Nieman Reports

April, 1955

SEE IT THEN

Tomorrow's TV Journalism

Robert Drew

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.

SEE IT THEN: Notes on Television Journalism

by Robert Drew

Television this year will break the one billion dollar mark in advertising sales. In 1956, the National Broadcasting Company predicts, television will do almost two billion dollars worth of business. John Crosby, TV columnist for the New York *Herald Tribune,* was a little sceptical of the NBC estimate. "Golly!" he said. "That sounds big to me. NBC's predictions in the past have all turned out to be wrong, but they've been wrong on the *low* side."

Vincent S. Jones, director of the news and editorial office of the Gannett Newspapers, who is studying the impact of TV on journalism, thinks that the impact is considerable and growing. "We have been hopelessly outdistanced in speed by radio and TV, in depth and quality by the magazines, and we have lost both prestige and glamour," he said. "The race for reader time means just one thing: One of the media will emerge as the dominant and indispensable item. So far it has been the newspaper. But it cannot remain in that position without some drastic changes."

Just what changes newspapers might be forced to make will depend on the character TV develops for itself. Perhaps the basic question about TV is this question of character. Will TV become knowing and articulate about the real world, or will it merely become beguiling and fanciful?

The question of the character of TV is largely a journalistic question, and it will be answered to a great extent by what TV does with its journalistic arm. I recently spent some time with network journalists discussing questions about TV and its journalism.

Is the character of TV pretty well fixed in its present form, or might it change significantly in the next decade? Is it possible for TV, which is basically an entertainment medium, to develop a bold and critical journalism of its own? Will the total effect of TV be to divert our minds with soporific fantasies, or to make us more aware of our own real problems?

There were these questions and others, and there were the discussions from which the following notes are excerpted, but there were no answers. Glimpsers of answers will proceed at their own peril.

The definition of TV journalism properly ought to include everything from a news bulletin to a national convention. I have made certain assumptions in order to narrow the definition down to those areas where significant character changes might be brewing. I have assumed that panel discussions and live reporting of conventions, parades, and hearings will continue to develop characteristics they have already displayed. I have assumed that the nature of TV is not limited to this static and public kind of reporting, that it has a capacity for mobile reporting on real life in the un-public situations that make up most of what is important about the news. The definition turns out to be—"Constructed stories on real people, situations, and events." This means approximately the kind of story the newspaper reporter goes after, using as a tool in this case a movie camera instead of a typewriter.

It includes three categories of shows:

—The 15 minute daily news summary: NBC's John Cameron Swayze; ABC's John Daley; CBS' Douglas Edwards.

—The 30 minute weekly news documentary that penetrates, develops, and makes sense out of specific stories: *See It Now,* Ed Murrow, CBS; *The American Week,* Eric Sevareid, CBS; *Background,* Joseph Harsch, NBC.

—The non-news documentary on contemporary life that

(*continued on Page 34*)

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Charlotte F. Robling, Darien, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Providence, R. I.; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D.C.; Melvin S. Wax, Claremont, N. H.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Boulder, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. IX, NO. 2 APRIL, 1955

Rewrite Man:

An Office Memo on Robert B. Peck of the New York Herald Tribune

by Joseph G. Herzberg

For better than forty years, a long line of New York *Herald Tribune* night city editors have tossed over to Robert B. Peck a sheaf of copy. "Shape this up, will you please, Bob," was the only direction the editor ever had to give. He could turn to the other stories piled on his desk, knowing that Bob Peck's story would come back to him in fifteen or twenty minutes.

Some time this April Bob Peck will do his last story on rewrite for the *Herald Tribune*. He is retiring and his familiar figure will no longer fill the rewrite bank's first desk, at the right hand of the night city editor. Since 1912, Bob has sat in that spot, the quietest man in the city room. Noise and hubbub wash around him, seeming never to touch him. The calm of his expression and manner never changes, whether he is writing a feature on a small boy or a late-breaking story for the lead of the paper.

Bob Peck is the last of the great rewrite men. When I came to the *Herald Tribune* in 1925, the strength of the rewrite staff was in Peck and Herbert Asbury, who wrote stories with astonishing speed. (Between stories Asbury worked on his book *The Gangs of New York*). Among newspapermen, the legend of Frank Ward O'Malley was still fresh, and on the New York papers of the '20's the brilliant rewrite men included Martin Green, Edwin C. Hill, Richard Lockridge, Walter Davenport, Thoreau Cronyn and Lindsay Denison.

Bob Peck was considered as good as any of those men and if you worked on the *Herald Tribune* you thought he was better. No one to equal him has come along in New York. One reason for that may be the decreasing dependence papers put on their rewrite staffs. In these taut times, newspapers devote so much of their space to the crises of each day there is little room left for the kind of stories in which the older rewrite men excelled. In themselves, the basic stories have not changed, but the lost little boy once good for a column must complete his wanderings in two paragraphs.

Readers of thirty years ago were much more fortunate souls than today's skimmers of the news of Formosa and foreign trade policy. On a Monday morning in 1925, under a single column, three line 30-point head on page one, Bob Peck began the readers' day with the following:

> Michael J. Regan was host to a few thousand of his Brooklyn friends at a ball at Stauch's Pavilion on the Bowery, Coney Island, until about midnight Saturday. After that, everybody was his own host.
>
> It was one of those informal give and take affairs. Everybody tried to give his neighbor a black eye and take away a better hat and coat than he wore to the affair . . .
>
> Up to midnight things were comparatively dull. Not more than forty-two persons had been carried out and laid on the flagstones to cool off. By 3 a.m. it was estimated that over-heated guests, if laid end to end, would have reached from Sea Gate to Ocean Parkway and various unofficial observers estimated that they did not come far from doing so, carelessly disposed as they were.

This was the typical Peck story and it ran a column and a half in 6-point type, detailing the holocaust that ensued when 4,000 of the 6,600 guests decided they had better be going home to prepare for early mass. These thousands descended on the cloakroom where eleven attendants were engulfed and the hat and cloak checks were hopelessly mixed up.

Peck's ability to organize a story taught many valuable lessons to young reporters whose copy underwent his gentle surgery. What was a loose end to the reporter, who did not know quite where to fit it in, might become Peck's lead and often a straying fact was turned into a capstone for close-knit detail.

These leads meant a great deal to editors eager to get out from behind the curtain of the 5-Ws. There was a dry martini lift for a deskman, who was low in spirit from shoveling along half a hundred humdrum items, to rest his eyes on the following:

> Orange, N.J.—It is becoming apparent that Orange is not armadillo-minded. The fact began to dawn today on Judge, an armadillo, and when a fact begins to dawn on an armadillo it is an exceedingly obvious fact.

The Peck touch shows itself in a later paragraph of the armadillo story. Judge, pet of two children, has fled his home, finding sanctuary in an ambulance garage:

Joseph G. Herzberg, now Sunday editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, was the city editor of *Late City Edition*. This is a tribute to a great rewrite man by his old boss.

When Edward Vaitulonis, on night duty at the ambulance station, looked up from his newspaper, there was Judge sampling a tire on an ambulance and trying politely to look as though he enjoyed the flavor. Judge is the soul of courtesy and it never occurred to him to complain that the huge doughnuts he had discovered were somewhat tough.

You hear nowadays that radio and television have changed "news concepts." This is sad to contemplate if radio and television newscasts have put an end to such paragraphs as Bob Peck wrote of a Brooklyn recluse who, like all recluses, died possessed of a huge sum:

Occasionally Miss Poppitz read. She had a twelve-volume biographical set, printed in Germany and published in 1849, and a German medical book published in 1846, which were her favorites because they were virtually inexhaustible. When a physician made his first and last call on her when she was stricken with her fatal illness four months ago, Miss Poppitz argued learnedly with him upon his diagnosis, basing her contentions upon statements in the German medical book.

In the evenings Miss Poppitz liked to go down to the basement and talk to her landlady, Mrs. Amy Maguire. Not only was Mrs. Maguire affable and intelligent but she always heated her rooms, always had the gas burning after dark and always had a newspaper. If Miss Poppitz's gas bill rose above 23 cents a month, she took measures to reduce it to reasonable proportions.

What broadcaster alive, imprisoned by his press association bulletins, could tell the following story as Bob Peck did eleven years ago?:

Costa Pavlides, of 141 Alabama Avenue, Brooklyn, who walks around town lugging $600 worth of dental equipment, keeping his eye peeled for swollen faces, was held in $500 bail yesterday in Felony Court, charged with illegal possession of novocaine solution and a hypodermic.

Mr. Pavlides, a native of Cyprus and a naturalized American citizen, said that he followed this practice in Egypt for years and nobody objected. His idea of the United States was that a citizen certainly had at least as much liberty as in Egypt and had the additional privilege of voting for Roosevelt.

No one ever counted the stories Bob Peck has written for the *Herald Tribune* these forty-three years. One could be sure only that none of them led to any tantrum or display of temperament. On telephoned stories from district men or corresponents he made a page or two of tightly written notes and only an occasional "yes" interrupted the correspondent's narration. A question or two as the stringer finished was sufficient to clear up some details and Bob Peck would turn to his typewriter. There were no false starts nor ripping out of copy paper from his machine. His flat-fingered method of typing made a steady beat. If you read his copy as I did for many years you marked the style of head, put in paragraph marks and topped the piece with his byline.

One thing you learned early. Never would you ask Bob Peck to write a funny story. He put his distaste for this kind of thing in a piece he wrote on the rewrite man in the book *Late City Edition*:

Few things are more irksome to a rewrite man than to have a lighthearted night city editor toss on his desk a few paragraphs of AP with the remark: "Here's a funny story. Got a parrot and a monkey in it. Write all you need about it."

It already was a tradition forty years ago that a story blessed with the presence of either a parrot or a monkey was a funny story. A story which has both these creatures in it, of course, is irresistible. As a matter of fact, it all depends on what the monkey or the parrot does whether the story is funny or not. Frequently the things they do would be much funnier if a horse did them.

Anyhow, it is poor psychology to tell a rewrite man in advance that a story is funny. The mere statement arouses skepticism and brings the bile to his fingertips. The mention of the monkey and the parrot is the last straw, and it generally is in a ferocious state of mind that he sets out to mangle that particular story.

Or maybe the psychology isn't so bad at that. Ferocity is sometimes an excellent state of mind in which to approach a story, especially a story labeled in advance as funny. It makes for lean and caustic writing, and sometimes the suffering rewrite man will turn out a funny story on the subject in spite of himself. Funny to other people, that is; in his own opinion, gall oozes from every sentence.

Bob Peck never had any romantic notions about newspaper work. By nature and by choice he is a rewrite man. He worked on the *Sun* after he graduated from Hamilton College in 1907 and switched to the *Tribune* five years later. He preferred his newspaper work sitting down.

"It often looks as though the rewrite man wasn't earning his pay," he wrote in his *Late City Edition* chapter. "As a matter of fact, he frequently isn't. From a third to half of the time, he may be loafing. The main thing is, however, that he is there, just as the members of a fire company are there, whether they are responding to an alarm or not. Members of the reporters' staff, working furiously at their typewriters for an hour or two before edition time and

recollecting previous hours devoted to covering their stories, might well put a rewrite man to the blush, if rewrite men blushed easily. They are not a sensitive lot, however. When they work, they work hard. When there's nothing to do, they loaf, a pursuit at which they are adept."

There aren't many stories about Bob Peck, a tribute both to his quiet skill and his own desire to keep himself out of anyone's way. One story I heard years ago may not be true but it so fits Bob Peck it deserves retelling. A reporter telephoned a story of a troupe of baby elephants getting loose in Newark, N.J. It passed through several hands and by the time Bob got the story the elephants had reached full size. The next day the reporter berated him for not describing them as baby elephants. "Oh, well," said Bob. "They'll grow up."

The Haps As They Happen

by Lawrence E. Laybourne

When you look closely at examples of successful journalism you discover a couple of common characteristics, no matter how unlike the journals may be in most ways: One of these is that successful editors *care* greatly about what they are doing. And another is that they have a very exact sense of identity with the men and women who make up their audience.

Now this sense of identity is pretty tenuous—almost entirely a matter of attitude—on the part of the editors I work for on *Time* and *Life*. Nevertheless it's the attitude that counts in asking the right questions, in finding the exact word, in making the decisions about news play that determine in the long months of doing it whether the business is being properly done for the man who depends on journalism to tell him what he ought to know. Somebody worked a part of this out once in a phrase and plastered it here and there on the walls of the *Time & Life* Building: "Never overestimate the reader's knowledge—never underestimate his intelligence." If this can be your genuine guide to writing and editing you are really going to stay in effective cahoots with your fellow Americans.

One of the advantages, I would suppose, to practicing serious journalism on a weekly newspaper is that you don't have to clew yourself to your job with any kind of a slogan, however good. I'm sure you almost never go back to the office after lunch without one of your readers asking you, right there on the street, "What's new?"

When they ask that of an editor they really expect to get an answer. He ought to be able to say, "Stick around, you'll see it in the paper."

The editor of a weekly national magazine—with a strong conviction that he is writing also for a decent swath of English-speaking people around the world—is not so explicitly aware that someone who says, "What's the word?" actually expects him to come up with it.

So from my point of view you seem very close to your audience. I know you also are thoroughly read. If your geographical sphere permitted I would expect to see the editor of the Scarsdale, N. Y., *Inquirer* out at one of these tables. It is miles ahead of the New York *World-Telegram and Sun*, or the *Journal American* or the *Post* in competing for my interest as a fellow who works in New York but lives in Scarsdale. The Scarsdale *Weekly Inquirer* is not—and here's a rub for you—ahead of the New York *Times* in interest.

As a reader of the Scarsdale *Inquirer* I am generally critical of it as I am of that fatuous array of New York afternoon dailies. And my criticism runs to the fact that it makes so little of its opportunities. I hope I won't seem impolite if I ask, how are you doing with yours?

Do you, first of all, realize how close you are to the lively concerns of your readers? It's obvious you are not trying to duplicate the world-event coverage that the dailies, the radio and TV, and the magazines have a clearer charter for. But you are delivering news of a much more particular and immediate kind, and nobody has to pretend he cares in order to prop up one sagging end of a conversation. Your people really care, and I suspect you care about them.

You have to care—and be sure it's reciprocated—when you deliver a somewhat gruff lecture to the audience, as I saw in the Milford (N. H.) *Cabinet*. It was an explanation of why the names of people who *don't* come to a party are not news. I submit the editor who can do this knows not only his stuff but his stuffed shirts, and somehow I regret that the passage of years has softened the tongue of or made more aloof the editor of *Time* who once printed in comment under a nasty letter: "Let Subscriber Goodkind mend his talk."

The troubles an editor has in his work are also something

This is from a talk by **Lawrence E. Laybourne**, Chief of the *Time-Life* Domestic & Canadian News Bureau, to the New England Weekly Press Association assembled at Boston on January 22, 1953.

he can share with his readers when he is truly at ease among them. Take the Berlin (N. H.) *Reporter*. In a story about the new type face and layout that he was springing on his people, the editor said he had another project in the works too—to write a handbook for country contributors and publicity chairmen.

After complaining it was a chore to do this he said it would be useful to show how to get material ready for the paper. "As things now stand," he wrote, "the staff of this paper has to re-write almost all of the club releases that are given us. Most secretaries and correspondents have no idea of what we want in the way of style, and there is some confusion in this."

To some practitioners of the dark arts of journalism it might seem just a touch rough to complain that your country correspondents aren't very good. Maybe stringers are easy to come by in the neighborhood of Berlin, New Hampshire. I'd gather they weren't too abundant around Milford because I see what I take to be one of a series of stories *about* stringers in the *Cabinet*. I guess I can take up this interesting question—or its Vermont angle anyway —with one of our own valued stringers, Gerry McLaughlin of the Springfield *Reporter*. I'm glad stringer trouble at Grafton or Windham or Chester didn't keep him away from this meeting.

I don't wish to stray too far from the point that may be not very obvious to you but seems extraordinarily important to me: You really have got your reader's ear. *Fortune* did a good series some time back on business communications and called it "Is Anybody Listening?" The answer was, well, in a word, no. If the question is put to you by your detractors it seems right for you to say emphatically, yes.

Now this ear is yours because the news you report is of first concern to your readers. A lot of it must bore you quite severely to handle, it being so long in length and so short in variety. But these meeting notices and personal notes and P-TA reports and such keep them reading, and I know you are doing your best to make this bread and butter news accurate and reasonably complete. That's about all it can ever be.

But, to ask you the same question that I keep wanting to ask the editor of the Scarsdale *Inquirer*, what are you doing with your opportunities? By opportunities I mean the solid news stories that come your way every so often. Maybe it's spot news—maybe it's a civic matter of roads or sewers or zoning or schools—maybe it's a good reason for doing a personality piece—maybe it's an issue that you have something to say about editorially—any of these are the occasion, or should be, for your very best effort.

Steady reliability is something your readers have a right to expect all of the time, on every page, of every issue. But zest, enthusiasm, penetration, these qualities you must really produce when the story gives you a chance. It is for these satisfying stories that you really got into this business in the first place—or stayed in, in the second place.

Let me be frank. I get the feeling, which I hope is wrong, that many editors and reporters just won't put out their best effort. There is a barrier of boredom, or cynicism, or fatigue, which keeps them off from real journalistic achievement. If we're not trying to be good at this we're going to be awfully bad without trying at all.

Have you got room for one genuinely interesting story an issue—if not memorable, then downright readable, if not penetrating, then at least provocative? Are you *in* motion journalistically, or just going through the motions?

I have some understanding of how difficult it is to keep the whole works even on the rails, but I've got fair evidence that it's not much tougher than other worth-while branches of this profession. Our Bureau Chief in Dallas, Frank McCulloch, who recently succeeded Bill Johnson, was editor and publisher of the weekly *Nevada State News* at Reno before he became a *Time* reporter in Los Angeles. I told him on the phone Tuesday that I'd be up here and asked what would make sense to say. "Tell them," he said, "that I work just as hard now as I did when I ran a weekly."

So I'm not going to feel sorry for you when you say you are too busy running a marathon to put on even a short sprint. Anyhow, I don't believe you owe it to anybody but yourself—unless it be your readers.

The sprint I'm talking about is that extra effort to surround a story, to see it all, every bit, and tell it better than anybody would have thought possible. Maybe you don't recall it, but one of the more astonishing innovations that the Connecticut Yankee introduced into the Court of King Arthur was a newspaper, and a weekly it was! I think almost nothing gave him more pleasure, at least as Mark Twain spun the story out.

The scene was a town some distance from Camelot, and Sir Boss was getting a little bored with a religious ceremony when he heard, through a window, "a note that enchanted my soul and tumbled thirteen worthless centuries about my ears: 'Camelot Weekly Hosannah and Literary Volcano—latest irruption—only two cents—all about the big miracle in the Valley of Holiness.' One greater than kings had arrived—the newsboy. But I was the only person in all that throng who knew the meaning of this mighty birth, and what this imperial magician was come into the world to do."

So the Connecticut Yankee, who had gotten the paper started, bought a copy and showed it to the sixth century monks around him. They wanted to know whether it was a saddle blanket or part of a shirt and whether the rain

would hurt it. He explained what it was, and for an example read them a story about the ceremony they themselves had watched. Mark Twain records "astonished and reverent ejaculations" all through the reading. "Ah-h-h." "How true!" "Amazing, amazing." "These be the very haps as they happened, in marvellous exactness."

That strikes me as the best thing I ever heard said about a news story—"These be the very haps as they happened." There are rewards as well as penalties in writing about what the reader knows pretty well also, on his own. I suspect this is a condition that you are acutely conscious of. Isn't it a fair rule to determine to add something new to every reader, in every story? If that is the way you go about your news-gathering I'll guarantee you will press your normal curiosity to new dimensions.

Let me suggest a few devices that you may want to look at, in reporting and writing:

1) Go for the detail. When the story is worth telling illuminate its small corners with the light of revealing detail. I saw an elegant example in a fire story in the Milford (Conn.) *Citizen*: the fire included a beauty shop, where four women were having their appearances attended to. We got their names, and the fact that after the blaze they were escorted to another beauty shop to have their hairdos completed. The very haps!

1A) Let's have exact quotes.

2) Don't be afraid to tell it like a story sometime—sequentially, making the most of dramatic narrative. You get a lot of interest and comprehension.

3) Don't insist on the old patterns. You are going to turn up matters that greatly interest your readers if you will look closely at a personality you have long taken for granted, or a situation that could merely be routine. For instance, when did you last really talk to the librarian about current reading habits, or her tastes in books, or what's the matter with the heating system? When did you do a thoroughly warm and human story about a farm sale, the way it really was? These are features maybe, but they are also news.

You have printed lots of handouts on church fund drives. Next time why not tell how it went, how much the pledges averaged, how that compares with other years, and even with other churches? This will take some time—and it won't come to you in a handout—but the stories will be the raisins in your weekly cake.

4) Finally, don't be afraid to say what you think—in stories as well as in editorials. You are making judgments all the time in this business, and it's refreshing to see some of them honestly stated fairly and in good taste. This may be the easiest possible way to start a row in this audience, but I believe you are creating more opinion by what you print or fail to print as news than by what you say in an editorial.

MY 30 YEARS WAR

by W. M. Tugman

With this swan song to the Oregon Press Conference, Feb. 18, William M. Tugman wrapped up thirty years as a thorny, independent editor. The first of the year he resigned as editor of the daily Eugene* Register-Guard *and started a new career as editor of a weekly, the* Port Umpqua Courier *in Reedsport, Ore.

When I was asked to talk about my nearly thirty years of combat service as editor of the Eugene *Guard* and *Register-Guard,* it was suggested that I pick the title and naturally I suggested "The Thirty Years War." It occurred to me later that the analogy may have been peculiarly fitting because history does not record any more inconclusive struggle than that which began with Frederick of Bavaria's aspirations to the throne of Bohemia in 1618 and ended with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.

I wonder if the wars which we have fought in Eugene—and the wars which most of us fight in this cockeyed newspaper business—are not equally inconclusive. Often I have said that if I could live my life over again, I would choose to be a surgeon if I could, because when the surgeon has completed his operation the patient is either alive or dead. Our "patients" are continually coming unstuck. Our battles do not stay won. Our wars bring no lasting victory or peace.

A reflective man might ask himself WHY we fight these fights, and it is possible to conjure up a broad variety of answers. Some of us may just naturally be pugnacious, bellicose. Sometimes bellicosity develops as a sort of occupational disease. A psychiatrist would probably attribute the bellicosity in part to the tensions under which we live and work. In many cases, the warlike poses are merely showmanship, but unfortunately most of us are not content with mimic wars.

Most of us, I am sure, are driven into battle by the same deep impulse which drove us into this business in the first place. I can find no better way to express it than in the beautiful line which Herbert Agar wrote to explain how Lincoln could endure wars which brought no real victory or evils worse than war itself:

"Because man was not meant to bow to iniquity!"

If we have any justification for being, it is in that thought. I am willing to concede that the publication of the news is our most important function, far more important than any opinions to which we may give birth—because those have only relative importance.

I am willing to concede that in publishing the news we

should be fair to all concerned, and I use that term instead of objectivity which in so many cases has degenerated into mere sterility.

Never have I had any patience with those who would try to erect some kind of fire wall between editorial policy (not opinion) and news narrative—because every single act of news selection or assignment becomes inevitably a matter of policy—whether to print or not to print, whether to play up or to play down, whether to print with or without comment.

Our problem as editors and publishers does not stop with defending the people's RIGHT TO KNOW; nor is the obligation satisfied by giving them only what they WANT TO KNOW; it must include WHAT THEY OUGHT TO KNOW.

Little things influence all of us greatly. In the little red school house in southern Ohio which it was my lot to attend from age 6, we had strapping young men and women of voting age and more who repeated the 8th grade every winter because there was no high school, and for social and biological purposes as well. They could lick the principal so naturally they ran the school.

Man was not made to bow to iniquity!

Tyranny always produces rebellion and in our little red school house rebellion became the business of a little band of confederates who were despised by the ruling majority (see Toynbee) and given the derisive title of Skunks. At the age of 10 or thereabouts I was elected Secretary of War for the Skunks—and I am afraid I have never been deodorized.

The Skunks licked the Bullies and drove them out of school; then they licked the principal and drove him out of town; then a very wise board hired a principal who licked the stuffing out of the Skunks—and the Balance of Nature was restored so to speak.

Little things stick in a man's memory and exercise a lasting influence. Often I have repeated the parting advice of old Dave Gibson, a very successful small town publisher, when he heard of the departure for Oregon:

"Give 'me a good clean print job, so's they can read what's in your goddam sheet; in your news colyums give 'em all sides of every question; and in your editorials you better say just what you damn well think and mean, because nobody loves a straddler and those that don't like what you said will buy the paper just to see what the sonofabitch is gonna say next."

Or the wisdom of an old time police chief:

"I was drug up down by the docks and the most important thing I learned was that next to havin' a few reliable friends, the next best thing is to have all the right enemies."

Thirty Years War! The more I think of it, the less I like that title because it connotes an old soldier counting his scars—something I must avoid or I'll bore you to death. It also suggests a guy who is through and I am not through yet. At least a few scars are still bleeding.

So I shall try not to weary you by recounting all the school fights, and higher education fights, and tax fights and budget fights which have occupied the fleeting years. I prefer to talk about a few of the things which I think I may have learned in all these brawls.

DEFERENCE. When I first came to Eugene we had a Scotch plumber for mayor, old Aleck Williamson, a pretty good guy. One evening he hauled me down, complimented me on the editorials of the last three weeks, and gave me a wonderful buildup for this kick in the pants:

"Yessiree, everybody in town's a readin' them editorials and getting' a great kick out of 'em. You know what me friend Dugald said last night. No? Well, sir, he says, Aleck, says he, it's bra' lad we got now doon at the *Guard;* he has a magnificent style, he has, but Aleck, how long are we goin' to let the young squairt think he's a runnin' the toon?"

It is wise—up to a certain point—to show a degree of deference to the elders.

PRESSING. Although I claim to be one of the six men in the U.S. who has actually given up golf, I seem to remember a fault called "pressing" which is just as ruinous in the editorial game as in golf. I am quite certain I deserve the discredit for electing one of the most incompetent officials Lane county ever had—because in a moment of righteous indignation I used Page One to call him "a liar by the clock"—which he was—but he was "a little fellow" and I had to learn that violence toward a "little fellow" often begets sympathy and adverse results.

TIMING. In many respects an editorial campaign is like a boxing match; timing is all-important. Months or even years may be spent in sparring round, preparing for an opening, watching for the exposed jaw and swinging fast and hard when the right time comes. In 1948 and again in 1950, Lane county was right for a county manager charter, but we were months behind time with our buildup and when we swung we walked right into the counterpunch.

OVERCONFIDENCE. A few years ago we lost a proposition for a county infirmary mainly because of overconfidence; we had an impressive committee, apparently no organized opposition; we took lots of time on the news and editorial buildup and failed utterly to have any personal work in the field. A handful of nursing home proprietors and some doctors upset the apple cart.

KEEP LOW. Editors unlike children should be heard but not seen. In other words I think it is poor business when the editor appears like Henri of Navarre waving his sword and shouting: "Follow where my white plume shines." Too many people are waiting to slug the bastard.

Once in a while an editor has no choice but to lead, but he should come to that role as the reluctant dragon, not the eager beaver. As a rule it is much more effective if it appears that the cause has won the newspaper's support.

I doubt if many communities experience anything as lurid as the Zorn-Macpherson fight of 1932—the measure initiated to move the University of Oregon to Corvallis. That brought many amusing experiences. Among others I learned the wisdom of the Commandment which says:

"Thou shalt not covet."

Shortly before Foxy Grandpa Kerr and the Corvallis Chamber of Commerce cooked up this mess of larceny, some of our own Big Shots in Eugene conceived the idea of trying to steal from Roseburg the Soldiers' Home which Congressman Hawley had promised them. Some seventh sense persuaded me to refuse to have any part in this political banditry. I cannot be credited with any great courage. I merely refused to "go along" and kept silent. But when the Zorn-Macpherson storm broke, Ed Turnbull and I were about the only two men from Eugene who could crawl into Roseburg to beg for help—and no more abject crawl was ever done even by a snake.

Those were tough times. Depression days. It came hard for little Eugene to raise the $52,000 which went into the fight. We learned a lot of things the hard way. There was the rich and prominent alumnus of the University who agreed to show his face with us in the Supreme Court when the ballot title hearing was held—for a fee of one hundred bucks. I shall never forget the patient comment of Judge Harris:

"Boys, you'll learn that real patriots are mighty scarce."

Nor can I ever forget the magnate and philanthropist who had permitted us to use him merely as a reference. When the election was over, the battle won by 4 to 1 (as we then thought), we found we had a slight balance in the bank, and somebody suggested that we should "do something nice for Mr. X."

What? A gold watch? Oh no. A scroll? Oh no. We couldn't do anything cheap like buying him a suitcase which might suggest leaving the state. It was finally agreed that the best thing would be to offer him a check for our entire cash balance—because of course such a big man would refuse to take it.

So we journeyed to Portland one bright December morning. We lined up in his office. Our spokesman made a gracious little speech which concluded by saying that of course we *knew* Mr. X was not interested in money and probably would not accept our gift but the least we could do was to tender . . .

I can still see that long claw come out and grab that check. So we all staggered out and down into Sixth Street. On the curb, somebody found voice and said:

"That SOB! He took it!"

Maybe it was a good investment at that.

If I were asked to mention the most important victories of my Thirty Years War, I would give prominence to a few that never made print. There was the time in 1938 when the Goon troubles were at peak when George Jones came in with what he said would be the banner story—a proclamation by the No. 1 Goon that beginning at midnight nobody, farmer or otherwise, would be allowed to take anything in or out of the Eugene Farmers' Cooperative cannery unless he joined the union and paid full dues.

"Did he put that threat in writing?"

"No, of course not."

"Tell him to write it out and sign his name and I'll spread it all over page one—along with a call for martial law in Eugene because nearly every farmer is already carrying a 30-30 on his truck."

The No. 1 Goon withdrew his threat against the farmers but retaliated by threatening to cut off our paper supply. Of course that didn't happen either. I feel that by prevention of trouble we preserved the peace of the community which is more important than any sensation we could print. And one of the most rewarding experiences in a long and bitter career was the day when two redfaced gents walked in with hands extended:

"We're from the railroad brotherhoods. We just heard about what you did in the Goon mess. We want to thank you on behalf of decent labor."

In 1943 when Jehovah's Witnesses convened in Eugene, we were able to mobilize in advance an enlightened public opinion which prevented the riots which surely would have resulted had there been no preparedness in that tense period. We lost a banner story, but—having witnessed three riots in my time—I am prouder of that riot story which never was written in Eugene than of almost any other accomplishment.

When I moved to Reedsport recently some of the brethren wondered how Bill Tugman could get used to speaking out only once a week instead of every day—and a few were kind enough to say it should be a daily voice. If I have learned anything at my age—which I doubt—it is that maybe once a week is enough.

"Man was not made to bow to iniquity."

That is a compelling urge, but it brings with it the peril of self-righteousness. An editor must not be afraid to speak out, but how can he be sure that he is just? We must not be afraid to hurt, but if we err, we must be as ready to make amends as we are to hurt. It is important to know the laws of libel and slander but it is much more important to know the laws of common decency, The Golden Rule.

In a recent issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Society

of Newspaper Editors I was interested to find a piece by Louis Selzer, of the Cleveland *Press,* for some years my chief rival on Cleveland's city hall beat, in which he—a fighting editor if there was ever one—urges forbearance if publication hurts unnecessarily. I was inteested to see him saying that he often withholds a story—if the hurt serves no public purpose.

Personally I cannot accept his dictum in its entirety. Perhaps in a very large city where nearly all news is selective, an editor can set himself up as censor. In a smaller community it is much more difficult. If you are going to print any convictions for drunken driving, I feel you must publish them all—in the smaller towns—or you will be getting into a situation which is grossly unfair to those who do not have access to the editorial ear. It is fascinating, nevertheless, to hear the man who has so often told his most potent advertisers to go jump in the lake advocating humility and humanity in the editorial sanctum.

In the main, I can look back over the Thirty Years War without too many pangs. I can blush when I recall how often I have picked the wrong guy for public office—as in the case of the two old boys who raced each other a few years ago. I picked A because he was tough as nails physically and mentally as compared with the other, whom I diagnosed as flabby. A, poor fellow, has been under the sod long ago. B is still going strong.

I am not morbid but I think it would do us all good if we were required to spend one month a year re-reading what we wrote 20, 30 or even 10 years ago—the utterances which no longer show the sheen of pure wisdom. I know that when I have to turn back through the files I lift the pages as gingerly as if I were opening King Tut's tomb.

In the 40 years I have been in this cockeyed business, I have seen much, but I cannot be sure that I have learned much except that each of us must BE HIMSELF. It is impossible for me to be a Charle Sprague or a Frank Jenkins or a Bob Sawyer or a George Putnam. Like Popeye, I yam what I yam. I am afraid I did not turn over any leaves on going to Reedsport. The years are not too many in which to make the *Port Umpqua Courier* into a rival of the New York *Times,* but I have the hope that maybe I may end like old Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. In his last days, the friends of the old Justice arranged a daily visitation system. It was Owen Wister's turn and Owen came provided with the appropriately improper story. The Justice sat there on the glassed-in porch wrapped in his shawl and from time to time he nodded. Suddenly he pulled himself up to an erect alert and said:

"I'm sorry, Owen. I must have nodded off. I know I'm slipping, but I can always snap out of it and call any man a son of a bitch if I have to."

Man was not made to bow to iniquity. Sometimes I think that the right to fight for what we believe is the only heritage worth saving.

The Tugman-Baker Team of Eugene, Oregon

by Charles T. Duncan

A rare and fruitful combination of journalistic talents was broken up late in 1954 when William M. Tugman left the Eugene, Oregon, *Register-Guard* to strike out on his own at an age when most men think of retirement. For nearly 28 years the *Register-Guard* had been the voice of Bill Tugman to thousands of readers, most of whom did not realize that he owned no part of it.

The *Register-Guard* is owned by Alton F. Baker, Sr., the other half of the unusual team. For nearly three decades the Baker-Tugman relationship stood as a modest but widely recognized and acclaimed symbol of journalism's brightest tradition—editorial freedom and independence unstifled by front-office pressure.

As unexpected as the resignation was the concurrent announcement that Tugman, one of the country's ablest and best-known small city editors, had bought a down-at-the-heels weekly in Reedsport on the Oregon coast. At 61 he was voluntarily giving up a position of prestige and security and taking on a job that would give many a younger man pause, for there are few careers in journalism more gruelling than that of running a weekly, and nuts to the "newspaperman's dream" myth.

(One of Country Editor Tugman's first little chores was to eat his own words. In a public statement in the *Register-Guard,* and strictly for lay consumption, he had suggested that one of his reasons for the move was a desire to "taper off a bit . . . and even find time now and then to catch a fish." It was picked up of course and evoked a horselaugh from the state's weekly brethren, who were nonetheless proud to have their fraternity joined by so distinguished a pledge.)

Alton Baker is one of the two publisher sons of the late

Charles T. Duncan, familiar to our readers for earlier articles, is professor of journalism at the University of Oregon, in Eugene, where the *Register-Guard* is a neighbor.

Col. Elbert H. Baker of Cleveland *Plain Dealer* fame. (The other is Frank Baker, who owns the Tacoma, Washington, *News-Tribune*.)

Tugman, too, was a *Plain Dealer* man. After graduating from Harvard he'd worked on several East Coast papers, including the Providence *Journal*. After World War I service he joined the *Plain Dealer* staff and became a top-flight reporter. Best known was his work on the Don Mellett murder case, but he was also laying the groundwork for what was to became true expertness in governmental affairs and politics.

Shortly after Alton Baker purchased the old Eugene *Guard* in 1927 Tugman came west to join him in the then placid little university town of 15,000 in the lush Willamette valley.

From the start of their association there was a clear division of responsibility between the young publisher and his equally young right-hand man. Baker "ran the business," and he had his hands full. The *Guard* had spirited competition in the morning *Register* (and later in the short-lived *News*) and the lean years of Depression were soon to be upon the land. Tugman, as managing editor, took over on the news-editorial side. Oregon has a proud journalistic tradition and Bill Tugman soon demonstrated his worthiness of it.

A fighter, but not a trouble maker, Tugman and "his" paper were embroiled in many a seething battle during his 28 years at the helm. And, as in baseball, "ya win some, ya lose some and some are rained out." Tugman's range of interests was tremendous. It was never beneath his dignity to swell the time-honored American chorus for "bigger and better (fill in the blank)"; indeed he did so *with* dignity and only when convinced that the goal was desirable and sensible. But his editorial horizons encompassed far more than new roads, more industry and better street lighting. Time and again he fought the battles of the University of Oregon, in one celebrated instance for the institution's very survival and more recently, in the darkest days of the witch-hunting terror, for academic freedom. To him and to another great Oregon editor, Charles A. Sprague of Salem, go much credit for keeping Oregon free of the loyalty oath, an untainted island between Washington and California. (Upon Tugman's resignation the University faculty, in an unprecedented action, unanimously passed a resolution expressing its recognition and appreciation of his devoted and effective service to the University. He has long been a visiting lecturer on the School of Journalism faculty and retains that position.)

He kept a strong light and a cold eye on city, county and state politics. Although anything but a cynic, as far as public affairs were concerned he lived by the dictum, "There are no great men." His last battle as *Register-Guard* editor was a crackling one with the city council, the main issue of which was Tugman's insistence that the council's deliberations be kept out in the open.

Win, lose or rained out, the *Register-Guard* (Baker bought the *Register* in 1930) fought hard. It—and Bill Tugman—won friends and made enemies. "If you haven't got any enemies, you don't deserve any friends," he often quoted. But always Alton Baker stood behind his editor.

"It has always been and will always be my pride," wrote Tugman, "that so long as I was editor of the *Register-Guard*, I had the professional freedom which every man in this business covets. No matter what the cost, Mr. Baker has never held me back from a fight—if it was a good fight."

The significance of this sort of team play can best be sensed by a newspaperman and perhaps the best expression of it came in an editorial tribute to both men by the Pendleton *East-Oregonian*: "Anyone who had the privilege of reading Mr. Tugman's editorials . . . knows that the publisher must frequently have had to bite his tongue. Bill was fiercely independent and while he didn't go out looking for fights he never backed off from one. He had an extra-sensitive sniffer for the public official or officials who were up to something that would hurt his community, and he'd go after them with the ferocity of a tiger. Bill knew, too, that there are almost no great men in politics—some rise to greatness on occasion, but infrequently—and he treated most of them with extremely rough candor.

"The important point of this is that Mr. Baker understood what, unfortunately, some newspaper publishers do not. He knew that people do not determine whether or not to do business with a newspaper on the sole consideration of its editorial page. They decide whether it is an honest newspaper that is printing the news of its community truthfully . . . and is honest about and devoted to its editorial beliefs—whether or not the majority of its editors agree. And, above all else, that it is FAIR."

Newspapermen too can best appreciate what the Tugman-Baker team did for journalism—on a modest scale, to be sure, but no true blessing is too small to be counted. Simply this: Tugman made the *Register-Guard* the dominant force in his community. Not domineering, despite its "monopoly" position, but dominant. Many newcomers to Eugene— and there were thousands in the wartime and post-war decade when the area more than doubled in population—sensed that here was a newspaper that was somehow "different." If they were careful readers they noticed the words that appeared daily in the masthead: "The newspaper is A CITIZEN OF ITS COMMUNITY." These were Bill Tugman's words and he meant them very seriously.

Tugman, with the help of the able staff of young reporters and deskmen that he nurtured, demonstrated that

size need impose few limitations on quality in newspapering. A British journalist who spent a few days in Eugene while on a Greyhound bus tour of the United States two years ago told this writer, with obvious amazement, that the newspaper "in this little Oregon town" compared favorably in content, tone and craftsmanship with any he'd seen in the country, regardless of size. "I want to meet the editor," he said, and he did.

Tugman's resignation was a major news story in Eugene and, in newspaper and political circles at least, throughout the entire state. There had been no hint of its coming. On the day of the announcement, Bill was already in Reedsport, up to his ears in the gnat-swarm of problems involved in getting out his first issue, oblivious to the stir he was making. Reedsport people themselves were startled and pleased at the attention suddenly focused by press and radio on their modest little town.

In Eugene the big question was why did he do it? It was incredible. Why, in a few years the man would have been able to retire, to relax and savor the fruits of his bountiful labors, surrounded by his friends and honored by his townsmen. Held in deep affection by many, admired by thousands more and almost universally respected, even by most of those who had little reason to love him, this "old school" editor had no readily apparent reason to give up his position as pre-eminent citizen of Oregon's third largest city for the unbelievably long hours and uncertain rewards of publishing a run-down weekly newspaper in Reedsport, population 3038.

Quite naturally, all sorts of rumors flew: "The Bakers have eased him out." (There are three Baker sons on the *Register-Guard* and Alton, Jr., became editor when Tugman left. The Bakers—father and sons—are men who would no more be capable of "dropping the pilot" than of handing out poisoned candy at an orphans' picnic). "He went too far in the last campaign." (To some people—in both camps—Bill Tugman always went too far in any political campaign. His news and editorial policies on campaign coverage would serve as a model for any newspaper, up to and including the New York *Times*. It would require a separate article to describe them). "His health is bad." (No man can burn up the road for 60 years the way Tugman has and not show it, but if he were looking for a rest cure he chose the last item on the list). These and other lines of speculation had one thing in common: they were all untrue.

Bill Tugman is a complex personality and he made this exceedingly difficult decision for a complexity of reasons. Publicly he said, ". . . family plans, a good opportunity in a good town, and the realization that at 61 a man should try to taper off a bit," and that covers it pretty well. As for the "tapering off" part, he knew this would make the move seem more plausible to well-wishers. Privately, he admits freely to long having wanted a paper of his own and when the Reedsport deal came up he decided it was now or never.

Far from considering himself self-condemned to live burial, Tugman looks upon Reedsport and his *Port Umpqua Courier* as the latest and biggest challenge of a life that has thrived on challenges. He sailed in with the zest of a college graduate, but with a wagonload more of sagacity and sure-footedness, and within a week he was as deeply immersed in the civic and social problems of Reedsport and the Lower Umpqua Valley as for thirty years he'd been plunged in those of Eugene and its Emerald Empire.

Of the scores of tributes to Tugman that filled the Oregon press, none came closer as an analysis of his greatness as a newspaperman than that of his old comrade-at-arms, Charles Sprague, editor and publisher of the *Oregon Statesman* in Salem:

"What distinguishes Tugman is that his editorial drives were based on principle. He kept his campaigning on a high level, refusing to indulge in the old practice of personal mud-slinging. He was objective in his editorial analysis of problems, as he taught reporters to be in newswriting. Bill Tugman ranks at the very top among editors for his editorial courage and integrity—an essential combination if a newspaper is to possess power and influence and gain and hold the respect of its readers."

Sprague then sounded a note that reflects the mixture of regret, incredulity and good wishes that Tugman's departure from Eugene aroused in his friends everywhere, in and out of newspaper ranks:

"So it is a matter of great regret to all of us in newspaper work to see Bill Tugman's name come down from the masthead of the Eugene *Register-Guard*. True, he will still have his own page, and this time in his own paper, and Bill will make it effective over Oregon. But his voice should be raised daily, and he should have a medium of wide circulation where his voice could be amplified. I close with expressing the hope that his venture in Reedsport will prove both restful and profitable—but only an interlude in a continuing career in daily journalism."

Tugman's reaction to this suggestion is not recorded. Characteristically, he would have grunted, peered over his glasses and reached for his hat. Bill Tugman is always reaching for his hat. There's always something that needs looking into.

P.S. When William M. Tugman left the Eugene *Register-Guard,* of which he had been managing editor and editor for 28 years, Alton Baker, Jr., became editor and Herbert Baker, managing editor. Robert B. Frazier, general assignment reporter and columnist, was made associate editor. Frazier was a Nieman Fellow in 1952-53.

"Get Writing"

by Louis M. Lyons

Just before Alan Barth's new book, *Government by Investigation,* came out, I had the luck to have him for an interview on my radio program. He had done a book, I suggested, on the issues that came under his eye as an editorial writer on the Washington *Post.*

"Yes," Alan said, "And fortunately, being right there on the Washington scene, I could go up on the hill and see some of these things for myself."

That is one of the reasons that newspapermen should write more books. They can see the thing for themselves. They are trained to see it factually and they are practiced in writing it down carefully, and if, like Alan Barth, they serve a newspaper that helps its readers to keep up with the score, they have a chance to interpret the meaning of what they see. They are thus strategically placed to write the more permanent record of the great events of their times. Not enough of them do.

One of my prejudices is that newspapermen should do more biography, especially of public figures. They often have rare chances; what is most apt to be deficient is an early acquisition of methodical note keeping.

The record itself is apt to be insufficient. Newspaper files tell the public side of the character, but that needs filling out and interpreting to put flesh and blood on the bare bones. William S. White, one of our ablest reporters, in the N. Y. *Times* Washington bureau, has done a fine job in "The Taft Story", chiefly from his own reporter's contact with Taft, and his understanding of Taft's politics and character. Another brilliant correspondent, Richard Rovere, has done this on a magazine article scale for both Taft and, earlier Dewey. "The Man in the Blue Serge Suit" was a notable characterization, and the title topped it off as titles rarely do.

Merlo Pusey, an editorial writer on the Washington *Post,* did a great biography of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes. This is worth mentioning because it illustrates very conspicuously a point of importance. Nobody can write a biography of a chief justice of the Supreme Court that will stand up and be accepted by students and lawyers and all, as Pusey's was, unless he brings a great deal more to his task than skill in writing. This skill he must have. But he must have vastly more. He must master the law in which Hughes did his life work. And not merely the law, but the impact upon the great cases before the Court of the political issues and the social needs of the times. Of course if he has had occasion to comment daily on the issues of the period, he is well launched for the systematic study his task requires; and we can assume it is a task to his taste. He has followed the Court and been fascinated by it. He has ready access, being in Washington, to the Library of Congress and the Court records. But even so, when he has acquired a law professor's understanding of the cases of Hughes' court, he still has the biographer's problem of understanding his man as a human being and the motivation of his life.

It is an exacting chore to set down faithfully another's words and thoughts, to reproduce his thinking for us. Boswell's "Life of Johnson" is the prototype of all such. But Lucien Price has done a noble job with his "Conversations" with Alfred North Whitehead—a labor of love and of reverence for a great mind—carried out over years, of recording the long conversations he had with the philosopher on Sunday evenings. Price had a dual role, first to prime the conversational pump and keep it in the channels he wanted —then, afterwards, to recall and set down the full and precise record. Years of reporting and years of note-taking prepared him for this. And of course years of reading everything of Whitehead's and of Whitehead's contemporary and predecessor philosophers. Finally, Price had to bring to these evenings the topics of conversations, of sufficient point and pith to plumb the dimensions of Whitehead's thought —to challenge his interest and stimulate his thought. For it was the essence of his thinking that Price was after. He had to keep the flow going, and in depth, to yield the nuggets he was after. This takes the kind of writing that is absolutely self-eliminating. The anonymity of reporter and editorial writer was his discipline for keeping his own role invisible in the recording of Whitehead.

A vicarious kind of book if you like, is the one Irving Dillard did, with the public papers of Justice Learned Hand—a fine name to have on a book cover. "The Spirit of Liberty" is its title and it rings with that spirit as the old judge fired up his opinions, his occasional addresses and public statements. This was a great book because it was made of the stuff of greatness. Dilliard's real contribution was in making a book of it. Judge Hand's papers had never been collected. He, in great modesty, deprecated the project, but did not stand in its way. Dilliard's biographical essay that precedes the Hand opinions is a fine job. Dilliard had had practice as a contributor to the American Dictionary of Biography for which he did 24 articles, as I remember it,—fine practice for an amateur biographer. But the unique and creative contribution of Dilliard was having the idea, exploring to find

that nobody had done anything with Hand's papers, and inspiring a publisher to take it on—a great one too, Alfred Knopf. This gives me a chance to moralize again. How did Dilliard come on this as a subject? Not just because he is editor of a great newspaper, the St. Louis *Post Dispatch*. Not merely because he is a vigorous crusading editorial writer. Rather because Dilliard has made it a life-long practice to follow the Supreme Court and its Constitutional cases with the same diligence and enthusiasm that a sports editor follows baseball statistics.

Dilliard did this as an incident of his daily news job, out of a conviction that a newspaperman needs to keep up with the score on the great Court cases—in which our great political issues come to decisive climax. One reason he had to do this with such thoroughness himself, and made a practice of it, is that the Supreme Court has not been thoroughly covered by the news; and an editor who wanted to keep up with it and get at the essence of every case had to follow it himself, have the abstracts and the decisions sent to him regularly, read them for himself and dig his editorials out of them. Dilliard went into this as a part of his professional needs. He has found the result a profitable by-product that has brought him stature of its own—magazine articles on the Court and its leading members, and on their record on civil liberties. It was out of this intimacy with the materials of his avocation that Dilliard realized the greatness of Justice Hand, the unique regard that other lawyers and jurists had for his opinions, and the fact that these had never been published. It was in looking for a publication on them, to read himself, that he realized the lack, and sensed in his own need, the convenience that would be served and the potential market that would be filled, by bringing them together and publishing them. This was a piece of amateur enterprise, but done by a pro in a field in which he had earlier developed professional competence.

"First and foremost get writing" is Samuel Eliot Morison's admonition to young writers. He, the greatest writer among our modern historians in America, is retiring this June, leaving a fine shelf of books, with more yet to finish. A good many years ago I bought a ten cent pamphlet by him to pass around to the Nieman Fellows of that year. It was written for historians, titled "History as a Literary Form" but its practical advice was as important to any kind of writer and its timeliness is perennial.

Hear Professor Morison on the business of getting started:

> "It is a terrible strain, isn't it, to sit down at a desk with your notes all neatly docketed, and begin to write? You pretend to your wife that you mustn't be interrupted; but, actually, you welcome a ring of the telephone, a knock at the door, or a bellow from the baby as an excuse to break off. Finally, after smoking sundry cigarettes and visiting the toilet two or three times, a lame paragraph or two gets committed to paper. By the time you get to the third, one bit of information you want is lacking. What a relief! Now you must go back to the library or the archives to do some more digging. That's where you are happy! And what you turn up there leads to more questions and prolongs the delicious process of research. Half the pleas I have heard from graduate students for more time or another grant-in-aid are mere excuses to postpone the painful drudgery of writing.
>
> "There is the 'indispensablest beauty in knowing how to get done' said Carlyle. In every research there comes a point, which you should recognize like a call of conscience, when you must get down to writing. And when you once are writing, go on writing as long as you can; there will be plenty of time later to shove in the footnotes or return to the library for extra information. Above all, *start* writing. Nothing is more pathetic than the "gonna" historian, who from graduate school on is always "gonna" write a magnum opus but never completes his research on the subject, and dies without anything to show for a lifetime's work.
>
> "Dictation is usually fatal to good historical writing. Write out your first draft in longhand or, if you compose easily on the typewriter, type it out yourself, revise with pencil or pen and have it retyped clean. Don't stop to consult your notes for every clause or sentence; it is better to get what you have to say clearly in your mind and dash it off; then, after you have it down, return to your notes and compose your next few pages or paragraphs. After a little experience you may well find that you think best with your fingers on the typewriter keys or your fountain pen poised over the paper. For me, the mere writing of a few words seems to point up vague thoughts and make jumbled facts array themselves in neat order. Whichever method you choose, composing before you write or as you write, do not return to your raw material or verify facts and quotations or insert footnotes until you have written a substantial amount, an amount that will increase with practice. It is significant that two of our greatest American hisorians, Prescott and Parkman, were nearly blind during a good part of their active careers. They had to have the sources read to them and turn the matter over and over in their minds before they could give anything out."

Prof. Morison urges the reading of the classics—notably the King James Bible, for vigor and clarity of language—and the use of the plain simple word.

Rachel Carson wrote "The Sea Around Us" out of her own technical career in the office of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. But of course that technical qualification and that rich experience would never have produced "The Sea Around Us" had not Rachel Carson had an artist's appreciation and a philosopher's profound feeling for the vastness, the mystery and the infinite variation that lies beneath the seeming sameness of the ocean waves.

Donald Culross Peattie writes the same way about trees. He began as a botanist, and is a natural artist in a field of natural science.

Indeed, does it occur to you that most of the science most of us know comes from the happy chance that a few great scientists were great writers—Darwin, Huxley, Eddington and Harlow Shapley who has brought "Our Changing Climate" within the ken of the layman.

Some who are not writers at all but who have lived in close and absorbing association with lively events have written fascinating accounts. Mme Fermi's report in the *New Yorker* last summer of the Manhattan Project in which her husband played a key role is not only charming description of the family and community life of some of our most noted scientists, but fills in some real biographical and historical gaps for us in a vital chapter of our times.

The husband of Gertrude Lawrence has given us in the *Ladies Home Journal* the vivacity and rich personality of his talented wife, and in a style that rises to his subject.

We tend to relegate the casual essay to a more leisurely day—until E. B. White comes along with a book whose very title "Second Tree from the Corner" challenges you to classify it as anything but most casual bits and pieces. But it is E. B. White. Anything he does has a sure market, his brilliance is so penetrating it shows through the stubborn anonymity of the *New Yorker's* Talk of the Town. It is the talk of E. B. White. Yet the book for which he is perhaps best known is not at all in character with the urbane, bland aimlessnes of Talk of the Town. It is a flaming crusade—"The White Flag"—a title of double meaning: White's name, of course, but a crusade for a higher cause than national sovereignty, for the universality of the One World association, of man's organized intelligence against atomic destruction.

One would say that the diary had been completely exhausted as a literary form until Brooks Atkinson disproves it with "Once Around the Sun."

John Blum helped edit the Theodore Roosevelt Letters—8 great volumes, $80 the set. Then as a by-product he did a synthesis of the political ideas and tactics of Roosevelt, in a crisp little book, for anybody who has $3.50.

Sybille Bedford has even done a travel book on Mexico, "The Sudden View" with such a fresh new look and such an individual pattern as to excite enthusiasm in the jaded daily book reviewers (New York *Times*, July 28.)

The development of some of our most able writers strongly suggests the importance of apprenticeship—of beginning with a small subject before attempting the largest. Thus Samuel Morison's early success was with the "Maritime History of Massachusetts". He brought to this that rare combination of talents and interests that made him the great chronicler of naval warfare and biographer of Columbus and historian of America. But it started him on a theme within a smaller compass, one that he could completely explore for himself, both physically, from Cape Cod to Cape Ann, and in point of the written record, all within his reach. It was a minor classic as soon as it was published, with the promise of all that was to unfold from that beginning.

Parkman did his one volume on "The Conspiracy of Pontiac" before he even considered the monumental structure of his many-volumed work of continental scope. Bernard DeVoto was a decade working up to "Course of Empire" through books of lesser dimensions, "Year of Decision" and "Across the Wide Missouri."

Right aroud the corner from me are a couple of other Pulitzer prize winners besides Morison.

One of them, Paul Buck, spent more than a decade on his doctoral thesis, that became "Road to Reunion." It was built brick by brick. When it was done it stood up, as the story of the South's reconciliation after the Civil War.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., was very young with his "Age of Jackson." But it was his second book. The first was an obscure biography but it involved studies of the same period and problems of doing a profile against the times.

Oscar Handlin began with a specialized study of what happened to the Irish immigrant to Boston. This was his foundation both in research and writing. From it he went on to "The Uprooted," which tells the larger story of the immigrant's problem in reshaping his life to America. He has gone on from that to an even larger pattern in "The American People in the 20th Century" — to show how our group conflicts have worked themselves out and the shape they have given our society.

Most of this is from a lecture at Breadloaf Writers Conference, 1954.

IPI - Initials That Stand For An Institution Serving the Interests of a Free Press

by Henry Tanner

The next nine months will decide the fate of the only existing organization which is able to fight the battle for a better and freer press on an international scale.

At the end of the year, the International Press Institute, an American idea turned into a truly international institution, may either have to quit or to cut down its operations to a meaningless minimum. If it dies, it will die of lack of funds—that is lack of support from the editors and publishers of the 30 countries it represents.

When IPI was founded in 1951, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations agreed to finance its operations for the first three years. After that, the founders felt, financial support would have to come from the press itself.

The three years were up last May, and the Institute has since been trying, half successfully, to stand on its own feet. Its income, from membership fees and through a special appeal to publishers, has been $25,000, or $30,000 short of its basic annual cost.

The Ford Foundation, as a result, had to make an additional grant covering expenses through December, 1955.

This new deadline is final. Later on, foundation money may still be forthcoming—but only for special projects and only if the international press itself contributes the $55,000 needed for the annual running cost.

IPI Director Elliot J. B. Rose, formerly a RAF wing commander and a literary editor of the London *Observer,* hopes to raise the missing $30,000 by increasing the number of members from 700 to about 1200 and by launching another appeal to publishers the world over. He writes in the Institute's monthly bulletin: "If the press as a whole and our members in particular do not want the Institute enough to be willing to underwrite our basic costs then clearly we are a luxury and should not be kept alive by outside bodies."

Having followed IPI's work from a distance for some time, I recently took a more thorough look at its record in order to find out whether it is a luxury or not. The conclusion, emphatically so, is: No.

My impression was strengthened last month by talks with a number of European editors and a visit to the organization's headquarters in one of the solid houses which have been looking down on the roofs of the Old City of Zurich for four and five centuries.

Henry Tanner is a Nieman Fellow on leave from the Houston *Post.* He visited IPI on a Christmas visit to his old home in Switzerland.

What is the IPI? And what has it done?

It may be well to say, first, what it isn't. It has nothing to do with the Cold War, which, in itself, is refreshing. It is not concerned with any futile effort at trying to promote freedom of the press where such freedom by definition cannot exist. No Soviet or Chinese or satellite editors are among its members. Neither has it any committees in Spain or Argentina.

Its aims are more modest, but also more realistic. It is limiting its membership and activities to countries in which the press is either free or at least free enough to put up a fight when its freedom is being abridged. It assumes that even in the most democratic countries freedom of the press can never for a moment be taken for granted but must constantly be defended. It further assumes, as do national organizations like the ASNE, that in order to defend their interests and improve their professional standards, newspapers and editors have to get together for concerted action.

For this purpose IPI has set up national committees in 30 countries in North and South America, Europe, Africa and Asia. It is open to publishers and editors who have a responsibility for the editorial and news policies of their papers.

And what has it achieved? Like its big brother, the United Nations, IPI labors under the handicap that the good it has done is much less spectacular than the evil that might have happened if it hadn't done anything at all. Nevertheless, it has to its credit a number of highly valuable and significant, even some concrete, achievements.

The most tangible results perhaps were obtained when it injected itself into the most heated international controversy of recent years and, at the height of the EDC debate in Germany and France, got leading editors from both countries to meet for two joint seminars.

At the outset of each two-day meeting the participants received documentation showing how German newspapers had misrepresented French motives in the EDC question and how French papers had misinformed their readers about German attitudes. The documentation was compiled by the Institute's research staff.

The result was a more valid contribution to Franco-German understanding than scores of speeches by assorted foreign ministers could have made.

A new IPI survey in both countries showed that the tone of many papers had become more moderate. Editors on both sides entered a "gentlemen's agreement" pledging

objective reporting. *Le Monde*—which is one of the bitterest foes of German rearmament besides being the most influential paper in France—permitted a German editor-in-chief to tell its readers at length all he thought about the "tragedy" of French rejection of EDC. In return, the Frankfort *Neue Presse* gave frontpage space to a *Le Monde* writer explaining the French view. An effort is being made to make such exchanges a standing feature in several papers.

Similarly, the setting up of mixed watchdog committees is being considered in both capitals.

Another case is that of the expulsion from Indonesia of a Dutch newspaperman.

IPI gave immediate and full coverage to the incident in its monthly bulletin. The Indonesian IPI members then issued a declaration condemning their government's action as a violation of the freedom of the press. Some local papers followed with equally brave and unpopular editorials.

Their action, which would hardly have been possible without moral backing from abroad, pointed up the significance of the case. IPI support enabled a small group of editors in an unsettled political situation and an atmosphere of aroused nationalism to strike a blow for press freedom in the face of bitter opposition from their government and the majority of their readers.

The solidarity of foreign papers probably saved the day also for the *Times* of Karachi whose prominent editor, Z. A. Suleri, was jailed on charges of sedition after printing a vehement editorial to the effect that the present leaders of Pakistan had betrayed the legacy of Jinnah. After Suleri's arrest, his news editor sent a wire to IPI asking for its help. IPI published the facts of the case and circulated them. A number of Western papers, including the London *Times,* responded with editorials.

Suleri was released after three months; his paper never ceased publication.

There are other cases, some more subtle, some more flagrant. The books on some of them are not yet closed.

If you read the IPI bulletin you find, for instance, that the Turkish government, with slow but apparently unrelenting consistency, is strangling the country's opposition press. The latest list of arrests includes a 78-year-old editorial writer who must serve a 26 month prison sentence despite an appeal to President Bayar by the country's newspaper organizations. One opposition paper, with its editor and three contributors in jail, has suspended publication.

IPI's reports on the plight of the Turkish press have not had any positive results so far, but the pattern of other cases may yet repeat itself: Without the moral support of an outside organization and access to the organs which influence world public opinion, the local editors would be virtually defenseless. Yet, fortunately, the governments which are most likely to suppress freedom of the press when it hurts their interests are also most likely to be morbidly sensitive to bad publicity abroad.

Besides being a sounding board for editors in distress, the Institute tries to serve their interests in these ways:

Once a year it calls a membership meeting whose chief merit, like that of the annual meetings of the ASNE, it may be to give the embattled editor a feeling of sharing his daily problems and frustrations with others. I talked to prominent and not at all convention-happy European editors who feel that these meetings alone would be sufficient to give IPI its raison d'être.

Then there is the monthly bulletin, a clearing house of ideas and information about local and international press problems.

A typical recent issue contained the following articles: An American (Barry Bingham) and a British (W. Vaughan Reynolds of the Birmingham *Post*) view of what the functions of the editorial page should be: a report on the state of press freedom in Australia by Albert E. Norman of the *Christian Science Monitor;* a description of relations between Soviet and Western correspondents in Vienna by John McCormack of the New York *Times;* an article by a prominent French jurist on newspaper coverage of French courts (previous issues had similar studies on England, Holland, Switzerland and the U.S.); an article by V. M. Newton Jr., ME of the Tampa *Tribune* and chairman of the Freedom of Information committee of Sigma Delta Chi, on the fight of American editors against the "Contagion of Secret Government;" a report on journalistic training in Britain, and a report on the Indonesian incident. In addition, there was a page-filling box entitled "The Freedom of the Press" (a standing feature) with reports on the present state of that freedom in Australia, Chile, Egypt, Germany, India, Iran, Pakistan, Tangier, Tunisia and Turkey.

Nor is that all.

IPI's Special Projects, in the past, were mainly research projects—*The Flow of the News, The News from Russia, The News from the Middle East.* In the future, the emphasis will be on seminars of the type held by French and German editors. There will be one between American and British editors in May. Another is planned for Asia. A third is expected to be held at the UN, in the fall, for the purpose of improving UN coverage.

Finally, preparations have been made for Institute assistance in training and educating young newspapermen from underdeveloped countries in the spirit and tradition of a democratic press. Indonesia has been chosen for a pilot project. If it succeeds, there will be similar programs in Africa and other parts of Asia—which brings us back to the issue of the lacking funds.

IPI activity in underdeveloped countries, Institute officials believe, is one of the reasons why they find it hard

to raise the money they need. It's a question of the haves and have-nots.

Editors with limited resources in some of the young countries which are experimenting with new political institutions and new social structures are more likely to benefit directly from IPI's work than the editors and publishers of the big democracies in which the press has not had to fight for its freedom in a really big way for some time.

This may explain why the publishers of Ceylon, India and Indonesia responded immediately to Mr. Rose's appeal for funds last year, while no contribution has yet been received, at this writing, from England.

It may be the reason, also, why a handful of Japanese publishers were willing to contribute $5000—or almost twice as much as the publishers of the 1,700-odd newspapers of the United States.

Can the Press Help Build a Free World?

by Mark F. Ethridge

I confess that the last five years have been intellectually the most distressing of my life, because I have had the feeling that somewhere along the way we have lost what Holmes called "that faith in the universe not measured by our fears," and to have evidenced what the executive board of the American Friends Service Committee called "a spiritual failure of nerve." My greater distress comes from the fact that with some notable exceptions newspapers of the country have been no more alert to what was happening to the United States than nine-tenths of the other citizens. And they should have been, if they are going to possess the power they do. It was not that we did not have warning. Three years ago Judge Learned Hand said to all who would listen: "We are in the distressing position of all who find their axioms doubted: axioms which, like all axioms, are so self-evident that any show of dissidence outrages our morals and paralyzes our minds. And we have responded as men generally do respond to provocation: for the most part we seem to think of nothing better than repression; we seek to extirpate the heresies and wreak vengeance upon the heretics. We have authentically reproduced the same kind of hysteria that swept over England in the time of Titus Oates and during the French Revolution, and over ourselves after the Civil War and the First War, except in our own case we have outdone our precedents."

And again the judge said:

"Risk for risk, for myself I would rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust which accepts rumors and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry."

Perhaps I feel as strongly as Judge Hand does because I have had the misfortune to live intimately with four major crises affecting the freedom of the individual—four catastrophies that warped the souls of man. One of them was the Ku Klux Klan era, when as a young editor, the Klan did me the honor, with its threats, of forcing my publisher to ride with a sawed-off shotgun on his lap. I landed in Germany on the day Hitler was elected and spent the first six months of his regime there. I lived through the first purges. I was the first American representative on a special mission to the Balkans when the Russians solidified their power in Bulgaria and Rumania. And the fourth phase which I have so unhappily lived through in the United States is that one which is superficially called McCarthyism. That designation flatters the evil genius of the Senator from Wisconsin too much; he was only the archangel of our darkness.

I agree with George Kennan, who in his brilliant Notre Dame speech said that the forces which had been aroused were "too diffuse to be described by their association with any one man or any one political concept"; that they were largely matters of the mind and of the emotions, all marching "in one way or another, under the banner of an alarmed and exercised anti-Communism—but an anti-Communism of quite a special variety, bearing an air of excited discovery and proprietorship, as though no one had ever known before that there was a Communist danger."

What we have been through was even deeper than that; it has been the fulfillment of the warning which Edward Livingston (as quoted by Palmer Hoyt in his Zenger Award speech) gave in 1789: "If we are to violate the Constitution . . . the country will swarm with informers, spies, and all the odious reptile tribes that breed in the sunshine of despotic power to convey your words distorted by calumny to the secret tribunal where fear officiates as accuser and suspicion is the only evidence that is heard."

But we have come only a little way back. People are be-

Mark Ethridge is publisher of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and *Times*. His is one of the vigorous independent voices in the American press. We have been glad of other chances to present his views in *Nieman Reports*. This is from an address to the first Ohio Press Institute in Columbus, Feb. 15.

ginning to stick their heads up and to counterattack. McCarthy has been censured. But, as Bob Hutchins pointed out to the National Press Club lately, Oppenheimer and Davies have been cleared of disloyalty but are not working for the government; Ladejinsky is not with the Department of Agriculture and Dr. Edward Condon, faced with his tenth or eleventh investigation, declared himself out of the game. The poison has gone too far to be recalled. The librarian who got fired in Oklahoma for subscribing to *The Nation* is not working in Oklahoma; Mrs. Mary Bethune and Paul Hoffman have not been invited back to make those speeches they were prevented from making because somebody whispered Mrs. Bethune was subversive and because Paul Hoffman was sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union. Canada Lee, Larry Adler and others, are not on the American stage any more. John Carter Vincent still can not get justice from the government.

The list is long and could be much longer. The danger in sacrificing a little liberty, which is what we began to do in 1950, is the same as sacrificing a little virtue. All you can do when virtue goes is to mourn it. But it is worse than that with freedom. When newspapers, among others, began to rationalize the first steps we took to repress some freedoms instead of letting common sense play, they set in motion forces that are not easily stopped, as France found out in her revolution. Repressions of that sort move in ever-widening concentric circles until at the end every man tends to regard himself as the only authority upon what is 100 per cent Americanism. Thus, the Legion forced the Girl Scouts to rewrite their manual. Minorities which stand to lose most by intolerance are inclined to join the pack. Catholics tried to prevent the showing of *The Miracle*. Jewish groups protested *Oliver Twist* and *The Merchant of Venice*. The NAACP tried to prevent the revival of *The Birth of a Nation* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin;* a Negro bishop protested *Green Pastures*. The American Legion tried to prevent the performance of *The Death of a Salesman* because its author was listed in Red Channels.

How foolish it sounds in retrospect! How foolish, how insane it all was! The primary job for all of us, particularly those of us who are newspaper people, is to try to help get the country back on the track of the Bill of Rights. That involves saying to the politicians of both parties, "Quit playing politics with our freedoms. They were too hard-won to be kicked around in your cheap and silly game."

There are two more problems which I should like to mention wherein frankness on the part of the press is much more likely to be helpful than harmful. The Supreme Court has handed down a revolutionary, or rather an evolutionary decision affecting segregation. Only one thing is certain about de-segregation: its inevitability. But already councils have sprung up through the South that are, despite the feelings of their respectable sponsors, nothing more than uptown Ku Klux Klans. They are largely dedicated to the idea of defeating de-segregation by "means short of violence." Now, nobody has any desire to hurry the transition; everybody has sympathy with the special problems that are presented where the population is overwhelmingly Negro. Unfortunately, most of the Southern papers that I have seen have either treated the issue emotionally, allied themselves with the councils or have been silent. I wonder if it occurs to them that the councils represent nothing more nor less than another Nullification movement.

Let me pose one more problem for the press and I am done. We are a world power. One of our lines of defense is on the Elbe and another is either in Quemoy and Matsu —or is not in Quemoy and Matsu—depending upon how "crystal clear" the President's policy is to you. It's not at all clear to me. But that's beside my present point. Members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors voted Germany's recovery, as vital as it is to us, the most under-played story of 1954. I nominate the Formosa story as the most under-explained story of 1955. Here we have been, perhaps on the brink of war—at least in position where it was one man's choice whether to make it or not—and I'll venture that nine-tenths of the American people don't know what it's all about. How many know, for instance, that Formosa doesn't belong to Nationalist China any more than it does to Red China? And that Chiang Kai-Shek is there as an interloper? How many know that the Formosans want their freedom as much as anybody else and have fought for it several times? Have we bound ourselves irrevocably to Chiang with the treaty which was ratified last week? Have we, in our overall policy, abandoned the Atlantic Charter and the hope that it held out to colonial peoples everywhere? Are we more concerned with legalism and expediency than with human rights?

Newspapers used to thunder their beliefs at Washington when we were a small and weak nation. Now that we are powerful, now that the press is infinitely greater in its capacity to communicate, it finds too little to communicate. It is serving largely as an ex-post-facto commentator.

You will observe that these things which I have mentioned as major challenges to the press all lie within the realm of, and affect, human freedoms: the security program, de-segregation, and the whole field of foreign policy. I think the answer to the question whether the press can help build a free world lies in its concern with these things and in its determination to find out somethig about them and then, having found, speak in the name of American tradition and decency. Elmer Davis was never more right than when he said, "This nation was not built by cowards; it will not be preserved by cowards."

Mr. President -

Reporter Writes Ike: What Are You Going to Do About Ladejinsky Case?

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. President;

I am submitting the following fact situation in compliance with your request for any factual information that indicates a government department has made a mistake.

• • •

Your Department of Agriculture has charged that Wolf Ladejinsky was a member of two subversive organizations.

The Foreign Operations Administration has stated flatly that Ladejinsky was not a member of any subversive organizations.

People in your Administration have informed me that the FOA position is correct.

However, the Department of Agriculture continues to reiterate the charge.

The charge was made in Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's press release dated Dec. 22, 1954. In this he called Ladejinsky "a security risk" and stated he held "membership in two Communist front organizations."

This determination is in direct conflict with a press release issued by the FOA on Jan. 18, 1955.

FOA Director Harold E. Stassen stated on that date that a review of the entire Ladejinsky file and an up-to-date FBI investigation show Ladejinsky was never a member of any front organization or subversive organization.

Mr. Ladejinsky's name was on the mailing lists, during World War II, of some of the front organizations subsequently cited by the Attorney General as subversive. He was not a member of any of these organizations, and many thousands of loyal Americans were on the same mailing lists," Stassen's release stated.

Despite the FOA statement, Secretary Benson continues to reiterate the charge that Ladejinsky is a member of two Communist front organizations. His department continues to circulate the charge.

I have been informed privately by Justice Department officials, FOA officials and others in the Executive Department that the Agriculture Department position on this matter was a result of a lack of a proper legal analysis of the file. This resulted in an unsubstantiated charge being made by the Department of Agriculture.

As long as the Department of Agriculture refuses to admit a mistake or substantiate its charge, Wolf Ladejinsky must wear a label stating he is a member of two subversive organizations.

High officials of other departments of government have stated privately that they are powerless to move in correcting this situation as long as Secretary Benson remains fixed in his views.

It is for this reason that I posed the question at the press conference.

The question was stated in a general way because of your past indications that you do not like to comment on specific cases.

This made it appear fair to ask what the White House will do in this case or similar cases, where an Executive agency persists in hurling charges that an individual is a member of subversive organizations when other Executive agencies state the charges are not true.

What will the White House do in this case where the Agriculture Department continues to hurl the charge that Ladejinsky was a member of two subversive organizations, when other departments state the charge is untrue?

What is the general policy of the White House with regard to correcting mistakes if it becomes clear that any Executive agency was making charges against an individual that were not substantiated?

Respectfully yours,

Clark R. Mollenhoff, 852 National Press Building, Wash. D. C.

—Boston *Globe*, Feb. 25.

Clark Mollenhoff's letter had its origin in the following question and answer at the White House Press Conference February 23:

Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Des Moines *Register and Tribune*—Mr. President, in the past you have made it clear that you deplored the fact that certain members of Congress have attacked individuals unjustly on the floor, but you at the same time said that that was a matter for Congress to decide for them, for itself.

Now, I wondered what steps you would take if it should come to your attention that someone in the Executive agency would call an individual a member of a subversive organization when they had no evidence to sustain that and it was absolutely clear that there was no evidence to sustain it.

A.—Well, now, I will say that I am —I am not a member of the Supreme Court, but I understand they don't answer these very long hypothetical questions. (Laughter.) When you bring to me facts such as you just now allege and bring them so that I can study them and not answer them in a press conference where I have nothing or any other side except a statement of accusation, then I will give you my opinion, but not now.

Q.—Mr. President, is that an invitation to permit this—

A.—You can—if you have any information that you believe of wrongdoing in this Administration, you are not only at liberty to submit any facts you have, I strongly urge that you do, and I assure you they will get the finest kind of consideration.

Three hours later Clark Mollenhoff was back at the White House with his letter for the President.

Mollenhoff has been a vigorous questioner since he covered the county court house in Des Moines. He smoked out the Department of Agriculture on the Ladejinsky case by publishing a letter which showed the nature of the charges against him. He then kept the issue alive in White House press conferences. Mollenhoff was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

Low Man on the Totem Pole

by Armistead Scott Pride

Seven years ago when *Ebony* magazine ran its lensy eye over the country for a count of Negro newsmen on daily newspapers, it came up with a total of fifteen. Four years later *Our World* took its turn and reeled off just a dozen. Today the figure stands slightly higher. There are twenty-one Negroes, including two of the four Negro Nieman Fellows,* working in news-editorial capacities on general dailies and one weekly. Negroes, almost all of them college graduates, may be found on the staffs of these dailies: the Denver *Post*, Chicago *Daily News*, Chicago *Sun-Times*, Chicago *Herald-American*, *Illinois State Journal and Register*, Fort Wayne *News-Sentinel*, Detroit *Free Press*, Minneapolis *Tribune*, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, Newark *Evening News*, New York *Post*, New York *Herald Tribune*, Cleveland *Press* (with two). Cleveland *News*, Toledo *Blade*, Portland *Oregonian*, Providence *Journal and Evening Bulletin*, Chester (Pa.) *Times*, and Milwaukee *Journal*. The weekly is the Clifton (N.J.) *Leader*, whose managing editor is a Negro.

The Middle West leads the country in the number of general newspapers employing Negroes. Three are concentrated in Chicago, where the *Tribune* alone lacks the token one Negro. It is not that the McCormick daily, which only recently discontinued its race-labeling policy following a three-year campaign by the City Club of Chicago, has neglected effort in that direction. It kept the orator, Roscoe Conkling Simmons, recently deceased, on its payroll as a Sunday feature writer for some years, and it took on a Columbia University journalism graduate as a cub reporter for a few weeks before the youngster sped East for more lucrative returns. The *Tribune* has just not succeeded in coming up with what it wants in the way of a Negro news worker.

The *Herald-American* led the way in Chicago late in the thirties when James M. Burr, a former Springfield, Illinois, publisher, took on part-time chores in the Negro community, followed by Wendell Smith, Pittsburgh *Courier* sports editor, as a full-time general sports reporter a decade later. Soon afterwards John Knight's *Daily News* hired Medill graduate Lestre Brownlee, who handles mixed assignments and has distinguished himself in the newspaper's slum block rehabilitation program. In 1952 the *Sun-Times* engaged Nieman Fellow Fletcher Martin, city editor of the Louisville *Defender*, as a copy editor. Hiram E. Jackson, a Lincoln University of Missouri art graduate, has been page designer and staff artist with the *Illinois State Journal and Register* at Springfield since 1939.

Ohio matches the four working in Illinois. The Cleveland *Press* has two: Ernest N. Jackson, Bowling Green journalism graduate who advanced from cub reporter to office boy staff chief, and Hilbert Black, on the police beat. Van Timmons handles art work for editorial promotion at the Cleveland *News*. George A. Moore, who served the *Press* as copy boy, crime reporter, and general assignment writer, transferred in 1947 to the Scripps-Howard TV outlet WEWS, where he is program director. Eight years ago William Brower became a reporter for the Toledo *Blade* and consistently has been given such a variety of assignments that he could never be called "The Blade's Negro News Editor."

Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri and Minnesota contribute one each to the Midwestern total of thirteen Negroes staffing general newspapers. The editorial and rotogravure section artist with the Fort Wayne *News-Sentinel* is Gerald Stewart, now in his seventh year there. A seasoned newspaperman, Collins C. George, who had served the Pittsburgh *Courier* as foreign war correspondent and managing editor, became a Detroit *Free Press* reporter in 1953. A few years earlier the Milwaukee *Journal* had made Robert Teague a reporter. Of him, J. D. Ferguson, editor, said:

> Mr. Teague's being a Negro has nothing to do with our employment of him. We told Teague whether he remained or not depended on his work. He has come up to expectations and made a place for himself.

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* has had University of Illinois journalism graduate John H. Hicks on its news staff since 1951.

Carl T. Rowan, Baltimore *Afro-American* alumnus and Oberlin College graduate, stepped into the national spotlight when he wrote a series early in 1951 for the Minneapolis *Tribune* based on his 6,000-mile tour of thirteen Southern states. The *Tribune* had taken him on three years earlier following his graduation with the master of arts degree in journalism from the University of Minnesota. He had also reported for the Minneapolis *Spokesman* and St. Paul *Recorder*, two Negro weeklies. He put in two years as rim man on the *Tribune* copydesk before moving outside on general assignments. During the war he served as communications officer on two ships with the Atlantic Fleet and now is a lieutenant junior grade in the naval reserve.

Armistead Scott Pride teaches in the Lincoln University School of Journalism.

The three-week series, each one placed on the *Tribune* front page, began with this sentence at McMinnville, Tennessee: "Nearly eight years ago I boarded a Jim Crow train and left this central Tennessee town of 6,000" and ended with this paragraph: "The South now races to catch up. And the Negro runs the same race. He knows that, in that 100 years which the South lost, he has come a long way from slavery. But he still has a long way to go." The series was titled *How Far From Slavery,* which was changed to *South of Freedom* when it appeared in book form and was made a Book Find Club selection.

Time magazine called the articles "a perceptive, well-written series on segregation and prejudice in the South as only a Negro could know them." *Editor & Publisher* hailed the series as "a significant, readable glimpse into the American race problem." The Minneapolis *Spokesman* declared that "the *Tribune* series is a tremendous contribution to American life and discussion . . . helping make America free in truth as well as theory."

For his series the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce gave Rowan its "service to humanity" award and chose him "Outstanding Young Man of 1951." His other honors included an award from the University of Minnesota Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, one of the three Sidney Hillman Foundation 1952 awards of $500 each for outstanding newspaper reporting, and the Lincoln University School of Journalism Citation of Merit. For the National Jaycees he became one of the "Ten Outstanding Young Men of 1953," all of whom received the "Look Applauds" accolade.

Late in 1953 Rowan, accompanied by a *Tribune* staff photographer, motored to the District of Columbia and communities in Delaware, Kansas, Virginia and South Carolina involved in the now famous U.S. Supreme Court arguments on school segregation, in preparation for a second byline *Tribune* string, titled *Jim Crow's Last Stand,* which appeared in the Des Moines *Register and Tribune* and the *Afro-American* as well. The trophies continued to come. The Education Writers Association gave Rowan one of its four plaques, awarded for important educational journalism in 1953, and Sigma Delta Chi cited him for distinguished reporting during 1953. He flew to India and Southeast Asia last summer as a State Department International Exchange specialist and at season's end continued the journey for the *Tribune,* which featured Rowa's daily eighteen-part series, "This Is India," in November and December.

Rowan's 1951 articles set a pattern for Negro members of daily news crews. Similar assignments for a "train" of articles went to George Brown on the Denver *Post,* William Brower on the Toledo *Blade,* James N. Rhea on the Providence *Journal and Evening Bulletin,* and Ted Poston on the New York *Post.* The Pottstown (Pennsylvania) *Mercury* in seven articles and the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle,* in fifteen, have shown that similar work can be done by staffs minus the Negro talent.

The eastern United States can point to only six Negroes working "up front" on general newspapers. The managing editor of a weekly, the Clifton *Leader,* in a New Jersey community of few Negro families is Leslie Nash Jr., who has served the newspaper in a variety of capacities since 1942. Publisher Augustine LaCorte regards Nash, with his forceful style, as "one of the best newspaper writers that I have come across" in thirty-five years of newspapering. The police desk at the Newark *Evening News* has the second Negro to be found on a New Jersey paper. He is Luther Jackson, Columbia University journalism graduate.

New York City, which less than a decade ago could count as many as ten Negroes working full-time in the news rooms of its newspapers, can cite but two today. After Arch Parsons received his journalism degree from the University of Michigan four years ago, he started a regular reporting beat with the *Herald Tribune* and has since become head of the *Herald Tribune* United Nations bureau. Last fall he became the fourth Negro to win a Nieman Fellowship for a year of study at Harvard University.

The veteran among colored newsmen with general publications today is Theodore (Ted) Poston, who started in 1937 as a New York *Post* reporter, doubling at times at feature writing and copy editing. Winner of many awards for his reporting, Poston, who spent five war-time years (1945-50) with government information agencies, had gone afield to interview Huey Long and to cover the Cicero (Illinois) riot, the Clarendon County (South Carolina) school segregation case, and the Tavares, Florida, rape case. His *Post* stories on the Florida episode brought the Department of Justice into the case and earned for Poston the Heywood Broun, George Polk, and New York Newspaper Guild awards, among others.

The Chester *Times* carries the one full-time Negro staffer on a Pennsylvania newspaper. The veteran of thirty-three years of newspaper work, Orrin C. Evans, a reporter-rewrite man with the departed Philadelphia *Record,* serves the *Times* regularly as foreign and national wire news editor and twice weekly as city editor.

Rhode Island, which has had several Negroes working in earlier days on its Providence dailies, has one today. James N. Rhea, a college graduate, is in his fifth year as a reporter for the Providence *Journal and Evening Bulletin.*

The Denver *Post* became the first daily in the Colorado capital to take on a Negro reporter when George Brown, fresh out of the University of Kansas School of Journalism, started there in 1950. Brown has had general assignments

but the *Post*, like the *Blade* at Toledo, the *Tribune* at Minneapolis, and the *Journal and Evening Bulletin* at Providence, gave its lone Negro reporter top billing with a page one series, replete with byline and photograph, on Jim Crow in Denver. The editor introduced Brown to the Denver public with a note escorting the Brown string:

> How does Denver stand on the issue of racial prejudice and discrimination? To get the answer, the Denver *Post* assigned Reporter Brown to check up. For Reporter Brown, the assignment involved familiar ground. Reporter Brown is a Negro . . .

West of Denver only one Negro may be found in front-office duty for a newspaper of general appeal. The Portland *Oregonian* started William A. Hilliard several years ago as sports writer and recently made him church editor (!).

Twenty-one Negro news-editorial workers (none in advertising) out of some 80,000 persons staffing the 1,784 general daily and 9,770 general weekly newspapers in the land come to hardly a drop in the bucket, far less than the ten per cent Negro racial proportion prevailing in the total population. Perhaps had the Negro not become the perennial low man on the totem pole in the American scheme of things and had his skills and abilities kept up with the likely newspaper demand for his services through the past scores of years, then he might today number something like six or eight thousand, instead of the paltry twenty-one whose names have just marched by.

How does one account for such a paucity in numbers of Negro personnel on general newspaper staffs? The answer has already been suggested but the executive of a Rocky Mountain daily newspaper may best speak for himself, and perhaps for his fellows, as far as the lack—total lack—of Negro advertising help goes:

> We don't hire Negroes in the advertising department because we have found that likes should call on likes in selling and since the Negro population is low in (name of city) we don't feel there is place for Negro salesmen.

The editor of an Indiana daily became more expansive:

> It is certainly true that opportunities for the Negro in that field have been very limited in the past and that very few Negro journalists have found jobs in it. For this there are several reasons, the principal one, no doubt, being plain old-fashioned race prejudice. Besides that, however, it is a fact that very few young Negro men or women tried to get into it. Apparently, those qualified have found their prospects better in other fields, and have gone there. In the last six years, for instance, not a single Negro with even the minimum educational background we require of any applicant has applied for an editorial department job on this newspaper, although there is no reason and no policy that would prevent us hiring a Negro for such a job if we had a vacancy on our staff and a qualified applicant were available.

The "plain old-fashioned race prejudice" has played a large part in the picture presented by the news, editorial and advertising offices of American newspapers—a picture practically shorn of a dark face. That picture—and knowledge of it is easy to come by—has led potential Negro journalists to believe they were not wanted there. The general newspaper office thus joins the hundreds of job sources bearing the sign: "No Negroes Allowed." Knowing this, the Negro youth has traditionally confined his journalistic bent to a smaller sphere or he has shifted his talents to other directions, where the promise of employment and future livelihood has been more certain.

In its national conventions for the past four years, the American Newspaper Guild has recognized the lean-to policy prevailing among the daily newspapers. A 1951 convention resolution declared

> The most general type of discrimination is the virtual barring of Negroes from white-collar departments—editorial and commercial—of daily newspapers, despite an occasional single Negro reporter on a large daily.

Each year since then the national organization has prodded Guild locals into assembling information on the hiring practices of newspapers and, through its Human Rights Committee, has concentrated its effort to gain publisher support for its anti-discriminatory stand.

Newspaper executives have a responsibility, beyond editorial proclamations, in helping to bring about more integrated American news staffs. Their news-editorial and advertising personnel could start reflecting the racial make-up of their reader clientele. They could demonstrate in their state, regional and national meetings, through resolutions and panel discussions, that they are amenable to—and in fact urge—Negro front-office employment. Individually, they could start the ball rolling by signing on up-and-coming Negro high school or college graduates as copy boys, thus orienting them to the rigors of office routine and accustoming office personnel to having a dark-skinned worker around. Others could get the "feel" of things as reporter cubs, copy readers, proof readers, or even advertising apprentices. Any such program of staff integration would surely proceed not on the basis of hiring a Negro because he is a Negro, irrespective of ability and qualifications, but rather on the basis of *not overlooking*, intentionally or unintentionally, the colored prospect of efficiency, capacity, and high promise.

• The other two are on the one Negro daily and on *Jet* magazine.—Ed.

•• This criticism from the Pittsburgh *Courier* is noted as from a Negro newspaper.—Ed.

Book Reviews

Elmer Davis Sees Darkly

by William Woestendiek

TWO MINUTES TILL MIDNIGHT, by Elmer Davis. Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrill. 207 pp. $2.75.

Nobody, Elmer Davis has been told, wants to read about the hydrogen bomb, or even to think about it. But, warns Mr. Davis, unless the people of the United States start thinking about it, there may not be any United States.

This sober and frightening thought is the theme of his new book, a companion piece to *But We Were Born Free.* The author borrowed his title from the clock on the cover of the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists."

"Some years ago," he writes, "that clock stood at eight minutes till midnight. When the Russians displayed their atomic bomb it went up to three minutes before, and their hydrogen bomb moved it a minute closer."

If the title seems ominous, this is an ominous frightening book. Mr. Davis is sounding an alert that is as shocking as the first wail of an air raid siren would be.

The thermonuclear war may never be fought, but Mr. Davis says he can't see why it won't be. If it does come he isn't sure the United States would lose. But he isn't sure we would win.

So he is calling on the American people to be ready for the possibility of whatever happens. The first responsibility lies on our officials and, above all, the members of Congress.

Of Congress, he writes:

"They ought to stop right now what seems to be an inclination to drive away all our allies whom Truman, Acheson and the force of circumstances gathered about us but whom the force of circumstances alone may not keep with us much longer if we go on kicking them around. It seems to me that the entrance of Communist China into the United Nations at this time would certainly be silly and might well be harmful to American interests; but not so silly, not so harmful to American interests as in effect our telling forty or fifty other nations that we expect them to do what we demand, whether they like it or not. (This year the forty odd were on our side; but next year——?)"

The task of ordinary citizens, says Mr. Davis, is even harder. All we can do is give what support we can to intelligent foreign and domestic policies—"if we can find any to support."

President Eisenhower, Vice-president Nixon, Secretary Dulles and Admiral Radford all come under fire as the author reviews the administration's policies—or lack of them.

He sees no reason why our obvious interest in keeping Formosa out of the Communist empire obligates us to support Chiang in his "largely theatrical" effort to regain the mainland.

He says diplomacy is our first line of defense but the first line fell when Dulles got rid of all the diplomats, like John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies, whom McCarthy wanted out. With the result that most diplomats today will avoid telling "inconvenient truths."

He writes that the Oppenheimer case (Mr. Davis dedicates the book to "J. Robert Oppenheimer, the first victim of the hydrogen bomb") has had a depressing effect on the morale of many of the scientists who must be our principal reliance in the next war.

And he criticizes the reduction in size of the U. S. Army. Congress, writes Mr. Davis, feels that "only ground troops have mothers."

Mr. Davis also is critical of the "official piety" of the current administration. He says our governmental theology "shows an increasing resemblance to some of the more deplorable techniques of advertising."

He devotes one chapter to refuting the "one-worlders," explaining that Communist trickery would lead any world state to disillusionment and catastrophe.

"Rather than have one world that would become totalitarian and obscurantist," he writes, "we might better have no world at all."

Mr. Davis implores all Americans to shake off their complacency and act courageously in a time that will demand a lot of courage. And above all, he urges them never to surrender whatever happens, if and when the war comes.

In his words:

"One point above all. We must not quit, we must not surrender. People who are on the various ground zeros that day will probably be the most fortunate, but for those who are not, let them remember that their behavior will in all truth nobly save or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

E. B. White once wrote that Elmer Davis had spent his life tending the twin fires of liberty and justice. This book is Mr. Davis' appeal to his fellow men to keep those fires from being extinguished.

Report on Labor Unions

by Guy Munger

THE STRUCTURE AND GOVERNMENT OF LABOR UNIONS by Philip Taft. Harvard University Press; 312 pp. $6.

The author, a professor of economics at Brown University, has gathered together in this book a wealth of specific information on the American labor movement that should be especially helpful to newspapermen.

The opening chapter of the book focuses on radicalism in American labor, the Socialists, the IWW, the Communists, but is really a kind of pocket-size review of union history. It is valuable background in understanding one of the crucial problems of unions in the United States.

Professor Taft gets down to specifics in describing union dues and salaries and the extent to which American labor is democratic. Perhaps in no other area of labor reporting and editorializing has there been a greater tendency to grab the nearest handy generalization and let fly with the conclusions. Citing an almost overwhelming number of statistics, Professor Taft concludes that union dues and initiation fees are generally very modest, and that union salaries are seldom extravagant. (As Harvard Professor Sumner Slichter remarks in the introduction, "Most unions are niggardly employers and do not apply their wage philosophy to their own officers.")

Professor Taft breaks new ground in an extensive report on methods of appeal within unions on disciplinary questions, coupling this with a discussion of whether union organization is democratic. He

Reviews—

concludes that for the most part it is. (Newspapermen will be interested in his assertion that the International Typographical Union seems to be a "microcosm of democracy.")

Those perennial newsmakers, the unlicensed seafarers unions, the teamsters and the steel and auto workers, are given separate chapters that make fascinating reading.

Professor Taft's conclusion: "Far from perfect, unions fundamentally reflect the will of their members. They not only fulfill a vital need for the workers' representation and protection in industry, but they are the most effective guarantee against Communist infiltration into American labor."

The Fifth Amendment

by Mort Stern

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TODAY. By Erwin N. Griswold. Harvard University Press. 82 pp. $2.

Now that the Communists-in-Everything hysteria, brought to a head by Senator McCarthy and others, has subsided, the American people seem to be taking what the late Chief Justice Stone called "the sober second thought" regarding the Fifth Amendment and congressional investigations.

It would be difficult to identify positively all the factors that have caused this essentially conservative (in the nonpolitical sense) reaction to set in. Courageous journalists and politicians have played a part. In any case, the healthy reaction seems finally to have jelled in the revulsion over the circumstances leading to the Army-McCarthy hearings.

But a sober pause for reflection can bear no fruit in constructive action without a clear and dispassionate reassessment of values. This is exactly what has been done for us by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School in *The Fifth Amendment Today*, a collection of three speeches he made in 1954.

What was wrong, Dean Griswold asks, with the branding of witnesses as "Fifth Amendment Communists" when they refused to answer questions before congressional committees and the one-member sideshows? Weren't the persons who invoked the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination guilty anyway? Didn't the ends justify the means? Why do we need a Fifth Amendment privilege? Where do we go from here?

In brief, these are Griswold's answers:

It is wrong, in fact downright dangerous to the preservation of our liberties, to assume that because a person refuses on constitutional grounds to answer a legislator's questions, particularly in regard to the witness's thoughts and opinions, that the witness is in fact guilty of the evil deeds he is accused of by the legislator.

Griswold points out that the history of the development of the privilege against self-incrimination (which, incidentally, means being obliged to accuse oneself, not admitting one's guilt) has been the story of man's rising above the devices of brutality, torture and inquisition, and that the privilege has been most significant "in connection with resistance to prosecution for such offenses as heresy or political crimes."

He also explains that we have made the greatest strides away from abuse of the privilege against self-incrimination in our judicial system. (What veteran courthouse reporter hasn't known a prosecuting attorney who thirsted for an opportunity to tear apart a particular defendant on the witness stand, only to find his desire frustrated by the witness's privilege not to testify against himself. And who would deny that an innocent but ignorant or nervous witness could be trapped into damaging statements by a clever prosecutor? Who isn't glad that third degree confessions are barred as evidence? Certainly the Fifth Amendment has proved itself in court).

But our attitudes seem to change when a legislator decides to make political progress at the expense of a witness in an investigation. There is no guarantee of fair interrogation in the terrifying atmosphere of floodlights, microphones, television and newsreel cameras and a press corps some of whose members are undiscriminatingly ready to print the most prejudicial statements of an unfairminded legislator.

There is another provision of the Fifth Amendment that says no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. But may not a witness before an improperly conducted legislative hearing be deprived of his liberty or his most precious piece of property—his reputation—without "due process"? The history of the "due process" provision has also been connected with the defense of the individual against injustice and the massed power of government, says Griswold.

Well then, do the ends justify the means? Griswold writes: "A failure to appreciate the intimate relation between sound procedure and the preservation of liberty is implicit, may I say, in that saddest and most short-sighted remark of our times: 'I don't like the methods, but . . .'

"Torture is a procedure, and inquisition without charge, forcing a witness to testify against himself, and the other things which were standard practice in the infamous Star Chamber would all fall into the category of procedure."

But you are on the wrong track, says Dean Griswold, if you look to the courts or to the executive to reform injudicious legislative procedures. Look to the legislature itself, he says. It has the responsibility and the power.

He suggests a number of possible reforms for legislative investigations, which, incidentally, he feels are quite necessary for good lawmaking when confined to proper purposes and procedures. Among Griswold's suggestions:

There should be no one-man subcommittee hearings in any proceeding in which a witness appears involuntarily. No subpoena should be issued to compel testimony except as a result of action by the committee itself, not the chairman or staff.

When a witness is summoned he should be given several protections. He should be told in advance the scope of the inquiry, should have right to counsel who should be entitled to speak on his client's behalf as well as advise him. If testimony is taken in executive session (which should never be done unless a witness is willing) no member of the committee or its staff should make public incomplete or selected versions of the testimony.

Witnesses should not have to submit to such distractions as broadcasting, television and newsreel cameras. A witness should have due notice of the nature of the evidence that is wanted from him. He should be entitled to explain his answers and he should be given an opportunity to answer any charges made against him or evidence produced by other witnesses.

Reviews—

China Prospect

by Selig Harrison

THE PROSPECTS FOR COMMUNIST CHINA. W. W. Rostow and others. Technology Press and John Wiley and Sons, New York. 314 pp. $5.

Here is a book that recognizes Communist China. Four scholars at the Ford-financed M.I.T. Center for International Studies confront the issues posed by rising Chinese power. As the first comprehensive factual look at these issues, their analysis sets a brisk intellectual pace. But the pace is neither too fast for the novitiate nor too slow for the student of foreign affairs. They have achieved remarkably effective treatment of a complex theme, solid, complete, yet understandable.

The authors address themselves directly to U.S. Asian policy decisions, warning that "even in a major crisis or hot war, the Free World's objective cannot be unconditional surrender or military liberation. There must be a clear Free World concept of a Chinese future that would meet the basic, continuing, still unsatisfied aspirations of modern China."

A hot war would only disrupt China's economic programs at home. Therefore Peking will press her expansion through "quasi-military erosion and political posturing." For the West, the arenas of decision are the still free states of Asia: "not merely guns and men, but capital, technique, energy, and a sense of human fellowship . . . could deny Peking her claim to military and ideological primacy in Asia, and help force, over a period of time, a fundamental re-evaluation of the Chinese Communist regime's domestic and foreign policies."

To develop this message, the book begins with a 92-page survey of Chinese history since the time of the Taiping rebellion in 1848. This section, chiefly by Frank A. Kierman, Jr., searches for the roots of the present situation.

Explaining why Chiang Kai Shek, after his apparent victory in 1927, went down to ultimate defeat, the authors point to his failure to consolidate military control over the entire country, the strain of Japanses aggression on China's economic fabric, and Chiang's own political thought with its emphasis on national unity at the expense of reform.

As Chiang's power rapidly plummetted after 1945, the "weakness and ambiguity with which the United States asserted its strategic interest on the Chinese scene may well have reinforced Mao in his instinctive ideological view that he would have to extend his power in association with the Soviet Union."

More than half of this historical survey traces the evolution of Chinese Communist policy, emphasizing changes since Mao came to power in 1949. Then follow the three central portions of the book, first an analysis of relations between the regime and the people, next a penetrating discussion of Sino-Soviet relations, and finally an original, detailed picture of Chinese economic problems by Alexander Eckstein, a former State Department economist.

Valuable as it is, the section on the regime and the people by its very nature suffers most from the research limitations imposed by a Bamboo Curtain. This in no way reflects on the major author of this section, Richard W. Hatch. In Part Four, Sino-Soviet relations, the book hits its stride.

Chinese dependence on Moscow rests on six factors:

1) Soviet control of Sinkiang, Mongolia, Manchuria, and North Korea, which "holds as a hostage for good behavior areas vital to China's economic development."

2) Soviet supply of equipment and spare parts for the Chinese armed forces.

3) Communist bloc supply of machinery spare parts.

4) Soviet indoctrination of young Chinese Communist cadres.

5) Infiltration of Soviet personnel.

6) Soviet control over Asian Communist parties "as a hedge on independent Chinese political strength in Asia."

But China has a trump card which offsets this dependence, the threat of defection. This wields great power because, in the struggle for Asia, "the loss of China would be an even greater loss than its attachment to the Communist bloc was a gain."

Moves for trade with China and for Peking's U.N. entry could actually make the alliance "a more acceptable foundation for Peking's conduct of external affairs by diminishing some of its costs." The West can best reduce the advantage of the alliance to both Moscow and Peking through a stalemated cold war that checks further disintegration in Asia: "the possibility of a crisis in Sino-Soviet affairs will be maximized if Communist expansion is halted for a sustained period and Peking is forced to live with the consequences of the Sino-Soviet alliance of 1950 and the New General Line of 1953-54."

The New General Line decrees austerity in the countryside, especially mandatory grain collections from peasants as industrialization moves forward. At the most, the book envisages a possible industrial establishment in 1957 based on three to five million tons of crude steel, roughly that of the Soviet Union in 1913 or Japan in 1930. To make China a modern industrial power will take decades, not years.

Why, then, the great hurry? Why "the grave risks of mass starvation, of the internal power machine being strained to its limit?"

Professor Rostow and his colleagues guess that the decisive factor behind current Chinese Communist economic policy is "the desire to increase as rapidly as possible the degree of power, independence, and freedom of action within the Communist bloc." The totalitarian control instruments in the hands of Peking can deal with any peasant unrest. Furthermore, the fact that China's key military figures, anxious to reduce dependence on Moscow, support the new policy, make it unlikely that this could provide the basis for any post-Mao split among the Peiping leaders.

But can agricultural output reach the heights decreed by Peking? Mao lacks the surplus food production to provide a margin while bending the peasants to his plans. "This is the basic line upon which the Communists must fight," the book concludes. "A repetition of the 20 per cent fall in agricultural output which marked the first Soviet Five Year Plan would constitute a disaster not to the Chinese people alone, but to the regime's ideological pretensions, and probably to its control machinery and unity as well."

Too late for review but not too late to recommend: WANTED: AN ASIA POLICY. By Edwin O. Reischauer. N.Y. Alfred Knopf. 276 pp. $3.75.

Reviews—

The Lippmann Philosophy

by John L. Steele

Walter Lippmann has furiously shaken Western Society by its ears and finds it a rudderless ship endangered to starboard by the rocks of popular balderdash and to port by the Jacobin counter revolution's ultimate result, dictatorship. It's pretty late right now to Mr. Lippmann, and unless skillful navigators can chart a new course fixed by old political-religious-moral stars the ship is doomed.

For in *The Public Philosophy,* Mr. Lippmann finds that Western Democracy is close to impotency, unable short of a drastic restart to save itself from an existentialist orgy of soft phrases, self-indulgence and upper Madison Avenue type sophistry tuned to "every man a king." It's Mr. Lippmann beating Mr. Lippmann's brains out in a harsh, hard book which any man who gives a finger snap about government and its mid-20th Century handmaiden of mass communications better get his teeth into before too long. The Sage of Woodley Road, it seems, hasn't been occupying an ivory tower at all; he's been in the bear pit, and apparently he's been there all alone.

The trouble, Mr. Lippmann finds, is not too much government, but too weak government. From the time the 19th century dreamy bubble of easy choice was pricked by World War I, the West has yielded the executive power of decision, even as to war and peace, to an undirected, hedonistic mob.

"In fact, the powers which were ceded by the executive passed through the assemblies, which could not exercise them, to the mass of voters who, though unable to exercise them, passed them on to the party bosses, the agents of pressure groups, and the magnets of the new media of mass communications," he finds. "The consequences were disastrous and revolutionary. The democracies became incapacitated to wage war for rational ends and to make a peace which would be observed or could be enforced . . .

"Where mass opinion dominates the government, there is a morbid derangement of the true functions of power. The derangement brings about the enfeeblement, verging on paralysis, of the capacity to govern. This breakdown in the constitutional order is the cause of the precipitate and catastrophic decline of Western Society. It may, if it cannot be arrested and reversed, bring about the fall of the West."

Voters, with purely executive prerogatives stuffed down their throats, just can't swallow the stuff, says Mr. Lippmann, and act invariably on the assumption that "whatever seems obviously good to them" (or to General Motors) "must be good for the country and good in the sight of God." The author opens himself to the charge of snobbery or worse. But he meets the charge with a ringing defense of Western civilization—if it can only shake itself of the soap opera approach to its problems and return to a public philosophy based on ancient truths, but geared to mid-20th Century techniques.

Mr. Lippmann's "public philosophy" went into eclipse with the industrial revolution, modern sciences and the two great wars. It embodies the principles and concepts upon which modern democracies were built. Only in time of great stress have the concepts been reduced to writing; as in Magna Carta, the Declaration of Indpendence, the British Bill of Rights of 1689, and the first ten amendments of the Constitution of the United States. Behind the documents and buttressing Western traditions of civility lie a core of ideas over 2,000 years old, as old as the Stoics, the Roman lawyers, the Christian Fathers. Though the institutions built upon the public philosophy still stand, the people no longer adhere to the philosophy, for the doctrine is hard and demanding.

"The modern trouble," says Mr. Lippmann, "is in a low capacity to believe in precepts which restrict and restrain private interests and desire . . . In the prevailing popular culture all philosophies are the instruments of some man's purpose, all truths are self-centered and self regarding, and all principles are the rationalization of some special interest. There is no public criterion of the true and the false, of the right and the wrong, beyond that which the preponderant mass of voters, consumers, readers, and listeners happen at the moment to be supposed to want."

The crying need, in Lippmann's view, is for a modern, positive, working doctrine of thought and conduct which governs man's appetites, sacrifices popular impulses to public principles, and accepts the hard decisions in lieu of the wrong, soft choices. The need, then, is for a body of principles and obligations which "only the willfully irrational can deny . . . only the willfully subversive can reject."

Mr. Lippmann's book will strike home to newsmen with its challenge to mass communications and its concept of free speech. His doctrine, overall, is as harsh and demanding as it is honest. But the stakes are high; no less than the very fate of Western Society.

Committee on Nieman Fellowships

Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh *News & Observer,* and John B. Oakes, member of the editorial board of the New York *Times,* will serve on the committee for selection of Nieman Fellows for 1955-56. These two newspapermen will join three members from Harvard in making the 18th annual awards of fellowships for a year of study at Harvard University.

They will consider applications from newspapermen of three years' experience, under 40 years old, who have the consent of their papers for leave of absence for the college year, September to June. Applications will be received up to April 15 by the Nieman Foundation at Harvard.

About a dozen newsapermen are awarded fellowships annually. The fellowships are supported by a legacy of Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal.* She left a bequest to Harvard in 1937 "to promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the United States and educate persons deemed specially qualified for journalism."

The Nieman Fellowships permit the holders to choose their own studies in any field at Harvard for background for further work in journalism. Since 1938 more than 200 newspapermen have held these fellowships, on leaves of absence from their papers, for studies for their own purposes.

The University members of the 1955 Selecting Committee are Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of the Law School, William M. Pinkerton, Director of the News Office, and Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Reviews—

Cold Civil War

by Guy Munger

GRAND INQUEST by Telford Taylor. Simon and Schuster; 358 pp. $4.50.

It is Mr. Taylor's thesis that the United States is now living in a state of "cold civil war":

"The elements of this conflict are diverse and tangled. In general and certainly inadequate terms, it may be described as a nationalist, 'native American' challenge to the middle-class liberalism and internationalism which have been the prevailing . . . political climate of the United States, Britain, and the democracies of Western Europe. The fears and forces of which this challenge is compounded long antedate the Communist menace."

Grand Inquest is a careful, complete documenting of this thesis and an application of it to congressional investigations. And it is this broad approach which makes the book so valuable to anyone who would give meaning to the near-madness of our times.

The first-line combatants in the cold civil war are a varied lot, running the domestic political spectrum from Senator McCarthy to Senator Humphrey. And the impact of the conflict on American institutions and beliefs is enormous. Sometimes we are caught up in the flood of statements, countercharges, and hearings in this domestic battle and see only chaos. The great virtue of Mr. Taylor's book is that it at least brings a feeling of order and understanding to the confused battleground.

The story of congressional investigations began in 1782 when Congress looked into the defeat of Gen. Arthur St. Clair, Revolutionary War hero, by Chief Little Turtle at the Battle of the Wabash River.

(The outcome of the investigation was perhaps a gloomy portent of things to come. General St. Clair appeared and reappeared before congressional investigators but was not cleared of blame until after his death.)

Mr. Taylor follows the history of investigations through to Senator McCarthy, discussing enroute the Know-Nothings, the development of an attitude by the courts that investigations are subject to judicial review, and the rise of "the illusion of investigative omnipotence."

Liberals can take small comfort in the part they played in making congressional inquiry the powerful instrument it is today. With great glee, they heralded free-wheeling investigations into the trusts, Teapot Dome, and the Great Depression. The fact that today the shoe is on the other foot proves only that investigations apparently will always be with us and we must learn to live with them with due regard for the rights of the individual.

Mr. Taylor's exploration of investigations and their clash with the doctrine of separation of powers and individual liberties is extremely detailed. Only one or two examples can be cited here.

Many Americans, Mr. Taylor concludes, are not much concerned with the damage investigations are doing to separation of powers and the Bill of Rights because the investigations are giving them something they think they want, "an extra-legal means of inflicting punishment on individuals who are distrusted. . . .

"These feelings, and the ambitions of those who exploit them, are what the cold civil war is all about. And this is why the loyalty investigations have been led by such men as Dies, Tenney, McCarran, Jenner, and McCarthy. If these investigations had been conducted by moderate politicians—by Paul Douglasses, Richard Russels, Leverett Saltonstalls, or even Robert Tafts—the investigations would not have produced the results that their most powerful supporters wanted. . ."

Inevitably, much of *Grand Inquest* is concerned with the doings of Senator McCarthy, and it is sobering to read again of those incidents in the Army-McCarthy hearings that seemed at the time so ludicrous or even amusing. But it would be a mistake to conclude that this is simply another McCarthy expose book. Its aims are much broader.

It is, for example, concerned with the growing tendency to believe that a good American must be ready at all times to bare his most innermost thoughts and political convictions and the awful parallel to this belief in NKVD interrogations and Communist Party "cleansings."

As for remedies, Mr. Taylor puts little faith in the numerous "codes of fair play" that have been proposed. He foresees difficulties of enforcement and the almost impossible task of transferring the judicial mind into the body of legislators. Summarized, Mr. Taylor would first of all depend on political action, with its implication that citizens are well-informed. He would also sharply limit the power of subpoena, subjecting proposed inquiries to the full membership of House or Senate before the power was granted. (At present, all standing Senate committees have permanent subpoena power.) Finally, he would provide for some form of Judicial review so that a witness who wished to challenge a committee's power to pursue a certain line of questioning could do so without risking a jail sentence.

Discussing the importance of some sort of reform in congressional investigations, Mr. Taylor concludes:

"Unless something like this happens, we are likely to become so preoccupied with right and left that we can no longer distinguish right from wrong."

Mr. Taylor, now a New York City lawyer, served from 1935 to 1939 as counsel to the inquiry into railroad finance headed by Senators Burton K. Wheeler and Harry S. Truman. He was also chief of counsel for the prosecution at the Nuremberg war crimes trials and has held other high government posts.

Government by Investigation: by Alan Barth

Everyone agrees that the power of Congress to investigate is a useful and necessary feature of our representative government. Most agree that the power has often been misused in recent years. It is time for a thoughtful, searching, fair-minded inquiry into the rights and wrongs of congressional investigations.

Alan Barth is qualified to make the inquiry by his knowledge of constitutional law as well as by his experience as a journalist on Capitol Hill. In *Government by Investigation* he surveys the past as background for the present. He shows that the authors of the Constitution, when they instituted a government of balanced powers, were even more concerned with the danger of legislative tyranny than with

that of tyranny by the Executive. He shows that their concern has been justified on more than one occasion, as notably in the period after the Civil War.

Getting down to recent cases, he describes some useful investigations conducted by committee chairmen of both parties. He shows that other investigations have renewed the mistake of Reconstruction days by invading fields that are properly reserved to the Executive. He shows that congressional committees have also usurped the functions of the judiciary, by holding legislative trials in which the committees act as grand juries, petit juries, and judges inflicting substantial penalties. He shows that some committees have interfered with the rights of private citizens, while others have attacked the proper independence of churches, universities, foundations, and the press.

Finally he suggests practical remedies that are available to the executive departments, the courts, the institutions of a free society, and, among them, the moderation and good sense of Congress itself. Plain-spoken but judicial in its approach, written for the intelligent layman, *Government by Investigation* is a book of the hour that will continue to be read for many years.

Alan Barth, author of *The Loyalty of Free Men* (1951), is an editorial writer on the Washington *Post*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1949.

(This book was not received in time for review. This notice is from the publisher's catalog.)

Letters

Keeping in Touch

To the Editor:

I guess I'm not a "pure" newsman since I've spent the last two years learning the advertising side of newspapering.

But one way, a very important way too, I keep in touch with what's going on editorial-wise is through my copy of *Nieman Reports*.

I always find time to read every page. Keep them coming!!!

—Robert S. Reed
Seattle *Times*

Local Courage

To the Editor:

Thanks very much for Sylvan Meyer's piece on local news coverage in the October *Nieman Reports*. It filled a hole which has needed filling for some time.

One point, however, was not examined too closely, in my opinion. That was the need for constant coverage of the routine beats—and the resultent complete coverage. As the city editor of a small (4,500 circulation) daily inside the metropolitan aegis of the San Diego *Union*, I fought a constant battle with our small staff to get on-the-spot coverage. "Attend the meetings," I urged. "Why?" they asked. "The publicity people will call it in tomorrow morning." And that was that. I haven't been in this business very long, but I did find that when the local City Planning Commission was covered in person, the commissioners were easier to get news from and there was a wealth of news which they hadn't considered "news" before. The same thing held for the many other facets of government which seem to tangle up the average person's life these days.

It didn't do any good, however; the average publisher of a small town paper is satified with having the publicity people calling in the story. And it's becoming pretty obvious to me why a lot of smaller papers are going under. So I took a job with a big-city paper covering the same area as before and making a bigger salary. I'd rather be on the small-town paper, but there is a limit to how many times you can hit your head against the wall.

Apparently, however, there are some exceptions and I suspect Gainesville is one of them. Again, thanks for the article.

—Alfred JaCoby
San Diego *Union-Tribune*

Sans Radio

To the Editor:

I am very pleased to renew my subscription to *Nieman Reports*, a "must" for every newspaperman of the land! It is surely the only publication that I read from the first line to the last one (with radio or TV closed to have complete silence!) with such pleasure and great profit.

—Alfred Renaud
City Editor, *Le Soleil*, Quebec City

Publick Occurrences

In his article in the January issue of the *Nieman Reports*, Samuel B. Warner, Jr., terms the Boston *News-Letter* "America's first regular newspaper." It is, of course, true that this journal was the first continuously published in what is now the United States.

This bare fact, however, is quite misleading. In 1690, 14 years before, the first newspaper to be published in America was issued by Benjamin Harris. *Publick Occurrences* lasted but one issue because it was suppressed by the government.

In every other respect, *Publick Occurrences* was a newspaper which was far superior to the Boston *News-Letter*.

Moreover, it was published without sanction of the colonial authorities.

These two characteristics are far more important than the fact that the paper lasted for only one issue.

And, because of that, *Publick Occurrences* should be recognized as America's first newspaper rather than the Boston *News-Letter*.

A. L. Higginbotham
Chairman, Dept. of Journalism
University of Nevada

[The other notable thing about *Publick Occurrences* was its name. No newspaper since has so correctly defined its function. Ed.]

From Gene Cervi

To the Editor:

Thank you for Houstoun Waring's article about our paper. I can attest to the wide readership of the *Nieman Reports*.

As you may have suspected, we have received letters from all over the country inquiring about *Cervi's Journal*. We propose to answer, as fully and as sympathetically as possible, all of these inquiries.

It was surprising to me that there was so much interest in this matter. It indicates that the ancient zeal of journalism still burns brightly in the hearts of many adventurous men. This is good for journalism and good for the country.

—Gene Cervi

"Journalistic"

Interesting to read that the definition of "journalistic" is going to be changed, but who is going to change the newspapers?

Very good issue in January.

—K. M. Elish
Middleburgh, N. Y.

Sheppard Trial Coverage

I know no reason why I should defend Louis Seltzer, although he has appeared to be a pleasant enough fellow the few times we've met; nor do I have any part in the squabble between his Cleveland *Press* and the Toledo *Blade,* which attacked it in the editorial you found "challenging" in your January issue.

As one of the reporters who worked the Sheppard trial, however, I am moved to reply to this and other such pious piffle to the effect that newspapers convicted Sam Sheppard and that the papers which covered the trial (except the *Blade* and, as I recall, the New York *Times*) were naughty boys indeed.

Much bad copy did come out of Cleveland. Much bad copy comes out of every big story. A few of the tabs tripped over their adjectives.

But the *Blade's* editorial is not justified by an occasional head in Chicago or New York. What about the heads it quotes from Cleveland, the ones jurors may have seen despite their orders to ignore the papers?

The first was:

"QUIT STALLING AND BRING HIM IN"

It would appear the editorial writer would have had to see that head to be able to quote it. It follows that he must have known, first, that it was not a news head at all but was over a Seltzer editorial, and must have known, second, that it appeared not during the trial but months before.

I fail to find any sin in the five other heads. Each was justified by testimony. I see nothing slanted in, to pick one, "TESTIFIES SAM CHANGED STORIES." That is what the witness said that day and what the jury heard.

There could be some quarrel with "SAYS MARILYN CALLED SAM A 'JEKYLL-HYDE'" because, as I recall, the remark was ordered stricken. But it was said. And the jury did hear—and heard long before it could sneak a peek at the line.

I did not see the *Blade* during the trial but wonder now what its heads were on its Sheppard stories of those days. The piece was a fast breaking one for a trial and it is possible the *Blade's* edition times came at more interesting periods. I do not know.

I see in the editorial that the *Blade* avoided, it says, "slanted headlines, color stories and lurid pictures."

I find none of the headlines quoted slanted. I recall no lurid pictures, except possibly for some sketches of Mrs. Sheppard's wounds. As for color stories, I am baffled by this complaint.

My paper's color consisted of personality pieces about judge, jury, defendant and the rest of the cast. It included some mood pieces, of course. The color was always sidebar. Filed ahead of it always was the straight piece. Our play was the same with the exception of a few dull days when the sidebar took top play.

In Cleveland, the out-of-town boys were surprised to find the papers, including Seltzer's, using much more space sympathetic to Sheppard than we did. They printed his letters to his child, almost wept over his family's plight, made his attorney a Darrow, made the police numbskulls. They did seize upon bits of evidence for new leads for line purposes, but that is the nature of the beast and, I have no doubt, were the *Blade* competitive, it would be doing the same thing.

Going back to the *Blade's* chiding of the Seltzer paper for "virtually demanding the arrest of Dr. Sheppard" what the paper did demand was that Sheppard be questioned, that he not be protected by suburban police, that there be an inquest, that the case not be allowed to die.

That would appear to me to be a function of a newspaper.

Certainly here if we found a fashionable or unfashionable suburb's six-man police force taking no action on any crime we would demand that it do so. Certainly if it were murder, and if Detroit detectives said a prime suspect was not even being questioned, we would insist on action.

Does not this fit with a later paragraph in the *Blade's* bit? That one reading:

"Incidentally, newspapers would be the first to protest if anybody else should attempt to obstruct justice in some such fashion."

The *Blade* said, or directly implied, that the press did not "keep their hands off the courts" and that—and this is a strange phrase—thus the courts could not "at least appear to hand down judgments according to the law and the evidence."

The *Blade* said in the same vein that had the trial been held in its town there "would have been no question about its fairness, no demand for a change of venue. The verdict would have been left strictly up to the jury."

This is the most important charge.

Does the *Blade* say the verdict was not left to the jury? Does it say the press forced a guilty verdict? Does it say the press did put its hands on the court?

Certainly its reporter must have told the *Blade* that it was the defense which always cooperated with reporters, not the prosecution and not the judge.

Certainly he must have reported that every request of the press for any privilege to the judge was denied during the entire course of the trial.

Certainly he must have told his paper that the change of venue motions were made only on the basis of reports of the police investigation and inquest of the preceding summer, and had nothing to do with the trial coverage.

Certainly he must have reported that the jury was an exceptional one and that some of its members made no secret of their dislike of newspapers.

Certainly the *Blade* was told that the judge, Edward Blythin, an eminently fair if strict man who loves the law, complimented the jury eloquently upon its verdict and discharge of duty, and said later that he believed the verdict justified by the weight of evidence.

Certainly the paper knew, too, that Blythin made a strong and fine defense of freedom of the press, on the record; that he defended the right of reporters to be in court when the defense challenged it; that yet he was no servant or even confidant of reporters but, instead, refused almost any information except from the bench itself.

There have been many other attacks on the coverage.

Most, I note, come from papers and magazines which did not staff the trial or which were beaten by the Hearst chain or the big independents like the *News* which did staff it.

The *Time* and *Life* accounts appeared ridiculous to those there. *Time* printed a bad excerpt from Dorothy Kilgallen's worst piece as typical.

They ignored the fact the piece was written for the *Journal American* in its style, that she was also filing and dictating new leads all day, that she was writing her overnights, conducting a daily radio show,

writing a daily column, commuting to New York for TV. She's a hell of a reporter in my book.

Dorothy, by the way, was outraged at the verdict, not that she did not think Sheppard guilty but that she did not think the case was proved.

I recall that the chief defense counsel during the trial said her summary of the prosecution's case would be an excellent closing argument for him.

Editor & Publisher lectured its supporters in another story, quoting a few tabloid leads used during the time the jury was being selected.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors voted the piece the most overplayed of the year.

I wonder what the editors who played it would vote, after checking their circulation figures.

I notice in your same issue that my friend Ira Freeman (who DOES look New York *Times*-ish, particularly when complaining there is no competent salad chef west of the Hudson) gave an account of his brief stay at the trial.

I believe the *Times* on the day Susan Hayes, Sheppard's parking lot mistress, took the stand, got around to mentioning this in the fourth or fifth paragraph. I've forgotten their lead of the day. Something to the effect the trial was still underway.

I see Ira wrote that he was unable to get much in the paper about what was going on in Cleveland.

—Russ Harris
Detroit *News*

Results in Mesa County

Grand Junction, Colorado
Dec. 20, 1954

To the Editor:

As a followup to the Nieman Scrapbook piece in the October issue on Spanish-Americans being discriminated against for jury service, I am happy to report that the story as it appeared in the Grand Junction *Daily Sentinel* DID bring results.

For the first time in the history of Mesa county, names of Spanish-American citizens were included on the tentative jury lists submitted to the county commissioners by the county treasurer and the county assessor. And for the first time in the county, seven Spanish-American citizens were among the 330 selected by the county commissioners and submitted to the Seventh Judicial District Court for service during the March term.

The commissioners also selected two Nisei for service and one or two Negroes. Both of these minority groups have very small representation here; Spanish- Americans are about six per cent of the total county population.

In the previous history of jury service, one Negro had been called for duty but failed to serve; one Spanish-American with an Anglicized spelling of her last name had inadvertently been included on a list several years ago. So far as is known, no Nisei has previously been included.

The fact that these minority group citizens have been included on the jury list does not, of course, mean they may be picked for duty. However, for the first time in the history of the county, their service will be a matter for decision of the court and attorneys based on the individual ability of the citizen rather than racial heritage.

It will be most interesting to see how it works out.

Alan Pritchard

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Private Enterprise Prospers In TVA Area

Chicago, Feb. 21.—I was met at the airport in Knoxville by Gilbert Stewart Jr., who was one of the people in the U. S. mission when I worked with it. He now lives in Knoxville, and it was very nice to see him again and to have dinner in the evening with his family at home, where I also met two of the directors of TVA, Dr. Curtiss and Dr. Paty.

Stewart kindly arranged a trip for Saturday after I had mentioned that it was a long time since I had seen any of TVA in operation. Before leaving for Chicago, I therefore had an opportunity to see some of the work accomplished in recent years.

On Friday morning arrangements were made by the American Association of University Women, who sponsored my talk, to allow me to see something in the afternoon of the remarkable work that is done at Oak Ridge.

There I visited the American Museum of Atomic Energy, which is the first of its kind in the world. It displays and demonstrates the unfolding story of atomic energy, and is operated by the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in cooperation with the atomic Energy Commission and its contractors.

I was particularly interested to find that the University of Tennessee is conducting a comprehensive farm research program on a 3000-acre tract. One phase of their program is a study of the breeding records of cattle accidentally exposed to radiation effects following the test explosion of the first atomic bomb at Alamogordo, N. M., on July 16, 1945.

These tests should provide valuable data for the very important discussion now going on as to the possible effects on human beings exposed to radiation.

This area, since establishment of TVA, seems to me to have prospered enormously. I recently read that a Republican congressman had called the whole TVA project Socialistic and Communist. If this be so, then it has certainly done marvels for private enterprise in this area.

The record of the increase in private industry and business, and the use of power on farms even throughout the mountain areas, is astonishing to someone who has not been here for several years. Almost all of this power is distributed through cooperatives and municipally owned plants.

Because the city of Oak Ridge was built by the U. S. government and is government-owned property, I was told by a newspaper woman who came to see me from there, it will be one of the first Southern areas actually to put into practice desegregation in schools.

One can only hope that it will be widely and carefully done so that it may help develop a pattern for other areas in the South.

—Dayton *News*, Feb. 21

Gilbert Stewart Jr. was a Nieman Fellow in 1947. Now with T. V. A.

Nieman Notes

1940

Weldon James made a two months tour of Europe and the Belgian Congo for the Louisville *Courier-Journal* this winter, to do a series on Spain and one on the Congo.

1941

Vance Johnson left Washington the first of the year, after more than a decade as a correspondent there, to go to New York as assistant to Paul Smith in running the publications of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Company.

Earl Newsome & Company announced on March 15 that **John H. Crider** has become an associate of their Madison Avenue public relations organization. Crider had been Washington correspondent of *Barron's Weekly*. Earlier he was for 19 years with the New York *Times* and for five years editor of the Boston *Herald*, where he won a Pulitzer Prize for his editorials.

CBS has moved **Alexander Kendrick** from Vienna to London where his office address is 26 Hallam St., London, W. 1. "I don't know what other Nieman Fellows are in the area besides Ernie Hill (1943, Chicago *Daily News*) but any Nieman visitor will get a hearty welcome." Another Nieman Fellow in London is Donald Burke, (1942) at the *Time-Life* office, New Bond Street.

1942

Donald Burke, London correspondent of *Time* and *Life*, reports that he has discovered a new sport in mountain climbing, and has remarried—Helena Malinowski, daughter of the late anthropologist at Yale.

1943

William A. Townes, managing editor of the Miami *Herald*, attended the American Press Institute seminar for managing editors, March 13-25.

1944

Theodore Andrica's 1955 All Nationalities Directory sponsored by the Cleveland *Press* and the Folk Arts Association, is a complete roster of 2000 organizations in Greater Cleveland belonging to 46 nationalities. It represents a compilation that has been in process ever since Andrica joined the staff of the *Press* in 1926 to become its nationalities editor. It is 95 pages, paper-bound, sells for $1.25.

Professor **Fred Maguire** ran a five day Press Institute at Ohio State University, Feb. 14-18 with 18 Ohio papers participating through staff members. It was the first such press institute held in Ohio and brought to Columbus a star group of speakers to lead discussions. One of the Institute speakers was Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, whose talk, "The Press—Can It Help Build a Free World?" is published in part in this issue. The Institute was aimed at city editors and concentrated on municipal problems.

Lawrence Fernsworth's name has become familiar to readers of the Concord *Monitor*, as their Washington correspondent. It is familiar also to readers of the New York *Times* as that of one of the correspondents active in questioning the President in the White House press conference. Mr. Fernsworth says he does as much work for his Concord paper as he used to do, as a European correspondent, for the London and New York *Times*. His friends will be glad to know that he is once again in good health.

After spending the post-war years in England in the service of government intelligence, **Charles Jennings** joined the staff of Free Europe Committee, Inc., as research analyst, the first of this year. His address: 110 West 57th st., New York City 19.

1945

Houstoun Waring, editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, received Sigma Delta Chi's Elijah P. Lovejoy award at Southern Illinois University in January. Waring reports the *Independent* has just added a No. 32 Linotype. The cost was $18,500 "but it has eliminated fly-by-night competition," he says. "I have had eight newspapers start up against me, but none since World War II."

Houstoun Waring reports on a trip to speak at Montana State University, that **A. B. (Bud) Guthrie**, living and writing in Great Falls, Montana, has been appointed by the governor to an eight-year term on the State Board of Education.

1946

A series on prison conditions in California by **Mary Ellen Leary**, associate editor of the San Francisco *News* ran across the top of page one in the *News* for ten days in February. Mary Ellen also manages a household under the family name of Mrs. Arthur H. Sherry.

1947

"The Big Story" featured on radio March 2d was by **Clark Porteous** of the news staff of the Memphis *Press-Scimitar*.

1948

A major project at the end of last year in the Chicago *Sun-Times* was a series by C[illegible] Larsen on the Chicago suburbs. In 11 articles it dealt with the suburban problems of rapid growth, of taxes, traffic, local government, school and other services, and relations to the city. The series attracted wide attention and brought praise and request for reprints from the American Society of Planning Officials.

George Weller won the 1954 George Polk Memorial Award for "distinguished achievements in journalism" in foreign reporting for a behind-the-scenes picture of events in Turkey. He is Rome correspondent for the Chicago *Daily News*. His wife, Charlotte Ebener, is author of a book, *No Facilities for Women*, published by Alfred Knopf in February, an account of her life as a correspondent in the Far East.

1949

Alan Barth, editorial writer on the Washington *Post* was in Cambridge to speak on the Harvard Law School Forum, March 11. He was interviewed over WGBH-FM on his new book, *Government by Investigation*.

After years of free lancing, much of it for *Collier's*, Robert deRoos has joined up with the magazine under the new regime of Paul Smith, as *Collier's* regional editor for the West Coast.

1950

Harper's for February had an article by **William McD. Stucky** of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* on Army public relations.

On March 1, **Melvin Wax** terminated his four years with the Claremont (N.H.) *Daily Eagle*, where he had been managing

editor and assistant publisher, to look for a larger field.

1951

Hoke Norris has joined the news staff of the Chicago *Sun-Times,* moving from the editorial page of the Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel.* Editorial writers, he says, are born not made, and he was born a reporter.

The Portland *Press Herald* has published 3,000 booklets of a series of **Dwight Sargent's** editorials on the legislature, and has sent them around to members of the legislature, schools and libraries in the state of Maine.

The March *Reader's Digest* had an article by Commander **William J. Lederer,** "They'll Remember the Bayfield," episodes from the Navy's lift of refugees from North Vietnam to the South.

Sylvan Meyer, editor of the Gainsville (Ga.) *Times,* was named "Young Man of the Year" by the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Gainsville. His award cited "his effectiveness in almost every field of civic activity through the columns of the *Daily Times.*" He has been its editor eight years and has led in many community developments, notably in starting a county planning commission.

1951-2

The North Carolina Press Association gave its Community Service award for 1954 to the Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel,* for articles on public issues, most of which appeared on the editorial page. Under the editorship of Reed Sarratt, the page staff in 1954 included two former Nieman Fellows, Hoke Norris (1951) and **A. G. Ivey,** who is now executive editor of the Shelby (N.C.) *Daily Star.*

1953

The first of the year, **Robert B. Frazier** was appointed associate editor of the Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard.*

1954

Robert C. Bergenheim, city hall reporter for the *Christian Science Monitor,* was one of seven Greater Bostonians cited as outstanding young men of the year by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. His citation was for his stories on municipal affairs, including a recent expose of assessing practices.

Douglas Leiterman is now national correspondent at Ottawa for the Vancouver *Province.*

1955

A daughter, Linda Patricia, was born to Patricia and **Albert Kraus,** Feb. 10. Al Kraus is in the business and financial news department of the Providence *Journal.*

Man of the Year

What a week! The county commissioners fired me from the planning board because we ran a story that one of them was caught driving drunk. We are persona non grata at city hall for complaining that the commissioners have by-passed meeting procedures and are convening at a local bar and the county officials just fired us as legal organ because we are plugging for a change in their pay system from a fees system to a salary system. Could you use a *Reports* article entitled, "I Am Used to being a Sunuvabitch"

The youngsters are fine and Ann is making money on lecture fees, so I suppose we will make out until we can get a different crew of politicians in office.

Sylvan Meyer
Editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times*

Legal Ads Pulled, So They're Free

Editor Sylvan Meyer said this week the *Daily Times* had lost its designation as official newspaper for legal advertising in a reprisal for editorial advocacy of a change from the fee to a salary system of paying public officers.

"However, paid or not," Mr. Meyer advised, "we will see that our readers get the information. We will publish a condensation of all legal ads affecting this city and county and have done so in the past.

"If these office holders expect their punishment to force a change in the editorial policies of the *Times,* they have made an error."

—*Editor & Publisher*
March 5

Mystery

To the Editor:

The current issue of the *Reports* is full of grand stuff—as ever. You should have a circulation in the hundred-thousands! How any newspaper man can get along without the magazine is a mystery to me. Enclosed is check for $4.00 for which please enter subscriptions for two young newspapermen.

Can you start these subscriptions with the current issue?

—Richard Henry
Knoxville, Tenn.

Press Message

VIA RCA AH 2499 SFU 360 TAIPEI 114 131229
ADM STUMP CINCPAC PEARL HARBOR
NEVER IN HISTORY OF NAVY COVERAGE HAVE CORRESPONDENTS BEEN SO WELL TREATED AND WELL BRIEFED AS WERE ON YOUR ESTES IN TACHEN OPERATION X
DISLIKE SINGLE OUT ANY ONE BUT WISH ESPECIALLY COMMEND RADM SABIN, SKIPPER PETERSON, CDR FORTER, CAPT WINN, CDR J SMITH WHO CAME WITH YOU AND LT JACHUM PIO X WARDROOM PERSONNEL UNUSUALLY FRIENDLY AS WAS EVERYONE ABOARD X WOULD ALSO LIKE COMMEND MARINE COL EDMUND WILLIAMS CDR SHORE PARTY X IN FACT NAVY GONE WAY UP IN OUR ESTIMATION X
ALSOP BECKER BEECH BIGART POTTER STONE MULLER JORDAN WILLIAM ZENIER GREENFIELD PREDERGAST SOCHUREK WATERS SPARKS SIMMONS HEPO X BINGHAM.

This handsome public relations job was of course set up by Commander **Wm. J. Lederer,** U.S.N., staff CINCPAC.

SEE IT THEN

(*continued from Page 2*)

develops methods of TV reporting: *The Search,* CBS; NBC's *Telementaries.*

Of these, the daily news summary is the constant, predictable factor in the future character of TV. It does not pretend to interpret or make particular sense out of what it reports. Speed is an important criterion, and it must be brief, factual, and descriptive. It is popular, well sponsored, and solidly built into the scheme of TV.

The weekly news-related documentary is the real heart of the question about TV journalism. It is here that TV will, or will not, make felt its full power as a journalistic medium.

Unlike the daily summary, which is a combination of the old radiocast and newsreel, the news documentary is a new form in itself. It is only a few years old, but it already has a modern grandfather. He is Ed Murrow, whose *See It Now* has for the past three years put TV's most powerful reporting on film. Murrow's work has changed the tune of even the most pessimistic and persistent critics of TV.

Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature,* said, "I was one of the early hatchet boys on TV. The thing that surprises me now is that there is so much that is so good. One hour of Murrow is worth a day and a night of anything else."

Charles Siepmann, one of the most astute critics of TV, predicted pessimistically in 1950 that . . . "TV will probably conform rapidly to a few . . . stereotyped conventions. . . . It will be technically ingenious and inventive, but artistically poor. . . . Except for rare occasions, and for some time to come, its true scope as a medium of expression will not be realized." But a few weeks ago Siepmann was full of enthusiasm for one part of TV.

"Ed Murrow's work has been extraordinary," he said. "His great insight is a conception of the news, not as externals, not as, say, bringing some far off place into your living room, but in terms of seeing into people's minds."

Siepmann described two shows Murrow did on the race problem in South Africa. "You see before your eyes what could never be explained to you in words," he said. "These reports made you feel what it is like to be a savage out of the bush up against the city. In one scene the blacks danced a wild bush dance in the middle of the city slums. The show ended with an interview between Howard K. Smith and the tough, tight-lipped prime minister. The prime minister had agreed reluctantly to answer three questions. Smith asked his three questions at the start of the interview, and then, before the prime minister could answer, he asked a fourth. What happened next was one of the most eloquent expressions of fascism I've ever seen. The minister said nothing. He clamped his jaws shut. He raised both hands in rage, and held them out flat against the camera."

Murrow has touched a nerve. He has revealed truth not only in his subjects, but in the nature of TV itself. He has liberated TV journalism from its public and static role. He enters the private worlds of private people and reports reality in a way that it has never been reported. What he does is unique to TV, but it draws on a wide range of traditions: the documentary film, the radio documentary, the non-fiction magazine report, and even realistic and naturalistic literature. Its method is to *show* the reader instead of telling. Its result is to make sense out of the news by giving the viewer the information and the stimulation to make sense out of it for himself. In essence, Murrow's new form gives the viewer *a sense of having experienced* the news.

Murrow has established a bridgehead for a new form of journalism, but he has failed to win what is considered in TV to be a mass audience. The quality of his show, for all its magnificent peaks, is inconsistent. It has attracted respectable numbers of people who either like the Murrow personality or who are basically interested in the news. But it does not seem to have evangelized among those millions of general viewers who might be won to an interest in the news by journalistic development of TV's unique powers. *See It Now* costs more than the sponsor will pay for it, and it must be subsidized by CBS.

People who know Murrow's problem feel that he has the idea-power to develop his form, increase his audience, and break out of his bridgehead. Such an advance by Murrow would create a broader financial base for TV journalism, train more people to an interest in his kind of reporting, and stimulate more journalistic projects. But Murrow's idea-power is being blocked by mechanical limitations and by the limitations of the photo-reporting talent he is able to put into the field.

The journalist in the field is limited by time, equipment, and budget, but he is also embarrassed by riches. Here, at last, all the methods of communication are synthesized. They are so many, and their relationships are so complex, that a mere human journalist has great difficulty using them all properly. Perhaps the deepest frustration of the TV journalist is a feeling that his journalism has distinct overtones of an art, and that this potential artfulness may remain an obvious, goading possibility without being realized in actual reporting. Because of the difficulties, it may be years before the full possibilities of combining a sense of reality with a sense of drama through the interplay of all the elements—images, movement, sound, words, music, and characterization—are developed.

The reality in Murrow's reporting is often stilted. His reporters intrude themselves into stories, deliver speeches, and shatter carefully-built effects. The great parts of his photography are some times overbalanced by stretches of dull film.

"If what Murrow is doing has an art to it," said Norman Cousins, "I think it is not so much in the film as in Murrow's handling of it in the studio."

"The trouble with journalistic shows," said Penn Kimball, former N.Y. *Times* man who now produces for *Omnibus,* is that they've got skilled, interpretive craftsmen in the studio, and relatively weak craftsmen in the field. A new kind of journalist is called for, maybe not the photographer himself, but a sort of news-gatherer who knows both the craft and the news. The networks send former newsreel photographers out to do serious, thoughtful stories on difficult situations. That's like assigning an ordinary city room news photographer to do a *Life* essay on Albert Schweitzer. If you can't get enough talent out on the story, you can't make it good enough to pull in a big enough audience to pay for making it better."

Though Murrow has built up the tightest, smartest production group in the business, it may be that the real block to his break-through is this problem of getting enough of the right kind of talent out on his stories.

Robert Saudek, head of the Ford Foundation's Radio-TV Workshop and producer of *Omnibus,* tried out a new idea for getting talent out on stories this season. He persuaded E. B. White of *The New Yorker,* and Russell Lynes, editor of *Harper's,* to write, produce, and narrate documentaries for *Omnibus.* Saudek gave each writer a subject, backstopped him with an experienced moviemaker, and turned him loose. E. B. White's story on a Maine Lobsterman, which was produced with Arthur Zegart, turned out to be austere, honest, and distinguished by a literary narration. Russell Lynes' story on a traveling road show in Missouri, produced with Richard Leacock, was extremely moving and distinguished by an infusion of literary power into the film itself.

Saudek's experiment proved that outside talents can be made effective in motion picture reporting. But it seems unlikely that a new form of journalism will grow up on talents periodi ılly borrowed from other fields. The general questions about TV may reduce themselves finally to the question of whether TV can raise up its own, indigenous talents. And the final answer may be found in the fortunes of Arthur Zegart, a sort of prototype of a new kind of journalist.

I first bumped into Arthur Zegart through my TV set. I was watching a *Search* story on San Quentin prison that started off well, got better, and became great. As the titles flashed by at the end of the show I noticed that the writer was Arthur Zegart, the director was Arthur Zegart, and the supervisor was Arthur Zegart.

When I met Arthur Zegart in person he was sitting in a board room with a moviola and a movie-writer named Jim Munves. Zegart is an intense, black-eyed director-producer in his mid-thirties. Munves, a former *New Yorker* writer, is just breaking into films.

"The problem," said Munves, "is that while devices for communication multiply, people seem to communicate less. This isn't necessary. We've got the means. All we have to do is present things in a way that is human, direct, and real."

"The great thing about Zegart," said Munves, "is the technique he has worked out for reporting reality on film."

Zegart and Munves work for "Information Productions," a film company headed by two former newsreel executives, Al Butterfield and Tom Wolff. The company handles production crew assignments for *See It Now,* and it produces films for *The Search.* "Can Butterfield and Wolff do what Zegart does?"

"No," said Munves. "They're managers. But the great thing about them is that they know its good when Zegart does it. It's amazing how few people who are supposed to know what's good, really know. You can't think of a network as a coherent thing like a newspaper. On a paper there is an editor who used to be a reporter and knows all about the business. On a network the top guy may be an ad salesman. He can't understand all the technical stuff, so he has assistants who claim to know. They can get away with murder on journalism. It's like having an ad salesman editing the New York *Times.*"

Zegart got up and paced around the moviola.

"Zegart's no genius," said Munves. "With a little training anybody could do it, couldn't they, Art?"

Zegart sat down. "No, by God," he said. "I have to disagree. There are lots of guys who could do it, but they'd have to be good reporters and have picture sense. By accident I had some experiences that trained me. I produced documentary films with the Air Force in England during the war, and later with the U.N. The luckiest accident was that I was always a bastard operation. I had to do everything myself: get my own ideas for films, write scripts, take the pictures, and edit the film."

"To Zegart there are two kinds of people in the world." said Munves. "Those who will communicate and those who won't. He can tell which are which. He has found out that you can get people used to cameras. If you use his technique, you can get real people being themselves and saying what they think. But reality by itself isn't

enough. It has to be treated so that it means something."

"Say you want to do a story on problems of old age, and you decide to show the problems of the mother-in-law living with her married daughter. First you would find the right family, then live with them for a couple of weeks until you knew their tensions and problems. Then you would find ways of showing them."

"We're getting too specific," said Zegart. "If I were doing old age I might just go down to the bus station and look at old people for a few days."

"But we're in this family now," said Munves. "Say the daughter and her husband have a party for their friends. Is the mother-in-law invited? Is she talked to or offered a drink? Does she sit in the corner, or stay in her room? Whatever happens will reveal something."

"The thing is," said Zegart, "you would have to win their complete confidence. My basic job is a missionary job. I had to go into San Quentin and get the officials to give me permission to walk out in the yard alone with the prisoners. The prisoners were hostile and suspicious. Being Ed Murrow wouldn't help you to walk into 4,000 prisoners and learn anything. In effect, I had to go in and say to the prisoners, 'We're trying to do something different from anything you've ever seen, different from anything you've ever imagined. You'll have to put yourselves in my hands and trust me.' If they would do that, I could get reality."

"No outsider had ever walked out in the yard alone with the prisoners. They turned away from me and wouldn't talk. But I walked around and spotted guys I knew *could* talk. While I was casing them, they were casing me. In the second week, I got into a couple of conversations, and finally I got some prisoners to talk to me in a room. Then I set up a tape recorder to get them used to machinery."

Zegart recorded 13 hours of conversation. The first hour began this way:

Zegart: Don't let this machine bother you. Just forget about it. No, don't watch that wheel spin around.

Prisoner: I just like to watch the wheel spin around.

Zegart: OK, but try to forget it. You guys know I can get the warden's pitch. I can get the pitch of some guys inside here who like to say all the right things. But I've been around and I know when I'm being conned. I don't want to be conned. I want the point of view of guys who know what goes on inside this prison.

The prisoners protested that if they said what they thought, they wouldn't get paroled. Zegart insisted that they had to trust him. They accused him of spying for the warden. Finally they spilled out their feeling. They let Zegart walk out of their cells with violent and incriminating conversations on his tape machine.

In the second week Zegart was watching prisoners talk to the parole officer when he spotted one who *could* communicate. He was due for another talk the following week. "That guy will walk in here and plead for his parole, even if we load the place with machinery and lights," said Zegart.

Prison Officials were sceptical.

After six weeks of casing, Zegart wrote a script and got it approved by CBS. The story was shot in two weeks. "No one has devised the equipment for work like this," said Zegart. "It's like trying to conduct modern war wearing medieval armour. We had to put up a Hollywood set with lights, a 300 lb. camera, cameramen, soundmen, and electricians, all in a small prison office."

The prisoner walked in to talk to the parole officer. Zegart talked to him. The prisoner looked at the lights and camera. Then he sat down and began a bitter, passionate plea for parole, oblivious of the machinery.

Zegart edited the film in New York. The result was one of the most powerful films of the *Search* series. Its high points were 8 minutes of real reality, the inner reality of prisoners up against the prison, against society, and aganst themselves. In one sequence, prisoner voices sounded over a picture of a cell block. They talked intensely about loneliness, love, and the perverse impulses that had returned them to prison time after time.

Zegart's dream is to get a series of films assigned to him that he can produce his own way, in his own time. Under the right conditions he feels that he can pack a power into reporting that is "something you have never seen, different from anything you've ever imagined." These films would be a break-through. They would bring mass audiences to real reporting.

Zegart is desperately hopeful that this new form will rise, and desperately unsure that it will. "TV looks like a desert to me," he said. "There are a couple of oases in it, Murrow and the *Search*, but they could blow away."

After five hours of talking to Zegart, I found out that his wife had just gotten home from the hospital that day with their first baby. "I was going to stay home today to help her," he said, "but talking about this kind of reporting is important."

Television may well find other approaches to reality reporting. Zegart is practically alone in his particular point of view. To him "Reality" means the revelation of subtle, psychological relationships. To many other TV reporters it means simply the true, physical surface look of a situa-

tion. But any approach to reality reporting that makes a break through big enough to alter the character of TV journalism, will probably have to include two of Zegart's conspicuous qualities: The vision that finds in drab reality the glowing center of significance and excitement, and some sort of moral equivalent to his overriding zeal and dedication.

Whether or not Zegart and others like him are able to work out their ideas depends on how much backing they get from the networks. There are evidences that the networks are not ready to focus down on the news documentary. NBC's President, Pat Weaver, has been pushing his "Responsibility Concept," which aims to diffuse cultural and informational inserts throughout all NBC's programs. *Variety* reported last month that this is due to include such things as getting a Heifetz or a Rubenstein to appear on *Howdy Doody*. But, in a recent memorandum, Weaver assured his staff that: "Of course, [we will continue] to do separate public affairs, news, and informational programs."

An indication of NBC's interest in the news documentary is its slowness to follow CBS's lead. It waited two years after Murrow's *See it Now*, appeared before it produced its own news documentary, *Background*. Then it appeared only three times a month. In *Background* as in *See it Now*, talent was concentrated at the top. Editorial direction under Ted Mills and Reuven Frank was excellent, but the show was put on film not by an elite group like Murrow's, but by regular daily news cameramen. "Despite all this, we were breathing on Murrow's rating only four months after we started," said Douglas Wood, assistant producer. "Then we got knocked out of our time by *Captain Gallant of the Foreign Legion*, starring Buster Crabbe."

One reason why the networks have not pushed the sense-making film report harder is that they have been absorbed in the prodigious and richly rewarding job of trying to better the daily news show. Davidson Taylor, Vice President in charge of Public Affairs for NBC, said, "The Camel-Plymouth show (John Cameron Swayze) is the most profitable single show on the network." It takes in about 6 million dollars a year. Almost all of NBC's vast news and stringer organization exists to supply it.

The networks have a strikingly unanimous feeling about the daily show and about the major criticism that has been leveled against it; namely that it tends to report news on which pictures are available instead of news in order of its importance. Davidson Taylor at NBC said, "Our show is on top because we have more 'hard' news in it. John Daley at ABC said, "Our rating has doubled in the past year because we give more 'hard' news than any other network." Elmer Lower at CBS said, "The Douglas Edwards show is best because we use more 'hard' news."

Even at CBS, which has pioneered in the news documentary, the daily show far overshadows the weekly. Ernie Liser, producer of Eric Sevareid's *American Week*, calls his show a "luxury." Elmer Lower said, "The term TV journalism may be exalted. Our big problem is the daily news show."

It may be, however, that progress on the news-documentary is being made in another field, the non-news documentary. NBC's *Victory at Sea* was a monumental film history editing job by Henry Salomon. CBS is undertaking a similar series, *Conquest of the Air*. CBS's Irving Gitlin has produced *The Search*, an erratic but powerful series of 26 films on contemporary research being done by U.S. colleges. NBC's Reuven Frank produced a film on Nazi War Criminals, *Road to Spandau*. Henry Salomon produced a one hour film on atomic energy, *Three, Two, One, Zero*. Salomon is now working on a vast history of the 20th century, *Project 20*, which may be years in the making. These projects probably represent a true urge to enlighten the public. They may also represent a hedge by broadcasters against agitation by educational broadcasters. Perhaps one of the most significant things about them is their potential for developing talents and techniques that could be applied to a new journalism.

To summarize, the character of TV does not seem to be fixed in its present form. It has a potential, which it may or may not develop, for extending its journalistic range from the present "public" kind of reporting, to a penetrating, "private" kind of reporting. Murrow's *See It Now*, and Harsch's *Background* have demonstrated glimpses of a unique and enormous journalistic power in the form of the sense-making reality report. There seems to be little doubt that if these glimpses were turned into a steady flow, it would transcend previous forms of journalism in impact and attractiveness. Such a development would significantly alter the character of TV, which, in turn, will ultimately determine changes that might be called for in newspapers.

There are things TV can do better than newspapers, but the real battle will not be between the printed and the electronic press. The real battle will be between those influences in both that inform, and those that merely entertain.

The more successful TV is in journalism, the more interest it will create in what newspapers have to say. The more successful newspapers are in informing, the more demanding viewers will be of Television. Interest in the real world is something that can be more easily stimulated than satiated. TV is better at stimulating, and printed media are better at satiating.

The larger question is this: Will TV sabotage newspapers by taking away dollars and readers, and then sabotage the sense of its readers by substituting soporifia for information? TV is proud of its brief, daily smatter of facts. It is pious about the public service shows, which it puts on when the great audience isn't looking. But journalists must not be deceived. Television is a huge, voracious, expanding entertainment industry. Its informational efforts may be a sop to the government, its own pretenses, and a few individual consciences like Ed Murrow's. Until TV turns its big guns—top time, budgets, and resources—to creating informational, sense-making shows good enough to pull in mass audiences, the national mind *is* being sabotaged.

In terms of journalism's traditional function—creating an informed national intelligence—Television is an enemy. But the enemy is divided within and its character is still being formed. Newspapers have more in common with TV journalism, than TV journalism has in common with entertainment TV.

Journalism must define its friends and its enemies, form coalitions, and act in its own behalf: The behalf of the mind, the democracy, and that half of the world it leads.

Robert Drew, on a Nieman Fellowship from *Life* Magazine, has been working experimentally with new patterns in television news.

Nieman Scrapbook

The Spanish View Of a Free Press Suggests '1984'

by Weldon James

(*Who recently returned from a visit to Spain*)

When several Spanish newspapermen came to Louisville last year, on an American tour sponsored by the State Department, they puzzled every local newspaperman who talked with them. They were as pleasant and likeable as could be—but when the talk touched on freedom of the press there was absolutely no meeting of minds.

The visiting Spaniards either went completely blank, or, as in one case, implied that radio and press censorship in Franco's Spain was chiefly a voluntary exercise of "good taste."

Last month in Madrid I discovered how false this implication was. And why our fellow journalists were so inarticulate: They had grown up and worked under the most shackled press this side of the Iron Curtain. Under a civil war-time 1938 law still on the books (and weighted with new extensions by administrative decree), it is a press not only censored but directed —told what not to publish, told what it must publish.

The penalties for non-compliance are heavy enough to sharpen anyone's exercise of probable "good taste." Last year they included removal of one editor by the government for publishing "news and editorials contrary to official policy," and a sharp reduction in one paper's newsprint quota for failure to publish a directed editorial praising the government's official slate of candidates for municipal office.

A natural result of all this is that one Spanish newspaper looks and reads almost exactly like any other Spanish newspaper—and that the Spanish reader, if not completely indifferent, seldom really believes anything he reads.

That could be a good thing. For, aside from the "official line" in Spain itself, the news of the outside world is likewise bent to conform to the Franco Government's ideas of what is good for "the national common welfare." Offensive items simply do not appear. What does appear inevitably, once Franco has made a speech of any international import, is press-agency tripe from Washington, London, Paris, etc., quoting "authoritative circles" on how the keen interest evoked by El Caudillo's discourse emphasizes anew Spain's "increased prestige and leadership in the world." And so on.

American and other foreign newspapers and magazines come into Spain nowadays—but only when they contain no material deemed dangerous to "the national common welfare." The New York *Times*, for instance, was banned 17 times in 1954. The United Press sells its wire service to the Spanish press, and the Associated Press sell it newsphoto service—but their editors know that if they don't precensor copy and photos to the official Spanish taste, a Spanish censor will do it for them.

On outgoing news the story is a little different. A "hot" cable will reach the Minister of Information's desk within an hour after an American correspondent has filed it, and he may be called in for remonstration or a little corrective discusion—under the threat, exercised several times in the past but not recently, that he may be invited to leave the country. Mail copy, however, is not censored, and a good bit of the non-complimentary coverage of Spanish events goes out in this way, usually to be published without attribution to the sender in Spain.

You'd think this system would satisfy even the czars of *Pravda* or *Izvestia*. You might think, indeed, that since Franco has been "liberalizing" his dictatorship in recent years (he allowed the first post-war municipal elections in 1948, more in 1954), and since his power seems unchallenged, that press controls might be a little liberalized too.

You'd be wrong on both counts. When I was in Madrid last month Minister of Information Gabriel Arias Salgado, one Spaniard without any sense of humor, proved it. He made a 10,000-word speech

Scrapbook—

(carried in full by every Spanish daily) clarifying the government's intention to tighten rather than relax its iron control. And he submitted to the Council of Ministers the draft of a new law that would put every one of Spain's 72 privately-owned newspapers more firmly in the government's grip.

A few quotations from the speech show that Spain's official mind today is not far from the double-think of George Orwell's *1984* if not that of Communist Russia or Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy:

The Spanish press, said Arias Salgado, is a genuine "public service" press dedicated to "the national common welfare." In this, of course, it is unlike that of the "liberal state," which is controlled by capitalist owners for their own ends, or the of the Communist countries," directed to serve the interest of a few people running the government."

There is no real liberty in "the liberal state," the Minister said: "Only liberty of error, which in the last century has crystallized in freedom of religion, conscience and thought, launched by this formidable catapult which is called freedom of the press." The consequences of "libertinage of information," he said, "are the bitter fruits of social and political decomposition."

It was against such consequences that the Press Law of 1938 proclaimed as its purpose "the redemption of journalism from capitalist slavery and reactionary patronage" and its conversion into a "national institution." Spain, Arias Delgado said, since 1936 has been "liberated from fallacies, from the liberal opiate, from liberal incongruity, and from liberal frailty and inefficiency," all of which "leave the weak naked and unarmed," deprived of "the only real and valid defense against oppression of the powerful, the protection of the state."

Such "liberation from liberalism," the Minister argued, "is not renunciation of liberty." On the contrary, it enables the individual "to acquire a more authentic liberty. This more authentic liberty is not a liberty against the state but liberty within the state, free of pressure groups and the pressure of parties—liberty backed up, defended and guaranteed by authority which has ceased to be indifferent to the fate of its citizens."

So it is that in the New Spain "only the truth may enjoy the liberty of being expressed," and the slogan for the press is "All freedom for truth; no freedom at all for error!" The state, naturally, must decide what is the truth: "it is obligatory for the citizen to adjust to the orders of authority," and all channels of public communication must be "subject to the national common welfare."

Preventive censorship, or, as the Minister more euphemistically termed it, "previous consultation" is only "a preventive function of harmonious cooperation and tutelage for the common good." It is especially necessary in the case of foreign news agencies, "fabulous trusts of wide international power," because otherwise the Spanish press would be abandoned to "possible colonization."

Those who don't appreciate such reasoning and "still clamor for so-called freedom of the press," Arias Salgado warned acidly, "demonstrate that they are very backward people," unaware that Spain has reached a plane where it has "much to say to and even to teach" the rest of the world.

But there must be some of these backward people around, even in Spain. Because the Franco Cabinet is now studying Arias Salgado's hoped-for proposal to "liberalize" the 1938 law. And it is about as simple as "liberating" a war-time steak: It would transfer full power over the Spanish press to the Minister of Information himself.

There are 28 articles in the draft law, but these points are the basic ones: (1) A publisher must "nominate" three men as "director" of his paper (in Spain the director is a combination of editor-in-chief, publisher, and managing editor), and, if none is acceptable, the Minister of Information will name his own man; (2) the director will be responsible not to the owner but only to the goverment, may not be fired without the government's permission, will be paid a salary determined by the government, will have complete policy, personnel, and operational control, must submit to censorship, and must not "harm the fundamental principles of the State and spiritual, national, and social unity of Spain."

The new law is aimed only at Spain's 72 privately-owned dailies. It will not affect the 38 owned by the Falange Party because, in one-party Spain, they have already demonstrated that the Falangists' devotion to "authentic freedom" is simonpure.

What the Franco Cabinet will do with the proposed law remains to be seen. The present one seems harsh enough. But the new one, clearly, could mean the end of private newspaper ownership. That would hardly displease Arias Salgado, for in his December speech to the Spanish press he said:

"In liberal countries, freedom of the press has never existed . . . There has existed only the liberty of some newspaper proprietors who . . . impose their own censorship, publishing what pleases them and omitting what they want, without considering the common welfare . . . because their object is private profit."

—Louisville *Courier-Journal*

Old-Fashioned Notion

There seems to be little doubt that interpretive reporting is steadily gaining the upper hand. At the most recent convention of Associated Press managing editors, the subject came up—as it usually does wherever newspapermen get together—and the objectivity boys once more were routed in ragged defeat.

One of the stubborn reactionaries who insisted on sticking up for straight news was Richard F. Pourade, editor of the San Diego *Union*. He had a feeling, and dared to express it, that the AP's fascination with interpretive writing "reverses clear back to the days before objective reporting." He feared that newspapers which have so long and painfully sought to "strain the bias, color, distortion, and wrong emphasis out of new stories, as far as humanly possible," may now be in danger of "wiping out a half century of progress in reporting."

Pourade's old-fashioned notion was that when the AP or any other wire service "becomes the source and authority for the news, then it is open to challenge the same as any news source or news authority." As an example, he cited a story by John M. Hightower, the AP's interpreter of diplo-

Scrapbook—

matic news. The lead paragraph read:

"U.S. prestige and popularity have been on the skids all over the globe for about a year and a half. Today the trend appears to have leveled off."

Who says U.S. prestige has been on the skids. Pourade wants to know. *Who says* the Eisenhower "good partner" policy has reversed the trend, as this dispatch asserted? If somebody in the back of the hall answers, "Hightower says it," then the next question would be Harold Ross' famous marginal note: "Who he?"

Pourade plied the AP editors with sentiments like these: "It is no longer enough to report an event—we must use editorial adjectives and adverbs that were weeded out of the sports pages 20 years ago. Now they have suddenly appeared in political writing to the detriment of the American newspaper.

"On the theory that we must place the reader on the spot and make him a participant in the event, we have stirred his emotions and bewildered him instead of enlightening him with a calm factual report of what happened. We have almost overwhelmed him with emphasis on the emotional, and the clash of personalities.

"In the charged field of politics, giving the reporter the freedom to write his reactions to a situation is like handing him a lighted match. Instead of bringing order out of confusion, we are emotionally charging everything we write."

Pourade is on the right, but I'm afraid the losing, side. After hearing him out, the AP managing editors gave a rousing endorsement of continued interpretive reporting. Not long afterwards, the AP put this lead on a second-day story of the State of the Union message:

"President Eisenhower appeared today to have put the Democrats in Congress on the defensive with yesterday's State of the Union message in which he either asked for action or laid the groundwork for future requests on 33 foreign and domestic problems."

Who says the Democrats were on the defensive? And whatever the name of the AP rewrite man whose opinion this was, who he?

Facts as Commentary

For contrast, consider one of the finest jobs of newspaper work of the season—Clark Mollenhoff's reporting, in the Cowles newspapers of Des Moines and Minneapolis, of the Wolf Ladejinsky security risk case. A more devastating interpretation of the Eisenhower Administration's security system could hardly have been written than in the day-by-day account of the Ladejinsky case. Yet Mollenhoff wrote as a reporter, not as an interpreter. He dug up facts, and it was the facts, not the writer, that made the commentary.

The story broke in a routine way. Ladejinsky confided to a friend on the Des Moines *Register* staff that he had been dropped by the Department of Agriculture for security reasons. The friend told a member of the editorial page staff, who passed the tip on to Washington. Mollenhoff confirmed the story and, over Ladejinsky's protest, published it.

Mollenhoff was ahead of most of his colleagues at every stage of the story, from Secretary Benson's confused and foggy explanations to President Eisenhower's aimless comments and Harold Stassen's hiring of the man who had been declared too dangerous for Agriculture. At one point, when Secretary Benson was unavailable at the Department of Agriculture, Mollenhoff resorted to the simple expedient of ringing the doorbell at his home, and got an hour's interview.

When it was over, Ladejinsky said: "I firmly believe that the issue was resolved in great measure due to the efforts of the press and radio and television media of the United States." In *Newsweek's* phrase, Clark Mollenhoff had showed that "the blunt, unvarnished question is a deadly journalist weapon."

—Robert Lasch

The Progressive, March, 1955

OUR REVIEWERS

Book reviews in this issue are by **John L. Steele** of the Washington Bureau of *Time Inc.;* and the following Nieman Fellows, now at Harvard: **Selig Harrison,** Associated Press; **Mort Stern,** Denver *Post;* **Guy Munger,** Greensboro *News;* **William Woestendiek,** Winston-Salem *Journal.*

COMING – These Articles in the Next Issue

Selling the Whole Truth

by Ernest H. Linford

Efficiency for What?

An Editor Gives a Dedication

by Irving Dilliard