incidents of the bitter fight waged by so-called organized medicine against most such plans, Dr. Means settles down to give his own ideas on how the economics of American medicine can be improved.

He would start at the bottom rather than the top and emphasize "spontaneous local endeavor" without any final plan being formulated for the time being. Each of the nation's 72 four-year medical schools, he suggests, could become the nucleus of a local health plan, providing complete medical, surgical and hospital care for its group of voluntary members. Hospitalization would be furnished at a teaching hospital with all patients available for teaching on the theory that this is advantageous to both the patient and medical science.

Dr. Means, a former president of the American College of Physicians, has been a member of the medical department of Massachusetts Institute of Technology

since his retirement two years ago after 28 years as chief of the medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital and professor of clinical medicine at Harvard Medical School.

"Organized medicine" is dead set against much of what Dr. Means proposes, and he obviously makes no serious bid for the support of the American Medical Association and its component societies. And yet, addressing the general reader, he makes a persuasive case that his remedy for the nation's medical malady is just what the doctor ordered.

The Age of Suspicion

The spread of know-nothingism is currently our gravest domestic threat. But the battle is far from over; it has, I think, just begun. And it will not be won by men who are so distracted by the McCarthy danger that they dismiss the external challenge of Soviet imperialism. This is, in essence, the parallel of the McCarthy hoax; for what he and like-minded men have done is to distort all reality by picturing the bedraggled American communists as far more menacing than the massive Soviet power, and by identifying with the communists all those who reject McCarthy's intolerant version of history.

The right to be wrong is an ancient democratic liberty; like the Soviet prosecutors, the McCarthyites would define as treason anything they regard as error.

In any contest with despotism, freedom is ultimately our greatest strength. The vision of America as a refuge of liberty and justice has won us esteem in the world; men who despoil that vision may lose us the comradeship of millions who yearn for liberty.

Those who say it is too late for civilized men to confront complex problems thoughtfully are society's eternal undergraduates to whom all human conflict is a kind of wild football game. They always minimize democracy's resources and grow frantic when it fails to score the first touchdown or is penalized for taking too much time in the huddle. But at critical moments in the past the processes of freedom have survived all the counsels of desperation; there is no justification for a national loss of nerve, now.

—*The Age of Suspicion*
by James A. Wechsler
Random House. \$3.75

Yankee Fiasco on Flood Control

by John M. Harrison

FLOOD CONTROL POLITICS. By William Edward Leuchtenburg. 339 pp. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. 1953. \$5.00

In the midst of a national political controversy over how to deal with natural resources in the United States, Professor Leuchtenburg's study of the Connecticut River Valley—which he might have titled "Futility Rampant"—is especially valuable. At least it provides a blueprint for how not to deal with flood control, power generation, pollution control, and allied problems.

Those who expect positive answers will be disappointed. The author only sets down what went on in New England and in Washington during those 23 years he has studied—1927-1950. His conclusions indicate that many individuals and many forces are in some degree responsible for what happened—or failed to happen. There were, he declares, many conflicting interests. He goes only this far in attempting to attribute blame:

"The poor record of the Connecticut Valley over the past two decades has largely been the result of the failure of the Corps of Engineers to achieve these adjustments of group interests, and the inadequacy of state efforts in the same field."

Mr. Leuchtenburg abundantly documents this charge. There was bound to be tugging and hauling as between political and economic groups in the Connecticut Valley. This could only have been offset by positive leadership on the part of federal or state officials in a position to crack a few heads together if need be. It was not forthcoming—neither from the Corps of Engineers when federal action seemed to offer some hope, nor from the New England capitals when the states were supposed to be doing the job.

Such vacillation and such pettifoggery as marked this era of disappointment for residents of the Connecticut Valley—three times the victims of disastrous flood during these very years—are hard to believe. Flood damage was important only when it became a convenient political weapon. Generating cheap power for New England's endangered industries never even got serious consideration until it was too late—especially since there was so little

chance that concern would soon be translated into action.

Always there was much talk of states' rights—oh, very much talk of that—and of the flooding of farms and recreational areas. Especially in Vermont, clocks were turned back to the days of the Green Mountain Boys, who stood ready to turn back invaders who might try to build dams. At their head stood George D. Aiken, then Governor of the state. Mr. Aiken, who since has gained a considerable national reputation as one of the more enlightened Republicans in the United States Senate, was eliciting cheers from the Liberty Leaguers after the 1936 election with his sterling defense of his state and all its lands against a power-mad Washington.

That the federal government's part in these off-again, on-again proceedings is no more inspiring was due largely to the "now you see us, now you don't" policy of the Corps of Engineers. But Professor Leuchtenburg has some interesting things to reveal, too, about the parts played by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Henry A. Wallace in scotching Senator George Norris' plan for the "seven little TVA's," of which the Connecticut was intended to be one.

It is neither Washington nor Montpelier, however, that the young historian author of this study blames for failures in the Connecticut River Valley, for the fact that the floods were not held back any more than needed additional power was generated. He does not belabor Republicans

as against Democrats, liberals as opposed to conservatives, private utilities interests, or those who wanted for a variety of reasons to keep the valley in its pristine state.

A student of these various forces, far more than he is a partisan of any of them, he examines their part in this futile effort to control and harness the waters of this valley. Typical of his conclusions is this:

"The rise of the leviathan state has not vitiated the importance of the principle of decentralized authority; if anything it has made all the more urgent the need for popular control of government. Nothing in the history of the Connecticut Valley, however, suggests that an unreasonable adherence to the dogma of states' rights makes any contribution to that end. One cannot answer the urgent need for flood protection by quoting Tocqueville."

It is in this spirit that Bill Leuchtenburg has conducted this study of a river valley, which—allowing for the many differences that are bound to exist—should serve as a microcosmic representation of other valleys with generally similar problems. What he has to say will give no comfort to those who now propose to turn the development of these resources back to the states and to private interests. But neither will it permit advocates of federal or regional action to rest without answering some embarrassing questions concerning what wasn't done in the Connecticut River Valley.

The author's concern plainly is to apologize for or to eulogize no one. His only concern is a very careful study of a monumental failure in the conservation of natural resources, and this he has ably done.

The Illusion of the Interstate Compact

One reason for the poor record of the Connecticut Valley [on flood control] stems from the limitations of the interstate compact device.

Although the interstate compact had been used on numbers of occasions for almost a century, it received its real impetus in the field of water resources in the 1930s. This was not an historical accident. The interstate compact for water resources came into favor at the very time that control of water resources shifted from state governments to the federal government, and, more particularly, when the strengthening of the

Federal Power Commission and the construction of the TVA and other public power projects threatened the interests of private utilities. Up until then, as Gifford Pinchot remarked, the utilities opposed state control and were "all for Federal control—because there wasn't any."

The essential feature of the interstate compact is that it attempts to resolve conflicts by giving one of the parties to that conflict a veto. Unless the other states will agree to the terms of any particular state, that state can refuse to enter into an agreement. The division

of a river basin on state lines accentuates the division of interests, making it far more difficult to strike the best balance of interests. It is exceedingly difficult to resolve the conflict between men who want to use a given piece of land for farming and men who want to use the same piece of land to protect downstream cities from floods. It becomes much more difficult to resolve that same conflict when, instead of being a difference between two groups of men, it becomes a difference between the sovereign state of Vermont and the sovereign state of Massachusetts. It becomes almost impossible to resolve the conflict when one of the sovereign states is conceded the power of veto. Yet this is what the interstate compacts for water resources attempt to do.

Throughout the controversy over the ratification of the interstate compacts of 1937, the New England states stoutly maintained that the compacts provided a splendid solution to the problem of flood control in New England. . . . If the West River dispute did nothing else, it shattered the illusion that the 1937 compact would have provided adequate flood control in the Connecticut Valley, and that the compact device offered a panacea for resolving water resources problems in New England.

Although pollution had been a serious problem for decades, no interstate agreement was reached even on that until 1947. What elements were present in 1947 that had not been there before? The most striking new feature was the fact that most of the states had solved or were on their way to solving the problem of stream pollution in their own states, and that the key state of Massachusetts had given punitive powers to its state agency just two years before. The interstate compact was the next logical step; not until the problem was solved within state borders, not until a political victory had been won over industrial and municipal interests within the states, was an interstate compact possible. . . . The New England states had yet to demonstrate that the compact would result in any more action on the part of the states than would have been undertaken without an interstate agreement.

—*Flood Control Politics*
by William E. Leuchtenburg

European Prognosis: Good

THE TEMPER OF WESTERN EUROPE. Crane Brinton. Harvard Press. Cambridge. 118 pp. \$2.50.

Those who have been impressed by the prophets of gloom, from Spengler and Toynbee through to current columnists, will be surprised at the provocative optimism that Crane Brinton holds on Europe.

Professor Brinton was solidly impressed with Europe in a long stay there last Winter. But he had been there much before, through more than 30 years, as student, tourist, and in the last war in our Office of Strategic Services. As an historian at Harvard, he has specialized on the intellectual history of Europe. Revisiting Europe after eight years, he notes its economic recovery, the evidence of the vitality of its people, its culture and its institutions. In spite of the war losses, Europe is richer today than before the war, and he sees it facing the future with vigorous spirit.

He thinks it unrealistic to expect political unification any time soon. But in the economic union already begun by the coal and iron pool, he sees a nucleus of integration that self interest will further.

He has examined the facts but he does not base his buoyancy on statistical reports. He reports also on what he feels about Europe. One thing he feels is that the long habit of diversity of opinion is a great guarantee against totalitarianism in the Western World. Habit, he says is a more important ally of our liberties than the rational liberal likes to admit.

As to the derogatory observations of current European critics,—Brinton recalls that in every age intellectuals have deprecated their contemporary culture. His own favorite example is the Boston legend that when Symphony Hall was built, a conservative Bostonian, outraged at the modernism of the time, suggested that instead of painting "Exit" over the doors, they should inscribe "This way out in case of Brahms."

We call the French burned out today, he says. But they have just set up the first major pilot plant for the use of sun power. And whatever we think of Existentialism, it is European, and the most important philosophical movement since the war. If T. S. Eliot is a sound prophet in predicting that the world will end, not with a bang but a whimper, then Brinton feels that Europe is safe for a while. For the bangs he hears from there suggest a nursery more than a death ward.

This is a short book, only 118 pages, and meant to be an impression and not a research report. It has a delightful personal quality, of informal exploration, of easy anecdotal discussing about what Crane Brinton finds and feels about the European present in relation to its historic roots and its prospects. It is not a bit dogmatic, just one man's point of view, illuminated by his first-hand observation and enriched by his deep familiarity with Europe. It has the flavor of a conversation with Crane Brinton, which is a lively and rewarding experience.

Louis M. Lyons

George Seldes' Story

by Charles L. Eberhardt

TELL THE TRUTH AND RUN. By George Seldes. Greenberg: Publisher, New York. 293 pp. \$3.75.

What might be described as the scatter-gun approach to autobiography marks this one by George Seldes. It's a collection of episodes, separated here and tied together there with Seldes' reflections on the press and politics, and it just doesn't flow into a meaningful whole.

Self-consciousness (for which he apolo-

gizes) keeps Seldes essential self from intruding very far into the story of his own life, except for an intimation now and then about a love affair or a circumspect reflection about his motives. Mostly he writes, as he might have written at the time, about his long newspaper tour in Europe, beginning with the first World War. Somehow, in 1953, flat description of a Chicago *Tribune* man's Europe of the 1920's doesn't sustain much interest,

China Tangle Unravelling

by Lionel Hudson

even though he scored with many a story and watched the turbulence of those years funnel into the violence of the thirties and forties.

Seldes sent copy from London and Paris, Berlin and Moscow, Rome and Riga. He writes of a post-World-War-II visit to Yugoslavia, the nation he now seems most to admire. And yet the best reading in the book is in the few light moments—the descriptions of life in Pershings's press section, where each correspondent was furnished a Cadillac, with chauffeur; the tale of Seldes' diligent negotiations to get a piece of the Vatican to be cemented into the *Tribune* tower, and his yeoman effort in smuggling Katherine Medill McCormick into Czechoslovakia.

Of course the traditional Seldes theme underlies this autobiography: his assertion of the venality, dishonesty, willful incompetency, and persistent inconsistency of the American press. But this indictment lacks the impact it carried when Seldes first aimed it in the 1930's—perhaps the punch is lacking because it smacks of a rehash.

In fact those who've read Seldes on U. S. newspapers won't find much in this volume that hasn't a clearly familiar ring. For instance one of the opening anecdotes of *Tell the Truth and Run* describes the author's dismay when the name of a brewery firm was cut from a story—one of his first journalistic efforts—of a traffic accident in Pittsburgh.

The same incident was recounted in the opening chapter of *Freedom of the Press* by George Seldes, published in 1935.

Some of the material is new but not news, and too much of it apparently was selected and written primarily to demonstrate that Seldes is not and never has been a Soviet Marxist communist. The result is that a negative, defensive tone pervades great slices of the book.

Tell the Truth and Run is too impersonal and fragmentary to make the man Seldes understandable—and thus the book is not good biography. And it's too limited and sketchy to illuminate the Europe and America of this generation and the previous one.

Although newspaper people will find the book moderately interesting, despite its shortcomings, the general reader is apt to find it boring.

THE CHINA TANGLE. By Herbert Feis. Princeton Univ. Press. \$6.

Herbert Feis appears to have committed himself to a series of unhappy endings that could make him the Hemingway of modern historians.

He could hardly avoid a certain amount of gloom at the end of *The Road to Pearl Harbor* and he had no option but to wind up his latest book, *The China Tangle*, on a most despairing note.

The China Tangle traces with impeccable sobriety American policy on China from the time of Pearl Harbor to the Marshall Mission.

If, as should be earnestly hoped by all interested in the Asian scene, Dr. Feis is to carry on the good work of collating and clarifying material on United States action in East Asia leading to the current situation, he must follow up with another depressing tale—at least so far as non-communists are concerned.

This would take us to the Korean conflict, broaden out to the Chinese intervention and perhaps to the Korean Armistice—both suitable for a Hemingway ending.

The China Tangle deals with the grim effort to sustain Chinese resistance in the first phase of the Pacific war, the contest between the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communists and the worried American diplomatic exertions at Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and beyond to carry out the concept of the United Nations in the Pacific. Dr. Feis admits with regret that it is a "tale of crumpled hopes and plans that went awry."

He plunges straight into an account of the ignominious retreat from Burma. He reports again what General Stilwell told the press in New Delhi: "I claim we got a hell of a beating. We got run out of Burma and it's humiliating as hell. I think we ought to find out what caused it, go back and retake it."

General Stilwell's reasons to which he attributed defeat are listed: hostile population, no air service, Japanese initiative, inferior equipment, inadequate ammunition, inadequate transport, no supply set up, improvised medical service, stupid

and gutless command, interference by Chiang Kai-shek, British mess on the railway, rotten communications, British defeatist attitude, vulnerable tactical situation.

It is a gloomy enough picture in itself but the sadist in me prompts me to complete the tragic circle by telling of the fate of two generals—one Chinese, one British—who were captured by the Japanese during the retreat. The Chinese general survived in Rangoon gaol until April, 1945 when he was stabbed in the back by one of his own troops.

The British general was strafed and killed by RAF Spitfires in May, 1945 while making his way to British lines after being freed by his captors.

Dr. Feis, of course, presses on with developments more critical to the world. He sums up with the thought that American people need not make excuses either to themselves, the Chinese people, or to the rest of the world for having failed in their attempt to "shape the vast country of China into the image of our desires."

The war in the Pacific ended abruptly before the U.S. effort in behalf of China reached its planned fullness and, in the civil war that followed in China, American diplomacy and military planning got entangled and stumbled.

Dr. Feis merely suggests there is still a chance that a better appreciation of what America sought to do with and for China will emerge out of the "debris of hatred and regret which have silted over it."

OUT OF THESE ROOTS. By Agnes Meyer. Atlantic-Little Brown, Boston. \$4.00.

Agnes Meyer belongs in the select company of crusading reporters whose disclosures of neglect have brought needed reform by reaching the public conscience. Her earlier book, *Journey Through Chaos* describes one of her most important campaigns. The story of that story makes the core of this book. It should be part of the education of every reporter. Mrs. Meyer's story suggests that of Ray Stannard Baker, that mild but persistent reporter who protested the epithet of muck-raker as applied by Theodore

Roosevelt to the most effective reporting of his time. They are poles apart as personalities. But they share a compulsion to set things right and a tenacity that carries through against the difficulties and discouragements that beset those who tackle such thankless but essential chores. They were brought up to believe that life was meant to have a use and to be used; and what they learned of journalism was that to make people understand was the beginning of correction of social evils. They grew out of rigid backgrounds from which they had to break free, but they retained a driving force of conviction which gave their writing a cutting edge. Tempered with high intelligence and driven with indomitable energy, it proved a penetrating weapon.

Mrs. Meyer's writing is lively, as incisive, as provocative and as compelling as her conversation. It is a story one can't escape and shouldn't want to.

—LOUIS M. LYONS

BY LAND AND SEA. By Samuel E. Morison. Alfred Knopf. New York. \$5.

This is one of Alfred Knopf's frequent publishing triumphs. These selected essays by one of America's greatest historians are great stuff, rich slices of history, saltily written, a happy sampling of the most brilliant writer among living historians. His work has the same verve and fascination and high style of his incomparable lectures at Harvard. Knopf wraps up in this one book parts of Morison's vast work on the history of our Navy in the last war; a glowing chapter from his biography of Columbus; a description of the great art form of the Yankee clipper ship; that classic book review, "History Through a Beard," in which he skins a fellow historian; the first lecture on American history given at Oxford University; the story of the Harvard Columbus expedition, following the path of the Great Admiral; Washington as a young man; an episode on the founding of Harvard College; and certain pieces that, together with the wry humor of Morison's prefaces to them, make collector's items. One is the piece on the centennial of the War of 1812, done for the Boston *Transcript* but rejected by that custodian of all that was proper in Boston because it might reflect on the loyalty of some local ancestors. One was a lecture

for a local Mayflower Society that was sourly received because it failed to celebrate in the Pilgrims the fountain source of Republican free enterprise. It contains one little classic that I have often distributed to Nieman Fellows as a pamphlet, long sold at ten cents at the Old South Meeting House. It is "History as a Literary Art" and what sticks longest in the mind from it is his admonition to young historians, that applies equally to

other writers—Get Writing.

He has a marvellous passage in it on all the excuses that writers use to postpone the painful process of starting to write. Nothing is more pathetic, he says, than the scholar who is always going to write a masterpiece but never gets down to it. Lucky that Sam Morison escaped this block about writing or our history shelves would be bereft of many of their liveliest chronicles. LOUIS M. LYONS

The News Void

Radio and TV Fail to Fill Place of Newspapers in Strike

by John Gould

If ever there were doubts over the complementary rather than competitive nature of the major news media, they were put at rest during the suspension of newspaper publication. Television and radio filled a real public need with their news schedules, but necessarily they fell far short of meeting the public's hunger for information. The lesson is that broadcasting and the press perform different services, but both are needed in modern life.

Perhaps more than anything else the lack of a daily press illustrated that the broadcasting industry is not normally equipped to give more than the top of the news—the major bulletins of the hour. The highlights of the news taken from the press associations form the backbone of the news efforts of the stations. Original reporting, except for top Washington or international developments, is not a broadcaster's concern.

Most of the stations spoke of increasing their news coverage, but this claim proved somewhat illusory. What was done chiefly was to give the same news more often, not more news in the sense of greater diversity and number of stories. It was this void in the coverage that the individual perhaps felt most keenly.

The special Sunday efforts of the broadcasters came closest to giving rounded coverage of many different fields, but even here a viewer could hardly help but notice broadcasting's inevitable subservience to the tyranny of time.

Gone for the last ten days was that indescribable luxury of deciding for one's self when to catch up on the news. The simple act of picking up the paper whenever one chose had to be abandoned in

favor of keeping an eye on the clock. Is it near the hour yet?

It also took a newspaper strike to impress upon the individual that the reader of a newspaper may be the most important editor of all. With the press blackout there was a denial of that inalienable right to pick and choose the news item in which one had an interest. To hear about something that did matter, one had to sit patiently through the trivia. It also was necessary on TV to wait out the comic strips, the reading of which represented some of the year's most atrocious acting. Fellas, you don't have to be a Duse to handle Little Orphan Annie!

But if the strike made one freshly aware of the varying capabilities of the different types of news media, under normal and happier circumstances this difference is a decided asset that can be easily overlooked or taken for granted. Each medium can in its own way add to the public fund of information.

Television is at its best in its pictorial reporting of actuality, as witness yesterday afternoon's "shots" of Andrei Y. Vishinsky, the Soviet delegate, as he listened to President Eisenhower's address before the United Nations. Radio has the advantage of unparalleled speed in quickly communicating information to a large public. And the newspaper has completeness, tangibility and permanence.

During the early days of the strike, Edward R. Murrow, the CBS analyst, in a singularly perceptive and understanding commentary on the role of the daily press, offered one observation that is timely: "A newspaper is like your youth—never appreciated till it's gone."

—New York Times, Dec. 9.

The Famous Press Conference

"The stormiest White House news conference of recent years" reported James B. Reston of the one that followed the attempt to subpoena former President Truman.

"Seldom in the memory of reporters has a President faced such a sharp barrage of questions . . . Reporters began jumping up as many as ten at a time."

This is the full text, from the New York Times, Nov. 12.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 11 (AP)—*Following is an unofficial transcript of today's White House news conference, with President Eisenhower's remarks in indirect discourse as required by conference rules:*

THE PRESIDENT—He had a few items that might be of interest. He, of course, thought we should all note that it was Armistice Day—he supposed a national holiday for the reporters as well as for him—but it seemed to be about the only time this week he could have this conference if he were going to, because, as he said before, he was leaving for Canada tomorrow night for a short visit.

However, Armistice Day has always meant a lot to all of us, and if he could ask a favor it would be that each reporter make some mention in your stories that it is Armistice Day, and what Armistice Day really meant to us at one time. That would be his speech on that subject.

The Canadian trip, as he had said, is really a courtesy call, but he has been invited to address the Parliament up there, and he intends to make the subject of his talk just a general discussion of some of the problems that are common to both countries and, of course, through the medium of that speech, to pay his respects to the Canadian people to whom we feel so close.

In this problem of segregation that has been always in the hands of some of our people since last January, going ahead on different fronts, the Navy has just made a very detailed report in the form both of a letter to him and in a statistical report. It is a very encouraging report, he must say.

The Philippine election seems, so far as the Administration can see from reports—and he has only the newspaper reports—seems to be progressing in the way that we should like to see elections progress in any free country. It looks

like they are going without duress, like there is no effort to rig it. They are going ahead as free elections, which is very encouraging.

This week we did have another election in this country, and last week, he believes, the question was asked whether he was pleased, and he had to qualify his answer very materially.

This week he could say he was pleased. (Laughter.) With that remark we will go to questions.

RAYMOND P. BRANDT of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*—Mr. President, I have a series—

THE PRESIDENT—Mr. Smith.

Merriman Smith of the United Press—I wonder if you could tell us your reaction, your opinion, of ex-President Truman having been subpoenaed by the House Un-American Affairs Committee?

THE PRESIDENT—Well, no, he couldn't say a great deal about this. Here is—he will give you his connection and his feeling about this thing.

Some days back Mr. [Herbert] Brownell [Jr.], the Attorney General, reported to him that there were certain facts that had been coming to light in Brownell's department that he felt should be made available to the public, and that he felt, moreover, it was his duty to do so, and he told the President that they involved a man named White, a man whom the President had never met, didn't know anything about.

The President told Brownell that he had, as a responsible head of Government, to make the decision if he felt it was his duty to make these things public to do it on a purely factual basis.

Brownell did tell him that the information had gotten to the White House, and that was all—and so that was his last connection with it until this incident oc-

curred of which the reporter spoke.

Now, he thought once before, before this group, he had tried to make quite clear that he was not going to be in the position of criticizing the Congress of the United States for carrying out what it conceived to be its duty.

It has the right, of course, to conduct such investigations as it finds necessary; but if the reporter asked him, as he understood it, his personal reaction, he would not issue such a subpoena.

EDWARD MILNE of the Providence *Journal-Bulletin*—Mr. President, do you, yourself, feel that former President Truman knowingly appointed a Communist spy to high office? A.—You are asking him for opinions, of course, based on nothing else except what he has told you and what he has read in the papers. No, it is inconceivable; he doesn't believe that—put it in this way—a man in that position knowingly damaged the United States. He thinks it would be inconceivable.

MR. BRANDT—Mr. President, my office asked me to ask this whole series of questions. A.—Just a minute. He [the President] is not sure of the custom here, and you may have one question, but there are a lot of other people.

Q.—I think they are pertinent to all of them. A.—Well, he [the President] will have to decide.

Q.—You answered the first one, did you know in advance of Brownell's Chicago speech, and did you approve it? The next question was were you consulted while plans were being laid to bring the White story out? You apparently offered—A.—No, the report was made to him that there was certain information that the Attorney General considered it his duty to make it public, and he did mention the word "White," although, as he said, he didn't know who was White.

Q.—Did you know in advance of the

plan to subpoena Truman, and did you approve? Do you think Supreme Court Justices should be subpoenaed by Congress? A.—He is not a constitutional lawyer, and he would again say the reporter was asking, there, his personal opinion—personal convictions. He probably, in that position, would not do it. He'd think there would be other means of handling it rather than issuing a subpoena.

Q.—Do you think the F.B.I. [Federal Bureau of Investigation] report is justified in calling White a spy when a grand jury refused to believe it on the basis of F.B.I. evidence—that was the grand jury investigation in 1947? A.—He knows nothing about it; you will have to go to the record and facts.

Q.—Do you think the Administration's action in virtually putting a label of traitor on a former President is likely to damage our foreign relations? A.—He rejected the premise, and would not answer the question.

Q.—What effect do you think such an action by the Administration will have on the Russians—good or bad?

THE PRESIDENT—Let him say something: anyone who doesn't recognize that the great struggle of our time is an ideological one—that is, a system of regimentation and of virtual slavery as against the concept of freedom on which our Government is founded, then they are not looking this question squarely in the face.

Now, the attack against freedom is on many fronts. It is conducted by force, by the use of subversion and bribery and boring from within, and it makes it necessary to practice more than ever that old saying, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Now, he thoroughly agrees with those who say we must be very careful how we apply our own activities, our own powers, our own authority in defending against this thing.

We must not destroy what we are attempting to defend, and so, just as earnestly as he believed we must all fight communism to the utmost, he believed that we must always fight any truly unjust, un-American way of uprooting them, because in the long run he thought we would destroy ourselves if we used that kind of defenses.

Now this is, however, something that

Would Be Read Abroad With Incredulity

It is true this text would at first be read abroad with incredulity. Few would believe that the President of the United States subjected himself to an incisive cross-examination by reporters who were "better briefed than he was on the answers to a cannonade of questions they shot at him," as the *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent described it. Few would believe that the reporters dared address the President with the challenging questions that were asked or that their editors published the questions and answers.

No European Premier or even a Foreign Minister would dream of according to the press the privilege accorded by President Eisenhower. Few European members of Parliaments and fewer reporters would venture to treat even a minor minister as American reporters treated the President.

Harold Callender, Paris correspondent
New York Times, Nov. 15.

is subject to the judgment of humans, and they are fallible; and when they see all of the efforts we have made over these last years rejected—he means our measures to make some peaceful arrangement—to see them rejected: the offers we made in 1946 about making available to all the world the entire atomic project that had been developed; every secret; make it available for peaceful use under any system that would give us confidence that all others were doing the same; and all the way down the line we have seen secrets stolen, we have seen all kinds of spy-working ahead, it is sometimes difficult to say there will never be an injustice.

But that, he said, must be the true path for every real American—to oppose these ideologies, these doctrines that we believe will destroy our form of government and, at the same time, to do it under methods where we don't destroy it. He couldn't define it any better than that.

ROBERT G. SPIVACK of the *New York Post*—Mr. President, taking up your answer to one of the previous questions, since Mr. Brownell has impugned the loyalty of a former President, and a grand jury said it couldn't find a basis for indicting White, don't you think there is

a moral obligation to make these reports—F. B. I. reports—public? A.—No.

Q.—And we have no way of knowing—

THE PRESIDENT—He didn't believe that you could make F. B. I. reports available, as such. He believed you could extract a great deal of material from them, but there were too many things in them that must be protected.

As a matter of fact, the original F. B. I. reports he would not allow to be shown to him except when he had to see them, because he just believed if we didn't protect their sources of information we would some day destroy them.

Now, the reporter also makes a premise he doesn't accept. The reporter said Mr. Brownell had impugned the loyalty of a President. He doesn't know—certainly Brownell never told him—that Brownell said that the President of the United States ever saw the papers. The Attorney General said they went to the White House. Now, that is all he ever told him, and he thought the reporter had made a mistake.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND of the *New York Herald Tribune*—Without making any premise at all, could I ask you whether you feel that a charge should be publicly made against anybody, an accusation, without the evidence being publicly made so that the public can assess the basis of the accusation, regardless of the F. B. I.?

THE PRESIDENT—He thought the essentials of the evidence probably had to be made available; yes, he would agree with that.

He didn't think—look, this goes back to what he said—he believed it was reckless, to say nothing of un-American action, to make from any kind of a favored position accusations where you were not prepared to show what had happened, and to make available the essentials of that evidence.

Now, here you have got a case where there are certain particular documents he doesn't think can be shown, but the essentials of the evidence certainly must be—so far as he knew—and he didn't know of any disposition to conceal it.

Q.—It has not come out yet, Mr. President.

MAY CRAIG of the *Portland Press Herald* and other Maine papers—Mr. President, I have been around for twenty-five years

here, and I found myself befuddled by failure to get the truth.

Isn't the question here whether the charge is true, made by Mr. Brownell? Isn't that the basic thing? Should not former officials who know, come and tell the truth to the people as they knew it?

THE PRESIDENT—He thought that was proper. He thought she had asked a question that sort of answered itself.

What we want is the truth, and so far as he knew, the Attorney General had no intention of concealing anything except the particular form of a document, and he assumed that other people, in giving their testimony, would do it in any way they saw fit.

Q.—Do you think former officials should be protected in not coming forward and telling their share in public happenings? A.—He didn't say they should be protected; he said he believed there was a certain—he was asked this question, how would he have done it—and he certainly would not, he said, issue the subpoena in the circumstances.

S. DOUGLASS CATER JR. of the *Reporter*—What did you understand was the purpose of bringing information from the files of the F. B. I. before a luncheon group instead of some official body, such as a grand jury, or another body of Congress, or something of that sort, by the Attorney General?

THE PRESIDENT—You can get direct evidence on that. He didn't even consider it. He had been told that there was going to be certain information made available. It was. You can go to the Attorney General himself.

ANTHONY LEVIERO of the *New York Times*—Mr. President, I think this case is at best a pretty squalid one. But if a grand jury, under our system, has found a man—has, in effect, cleared the man or at least has decided it was insufficient evidence to convict him or prosecute him, then is it proper for the Attorney General to characterize that accused man, who is now dead, as a spy and, in effect, accuse a former President of harboring that man? That was quite plain in the statement of the Attorney General. A.—He suggested now—look, all you are trying to get now is his personal opinion—Q.—That is right. A.—About certain things.

Q.—Yes, sir. A.—He [the President] was not either a judge nor was he an accomplished lawyer. He had his own ideas of what was right and wrong, but he would assume this: you were asking him to answer questions where, with all of this in the public mind, the Attorney General was here to answer it himself. Let him answer it.

Q.—He has refused to answer the questions, you see. (Laughter.)

ANDREW F. TULLY JR., of the *Scripps-Howard* newspapers—It is true that Mr. Brownell is here, but he won't see reporters. (Laughter and cries of "hear, hear.")

Q.—I wonder if we can ask you to exert your influence to get him to see us? (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT—Well, of course, after all, he thought that here that you were probably getting a little bit more impatient than Brownell thinks you should be. He didn't know exactly what Brownell had in mind; he was certainly ready to talk to Mr. Brownell more about this when he returned to town, but he was not going to give him orders as to methods in which he handled responsibilities of his own office.

Now, this is what he wanted to say: He had found Mr. Brownell interested in justice and decency in cleaning up what he had got to clean up.

The Administration had gone ahead in many lower echelons—he believed there was a report published it had gotten some 1,400 people that it thought were security risks.

The Attorney General published, now, a particular case, and it has aroused tremendous interest, now we will see how he handles it, and the President is not going to color his case or to prejudice his case in advance in what he says about it.

Q.—Can you give us any indication of when the proof of these charges is going to be offered by Mr. Brownell?

THE PRESIDENT—Of course, he couldn't. He just said that Brownell has got to handle this case in his own way, but now he just says that he is not supposed, and he does not intend, to be one that is a party to what looks like rank injustice to

anybody. That is all he can say on this.

MR. LEVIERO—One more question. In so far as we have been allowed to know the facts, the case rests on the testimony of two confessed traitors, Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley. I wonder if the F. B. I. independently has developed any evidence to sustain the charge of espionage? A.—Again you will have to ask Mr. Brownell; he didn't know.

ROBERT L. RIGGS of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*—There has been some question as to whether the F. B. I. report said Mr. White was a spy or whether it says he associated with Communists. Did Mr. Brownell say to you that the F. B. I. report called him a spy?

THE PRESIDENT—Ladies and gentlemen, he was going to answer his last question right now on this subject for this morning, at least.

He had told you exactly, Mr. Brownell had come in and reported to him that there was evidence that there had been subversive action in which high Government officials were aware of it, and the Attorney General knew that, or he gave him the name as Mr. White, and Brownell said the evidence was so clear that he considered it his duty to lay it out because he said, certainly, he was not going to be a party to concealing this, is the way he explained it to the President. The President said you have to follow your own conscience as to your duty. Now that is exactly what he knew about it.

PAUL RANKINE of *Reuters*—Mr. President, could you tell us anything about the subjects you expect to discuss at the Bermuda conference? A.—There is no agenda. The invitation and all the conversations and the communications on the subject are that they are to meet on an around-the-table basis to discuss problems of interest to the three Governments, and that is all, and on a very informal basis.

OSCAR W. RESCHKE of the *German Press Agency*—Mr. President, is it being considered to ask the Government of the Federal Republic [of West Germany] to be at hand for the conversations? A.—Not that I know of.

MR. SMITH—Thank you, Mr. President.

Conquering Mt. Everest Told by Times Reporter

Newsman, During Visit Here, Reveals Secret Code to Paper Gave First News of Feat

"Snow conditions bad. Advance base abandoned. Awaiting improvement. All is well."

Those words, a secret code flashed to the London *Times* by radio, told England and the world—on coronation eve—that a British expedition had reached the summit of Mount Everest.

The reporter who sent the news—with the "highest dateline" ever filed—told his story in Milwaukee last week end. James Morris, 27 year old London *Times* correspondent, visited here on a tour of the United States. He has a grant from the Commonwealth fund in New York to travel in this country for a year.

First Telling for Publication

His interview here marked the first time Morris had told his story for publication. His own newspaper, which carried thousands of his words on the expedition under an exclusive contract for news of the Everest climb, didn't print it.

"The *Times*, you know, doesn't personalize its news," Morris said. "In fact, I didn't even get a by-line on my Everest dispatches."

Morris, a slim, youthful looking man with the rosy cheeks you'd expect of a mountain climber, said he got his assignment unexpectedly. He was no professional adventurer. Only three and a half years out of Oxford, he was a *Times* foreign staff writer.

"I suppose they picked me because I was young and healthy," he said. "It did come as a surprise and without much advance notice. They told me about the first of February and a couple of weeks later I was flying to India."

"We (the *Times*) had bought exclusive rights to the news of the expedition and made extensive preparations to get it out.

The problem was that the mountain camp was 200 miles from the nearest cable office at Katmandu. So I took a number of runners—Nepalese natives who specialize in traveling through the rugged Himalayan country.

"My agreement with them was to pay on a sliding scale—depending on how fast they got back to Katmandu. Several made it in six days, which is quite remarkable speed."

Morris based his runners at the main camp at an altitude of 18,000 feet. He sent his dispatches—daily toward the end—in code to prevent their interception by rival English newspapers. The opposition—unable to accompany the expedition—had radio monitors at Katmandu attempting to pick up the radioed stories another *Times* staffer was relaying to London from the news Morris' runners brought from the mountain.

After reaching Everest, Morris learned that he might not have to depend on the runners to flash the big news when the summit was reached. He discovered that there was a secret government frontier post 35 miles from the camp. Its mission was to watch for Communist agents crossing from Tibet into Nepal. It was equipped with a radio transmitter in communication with Katmandu.

Climbed to 22,000 Feet

"I decided to try to get the final message out that way. I couldn't be sure the Indian people at the post would send it. I knew they wouldn't if it were gibberish. So ahead of time, I devised the code and sent it to Katmandu by runner."

"The afternoon we expected to get the word, I climbed up to camp 4—at 22,000 feet. It was May 30. Only after we saw Hillary and Tensing coming down the mountain toward us did it occur to me that maybe I could get the news to London in time for the coronation."

"The most exciting time was watching them coming down. We tried to decide

if they were gay or despondent—to indicate whether they had made it. When they got nearer, we rushed out to meet them.

"They didn't have to tell us. We just sensed it and began shaking their hands. It was a tremendous moment."

Got Off Code Message

"I spent about an hour getting the story from Hillary and then headed down the mountain. It was squashy and nasty going and I became very tired. When I got to the base camp, I was exhausted. But I started writing my story. At the first light of dawn, I got off a runner to the frontier post radio with the code message."

"'Snow conditions bad'—that meant the mountain had been climbed. 'Advance base abandoned' meant Hillary. 'Awaiting improvement' meant Tensing. I just added 'all is well.'"

"Of course, I sent my detailed story by runner to Katmandu because I couldn't be sure that the government radio would send the flash. As a matter of fact, I didn't learn until the morning of the coronation—while listening to BBC—that the word had gotten through."

Morris said that it was Hillary who first reached Everest's summit, 29,002 feet above sea level. But that was purely an accident, he said. Hillary and Tensing alternated in the lead, roped together, and it was merely by chance that Hillary was the first man to set foot on the "roof of the world."

Takes Blame for Controversy

For the world-wide controversy that later developed over which man was first, Morris took the blame.

"I forgot to ask at the time and our first stories didn't say. It just didn't seem important because both worked together as a team and neither could have done it alone," Morris explained.

"Later, however, some Nepalese nationalists met the expedition on its way back to Katmandu and started all the fuss. They made it into a political thing which it never was in the expedition itself. Actually, Hillary and Tensing are the best of friends and each gives the other the credit."

Milwaukee *Journal*, Nov. 2.
by Harry W. Hill,

Nieman Notes

1939

A report on the first "Nieman baby" now approaching his 15th birthday, comes from his father, **Frank Snowden Hopkins**, a foreign service officer stationed at Stuttgart, Germany. His son Nicholas, born Feb. 20, 1939, while Frank was at Harvard in the very first group of Nieman Fellows, is now 5 feet 11. He is attending a Swiss school, rooming with a Turk and an Italian. His roommates speak English, but school is taught in High German. The younger Hopkins children, Martha, 12 and Richard, 6, are attending the Stuttgart American Dependents School, run by the Army with about 1,000 pupils. After a year-and-a-half in Germany, Frank and Ruth Hopkins have acquired the language and German friends and report that Germany is one of the countries where there is no real problem of anti-Americanism.

Southern Democrats looked like any other kind to the Administration, when they finally got around to them. So **Osburn Zuber** is back in Birmingham. And a good thing, he says, that he didn't sell his house in Birmingham when he was persuaded during the war to leave newspaper work to serve in the Small Defense Plants Administration, which now wears a new look as the Small Business Administration.

1940

J. Edward Allen and his family made a trip home from Switzerland for Christmas in Hingham, Massachusetts. Allen has put in six years as chief of information service, International Labor Office, at Geneva. He sends this report of

What Goes On at Geneva

After six years at ILO I can now give you a brief fill-in on what got accomplished. The number of ratifications of ILO conventions has very nearly doubled since Dave Morse, then acting secretary of labour, took over as Director-General in 1948. There are now on deposit about 1400 ratifications of 103 conventions. One of the most widely-ratified—granting workmen's compensation protection to alien workers—has been put into force in more than 40 nations. The one I like best, however, is the convention granting interna-

tional social security protection to 45,000 bargemen and boatmen on the Rhine river. I like it because of its explicit, detailed provisions and because it was accepted unanimously by the owners, workers and governments of all the Rhine countries. I like it also because, after it was concluded, the ILO didn't try to set up a new bureaucracy to administer it, but turned the administration over to the already-existing Central Rhine Navigation Commission.

There is a real source of pride and pleasure in watching these ideas pass through the negotiating stages and become accomplished facts. I have seen the ILO launch and complete its investigation of conditions on ships flying the Panama flag, and finally the probe of the UN-ILO Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour into charges against many nations, including the Soviet Union and the United States. This committee, headed by Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, wrote an extremely detailed report which I am sure will prove of lasting importance in the development of international law.

The UN-DPI reported the first two sessions of the committee and the ILO News Service reported the last two, including the final report. You might be interested to know that, to date, I have received 73,000 requests for the English communique based on the final report and more than 21,000 requests in French.

We are currently printing publicity material in 22 languages and broadcasting in 27. I have a little radio studio which is actually an arm of the UN Radio at the Palace of Nations. Our newsheet is now being published in Hindu, Urdu, German, Portuguese, French, Spanish, English, Swedish and Danish, with a one-page insert in a UN bulletin at the Hague in Dutch.

Soon after I arrived in Geneva I discovered that the accepted American custom of embargoed release hours around the world wouldn't work here. We made an arrangement with the wire service bureaus here to give them a two-hour jump on important happenings at Geneva, with simultaneous distribution of ILO material on an immediate release basis two hours later at UN headquarters in New York and ILO branch offices in Washington, Ottawa, New Delhi and sometimes—but not often—Rome, Paris, London, Karachi and Copenhagen. We worked out a system at

the recent Asian Regional Conference in Tokyo by which news reports were actually released at UN headquarters in New York at an hour earlier than the filing hour in Tokyo. This was due, of course, to an advantageous time lag.

I was in some doubt whether the ILO could be made photogenic when I took the job but, thanks to Harry Truman and the effect of his Point Four declaration, we have a big operational technical assistance programme which provides some excellent photo stories. Our technical training centre at Tripoli now has a staff of 35 foreign instructors paid by ILO under the Expanded Technical Training Programme of the UN and Specialized Agencies. We made an arrangement with Brazil to use the excellent National Apprenticeship Training Centres there for the benefit of all the Latin-American countries. Our productivity missions in India and Israel have done much to make work less fatiguing and more productive for local workers.

I presume that I tend to become a bore when I begin to harp on my wares but thought you would be interested. I have often thought how much John Clark, a Nieman Fellow in 1938-9, would have enjoyed seeing these things for which he made a pioneer contribution as secretary to John Winant come to fruition. Please give my regards to all old friends.

A special 50th anniversary issue of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, put out by *Editor & Publisher*, has its leading article by **Hodding Carter**. The title: "South Is Old Lady No More." He tells the story of the South's rapid development partly in terms of his own city of Greenville, Miss.—its new highway, new bridge, new high school, factories, parks, Negro swimming pool, a growing new beef raising industry and rice crops where recently cotton was the one crop, and a new hospital offering Negroes "the same facilities as to white."

"Our newspaper has recorded all these changes," Carter writes, "and it is itself proof of gratifying and significant change. Fifteen years ago we had less than 500 Negro subscribers in a county whose population was two-thirds Negro. Today, though the number of Negroes has actually diminished, we have more than 6,000 Negro subscribers,—not enough in propor-

tion to their numbers, but a heartening result of increased education, increased income and increased civic interest . . .

1943

Frank K. Kelly was responsible for the American project in the Flow of News Report by the International Press Institute. See review on page 2. In the course of a year, researchers examined 177 newspapers and 45 agency reports. Their findings were evaluated by 500 editors, foreign correspondents and wire service executives. Since the completion of the project, Kelly has been with the American Book Publishers Council and signs their Bulletin which reports on book censorship activities.

1944

Jacob S. Qualey is now an editor for Meridian Magazines, publishers of World-Crime Detective and Five-Star Detective. His address: home, 145 East 23d st; officie, Room 606, 366 Madison Ave., New York.

1946

Mary Ellen Leary (Mrs. Arthur H. Sherry) writes of the way she manages her double life as journalist and mother of a baby beginning to talk. She was invited back, after the baby, to her old job as political editor of the San Francisco *News*. But the long legislative sessions were out of the question, she says, so she is "pinch-hitting for the editorial writers at times, on politics other times. Just working eight hours a day and luxuriating in much leisure, and in staying close to home."

1947

The American Forestry Association presented its 1953 distinguished service award in journalism to **Ernest H. Linford**, chief editorial writer of the Salt Lake *Tribune*, citing "more than 100 distinguished editorials on basic soil and water problems in the last five and a half years. He has been the spearhead of his newspaper's vigorous campaign to safeguard and wisely use all renewable resources in the nation."

1948

Robert W. Glasgow became Toronto bureau chief for *Time*, Inc. in November. He had been with *Time* in its Chicago

bureau for four years, after serving as mid-West correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune*.

Justin G. McCarthy arranged the first dinner of the season for the Washington Nieman Fellows, with John L. Lewis as guest speaker.

Robert M. Shaplen, in New York, is finishing a novel based on life in South East Asia where his own experience as a correspondent provided the material for his book of short stories, "A Corner of the World."

1949

David B. Drieman of *Life Magazine* and **Lawrence G. Weiss** of the New York *Sunday Times* drove through the smaze of New York to New Haven to reach the Yale Bowl in time for the kick-off at the Harvard-Yale game. They turned up in seats just behind an expedition of eight of the current Nieman Fellows who had started from Cambridge in time to take in the 10 o'clock ceremony of Yale's honorary degree to President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard.

Robert de Roos spent several pleasant Autumn days in Cambridge, digging out an article for *Collier's* on the Social Relations Department at Harvard.

George Weller, foreign correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News*, made himself some news last Fall by swimming the Bosphorus. For space reasons, we use the *Publishers' Auxiliary* report of the feat as shorter, though less exciting than George's own story:

ISTANBUL, Turkey—Last week George Weller decided to go from Europe to Asia by water. He did. He swam all the way.

The Chicago *Daily News* foreign corre-

spondent dived into the spinning current of the Bosphorus below the medieval towers of Robert College, and, in his own words, "headed for Asia, just under a mile away."

The swim was "an exploratory effort to test the currents for (Champion Swimmer) Florence Chadwick and get some idea of her sensations when bucking the millrace pouring down from the Black Sea into the Sea of Marmora between the high, rocky walls of the Bosphorus," Mr. Weller wrote in a Chicago *Daily News* story describing his swim.

"But," he added. "without Florence herself master-minding the crossing. I should never have reached Asia."

Going ahead in a motorboat, Miss Chadwick shouted instructions and encouragement to Mr. Weller. Also in the boat was Fred Zusy, Associated Press chief for Turkey.

It was a long, hard swim, in a strong current.

"When I raised my face in the breast stroke, the waves slapped it and filled my mouth," Mr. Weller wrote. "I began losing sense of movement or direction of the bow of the motorboat."

But he kept going—and he made it, to be welcomed on the other side by "a dozen Turkish soldiers washing their underwear on the rocks."

It took 23 minutes and 15 seconds.

1950

Melvin Wax, managing editor of the Claremont (N. H.) *Daily Eagle*, shared the program for a Nieman Dinner, Dec. 9, on the problems of the small newspaper. Roger Tubby, publisher of the *Adirondack Enterprise* in Saranac Lake, N. Y., and John Lewis, publisher of the Franklin (N. H.) *Journal-Transcript*, joined in the session.

1952

Joseph Givando resigned from the editorial staff of the Denver *Post*, November 1, to become managing editor of the Fort Dodge *Messenger*, Iowa, an afternoon paper with 19,000 circulation.

1953

Watson S. Sims covered the New York newspaper strike for the Associated Press in the Period when Harry Truman was walking to the New York AP office to get his news rolled up in a bundle for him.

Our Reviewers:

Henry L. Trehwhitt, *Chattanooga Times*; **Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.**, *Rochester Times-Union*; **Richard Dudman**, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*; **Charles L. Eberhardt**, *New Mexico Newspapers, Inc.*; and **Lionel Hudson**, *Australian Associated Press* and Reuters, are Nieman Fellows this year; **John M. Harrison**, *Toledo Blade*, was a Nieman Fellow 1951-52; **Louis M. Lyons** is curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

H. J. E. Kane

THE PRESS
Christchurch
New Zealand

Mr. Louis M. Lyons,
Curator, Nieman Fellowships,
44 Holyoke House,
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts,
UNITED STATES.

Dear Mr. Lyons,

It is my sad duty to advise you of the death of our chief reporter, Mr. H. J. E. Kane, who was the first Associate Nieman Fellow from New Zealand. Mr. Kane was killed in a motor accident on the night of November 5 when on his way home from the office.

Mr. Kane's death was a terrible shock to all of us here. We had missed him very much during the year at Harvard, and all

the staff were most interested in what he told us of American academic life and other aspects of life in your country. He returned full of enthusiasm and new ideas which, unhappily, he had little time to put into effect on this newspaper.

I know that you and the other Fellows who studied with him will regret his passing almost as much as we do. So that you will be able to give the news to them I enclose a clipping from the *Press* of the report of the accident.

No doubt you will wish to express your sympathy to his widow. Her address is 22 Straven Road, Riccarton, W1, Christchurch.

Yours sincerely,
J. M. Caffin
Chief Reporter

MOTORIST KILLED

STATION WAGGON AND TRUCK COLLIDE

Accident in Riccarton Road

A motorist was killed in an accident on Riccarton road last evening when his station waggon and a heavy truck collided. He was:

Herbert John Espie Kane, chief reporter of "The Press," aged 42, of 22 Straven road.

Witnesses of the accident, which occurred at 10.18 p.m., near the corner of Riccarton and Clarence roads, said that Mr. Kane, who was returning home, swung out to the right-hand side of the road to avoid another car which had pulled out from the kerb. His station waggon and the truck, which was travelling towards the city, met almost head on.

A St. John ambulance took Mr. Kane to the Christchurch Public Hospital. He was found to be dead on arrival.

Mr. Kane had been chief reporter of "The Press" since 1947. He was born in Gisborne, and was educated at the Kaiti School, Gisborne, and Terrace School, Wellington, of which he was dux in 1924, and at Wairarapa College. He completed a B.A. degree at Canterbury University

College in 1935, and from work as university correspondent joined the staff of "The Press" in 1936. He went to Hawke's Bay as chief of staff of the Hawke's Bay "Daily Mail," and was later chief reporter of the Motueka "Star-Times." He then rejoined the literary staff of "The Press," and had been on the staff since then, except for a break of two years, 1943 to 1945, in which he trained and served as a navigator with the Royal New Zealand Air Force in New Zealand and the Pacific.

In 1951 Mr. Kane was selected under a Carnegie Corporation grant as an Associate Nieman Fellow, entitling him to an academic year at Harvard University and to two or three months' tour of United States newspapers. He spent the academic year at Harvard last year, and before returning to New Zealand travelled by car through the Southern States and the West to San Francisco.

Mr. Kane is survived by his wife, formerly Miss Margot Wallwork, and a son and daughter.

Christchurch Press, Nov. 6, 1953

Interesting

Keep Nieman Reports coming. It is an extremely informative, interesting and educational publication.

Fred M. Shideler
Dept. of Journalism
Oregon State College.

Letters

No One-Party Press— In Montgomery, Ala.

When Adlai Stevenson spoke before the Georgia legislature on November 24, most papers thought it was news. But not the *Montgomery Advertiser*, a monopoly organ in the Alabama capital that serves the central and southern part of the state and boasts of its Republican convictions. It supported General Eisenhower last year. The *Advertiser* printed not a word about Stevenson's speech to the legislature of a neighboring state.

Here is the lead on the *Advertiser's* story November 25: "Adlai Stevenson flew in here late yesterday afternoon, a few minutes ahead of a thunderstorm. He arrived from Atlanta, Ga., where earlier he had addressed the Georgia legislature."

That was the only reference to the Georgia speech, the first Stevenson had made in the South since the election.

The next day the *Advertiser* denounced Senator Lister Hill for his article in the *Reporter* magazine complaining that because of the one-party press Democrats have a hard time getting their message to the people. The *Advertiser* said it is "impoverished humbug" to say that the "Democratic voice" is "muffled by the wicked Republican press." Yet on the day before, the *Advertiser* had refused to tell its readers anything about an important speech made by the leader of the Democratic Party.

Southern Democrat

Lasker Award Entries

The Nieman Foundation will receive entries of newspaper or magazine articles for the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism awards for 1953. Entries may be mailed anytime up to February 15. Entry blanks can be secured from the Nieman Foundation, 44 Holyoke House Cambridge. Six copies of any article submitted are needed, for distribution to the judges. The Lasker awards are offered as in previous years in cooperation with the National Association of Science Writers, for the best article or series in the field of medicine or public health.

Foreign News

(Continued from Page 2)

uses. In fact only the *New York Times* uses that much and it gathers most of it itself.

Three-fourths of this flow came from Korea, England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the UN. The war accounts for Korea, the occupation for Germany and Japan, the Vatican for Italy, and England and France are the traditional stations of foreign correspondents. The UN has a novelty factor; also it is in New York. The novelty of India as a new nation did not bring its news above one per cent. Canada, next door, accounted for only 4.6 per cent of the foreign news flow. Korea and England each accounted for about 13 per cent. France came next. It took pretty close to a revolution to bring South America in, and a movie actress or an athletic king to get a dateline from Scandinavia.

Two-thirds of all the foreign news dealt with war or politics—"official news." This was a main criticism of foreign correspondents and readers.

Disasters, crime, sports and the inevitable 'human interest story' accounted for 22 per cent. Broader, more general news about how people live in other lands got only 12 per cent.

The *New York Times* carried 32 columns of foreign news a day. The *Oklahoma City Times* carried 3.8 columns a day—this cited evidently because it was close to the average. Two-thirds of all dailies receive AP foreign news. A little less than half get UP (245 papers have both). One-fifth have the INS (174 papers have all three). Reuters serves 36, Overseas News Agency 25, Canadian Press 3. North American Newspaper Alliance and Scripps Howard Newspaper Alliance also supply foreign news material.

The *New York Times* foreign service goes to 31 papers, the *New York Herald Tribune* news to 21, the *Chicago Daily News* service to 45 and the *Chicago Tribune's* to 38. These services do not send the full foreign file of their papers. They send clients about 15,000 words a day of the more important stories. This of course supplements the file of the wire services, or vice versa.

As to the proportion of the news used in the member papers, one mid-West afternoon paper that was receiving 447 columns in a week from four agencies, used 15

columns that week. Ninety-five per cent of what it used was from one agency. A Southern morning paper used 41 columns in one week out of a total of 61 columns received from one agency, and 6 per cent of the file of a second agency. A more typical Southern paper used 27 columns out of 200 columns received from two agencies, about 14 per cent.

Of 155 editors queried about how good a job is done, 105 thought good, 23 fair, 27 poor. Half of those who said "good" explained they meant only in the larger papers and only in terms of space limits and costs and conditions of foreign coverage. But the other half put no qualifications on their satisfaction with the job done. How complacent can you get?

What the 27 per cent say is obvious enough. News is insufficient from South America, India, Southeast Asia, Canada and other areas, including the Soviet bloc. Foreign news is too largely official news. Foreign correspondents lack background to produce informed reports. So do the news editors handling the foreign news.

The foreign correspondents, asked to make what they could of the news samples from their countries, were unhappy. "The coverage may be accurate as far as it goes and still be shallow. It may be detailed and still not be explanatory." They complain of "the habit of trimming all but the first few paragraphs from dispatches." The report sums up the appraisal of the foreign correspondents. "In the average American newspaper the picture of other countries is generally objective but spotty and incomplete."

The editor defending his scant news file from abroad can point to the readers as shown by surveys to read very little of what is printed and to get very little out of that. Most don't want any more, or not at the expense of local news. Of course most have no way of knowing how much they would like of a more interesting, more informed report.

The data on reader ignorance, though familiar, is always appalling. Barely half could recall any recent news in which Secretary Dulles figured. Less than half could recall reading anything about Syngman Rhee or Tito. Less than half could name more than one Soviet satellite.

But even so, the arithmetic of the reader surveys shows the average reader going through 12 column inches a day of foreign

news. This suggests that an informed wrap-up of half a column a day done in the office from the foreign file might be serviceable.

Asked what they wanted to make foreign news more interesting, readers suggested: 1) News written in a more simple understandable way; 2) more pictures; 3) more accurate news ("a surprising number of readers hold the foreign news in their newspapers is not accurate or truthful. They believe it is propaganda."); 4) more human interest (about the way other people live); 5) better presentation of foreign news. (Foreign news is "scattered all through the paper," "hard to find.")

The most persistent question raised in the report is whether the amount of foreign news printed could be made to mean more to the reader. This would mean explanations to give meaning to remote and complex affairs. The wire services insist that they are providing more of such informing background reports than their clients care to use. This is provided habitually in the few papers served by adequate foreign staffs. You can count these on one hand.

Besides the news flow to the United States, the study examined the flow between India and the West and between West Germany and the rest of Western Europe. These I must omit, except to commend them to foreign editors and all students of foreign relations as helping to explain many things.

India is a very special problem. In no other country perhaps is foreign news given such importance. They give great attention to the UN, as well they might in view of the caliber of their leaders there. The orientation of their journalism to Western Europe, notably England, is much criticized by their nationalist editors who are hard put to it to find ways to cover India. It is a jolt to an American to discover that the sources of news of the United States are neither American nor Indian. Chiefly Reuters. This sharp limitation is aptly described by Robert Trumbull, analyzing its results, as "not a happy circumstance." This alien screen of information between two countries applies to many other areas and is of course a problem in the promotion of peoples understanding of each other. It puts a large responsibility on the United States Information Services which, in India, is the chief American source of news.