

Nieman Reports

VOL. 2, NO. 3

Published by the Society of Nieman Fellows

JULY, 1948

Reporter in the Bear's Den Harry Martin

Man and Newspaperman

Walter H. Waggoner

Newspaperman's Journalism School

T. E. Kruglak

Pre-Fab Editorials

Louis M. Lyons

The Newspaper's Blind Spot

Nathan Robertson

Editorials--Whether, Why and Whither

Rebecca F. Gross

Cherokee Phoenix

Charles W. Gilmore

Consul Reeves of Macao

Robert M. Shaplen

Nieman Notes — Bill Townes' Swan Song in Tacoma — George Weller's Review of "The Silent People Speak" — Scrapbook — Tom Sancton on the Southern Revolt — Gerald Johnson on The Human Nature of Newspapers — A Question on Medical Ads — Letters.

The Hallmark of a Profession

by Vannevar Bush

This, from the address of Dr. Bush at the Centennial of the Lawrence Scientific School, was said for engineers. The newspapermen who heard it observed that it could about as well be said for journalism.

The hallmark of a profession, originating how far back in the dim past we cannot surmise, is that its members minister to the people. It is out of this concept of ministry—of the assuming of responsibility for the vital affairs of others because of superior specialized knowledge—that there have grown the idealism of the professional man and the recognition in him by others of a quality of altruism which is its own reward. Upon this recognition by the people is based the continuance of a profession, for it exists only as the people because of confidence in its integrity and faith in its general beneficence permit it to maintain its prerogatives and to speak with authority in its own field. A profession is a class apart, but apart because of admitted dedication, not because of special privilege or falsely assumed superiority. Whether from the aboriginal medicine man, from Appollonian diviners, from Etruscan haruspices, or from whatever ancient source we choose to derive the concept, the group which is truly a profession because of its ministry to the people still, as its precursors did, safeguards its ministry by the maintenance of a strict code of conduct, by the long training of neophytes inculcating in them pride in the cult, initiating them into the mysteries, and disciplining them rigidly in its formulas, and by the severe restriction of its numbers through the imposition of intellectual hurdles to be surmounted. At times, it is true, things such as these have become dominant in the thinking of one group or another. At times they lead to abuses. At times they have thus obscured the great central principle which is their only real reason for existence. When this has happened, no matter how impressive the trappings, how profound the utterances, how awesome the mysticism that have been retained, what was once a true professional group has become a self-seeking entity possessing neither health nor virtue. So it must remain unless and until once again it regains the light and sub-

ordinates all else to the duty and privilege of simple ministry to the people.

Emergence of the young engineer from apprenticeship and his initiation into full stature are usually circumscribed by the fact that the engineer generally functions as a member of an industrial organization after having served his apprenticeship in the same sort of organization. He thus easily comes to devote his entire energies to the affairs of the organization rather than to enter it after he has attained professional recognition elsewhere, as is usually the case with members of the medical and legal professions. He is thus likely to be primarily an employee, and to lose some of that independence of opinion and utterance which professional men treasure. To recognize that all this is true is by no means to agree that engineering is not a profession. On the contrary, the profession of engineering is steadily progressing toward the solution of these implied problems. More responsibility is being taken by the masters for the training of neophytes. The development of acknowledged codes of professional standards is proceeding. The strictness of the essential disciplines is providing selection. There is much to do, and the road is long, but progress can be discerned, and the profession is slowly finding itself as a profession. We, who celebrate centuries, should not be impatient.

But, more important, they who maintain that such influences are a barrier to true professional stature for engineering risk mistaking the shadow for the substance. The hallmark is ministrations to the people. So far as this is truly and humbly regarded by engineers as the crux of their calling, so far they are a profession. That many engineers so hold it, we know, and we know that they will continue to do so. Stemming in part as it does from the long and honorable disinterestedness of science, their tradition is warranty enough for this assurance. And there is further warranty as well.

Engineering owes its being both to sci-

ence and to business, and from certain trends within this second source its professional spirit already is beginning to draw strength which can be counted on to swell with time. For in our day we are seeing the gradual appearance of the man of business who is heir of the ancient trader and merchant, but who is more than this, who is a professional man in the full sense. These men are as yet scattered, as yet without organization, as yet with none of the outward signs and symbols of the long established professions. Their appearance is in part owed to a gradual change in corporate form.

When we go to those corporations whose ownership is so diffused that management becomes in effect a self-perpetuating entity, we enter upon a new and profoundly significant condition. The task of management here becomes fiduciary in essence, closely akin to trusteeship, with obligations to government, employees, owners, consumers—all properly weighted. In management groups of this sort we find men who have the professional philosophy in high degree, who conduct their affairs for the just and equitable benefit of all four groups, who seek to maintain their organizations strong and able as agencies for ministering to the needs of the people. They have much in common with trustees of foundations, of hospitals, of nonprofit organizations devoted to the public welfare. So also have they with those who have made a career of service to the people through government and who regard their duties as a public trust. We need more of such men, and I think we shall have them for this trend is continuing, and out of it there may well one day come a new profession with its own traditions and beliefs, a profession capable through skill, through acumen, through integrity, of so managing prosperity as to make it conducive to the health of a nation, and a profession with which the profession of engineering can collaborate to good ends.

NIEMAN REPORTS

Editorial Council

JOHN McL. CLARK, Claremont, N. H.
THOMAS H. GRIFFITH, New York City
A. B. GUTHRIE, JR., Lexington, Ky.

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH, N. Y. C.
CARROLL KILPATRICK, Washington
ROBERT LASCH, Chicago, Ill.

WILLIAM J. MILLER, New York City
PAUL L. EVANS, Mitchell, S. D.
BEN YABLONKY, New York City

JUSTIN G. MCCARTHY, Washington, D. C.

LOUIS M. LYONS, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman

Reporter in the Bear's Den

The President of the American Newspaper Guild Sends This Account of Negotiating with the Communist Delegates at the UN Conference on the Press at Geneva Where He was One of the American Delegation.

by Harry Martin

Taming the Russian bear is no difficult trick. He can even be made to eat his own words right out of one's hand in public!

If disarmed of the veto weapon, faced with opposition prepared to become as tough as appears necessary, and compelled to compete for majority support in open forum on equal terms with the spokesmen for democracy, Soviet representatives in world sessions can be brought and kept under control.

This the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information in Geneva discovered early in the proceedings. I believe the prompt application of the discovery was responsible for the historic success which the Conference was able to achieve in the continuing campaign for man's right to know what is happening.

Circumstance brought first employment of this realistic policy in Committee Three, the Committee on Free Publication and Reception of Information, in which I happened to be representing the United States, with sterling support from Howard K. Smith of CBS, David Henry of the American Embassy in Moscow, Sam DePalma and Allan Dawson of the State Department. It was there, for some unknown reason, that the Communists decided to unlimber their heavy verbal artillery first, a decision which they soon were to regret.

It developed that the Russians and delegations from the Soviet satellite states, realizing that any real advancement for the cause of free speech at Geneva would be a setback for their own rigid government controls on such freedom, had pre-decided to turn the Conference into a platform for Communist propaganda. They had virtually transferred the Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) from Moscow to Switzerland for that purpose, along with the equivalent propaganda machines of the lesser Red nations. Every member of each Eastern delegation—Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria and Romania—had come loaded with pocketsful of long, carefully-written statements predicated initially upon the agenda, but departing quickly therefrom to paint the Communist press as the world's freest and best in contrast with the press of the dem-

ocratic countries which the Marxists try constantly to smear as monopolistic and managed from Wall Street.

Jacob Lomakin, Russian consul general in the United States, and Poland's Witold Konopka were the first bears to leap at the throat of the American newspapers. Their speeches were similarly stretched in length, lying, and logic. As that day's session (March 26) had already run beyond closing time, I suggested to the Chairman, an able diplomat and former newspaperman from Mexico named Dr. Raul Noriega, that adjournment until the next morning would be proper and that I would request permission to be the first speaker at that time. It was so ordered. Overnight, some of our American group urged that it was too early in the Conference to become embroiled in a battle with the Kremlin agents and that I should permit the present attack to pass in silence. In fact I was definitely instructed to that effect by the delegation Chairman during the customary breakfast get-together at Hotel Des Bergues before driving out to the Palace of Nations. Needless to say, being an American newspaperman myself, I had no intention of abiding by any such instructions. Subsequently, the Chairman and all concerned came around to complete approval of the "get tough" tactics for the simple reason that it worked.

When the Committee session opened, I took the floor, pointed out that neither the press of the United States nor that of the Soviet Union was on trial in the Conference and chided Mr. Lomakin for his ignorance of the American press, reminding him that the Soviet Union itself is actually the world's greatest monopoly.

"Mr. Lomakin," I said, "you have spoken glibly of the American press as controlled by a dozen individuals and as being of a fluctuating, irresponsible nature. The American press, like any instrumentality geared to day-to-day developments in the news realm, reflects those developments fairly accurately in its makeup, so that such fluctuation as you may discover is only the natural reflection of the ebb and flow of world affairs, the consequence of the pursuit of truth which could never happen in your country where the press

is geared solely to the trend of developments within the narrow framework of a single ideological picture. However, never in its long and comparatively illustrious history has the press of the United States been guilty of any fluctuation to compare with the fantastic flipflopping of the ideological line pursued by the controlled press of the Soviet Union."

On the second point (monopoly), I noted that no newspaper chain in America owns more than 20 papers, that there are 1,709 daily papers here of which 83 per cent are locally owned and edited and that there are 10,000 weekly newspapers nearly all of which are owned and operated by their own individual editors. Reminding him that in Russia the Administration of Agitation and Propaganda supervises the Soviet press in its every detail, I maintained that the discussion had taken an amusing turn.

"We have the representative of the one country which engages in a completely autocratic and thoroughly accepted censorship attacking freedom of the press in another country where there is no censorship," I said. "As a matter of fact, we have in our own press a place for statements of the sort made by the representative of the Soviet Union and that section is called 'the comic section' or 'the funny paper.' Such statements as you have heard here could actually be true only on that day when there is opportunity for publication in the Soviet Union of an opposition paper. When that day comes, the distinguished representative of the Soviet will be in much better position to express criticism of any other nation."

There was a brief flurry of discussion and then the Communists went to work in earnest. One by one, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Russia again, each of them poured lengthy, vitriolic indictments of the American press into the record. Since nearly all of them spoke in their own native tongues only, and since each had then to be translated in turn into English and French, each 30-minute speech consumed 90 minutes of the Committee's valuable time. Every one proclaimed that the Communist press was pure and free and uncensored and that the democratic nations were defiled by the most evil of

monopoly-controlled, prejudiced papers.

This continued all day long on the 27th. It resumed on the 28th and again on the 29th. Hour by hour, the Eastern bloc piled up their mountain of malice, virtually all of it completely out of order, a flagrant presumption upon the fact that the Spanish-speaking chairman could not understand the Slav languages of the delegates in question and hence did not know—and could not rule—they were out of order until their remarks had been concluded in the original tongue and translated into French and English. I determined not to speak again until every Communist delegation had had an opportunity to do so—and hence had used up his prepared ammunition!—and so raised no objection until the procession of propagandists had all finished. On the afternoon of the 29th it came my turn to answer.

"Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates," I began, "we have listened patiently through two long, arduous sessions to a great deal of extraneous discussion concerning matters that are not at issue in the Conference or in this Committee. The delegates would have been entirely within their rights at any one of scores of junctures to call upon the distinguished Chairman to rule the statements out of order. The delegate from the United States felt, however, that there should be full freedom for discussion for any honorable delegate to speak his mind.

"In the course of the debate, however, there have been many irresponsible, erroneous charges leveled at the press of the United States. In support of these charges, the delegates in question have read numerous statements lifted out of context from various books, pamphlets, newspapers, etc., a wierd collection of opinion, half truths, false judgments and such, the very publication of which is proof that there is the fullest freedom of uncensored expression in the United States

"I tried very hard to discover what American papers have offended the sensitive feelings of the gentlemen from the East. I kept close check, Mr. Chairman, on the newspapers against which there appeared to be complaints. These turned out to be the Hearst newspapers, the Scripps-Howard newspapers and the Patterson-McCormick newspapers. Let us see what this amounts to in comparison with the American press as a whole. At last count, there were some 19 Hearst papers, about 17 Scripps-Howard papers and three McCormick-Patterson papers. According

to the arithmetic taught in the free schools of the United States, that would total up to a figure of 39. Thirty-nine newspapers out of the 1,700 daily papers and the 10,000 weekly papers in the United States! That would still leave 1,661 daily papers, plus the 10,000 weeklies. And I submit that it is preposterous to condemn an entire press, the thousands and thousands of editors and newspapermen of these 11,661 publications, just because of some ALLEGED faults of a paltry three dozen! As a matter of record, honorable delegates, it might interest you to know that the late great Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President of the United States in both 1940 and 1944 against the determined opposition of the 39 newspapers in question, a clear indication that the American people have more than sufficient means of keeping themselves informed about political issues.

"I see no point in boring the honorable delegates further on this subject. However, the honorable delegate from Byelorussia raised a question in which he called for an answer. He asked what kind of censorship I had been talking about in my brief remarks in reply to the Soviet and Polish delegates. He asked what sort of censorship can there be of papers that are published by trade unions; and as a trade union president, I propose to answer simply by citing chapter and verse on Press Control from the laws of the Soviet Union. I have before me a document, No. 31, Compilation of Statutes and Orders of the Worker-Peasant Government dated July 5, 1931."

Then I proceeded to read verbatim the Press Control Law which establishes Glavlit, or the Main Administration for Affairs of Literature and Publishing Houses, with complete authority of life and death over every publication in the Soviet Union. Its decrees are final and absolute, without appeal, and it may confiscate or destroy any offending newspaper without notice, trial or even explanation. The control is so absolute that the delegates from the free countries of the world listened practically pop-eyed with amazement as it was read into the record.

I closed with the assertion that "any government practising a control so rigid, so complete and so monopolistic as this is scarcely in position to criticize the free press of any other peoples" and the promise that "I do not propose to burden the honorable delegates further with any remarks on this extraneous issue, regardless of what additional propaganda may be presented by the delegates who have oc-

cupied most of our time for the last two days to little avail."

The neutral Swiss newspaper, the Geneva Tribune reported next morning that "Mr. Lomakin immediately tried to answer the American allegations, but either the statements could not be denied or he was caught short, for he lingered over general matters which did not refute very much." Page One of the London News-Chronicle reported that the "President of the American Newspaper Guild. . . startled Eastern bloc delegates by reading the 1,000-word statute of Glavlit to which the Soviet State in 1931 gave control over all publications" and "the Soviet delegate, Mr. Lomakin, then spoke, but made no reference to Mr. Martin's quotation. These reactions were typical of the results.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lomakin walked over to me after adjournment and asked me to repeat the date of the Law I had read. I showed the document to him. He looked at it long and hard, then shook his head slowly, said, "Oh, I see," turned and walked away. The words were Russia's own and the world had watched as the Soviet delegates let them pass without challenge.

From that moment, there was no further extended attack from the East—save for one momentary flourish in a drafting committee on the question of "warmongering" in the press.

Only two Red delegates had been named to this sub-committee—Russia's Jacob Lomakin and Poland's Witold Konopka. But when the session came to order on the afternoon of April 1, 1948 at the Palace of Nations, representatives of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Albania were gathered expectantly at one end of the table with Comrades Lomakin and Konopka in a group that overshadowed the other seven legitimate members of the Drafting Committee in size. Obviously, something was in the wind.

We were very soon to discover what it was. Chairman Raul Noriega of Mexico had hardly completed the sentence calling attention to a Netherlands delegate's tentative resolution against censorship as the first order of business when Mr. Lomakin asked for—and got—the floor. The Soviet official stated as a preliminary that the Netherlands resolution contained nothing new and should be withdrawn. Then he proceeded to open up with a speech attacking the American newspapers.

He closed amid a salvo of handclapping and cheers from his Marxist companions.

He had spoken in Russian, of course, and we had to wait interminably while his remarks were translated aloud into the two official languages, English and French. After hearing the English, and while waiting for the completion of the French translation, I made up my mind on an answer that I hoped would serve the dual purpose of deflating the Lomakin demagoguery and get us back on the simple track of writing the resolution, without the loss of much more precious time.

"Mr. Chairman," I said, "now that we of the Drafting Committee have had another of the daily laughs provided by the eminent Soviet humorist, Mr. Lomakin, and have also enjoyed the merry outbursts from the clique of little bears at the end of the table, may I suggest that attempts to transform the Drafting Committee into a forum for political propaganda cease and

that we get down to our work of writing these resolutions?"

That did it. For a full moment, there was a strange silence, then an angry uproar from the lower section of the table.

"The little bears" had worked themselves up into a lather. Only one of their number, however, was entitled to speak as a member of the Drafting Committee.

"I propose," roared the Polish delegate, Mr. Konopka, "that the delegate from the United States be called upon to apologize and to withdraw the insulting words he has used against these delegates who have come here today to express their will for peace."

Whereupon I said, "Now, Mr. Chairman, I move formally that the entire discussion of the afternoon session be stricken from the record and that we get down to business."

Without even putting the vote, the Chairman ruled that this would be done. There was no objection.

And so it came about that the Communists had to sacrifice an hour-long propaganda speech from the record just to strike therefrom three little words.

Not a bad trade, methought.

And from that moment forward, whenever and wherever in Geneva the satellite Communist countries were discussed (except in formal Conference sessions), the term that was invariably employed was "the little bears."

We settled down to our work, proceeded with a minimum of unnecessary interruption and were able to conclude the tasks of Committee Three a full week before any other Committee in the Conference. The Russian bruin had been trained in short order to dance to his own music.

Newspaperman's Journalism School

by T. E. Kruglak

Working newspapermen have definite theories about journalism and education, but seldom are they called upon to help outline the duties and responsibilities of institutions charged with turning out candidates for the working press. In the words of the advertising slogan, men who know newspapers best, rarely have the opportunity to do anything about it, except through anguished letters to **Editor & Publisher** or the **Guild Reporter**. We are not talking about newspaper brass—they're too well represented.

But at one university in metropolitan New York, working newspapermen do have a chance to teach their specialties the way they want to, and lay down the rules governing the care and feeding of embryo journalists.

Long Island University, whose president, Tristram W. Metcalfe stepped from education editor of the *World-Telegram* to his present post, is the scene of this experiment.

Last year the writer was assigned the task of organizing the LIU journalism department. As a graduate of a midwestern school of journalism we were well equipped to make comparisons—and on the surface the situation seemed hopeless. LIU possessed none of the shiny press buildings, the elaborate type laboratories, or the daily newspapers of the Big Ten.

But at the same time, it had none of the hidebound regulations and pseudo scholarship which sometimes produces a master's thesis in journalism based on the

number of times the letter "J" appeared in 1800 lines of newspaper copy selected at random from 234 newspapers.

A metropolitan university—not to mention a school of journalism—suffers from the natural conflict between college life and the big city attractions. The metropolitan journalism school is faced with the choice of concentrating on the intellectual and moral aspects of journalism, with the production of newspapermen a result secondary to instilling into managing editors and publishers an awareness of the sociological functions of the press. Or it can take another road, that of nominal preparation of students for newspaper work by imitating the University of Iowa, but without the valuable *Daily Iowan* for laboratory work, creating a school which plucks no fruit from the rich trees of metropolitan journalism, but is merely a mechanical imitation of the college town unit.

The third alternative is to try to think in terms of the metropolitan medical schools which are good because among other things, they encourage working experts to devote part of their time to teaching!

The analogy of course is not too good—nor complete. But it made sense to us. We decided that the LIU journalism department would have no retired newspapermen or disillusioned reporters seeking the sanctity of academic life. In fact, we would hire no full-time instructors.

We based this theory on our belief that no matter how good an instructor an ex-

newspaperman may be—once he has retired from daily newspaper work, he is too apt to say, "Now when I was on the *Daily Blatt*—" instead of being able to say, "The book's all wet, here's the way the newspaper thinking has changed."

Lest all this sound too ethereal for words, let us cite the recent ITU strike in Chicago and the impending one in New York. In a standard journalism school, the instructors would (and undoubtedly did) write to their old friends on the Chicago newspapers for data on changes in newspaper practice as a result of the strike.

At Long Island University, the instructors were able to tell their classes, from their own daily experiences exactly what the ITU strike would mean to newspapers and newspapermen. Our advanced copy class instructor, for example, had spent the better part of a month fussing with vari-type heads, paste-up type, and all the emergency preparation his paper was making for the strike. Other instructors were getting first hand information concerning methods to be used on their papers. When you consider that our instructors run the range from the *Times* to the *Mirror*, it is evident that LIU journalism students had a pretty complete picture of the meaning and force of an ITU strike. This is what we mean by a "Newspaperman's Journalism School."

That the standard schools of journalism are beginning to realize their short-comings is quite evident in the growth of

newspaper "internship" plan. **Editor & Publisher** is full of stories of journalism instructors who have discovered the joys of spending summer vacations working on daily newspapers.

Fortunately we already had a nucleus of working newspapermen affiliated with the university informally, lecturing on journalism as part of the English department curriculum. Paul Gould of the **Brooklyn Eagle** was teaching a laboratory journalism course which had been praised by the **Newspaper Guild Front Page** as one of the few practical courses offered in New York. As part of our plan, this grew into an advanced reporting class which is typical of our present courses, and indicates how we operate a newspaperman's journalism department:

Advanced Reporting 103 carries four credits each semester, and sessions are of two hour duration twice weekly. The class, even in these days of swollen enrollments (and LIU has 5000 students), is rigidly limited to fifteen students. Instead of trying to teach the students the mechanics of the craft during the class session, Paul Gould uses the time to discuss the background of reporting, the col-

lective experience of the group in their outside work, and sums up each session with a detailed criticism of the outside assignments based upon his own newspaper's standards.

The outside assignments are not dry runs, with a class city editor handing out imaginary tasks, and the instructor grading the story before consigning it to the waste basket, but actual newspaper reporting.

Despite Brooklyn's reputation as a closely knit community, it is no such thing. Three daily newspapers died there during the past fifteen years because the publishers thought the same. It is more area conscious than it is borough conscious, and hence area weeklies have taken over the field once controlled by the **Brooklyn Standard Union, Times, and Citizen**.

Advanced Reporting students work on these papers, covering everything from police headquarters to the Flatbush Rotary banquet. Typical (or at least we hope it is) of the way they operate is that of one of the students who ran down a tip which resulted in an exclusive front page by-line story on the first defection from the Truman ranks among top Brook-

lyn politicians. Days later, the metropolitan dailies picked up the story as hot news. Of course poetic justice would have instructor Paul Gould Brooklyn's **Eagle** "scooped" on the story. It was.

Can this technique be applied to non-metropolitan schools?

We believe that it has an even better chance of success in the smaller cities, with the school's journalism head organizing the same type of cooperation with the local dailies or weeklies. There is one word of caution however. Avoid "visiting lecturers!"

If this plan is to succeed, the newspaperman should become a full time member of the faculty in the sense that he is an integral portion of the school. His services may be on a part-time basis, but he must not look upon his duties in that light.

This balance of students working under pressure, plus the sociological aspects of first hand indoctrination is the combination we seek at LIU, and if it continues to work out as well as it has in its first year of trial, it may some day set a pattern which will fit the purely trade schools and the liberal arts practitioners.

Institute On Foreign Relations Marks Nieman Reunion

A week's Nieman Institute on Foreign Relations the first week in June was attended by 60 Nieman Fellows and 20 other newspapermen, most of whom were members of the National Editorial Writers Conference.

Areas of strategic importance in foreign relations were discussed in eleven half-day seminars by members of the Harvard faculty, State department representatives, foreign correspondents, representatives of the United Nations, the undersecretary of the Army, the United States member of the International Trade Conference and other authorities on special topics.

The editorial writers held one session on the special problems of the editorial page. Pres. James B. Conant and Erwin Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor* were the speakers at a dinner for the Institute.

The final day of the Institute was Reunion Day for the Nieman Fellows. Reports were given from each year's group at a luncheon. Mark Ethridge and Archibald MacLeish were the speakers at the final Nieman Dinner at the Signet Society. The wives of 36 Fellows attended the Reunion and many of them the Institute sessions.

A high spot of the Reunion was a mint julep party given by the Kentucky Fellows and their papers at the Harvard Faculty Club, with many old friends of the

faculty joining the festivities.

Lieut. Gov. Arthur W. Coolidge of Massachusetts and Mark Ethridge, publisher of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* joined in a North-South skit to enliven the proceedings.

Teas were arranged daily by the wives of the Nieman Committee members.

The Institute Program:

MONDAY, MAY 31

Economics of ERP—Edward S. Mason and John H. Williams of Harvard's Littauer School, and Clair Wilcox, U. S. member of the International Trade Conference.

China and Southeast Asia—John Fairbank, director of China Regional Studies at Harvard, and Harold Isaacs of *Newsweek*.

TUESDAY, JUNE 1

U. S. Resources for World Demand—Kirtley Mather of the Geology Department and John D. Black of the Economics Department of Harvard.

After ERP What?—W. Y. Elliott of the Government Department and Seymour Harris of the Economics Department, of Harvard.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2

East to Russia—Owen Lattimore of Johns Hopkins and E. A. Ackerman of the Geography Department of Harvard.

Russia and the Russians—Clyde Kluckhohn, director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard and Henry Shapiro of

UP, former Moscow correspondent.

The World Problem of Freedom to Report—Lloyd Free and Erwin Canham of the UN Commission on Freedom of Information.

THURSDAY, JUNE 3

Outlook for the U. S. Economy—Alvin H. Hansen of the Economics Department at Harvard.

Italy and the ERP—Prof. Gaetano Salvemini with commentary by Payson Wild. FRIDAY, JUNE 4

Recent Political Trends in Russia—Merle Fainsod, chairman, Government Department at Harvard.

Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union—Francis E. Stevens, chief, Eastern European Affairs, State Department, and Fred W. Neal, formerly on the Russian Desk, State Department.

UN and the Press—Wilder Foote, director, press section, UN, Ferdinand Kuhn, Washington Post correspondent, Robert Manning, United Press correspondent, and Gilbert W. Stewart, information staff, U. S. Mission to Iran.

Strategy of Air Power—Prof. George Baker of the Finletter Commission.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5

Germany in ERP—Gen. William Draper, undersecretary of Army.

American Foreign Policy—Mark Ethridge, chairman, UN Commission on the Balkans.

Editorial Writing Made Easy

E. Hofer & Son Do the Work for 59 Papers with 390,008 Circulation

by Louis M. Lyons

The tradition of the newspaper editorial is that it presents the view of the newspaper editor. In the editorial his readers expect to find the editor's considered judgment on the news. That is what they have been led to expect.

What would be the readers' judgment of an editor who farmed out his editorials to some one else without letting them know? Suppose this some one else was an anonymous person not resident in their community or within a thousand miles of it—some one not working for the interests of their community or even the interests of their newspaper—but working for some special interest with an axe to grind of which the readers are not told.

Well, there are at least 59 newspapers in the U. S. with a total circulation of 390,008, which do just that. Within a few days of April 1, 1948, 53 of these 59 papers all printed as their own an identical editorial under the same identical heading in the 53 different communities in 25 states, and none of them wrote it. Not one. It wasn't even written by one and copied by the others. But all 53 presented it to their readers as their own editorial. The other six of the 59 changed the title on it or added or subtracted a sentence or two before running it. It was still the same editorial.

The editorial was actually prepared and distributed by the Industrial News Review, owned and operated by E. Hofer & Son of 1405 Southwest Harbor Drive, Portland, Oregon. This concern distributes prefabricated editorials to newspapers on behalf of power interests, especially in opposition to Federal power. This outfit has discovered that there are editors either too lazy to write their own editorials or venal enough to present the paid-for propaganda of special interests as their own views.

E. Hofer & Son evidently consider that the interest of their clients is served by opposing and discrediting any or all Federal government programs and in smearing such independent minds and free institutions as do not supinely fall in line with the views of their special interest clients. Such free and independent minds are to be found in colleges where their function in teaching economics and government parallels the function of the honest, independent editor.

So E. Hofer & Son put out editorials attacking bills for Federal support of ed-

ucation, and look for opportunities to attack the teaching in free universities. They saw such a chance in March and exploited it. They plucked a sentence out of context in the annual report of President James B. Conant of Harvard, applauded him for it, then twisted their interpretation until they had concocted an "editorial" saying precisely the opposite of what President Conant was saying—and sent it out to complaisant editors to use as their own material. The 59 did so use it. Its heading in 53 of them was: "Housecleaning Due in the Colleges," a smear on college teaching as biased. That was not the considered view of any of these editors. It was not President Conant's view. It was a view that E. Hofer & Son evidently thought would please their clients to have disseminated through the anonymous editorial columns of a wide distribution of newspapers.

Not all of these newspapers are insignificant. They include Maine's Biddeford Journal and Bath Times, both dailies.

They include the Port Huron (Mich.) Times Herald, a daily of 26,000 circulation; the Nashua (N. H.) Telegraph, a daily of 10,000 circulation; the Lockport (N. Y.) Union-Sun and Journal, with 10,000 circulation; the Wheeling (W. Va.) News, a daily of 25,000 circulation, and the Beckley (W. Va.) Post Herald, a daily of 16,869 circulation.

These 59 newspapers are not the whole score. For the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald credited the editorial to the Newton Daily News. It may have been misled into believing it was reprinting an actual editorial by a contemporary. The Newton (Iowa) News, a daily with 6,016 circulation, is not among the papers clipped by the press clipping bureau (Burrelle's) from which these 59 papers were tallied on this one editorial. So we know the score is incomplete. Indeed, 20 or 30 other papers have been revealed by the same clipping service to have used identical editorials on other issues.

Now there's no question here of whether

The Hofer "Editorial" in 59 Papers

House Cleaning Due in Colleges

James B. Conant, president of Harvard, recently said: "The nation has a right to demand of its educational institutions that the teachers dealing with controversial subjects shall be fearless seekers of the truth and careful scholars rather than propagandists. But granted honesty, sincerity, and ability, there must be tolerance of a wide diversity of opinion."

No one can quarrel with that doctrine, and it could well serve as a model for any university in a free country. However, it is evident to anyone who has even a cursory knowledge of modern teaching that much of the instruction on controversial problems is warped and biased. This is done, in many cases, by individual teachers who are trying to sell some ism or other. And it is done in many other cases by text books which bend the truth in order to hew to what amounts to the party line.

It is one thing, for instance, to show the student what socialism and communism and the nationalization of industry involve, as contrasted with a capitalist or free economy. It is a very different thing to deliberately make it appear that the super state is the answer to the ills of mankind, and unfortunately that is an impression that emanates from many colleges today. It is all very well to discuss what may be wrong with the American system. But, at the same time, we must honestly teach what is right in the American system, as proved by the results it has achieved for the masses of people.

Academic freedom is as basic as any other freedom. It must be protected from fanatics on either the right or the left wings of political and economic thought. But it must justify itself, as Dr. Conant said, by fearlessly seeking the truth—not by tearing down the principles which make the freedom of some professors in American universities to promote political and economic philosophies which, if adopted, would destroy the liberties and opportunities on which our nation was built.

N I E M A N R E P O R T S

a paper has a right to print the camouflaged views of special interests. The question is one of dealing honestly with the readers of a paper's editorials. There is no problem about handling such stuff as E. Hofer & Son put out by a paper that wants to use it. The Mesabi News of Virginia, Minnesota, published it under a boldface head: "Editorial Opinion of Others," and with a credit line to "Industrial News Review, Portland, Oregon." The editor of the Mesabi News may be as lazy as the other 59, but every reader and writer of editorials will agree he is more honest. (More is redundant. Scratch it out.)

Of these 59 papers, 53 used the canned editorial without changing a word. Six others changed the head on it or changed the opening or closing sentence to give it a slight touch of their own. Thus the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune changed the head and wrote its own sentence in place of the closing one of E. Hofer & Son. It's still the same editorial. The Hibbing (Minn.) Tribune, with 7,913 circulation, wrote its own lead and added a punch line, but left the body of the editorial as it came in. The Concord (N. C.) Tribune, the Columbia (Tenn.) Herald, the Cadillac (Mich.) News and Port Huron (Mich.) Times changed the heading to "Academic Freedom" and did some penciling of their own in the editorial before palming off the views of E. Hofer & Son as their own editorial.

Here is a table of the papers that ran the editorial—"Housecleaning Due in Colleges."

ALABAMA	CIRCULATION
Mobile Post (w)	3,012
CONNECTICUT	
Bridgeport Life (s)	15,695
DELAWARE	
Middletown Transcript (w)	2,492
FLORIDA	
Dade City Banner (Friday only)	Pop. 2,560
ILLINOIS	
Blue Island Sun Standard (w)	8,400
INDIANA	
Terre Haute Tribune (d)	26,662—
IOWA	
Newton Daily News (d)	6,016
Oskaloosa Herald (d)	6,660†
LOUISIANA	
Minden Herald (w)	1,800
MAINE	
Bath Times (d)	3,929
Biddeford Journal (d)	8,624

MASSACHUSETTS	
Cambridge Recorder (w) (no circulation given)	
Dorchester Beacon (w)	10,123
Orange Enterprise & Journal (w)	2,400
South Boston Gazette (w)	7,409
MICHIGAN	
Cadillac News (d)	4,234*
Ishpeming Iron Ore (w)	983
Port Huron Times-Herald (d)	26,881*
MINNESOTA	
Austin Herald (d)	9,549
Hibbing Tribune (d)	7,913*
MISSOURI	
Moberly Message (w)	2,685
Trenton Republican-Times (d)	2,775
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Dover Foster's Democrat (d)	3,085
Hampton Union & Gazette (w)	1,200
Keene Sentinel (d)	5,069
Nashua Telegram (d)	10,616
NEW JERSEY	
Carteret News (w)	2,800
Gloucester City News (w)	3,100
Hillsdale Herald (w)	921
Hillside Times (w)	2,312
Park Ridge Local (w)	1,390
Pemberton Times-Advertiser (w)	2,619
West Orange Chronicle (w)	2,502
Westwood Chronicle (w)	1,120
NEW MEXICO	
Hobbs News and Sun (d)	6,500
NEW YORK	
Lockport Union-Sun & Journal (d)	10,093
Tottenville Staten Island Transcript (w)	1,500
Yonkers Times (d)	2,020
Yonkers Record (d)	8,210
NORTH CAROLINA	
Concord Tribune (d)	6,961*
OHIO	
Piqua Call (d)	6,974
Bucyrus Telegraph-Forum (d)	6,181
PENNSYLVANIA	
Blairsville Dispatch (w)	2,750
Kittanning Simpsons' Leader-Times (d)	9,810
Masontown Klondike Bulletin (w)	4,730
Oxford Press (w)	1,500
Philadelphia Frankford Bulletin (w)	32,500
Phoenixville Republican (d)	5,320
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Gaffney Ledger (w)	3,650
TENNESSEE	
Columbia Herald (d)	2,918*
VIRGINIA	
Narrows News (w)	1,987

Radford News Journal (d)	3,015
WEST VIRGINIA	
Beckley Post-Herald (d)	16,869
Wheeling News-Register (d)	25,153
Williamson News (d)	6,280
WISCONSIN	
Janesville Gazette (d)	17,341
Shawano Leader (d)	4,605
Wisconsin Rapids Tribune (d)	8,165
Total	390,008

* Used editorial with slight change in text and title changed to "Academic Freedom."

† Credited editorial to another paper.

— Title changed to "Where to Draw the Line." Slight change in text.

Of course these 59 papers and their 390,000 readers are only a fraction of those exploited by the pre-fab editorializing of E. Hofer & Son on behalf of their clients. These 59 were picked up by one clipping bureau in one month quite by accident because their editorial happened to mention the annual report of the President of Harvard. But it is something to think about that these 59 "editorials" which were all one "editorial" and that not an editorial but a propaganda sheet item, add up to more than all the news clippings on President Conant's report, which was nationally distributed by the press associations. More papers carried the twisted commentary of E. Hofer & Son than carried any news on the President's Report. No news account of the President's Report was found in any of these 59 papers. So all that these 59 communities got a chance to read of the annual report of Harvard's President was this perversion of it by E. Hofer & Son.

E. Hofer & Son found the President's Report applicable to their purposes. How many other people among the 390,000 readers of these 59 papers might have found it applicable to their interests, we don't know, but we know that none of them had a chance because all they had served to them was the capsule that E. Hofer & Son chose to twist to their purposes. The clippings on President Conant's report just happen to make the subject of our exhibit. On how many other subjects of public concern does the same state of affairs obtain?

The medical profession has a procedure for malpractice. So do the lawyers. There is an American Newspaper Publishers Association and an American Society of Newspaper Editors, and there are ethical codes for journalism sponsored by these and by state press associations. This exhibit is offered to any who accept any responsibility in these matters.

MAN AND NEWSPAPERMAN

by Walter H. Waggoner

So much is asked these days of moral responsibility by the press and so little of moral leadership by human beings that a listener is constrained to ask: is this moral quality supposed to be born out of the intercourse of human spirit and public trust, or spring, miraculous and full-blown, from the arrangement of type on the editorial page?

The one glaring consistency through all the demands for press responsibility is that those who complain the loudest about the awful state of human affairs rarely look into their own souls for the cause. They shift the blame to an impersonal scapegoat—what Stuart Chase has called a "blah," meaning Wall Street, Big Business, Government Regulation, Bureaucracy, the Press—and seek the remedy there. For all the looking, it is rarely found.

Something better than buck-passing, but something less than detached self-analysis, has been achieved, however, by three more or less recent attempts to get to the root of press weakness: two by groups of practicing newspapermen, a third by a committee of philosophers, theologians, historians, economists, attorneys, a banker and a poet, who qualify as readers of newspapers.

Of the newspapermen; one group—nine Nieman Fellows of 1945-46—unfolded their blueprint for a better press in their book, *YOUR NEWSPAPER*; the other is considering a new creed and list of editorial precepts for the already high-minded *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. The corps of distinguished readers is the Commission on Freedom of the Press, author of several searching volumes on the press and its practices.

Each party staked out its plot for investigation quite independently of the other, and there seems to have been no collision of the major claims so far. But they have left unexplored a separate, nearly virgin territory, offering great prizes behind its peripheral tangle of prejudice, mischief and ignorance. This is the area of personal morality; and personal morality, it seems hardly necessary to say, requires some cultivation before a full harvest of institutional morality can be got in. So far, the ground has hardly been broken.

This is not to say that "morality," as such, is ignored by the press critics. On the contrary, a "moral" press is the goal of all of them, and newspaper behavior is constantly being held up to the light of "moral standards" for the judging of it. But the manner of the individual is passed over quickly, and here may be the source of weakness in so much press criticism today.

The work partly of a moral philosopher (Prof. Hocking) and an eminent Protestant theologian (Dr. Niebuhr), the General Report by the Commission on Freedom of the Press came closest to identifying the character of the person with the character of the institution. It stated: "The outside forces of law and public opinion can in various ways check bad aspects of press performance, but good press performance can only come from the human beings who operate the instrumentalities." Ignored or overlooked, this little time-bomb went unmentioned in the critical comment about the General Report. It can be assumed no one takes such advice very seriously.

Perhaps an appeal for publishers and editors to be like Caesar's wife isn't realistic while "realistic" means cynical, hard-boiled and materialistic. Just how much more "realistic" is it to expect a reformed press to emerge from a minor change in the libel laws, an advertising restriction or two, a raise in pay for the reporters, or an occasional prosecution under the anti-trust act? Most critics seem to want the press always on the side of truth and beauty; none would suggest that the change might first come in the character of those who "operate the instrumentalities."

The forward-looking editors of the *Post-Dispatch* happen now to be preparing an even stronger editorial directive than the pithy admonition put in the masthead by the late John Pulitzer. What the *P-D* seems to be in for is a moral regimen for its news and editorial conduct that would do credit to an order of Jesuits. Praiseworthy, of course; this newspaper will set a pace for press standards that has never been equalled. But the apostles of this sort of standard for institutional responsibility will be the first to denounce as illiberal and authoritarian a similar code for human action.

This is not to argue for an authoritarian moral or ethical code, although the writer

would be happy to do so with a pitcher of beer at his right hand and a couple of hours before him. But what kind of cart-horse relationship is it to set up an inflexible moral criterion for a complex institution like the press before asking for some kind of measurement for the man who makes and runs it?

The relativism of human morality is a basic premise for modern skeptics. They cite the codes for Main Street, the Champs Elysees, the tribal places on the upper Amazon. But among these relativists are also the critics who expect the Soviet press to be comparable to ours (or vice-versa, who judge the owner-edited weekly paper of a corn-belt town in terms of the corporate daily of an Eastern metropolis, who condemn "partisanship" in one paper and propose "critical reporting" by another. Prof. Perry Miller remarked at a Nieman Dinner—the season's noisiest, it turned out to be, although a guest sized up the Niemans as "a bunch of Christers"—that relativism is a 'dogma itself, and one of the most insidious. Even more insidious and a good deal less honest is the practice by some of the press critics of talking the dogma of relativism from one side of the mouth and absolutism from the other.

In such a way, of course, is there honor among thieves and ethics among newspapermen. Here is the basic split between man and newspaperman. A reporter (or city editor or publisher—we play no favorites) who violates his marriage vows with ho-hum indifference is morally outraged by Edward Kennedy's breaking of a "hold for release."

Today there appear to be three popular ways of considering morals or morality, each of which can probably claim some credit for the status quo—the Negro preacher's "mess we're in." First, moral standards are an occasionally useful, but highly elastic yardstick, stretched to fit the crime. Second, they are old hat: good enough for Grandpa but not, as Dr. Kinsey has shown, good enough for me. Third, they are an academic measurement of behavior in a vacuum, but among "the facts of life."

The last may have been what Joseph Alsop had in mind when, at the aforementioned Nieman Dinner, he distinguished "moral" from "real" issues. The conclusion is inescapable: moral questions are illusory, morality a red herring drawn across arguments by fogies or theolo-

Walter H. Waggoner of the Washington bureau of the New York Times was a Nieman Fellow, 1947-8.

gians and of no earthly use. Realism, meaning the sordid, the self-seeking, the strategic, is our 20th century "truth."

This excursion into current vogues of moral criticism was not for sight-seeing purposes only. The point is, a lot of thoughtful people are demanding a firm moral framework in newspapers while dismissing as an "idealist" or tyrant anyone suggesting a mite of the same for man. Alfred North Whitehead might have had this duality in mind when he criticized us for "the self-satisfied dogmatism with which mankind at each period of its history cherishes the delusion of the finality of its existing modes of knowledge."

"Skeptics and believers are all alike," he wrote in his *ESSAYS IN SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY*. "At this moment scientists and skeptics are the leading dogmatists. Advance in detail is admitted; fundamental novelty is barred. This dogmatic common sense is the death of philosophic adventure. The Universe is vast."

If a moral framework is impossible for the human personality, about which the psychologist and his descendants know so much, is it impossible for that monstrous Hydra, the Press? This is not to say that reform is not worth trying. There is immense, almost unlimited room for

improvement, and it should be speedily undertaken. But why not also some thought to the human being? May not this be the only frontier left, demanding bold advances into human conduct and conscience by pioneering minds? And one of the wisest of recent books, Sir Norman Angell's *THE STEEP PLACES*, reminds us: "It may be true that we cannot 'change human nature,' but we can change human behavior and ideas."

That, spanned in one breath, is human aspiration since the birth of mankind. It is Prof. Whitehead's "philosophic adventure." Taken as counsel today, it can be the life of us all—and, incidentally, the Press.

MASSA'S IN DE COLD, COLD GROUND

THE FUNERAL OF MAN O' WAR

by William Stucky

Sometime soon Central Kentucky will unveil, with what the planners consider appropriate ceremonies, an heroic bronze of Man o' War, the race horse and sire whose death Nov. 1, 1947, stirred the Bluegrass as few deaths have. The statue, done by Sculptor Herbert Hazeltine, will command an acre-sized, open-air shrine, landscaped and moated, on Samuel M. Riddle's Faraway Farm near Lexington, where Man o' War lived and loved for 26 years.

The tribute first was planned on March 29, the great stud's birthday. But Sculptor Hazeltine's reluctance to leave France to supervise the final casting over here has held things up. It is expected, however, that when all is ready the panegyrics will be fitting. Faraway Manager Patrick O'Neill thinks it will be "big, very big"; the Lexington Board of Commerce is standing stoutly by, confident of receiving an invitation to take charge. Of one thing all parties are certain: cost is no consideration.

When the statue has been bared and the shrine fully dedicated, there will have been spent a handsome amount, estimated (by some who ought to know) at \$250,000. That sum includes everything, the land and improvements, the embalming and burying of the 1,100-pound body, the sculpting and casting, and the flowers that people were kind enough to send when the stallion was laid away.

If last fall's funeral sets the pattern for

this spring's unveiling, the coming event will be big, all right. The burying, even in a part of the country where horse cemeteries are commonplace, exceeded all expectations. Forty-five hundred people, answering to the call of press and radio, visited the farm either to attend the services or to see the carcass as the big chestnut "lay in state." People in the Bluegrass were proud of Man o' War's track record and considered him the greatest thoroughbred that ever lived; they made him an honorary citizen of the City of Lexington and were pleased when he became an honorary colonel in the Army's First Cavalry Division; they recognized him as the region's trademark in the tourist business and as the Board of Commerce's chief stock in trade. They knew there would be moaning at the bar. But it is to be doubted that even the horsiest among them were prepared for what came.

They might have expected something quiet and dignified. When Man o' War was brought to Lexington in 1921, Mr. Riddle thumbed down the Board of Commerce which had suggested a reception at which "little girls would spread flowers" just before the horse. Mr. Riddle had said, "Man o' War is just a horse."

In the 26 years since, 1,300,000 visitors had seen the big stud: his get had paid off on innumerable \$2.00 tickets. This time the Board of Commerce had its way and, if no flowers were spread, \$450 worth were banked around his grave.

Mr. Riddle himself set the stage for the burial. He set aside the horse's "private paddock" as a one-horse graveyard, had it landscaped and built a path leading to it

from the farm's main-entrance drive; he built a circular walk and at its outer edge he placed three equidistant mourners' benches; inside the moat he planned the grave which would be surmounted by Sculptor Hazeltine's statue. He imported a pedestal of New Hampshire blue granite for the statue. He had a coffin ready. Beyond these preparations, he seems to have been content to let the horse be buried in a routine manner.

A routine burial, however, did not satisfy the Board of Commerce; the horse's private physician, Doctor William McGee; Manager O'Neill and the local media of mass communications.

Doctor McGee, a member of the veterinary firm of Haygard and Haygard, saw the 30-year-old horse every day from the time he was withdrawn from public view in May until his death. He stayed all night several nights, expecting a fatal heart attack. When the third and last attack came on Friday, October 31, he "knew the end was about there." The big horse, after lying quietly in his stall all that night, fought to get up. Doctor McGee had instructions not to let Man o' War suffer. He administered sedatives and called Mr. Riddle long-distance for permission to cut short the horse's suffering. Mr. Riddle consented, and Doctor McGee cut it short.

Then he took the step that started it all: he called Mr. D. M. Lowe.

Mr. Lowe, one of Lexington's better-known morticians, had never embalmed a horse but he was willing to try. Doctor McGee assumed "Mr. Riddle felt nothing was too good for Man o' War."

Mr. Lowe received the news about mid-

William Stucky is city editor of the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, in the center of the Bluegrass country.

afternoon on that first day of November and with his assistant, Mr. William P. McCarney, headed out to Faraway Farm with what he hoped would be adequate equipment. Doctor McGee met them and took them into the stall. The horse was stretched on the floor where he had died. It was a good thing the doctor was there, Mr. Lowe learned, "because our embalming equipment was too small and we could never have done it without the doc's tools."

As it was, the job took a little under three hours. Both Mr. Lowe and Mr. McCarney thought this was pretty good time, all things considered. "We treated him just like a human being," Mr. McCarney said. Mr. Lowe explained this in terms of arteries and incisions. When they had finished they left him on his right side, "so it wouldn't show where we'd sewed him up."

Although Mr. Riddle himself, now 86, wasn't able to get down from his Chester Heights, Pennsylvania, home to inspect their handiwork, Mr. O'Neill termed it "a real nice job, a dandy job, none better." Mr. O'Neill had been with the horse "night and day" for the last month.

The embalming done, Mr. Lowe and Mr. McCarney went home, and Mr. O'Neill announced to the press that the horse would be buried on Monday.

The next morning, Sunday, Mr. Ed Wilder, executive secretary of the Board of Commerce, received the news of the precipitous burial in his morning paper. He immediately called Dr. McGee. By that afternoon Mr. O'Neill had decided to have the funeral Tuesday. Doctor McGee explained later that "Mr. Riddle was very reluctant to go ahead and do the thing right on such a big scale, but I told him I thought the people around here rather expected him to do the right thing by Man o' War." Mr. Riddle's decision was made easier by a heavy rainfall which made it impossible to get the grave dug by Monday anyway.

Doctor McGee's intercession was all the trade board needed. It announced immediately that Man o' War would be laid away at 3 P.M. Tuesday and would "lie in state" until then, beginning at Monday noon.

"The farm gates will then be opened to visitors until time for the interment," the press reported Monday. "Flowers may be sent after noon today."

This forewarning was followed by a raft of more detailed announcements issued in the name of Mr. Ira Drymon who, as chairman of the Board of Commerce's agricultural committee, was nominally "in charge of arrangements." Mr. Drymon later disclaimed any credit for originating the idea of a public funeral and gave all

credit to Mr. Wilder. Mr. Wilder, who had frequently been quoted as saying Man o' War "has done more for this community than any creature—human or animal," was equally self-effacing. "It had been planned for many years," Mr. Wilder said; it seemed "it was an outgrowth of various meetings of various groups." Mr. Wilder could be no more specific about the groups and also denied having said "in those words" that the horse had done most for the community. He added, however, he would like to know who had done more.

The announcements of arrangements did not fall on deaf ears. The two Lexington newspapers, three radio stations, and the wire services with local offices reported them with appropriate reverence. No detail, not even to the number of bottles of embalming fluid (23), escaped their notice. They pictured the handsome polished-oak casket, with its lining of black and yellow—Mr. Riddle's racing colors. They dwelt on descriptions of the graveyard, the walk leading up to which was "flanked by 30 pyramidal hornbeams, one for each year of Man o' War's life, although . . . O'Neill said this was only a coincidence." They gave unsparingly the preparations for the funeral, down to the last silent tribute which would be paid as two buglers sounded taps. The buglers would be furnished by the local American Legion's Man o' War Post.

By Tuesday, all race tracks then operating had been asked to "observe a moment of silence" at the hour set for the funeral. Word had been received that the First Cavalry Division, then in Tokyo, would stage an honorary retreat in memory of its honorary colonel. Already 2,500 people, falling in step with the Board of Commerce, the press and the radio, had filed through the Faraway horse barn to see the body. These the Lexington Herald described as a "steady stream of mourners."

In a very literal sense many of these people, sportsmen and swipes alike, were saddened by the death of a champion and the passing of an era, quite apart from the dollars and cents loss to the community. But by then what might have been just the burial of a horse had become a "final tribute" to the "most revered member of the equine family." It was also: "laid to rest," "lie in state," "last rites," "the eulogy," and "floral wreaths."

Faraway Farm lies about six miles from Lexington. By funeral time cars were lined up for more than a mile on either side of the entrance, and traffic was snarled as far back as the dilapidated Negro settlement which sprawls on either side of the road leading to the farm. Some 2,000 people were milling on the walk around the moat. Representatives of the

radio, press, and newsreel companies jockeyed for positions in the crowd. Life's photographer had three different cameras slung around his neck.

The coffin had been removed from the barn and placed at the end of the walk leading up to the moat, so that everyone approaching from the main entrance might get a look. Only the moat separated the coffin from the tremendous grave dug in the small sanctum sanctorum which the moat surrounded. It had been dug just at the foot of the blue granite pedestal.

Because of a slight miscalculation, the coffin was a few inches too small, and Man o' War lay cramped and foreshortened, like a child's drawing. His head rested on a large pad of cotton. A strip of black cloth had been placed over his genitalia.

An occasional spectator came up to the coffin, looked down and patted the wrinkled neck. Others reached over and plucked hairs from his tail. High above him, perched on the crane which—for \$800—was to hoist the coffin over the moat and into the grave, photographers clung precariously.

Beside the grave, Mr. Lowe, his undertaker's suit hidden by a pair of Army Air Force coveralls, moved in and out of the small crowd of performers and reporters. He helped arrange the "many floral tributes" and smooth the carpet of artificial grass his firm had supplied to cover the huge mounds of wet dirt at each side of the grave. Before the ceremonies got under way he removed the coveralls.

The agricultural committee of the trade board had taken pains to see that no segment of the community was denied a part in the services. It had picked two men to act for the Board of Commerce, three for the thoroughbred industry, two for the horse magazines and two for the family—Mr. O'Neill and Doctor McGee. They all spoke.

Mr. Drymon opened the ceremonies and announced that he would read the eulogy after the others had spoken. The local radio stations hesitated to describe him as "master of ceremonies" though he told the crowd later that he considered the occasion more a "celebration" than a funeral." He explained it was a celebration "expressing our appreciation for Man o' War's long and very useful life." While cameras ground and bulbs popped, he started the series of introductions.

Mr. Charles Sturgill, president of the Board of Commerce, praised Man o' War as a "citizen of Lexington," a "friend and benefactor" who had brought thousands of dollars to the city.

Mr. A. B. Hancock, Jr., president of the Thoroughbred Club of America and a director of the National Association of

Thoroughbred Clubs, rejoiced that, although the horse was dead, the blood-lines would be carried on.

Then came Mr. Leslie Combs, chairman of the Kentucky Racing Commission; Mr. Louis Lee Haggin, president of the Keeneland Race Course; Mr. J. A. Estes, editor of the Blood-Horse (Mr. Estes told of wiping away a tear as he wrote an editorial on the horse's death); Mr. Neville Dunn, editor of the Thoroughbred Record; and Mr. O'Neill and Doctor McGee.

The eulogy which Mr. Drymon read was a three-and-a-half-page, double-spaced resume of Man o' War's life.

When Mr. Drymon had finished, two members of the Man o' War Drum and Bugle Corps stepped forward. The corps' uniforms are jockey outfits, and for the occasion both were wearing Mr. Riddle's black and yellow silks. The first climbed to the top of one of the mounds of earth; the other stood on a plank spanning the moat. The first started taps.

The men's hats came off. A large grey-faced woman in red stood beside the coffin and wept. Several men knuckled their eyes.

The bugler finished and the hats were half-way up to the heads when his partner began the echo. The hats came down again, and the big woman cried some more.

The crane slowly moved into place, and a crew of farm hands swarmed up to bolt the lid down. There was a slight delay when the crane operator misjudged his distance and got the big box stuck at the edge of the grave. Someone passed a handkerchief up to Mr. Lowe who tied it to one of the handles. The owner wanted it buried with Man o' War. A workman, jumping into the moat to help unstick the coffin, slipped and fell in a puddle. It was the only time the crowd laughed.

The coffin down, the crowd trailed away, except for a dozen or so who stayed to flch bouquets from the bier of the "most-est" hoss." Kentuckians had done right by another of their heroes; Man o' War had joined the long list headed by Henry Clay and John C. Breckenridge.

Committee of Newspaper Industry Asked to Review First Nieman Decade

A newspaper committee to review and appraise the Nieman Foundation at the end of its tenth year was appointed by President James B. Conant of Harvard this Spring. The majority of its 14 members spent May 29th and 30th at Harvard hearing reports and asking questions about the Nieman Fellowships. They heard from President Conant, four deans, the Nieman Committee and several of the professors who have seen most of the Nieman Fellows. They lunched with President Conant, had dinner with a group of the faculty and a breakfast with the Council of the Society of Nieman Fellows and questioned a number of the former Fellows on the Council.

The Review Committee organized with Geoffrey Parsons, chief editorial writer of the New York Herald Tribune as chairman and Robert Brown, editor of Editor & Publisher, secretary. The other members who attended the Cambridge meeting were Mark Childs, Washington columnist, James B. Reston, diplomatic correspondent of the New York Times, Philip Graham, pub-

lisher, the Washington Post, Erwin Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor and president of the ASNE, Robert McLean, publisher, the Philadelphia Bulletin and president of the AP, Sevellon Brown, publisher, the Providence Journal, B. M. McKelway, editor, the Washington Star.

Later in the week two other members of the committee, Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, were in Cambridge and made their own inquiries. Mr. Ethridge had a conference on the subject with Pres. Conant.

The remaining members of the Review Committee, who could not attend the meeting in Cambridge but are expected to participate in a report by the whole committee at the completion of their inquiry are; Roy Roberts, publisher, the Kansas City Star; Palmer Hoyt, publisher, the Denver Post; Paul Smith, editor, the San Francisco Chronicle; and Virginius Dabney, editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch.

THE NIEMAN FELLOWS RESOLVE—

One week after the visit of the Newspaper Review Committee, the Society of Nieman Fellows at their reunion dinner, attended by 60 of the 122 Fellows, unanimously passed a resolution to be sent to the Review Committee. The resolution was introduced by Hodding Carter, the one Nieman Fellow on the Review Committee. The Resolution:

WHEREAS the Nieman Experiment has now concluded its tenth year, and
WHEREAS it was understood at the beginning of the Experiment that its results would be examined at the end of a stated period, and

WHEREAS such an examination has now been undertaken by a distinguished group of American journalists, now therefore
BE IT RESOLVED by the Society of Nie-

man Fellows here assembled,

THAT the Society record its gratitude to the Corporation of Harvard University and to President Conant for the hospitality of the University to this new experiment in American journalism and to its participants,

THAT the Society extend its appreciation that the Experiment, as conducted, has been of inestimable benefit to the Fellows and, in their judgment, to the practice of journalism in America, and

THAT the Society extend its appreciation and affection to Archibald MacLeish and Louis Lyons as the Curators of the Foundation who gave the Experiment shape and carried it successfully through the first ten years of its history to its present milestone.

The Cherokee Phoenix

by C. W. Gilmore

First Indian Newspaper Fought Losing Battle for Civil Rights

The story of the Cherokee Phoenix does not appear in any history of American journalism. This omission, of course, does not alter its status as the first Indian newspaper; nor does it detract from the little weekly's courageous fight for civil liberties. But the suppression of the Phoenix by military authorities in 1835 merits a place in any study of this country's free press tradition. For the Cherokee Phoenix was a minority newspaper and Indians, apparently, were not included in the Bill of Rights. The Phoenix has been conveniently forgotten.

The crime of the Cherokee Phoenix was its editorial opposition to the forced migration of 13,000 Indians from northwest Georgia. When the Cherokees finally were evacuated as prisoners in 1838, and sent down "the trail of tears" to the west, fully one-third perished on the unhappy journey. It was against this exodus that the Phoenix lifted a native voice of protest. The editorial campaign led eventually to the destruction of its press by Georgia National Guardsmen.

The first Indian newspaper became possible in 1825 when the general council of the Cherokee Nation officially adopted an alphabet invented a few years earlier by an illiterate half-breed named Sequoyah. The alphabet consisted of 85 characters, some of them English letters copied from an old newspaper, and some of them pure invention. But, as a phonetic transcription of the Cherokee vocabulary, Sequoyah's alphabet could be mastered reasonably well within three days of study.

The invention opened new vistas for the Cherokee Nation, which stoutly defended its independence on the basis of a constitution, patterned after the federal document. It had a popularly elected council, with legislative, judicial and executive branches. Trial by jury was guaranteed and, for a time, a representative of the Nation remained in Washington as ambassador.

The Cherokee capital was at New Echota, a log cabin, frontier town between Atlanta and Chattanooga. The village had become a seat of government for In-

dians who had been forced into the hills by encroaching white settlements to the south. Among the residents of New Echota was Dr. Samuel A. Worcester, a missionary from New England, who visualized Sequoyah's alphabet as a means of disseminating religious literature.

He urged, therefore, the establishment of a tribal newspaper, to be printed in the new syllabary. In 1825 he wrote the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions: "The Cherokees have for some time been very desirous to have a press of their own, that a newspaper may be published in their own language." But apparently the board took a dim view of the missionary's plan for nothing happened until several months had passed by. Then, on Oct. 15, 1825, the Cherokee Council authorized \$1,500 for the purchase of a press. The clerk of the council, a mission-educated Indian named Elias Boudinott, was chosen to procure the printing equipment. Even in this primitive wilderness, the council displayed unusual insight into one problem of newspaper operation. Boudinott was required "to keep a correct amount of travelling expense."

Boudinott took the \$1,500, a copy of the alphabet and, ostensibly, an expense ledger and went to Boston. There the Baker and Greene iron works agreed to build a press and cast two fonts of type, one in English and one in Cherokee. When Boudinott returned in 1826 he was appointed editor by the council at a salary of \$300 a year, to be paid quarterly. Again the Cherokees grasped a fundamental of newspaper production. They appointed Isaac H. Harris, as printer, at a salary of \$400 a year. Harris was given the power to employ a journeyman assistant, "of sober and studious habits," at \$300 a year—equal to Boudinott's pay.

By 1827 plans for the new paper had been completed. The council adopted a platform. The publication was to contain: "Laws and published documents of the Nation; accounts of the manners and customs of the Cherokees and their progress in education, religion and the arts of civilized life, with such notices of other Indians as our limited means of information will allow; the principal interesting events of the day; miscellaneous articles, calculated to promote literature, civilization and religion among the Cherokees."

The press and type were transported by water from Boston to Savannah, carried up the river to Augusta and then 200 miles by wagon into the hills of New Echota. The equipment was housed in a frame building, 20 by 24 feet, and there Harris and his "sober and studious" journeyman, John F. Wheeler, designed a Cherokee type case. Wheeler later described the equipment as follows:

"The press, a small royal size, was like none I ever saw before or since. It was cast iron, with spiral springs to hold up the plates, at that time a new invention. We had to use balls of deerskin stuffed with wool for inking, as it was before the invention of the composition roller."

From the outset the Cherokee Phoenix faced difficulties in obtaining newsprint, largely as a result of the remote isolation of New Echota. The first issue was delayed several weeks, while paper was brought overland from Tennessee, but finally appeared on Feb. 21, 1828. The Phoenix contained four pages, 21 by 14 inches, of five columns, half in English and half Sequoyah's Cherokee alphabet. The masthead, with its legend "Protection," bore a picture of the mythical Phoenix. In his first editorial, Editor Boudinott wrote optimistically:

"We would now commit our feeble efforts to the good will and indulgence of the public, hoping for that happy period when all the Indian tribes of America shall arise, Phoenix-like, from the ashes, and when the terms Indian Depredation, Warwhoop, Scalping Knife, and the like, shall become obsolete, and forever buried deep underground."

The subscription rate was \$2.50 a year, if paid in advance, and \$2.00 a year if the subscriber could read only the Cherokee language. Readers were invited to procure six subscriptions and receive a seventh free of charge. The advertising schedule began at 75 cents "per square" for the first insertion, 37½ cents for each continuance and "longer ones in proportion."

Boudinott undertook to print all the laws of the Cherokee Nation, in serial form, along with new legislation. His formula included excerpts from English literature, exchanges from other newspapers (the Phoenix exchanged on an equal basis with the London Times, among

others), a lost and found column, political announcements from council candidates, farm news, poetry and legal notices from husbands no longer responsible for the debts of their wives. The state of Georgia recognized the Phoenix as an official organ and inserted advertising in it.

But Boudinott's strong editorial voice was felt from the beginning. His sentiments, indeed, were often too strong for his fellow Cherokees. Just nine months after the first issue, the council stepped in. "The editor is hereby required," the council declared, "to withhold from the columns of the Phoenix scurrilous communications which may have a tendency to excite and irritate personal controversies."

But a month later, on Dec. 27, 1828, the Georgia legislature unilaterally described the Cherokees as tenants at will, concluded that the state could take possession at any time and ordered the Indians to evacuate northwest Georgia within a year. The state maintained that the Cherokees were a semibarbarous tribe, encumbering the land of the state and blocking the advance of civilization. The legislature politely ignored the liberal constitution of the Cherokee Nation, with its guarantee of freedom.

Boudinott was undaunted. He continued his editorial campaign and on March 4, 1829, wrote: "The paper is sacred to the cause of the Indians, and the editor will feel himself especially bound, as far as his time, talents and information will permit, to render it as instructive and entertaining as possible to his brethren, and endeavor to enlist the friendly feelings and sympathies of his subscribers abroad, in favor of the aborigines."

A series of misfortunes now beset the Phoenix. In addition to the difficulties in obtaining paper, which caused the omission of several issues, Boudinott was confronted with bad mail service. Mail from New Echota was handled by post rider. The March 4th issue, for example, fell from the saddle of the post rider and remained submerged for seven hours in Holly Creek. The postmaster at Spring Place, however, promised to dry out the papers and attempt delivery.

Shortly thereafter John Wheeler, the journeyman printer of sober and studious habits, married an Indian maid and left for a honeymoon of three weeks. The Phoenix suspended entirely during Wheeler's absence, but upon resumption modestly attributed the hiatus to a delay in the shipment of ink.

Although but 26 years of age when he became editor of the Phoenix, Boudinott was plagued by ill health and missed is-

suages occasionally for that reason. He ran into difficulties even with his chief printer and wrote a friend on one occasion, "You will see by the Phoenix that we have had a change of printers, the former printer, Mr. Harris, who is a Methodist by religious profession, has occasioned me a great deal of vexation. He has been secretly circulating falsehoods xxxxx his conduct became intolerable." Boudinott finally received authority from the council to fire Harris but, wrote the editor, "he returned to me a very insolent answer and declared he would not deliver the office except by force." Harris was evicted by the Cherokee marshal, on orders of the council.

In 1831, apparently referring to Printer Wheeler, Boudinott wrote editorially: "Let our patrons bear in mind that we are in the woods, and as it is said by many, in a savage country, where printers are not plenty, and therefore they must not expect to receive the Phoenix regularly for a while, but we will do the best we can xxx This week, we present to our readers but half a sheet. The reason is, one of the printers has left us; and we expect another, who is a white man, to quit us soon, either to be dragged to the Georgia penitentiary for a term of not less than four years, or for his personal safety to leave the Nation, to let us shift for ourselves. Thus is the liberty of the press guaranteed."

The forced evacuation which the Georgia legislature had ordered was slower in coming than was threatened, due to court litigation in behalf of the Indians. But eventually the United States Government upheld the Georgia position and Boudinott tempered his editorial attacks. He urged in 1832 that the determined attitudes of the state and the nation compelled the Indians to consider the question of removal. Apparently Boudinott, in failing health, was resigning himself to the inevitable.

As his editorial campaign slackened in vigor, Boudinott incurred the wrath of John Ross, the Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation. Ross had been instrumental, as head of the Nation, in establishing the Phoenix but he was the leading landowner of the Cherokees. Indeed, as a farmer and merchant, Ross was at the time one of the wealthiest men in Georgia. Evacuation of the territory would cost him everything. He was in no mood to temper the fight against the state of Georgia.

Ross soon ordered Boudinott to publish only the sentiment against evacuation, undoubtedly the prevailing wish of most of the Cherokees. But Boudinott was unwilling to do this. He contended that he should prepare the Nation for the event-

ual movement to the west and, if possible, ameliorate the conditions. Boudinott resigned as editor of the Phoenix in September, 1832 and the council immediately appointed as the new editor Elijah Hicks, brother-in-law of Principal Chief Ross.

Hicks restored the Phoenix as an outspoken voice for Cherokee independence. Boudinott remained in peace at New Echota and was one of the Cherokee leaders who signed a treaty that provided for removal to the west. His sincere, but ill-advised, action cost him his life four years later, after the evacuation. He was killed with knives and hatchets.

Meanwhile, Hicks and the Cherokee Council waged a diplomatic and journalistic war against Georgia authorities until it appeared that New Echota would be taken by force. The Phoenix suspended publication on May 31, 1834 to enable the council to smuggle the equipment across the border into Red Clay, Tenn. However, Georgia Guardsmen were ordered into New Echota and in October, 1835, they seized the plant.

Apparently Georgia authorities used the equipment for a time printing propaganda material. Chief Ross complained to the Secretary of War early in 1836 that the press was being "used by the agents of the United States in publishing slanderous communications against the constituted authorities of the Cherokee Nation." However, when the evacuation began in 1838 the printing plant of the Cherokee Phoenix had long been destroyed.

Although a free Indian press died with the Phoenix, the Cherokees published a supervised successor in the form of the Cherokee Advocate after they had been removed to Tahlequah, Okla. The Advocate continued from 1844 until 1906, when the tribal government was dissolved.

Oklahoma Headline

It seems to me that some sort of special award should go to the Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman for the headline it put on the story announcing Jim Curley's opposition to the renomination of Harry Truman. The Oklahoman's head: **CURLEY BITES HAND THAT FREED HIM.** The head, incidentally, appeared on the front page of the copy of the Oklahoman which won second place in the N. W. Ayer Typographical Contest. I don't know whether it had anything to do with it.

Regards,
Harry S. Ashmore
Editor,
Arkansas Gazette

Some of My Best Friends Were Pirates

The Story of Consul Reeves of Macao

by Robert Shaplen

When the war in the Pacific ended and the attention of correspondents was mainly directed at the occupations of Japan, Korea and North China, one of the neglected areas was the lower China coast and Southeast Asia. Months later, weary of the cold of Manchuria (both literally and with regard to Russian reception committees) and of the red-tape barrages in Tokyo, some American writers began to turn their eyes to Hong Kong and warm points south. A lot of them promptly disappeared for weeks and were subsequently found chasing elephants in Indo-China or cornering the silver market in Siam. A few set about earnestly covering the intricate political quarrels that arose out of the fights between the old colonial powers and the new driving native nationalist movement. By the time any of them ran into John Powell Reeves, the downholds from the home offices had begun to pour in, with the result that one of the best feature stories of the war in the Orient went begging.

Reeves, by then, had become something of a South China legend. Officially, he had been, throughout the war, His Britannic Majesty's Consul in the Portuguese colony of Macao, just south of Hong Kong. Unofficially, he was a smuggler, a spy, an illegal emigration expert, a relief administrator, a lover of pirates, and an all-around Jap-hater. He also was the secret editor of a newspaper.

In the early Spring of '46 I went by steamship from Hong Kong to Macao to see him before he started on his trip back to England. I found him in a light-colored shirt and white shorts, wearing pale-rimmed glasses, with his feet up on his desk as he sorted through stacks of papers, trying to explain what they all meant to his successor, a clipped old-school British army officer just turned diplomat, whose name, it seemed quite properly, was Gordon Hill-Murray. Reeves invited me to have a drink and lunch. As the only Allied representative during hostilities between New Guinea and Chungking or Vladivostok, he had also represented American interests in the colony, in which capacity he was to lend me twenty pounds

two days later when I got stranded during a typhoon.

He lived on the waterfront in a stone house that was more than 100 years old and was filled with strangely carved Portuguese furnishings. When the war began he told me, he had been offered a chance to leave Macao and go home, but that, he said proudly, "would not have been in the best traditions of the service." A year before Pearl Harbor the British had the foresight to install a career man in the job, and Reeves regarded it as a duty to stay there. "The Foreign Office is no fool, you know," he advised me.

In January, 1942, his whole staff had consisted of a slim Portuguese girl named Micas Gonsalves, who was still with the consulate. By the time peace came, according to a framed chart on the wall he explained to me, he had 150 Chinese, Portuguese and Hindus working for him.

With this nucleus, Reeves had provided food and relief for some 10,000 persons in Macao—Portuguese-British citizens, Chinese refugees from Hong Kong who were former British government servants, some Filipinos and a miscellaneous group of Indians and Malaysians stranded there. This smooth-functioning staff also established and ran schools and offered medical and nursing care, in addition to carrying out a variety of specialized activities from time to time, such as arranging rendezvous with the famous Chinese south sea pirates when Reeves wanted to smuggle someone to Yenping, a small pocket of Free China about eight hours by junk from Macao. Among those he got out in this fashion were four Navy fliers off the carrier Lexington, who were shot into the sea in January, 1945, picked up by fishermen and smuggled into Macao under the noses of the Japs, and then smuggled out again to safety.

Reeves never dealt with the pirates directly because it would have left him open to Jap charges that he was transgressing his consular duties. But he had his "agents" get in touch with the friendly pirate chiefs through Chungking loyalists; and a night or two later the buccaneer selected would put into Macao, flying a Jap flag to allay suspicion. Reeves' guest would slip aboard and be in Allied territory by morning. "The pirates were my best friends," Reeves summed it up simply.

The incident involving the Lexington fliers, however put an end to another of Reeves' activities—his editorship of the Macao Tribune. This dated back to July, 1943, when, as Reeves put it, he and three Portuguese friends started the paper partly as "amusement" but mostly "to get out a little propaganda."

At first it was a twelve-page weekly, but it soon developed into a four-page daily. Reeves got almost all his news over the radio, but—as with all newspapers in Macao as well as in Portugal—all copy had to be censored. And the censor further insisted that the demands of Portuguese neutrality be met by giving equal headlines and equal space to both sides.

While the Macao Tribune dealt freely with Allied victories the world over, Reeves managed generally to limit his Japanese coverage to such features as the story of the baseball prowess of one of the Japanese officers in Macao. But he made his mistake in handling the story of the Lexington raid. As a result of a briefing lapse, the American planes strafed the Macao harbor and did some \$500,000 damage to the port, including the blowing up of a valuable gasoline dump. Reeves' deadpan account of the attack in his paper (all bylined, of course, but the Portuguese knew who was responsible) was written in a masterful tone of British understatement. It had none of the Latin passion that had been aroused in the Portuguese over the disappearance of the gasoline et al, and the Macao censor decided that this failure to condemn the attack was grounds for banning the paper, which he promptly and irrevocably did. Reeves took back to England with him the files, though, and some day they may be valuable historical evidence, or at least an interesting compendium of Macao-iana.

Reeves was also a writer of limericks, and he published them in the paper once a week. From his neutral vantage point in the center of the Japs, quickly won but loosely held empire, this one he showed me seemed especially apropos:

"The makers and printers of maps
Are really the brainiest chaps,
To me it's a mystery
How they keep up with history
Without suffering a mental collapse."

Probably one of the reasons the Japs never lodged a protest against Reeves

was because they were engaged in too many shenanigans and plots there themselves. They used Macao all during the war as a place to speculate with foreign exchange, to buy wolfram from collaborationist Chinese, to conduct espionage, and for gambling and relaxation. At one time or another, the Japs were offering Chinese trigger-men between 30,000 and 60,000 Portuguese patacas (\$6,000 to \$12,000 U. S.) for the head of His Britannic Majesty's Consul.

"When the price was only 30,000, I didn't mind going out," Reeves said, sipping a glass of Pym's on the porch, "but when it went to 60,000 I stayed home and learned fencing." He added that once his car was tampered with so that when he turned the ignition on the wires went white hot, and on another occasion the Japs left an unsuccessful time bomb outside his house. Finally, at the request of the Macao police, Reeves wore a gun around the town. "I was a little miffed,"

he said, "because the chief of police had 75,000 patacas on his head and I never got above sixty."

One of Reeves' big headaches during the war was the matter of getting money. The Portuguese were all for helping him, since the pounds that were wired to Reeves via Lisbon backed them in printing patacas in Macao. Reeves had radio contact with the British embassy in Lisbon and his monthly relief remittances were usually prompt, but he had considerably greater difficulty getting anything out of the State Department in Washington. Much of what he got from abroad found its way into the hands of the pirates, who smuggled in rice and other foods for Reeves' dispensing staff from Canton and various mainland spots.

When the typhoon that struck Macao during my visit was over, Reeves and I left on the same ship for Hong Kong, where he was to board a carrier that would take him back to England and a

new assignment. The send-off he got was a sentimental tribute to what he had done for Macao and its people.

The governor and all the prominent Portuguese, as well as Chinese, came down to the trim little pier in mid-morning to bid him God-speed. They stood on the dock, a brave little band in their Sunday best, and sang "For he's a jolly good fellow" as the boat wheezed and whistled and slid gently away. Attired in a white suit, Reeves stood on deck and waved to them, and I saw there were tears in his eyes. When the ship passed by the Consulate on the ocean side of the peninsula, Reeves dipped his flag which had been attached to the halyards, and Hill-Murray responded from the Consulate ashore. It was all very protocol and formal, but when it was over Reeves took off his coat and tie and slumped in a deck chair with a tall glass of beer. "I don't care if that carrier gets back to England by way of the North Pole," he said. "I need a rest."

EDITORIALS--Whether, Why and Whither

by Rebecca F. Gross

Newspapers should print editorials, and write them so they will be read, it was agreed at the first annual meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers. Nobody contradicted the proposition that editorial pages in American newspapers ought to be more varied, stimulating and original than they are.

The published transcript of on-the-record talk at three sessions of the new organization of editorial page people reflects general opinion, of speakers and rank-and-file participants in the discussions, that most current editorial pages are pretty pale blueprints of what they could become.

As for the remedies and recommendations, these were the chief prescriptions for improvement:

Get the editorial writers out into the hurly-burly, to seek facts and impressions at first hand, let them get acquainted with the human race and learn to talk to it as if they knew it as a guy named Joe.

Stir up editorial writers to show more spunk in educating their publishers to a better appreciation of editorial responsibility, to make editorial pages as free as news pages from publisher bias and interference.

The givers of this advice admitted that it does not apply with full force to the one-man practitioners who handle the editorial pages of smaller newspapers, or to the editor-publisher who runs his own double-barrelled show—but the members of the conference were predominantly from the 75 largest cities in the country, and there were forty or fifty men from smaller dailies to testify to the validity of the suggestions.

The isolation of many editorial writers from their readers and from direct contact with the sources of information was blamed for a tendency toward pontificating on general subjects, in language cluttered with cliches.

The conference did not go much beyond the diagnosis of major ills and the proposal of some specific remedies in its discussion of greater effectiveness for editorials and editorial pages in American newspapers. It moved right up to the threshold of a dynamic idea, however, and set up direction signs which may lead the second national Conference into a stimulating exploration of the techniques of an editorial leadership which would "cover" the ideas, interests, needs, and overall activities of its community of readers, as thoroughly and conscientiously as news columns cover the news.

a funeral oration and wound up with a keynote speech, providing two sound texts on which other speakers helped preach the sermons.

"Why have editorials at all?" he wanted to know, as he condemned the average editorial page as monotonous and pedestrian, objected to the practice of making editorial writers out of reporters who are "weak in the legs," and kicked about editorial pronouncements that straddle the fence instead of taking a stand. Then he cut loose with the first expression of the two best items of sound advice to come out of the discussion.

"Get out of the office" was his first admonition to editorial writers. Other speakers rang useful changes on that theme—suggesting teams of editors and reporters working together, editorials written by reporters, trips by editorial staffs to visit community institutions, and other stratagems for bringing editorial writers out of the sanctum and into the street.

Mencken's second piece of wise counsel was the reminder that the true aim of the editorial page is to "appeal to the intelligent reader in his most intelligent mood." This notion, too, was echoed by others, who urged more expert illumination of specific problems, designed to inform and convince the people who can initiate action. The fallacy that the influence of an editorial page is measured by the number of its readers got very brief

Rebecca F. Gross has just completed a Nieman Fellowship to return to the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express where she is editor of both the news and editorial pages.

Guest-starring at the first of the open sessions, Henry L. Mencken started with

attention; the discussion of editorial campaigns offered plenty of evidence that community action can be instigated by reaching the right people with convincing facts and figures, rather than by convincing all the readers.

The plan of the first Conference of Editorial Writers was a good basic groundwork for developing future programs of continuing usefulness.

The first of the three open sessions covered in the stenographic notes dissected a cross-country selection of editorial pages. The surgery was done by Ralph Coghlan of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Philip Wagner of The Baltimore Sun, Will C. Conrad of the Milwaukee Journal, and M. R. Ronald of the Mitchell, S. D., Republic. Speaking in a room whose walls were covered with the exhibits—all published on the same hot day in August—the four clinicians spared no tender feelings. Publishers caught some of their criticisms for editorial weaknesses, but the writers were handed a rather generous share of the blame for wishy-washy comment, sloppy writing, lack of real information, a preponderance of general rather than specific subjects, and a rash of high-sounding views on economic and political matters at the expense of local and state issues, human interest, humor, historical, literary and social-minded topics.

The post-mortem revealed some healthy conditions, too, and the critics were cheered by discovering enough editorial vitality, in large papers and small, to warrant their conclusion that editorial writers can cure a good many of their current faults by shaking the lead out of their pants and running up a bigger bill for telephone tolls to collect specific facts for stimulating opinions.

The stark experience of seeing their editorial pages tacked up on the wall probably was one of the most salutary events of the conference for the editorial writers—some of whom begged for a little advance notice of the next such display. The array was an appropriate backdrop for discussions of the overuse of syndicated columnists and monotonous typographical display of editorial comment and features—both subjects on which more discussion is promised at future sessions of the Conference.

The headaches and satisfactions of editorial campaigns for municipal reform, described with chapter and verse, by Robert Lasch of the Chicago Sun, John H. Crider of the Boston Herald, and Richard B. Fowler of the Kansas City Star, boiled down into a set of principles which has

Harvard Man Defined

A correspondent who prefers that he remain anonymous has submitted material designed to throw more light on the character of the Harvard man. A new edition of the Harvard catalogue that lists the names of all graduates was distributed recently and our correspondent, walking through the reading room of the New York Harvard Club, heard a distinguished looking gentleman explain to his friend: "What I say is, if a man's in here, that's who he is. If he isn't, who is he?"

N.Y. Herald Tribune

been tried and found dependable by the Main Street School of editorial writers who live among their readers.

Editorial effectiveness, they testified, requires a nice balance between nagging and persistence, good timing to create the climate of public opinion in which things can happen, educating the public while things are cool so you can strike when the iron is hot, development of an editorial philosophy which is consistent but not static, combination of news coverage and editorial comment, backstage encouragement of other factors in the community instead of too much blatant newspaper leadership, and sacrificing the editorial splash for the quiet approach when that appeal can get closer to the goal. The kernel of their joint advice was that local newspaper campaigns accomplish most when they are conducted as part of an education, community leadership, and general editorial philosophy of constant news-editorial cooperation to create the fertile soil from which successful municipal crusades can grow.

Problems of creating variety on the editorial page, discussed by Donovan H. Richardson of the Christian Science Monitor, editorial background as seen by W. H. Grimes of the Wall Street Journal, and letters to the editor viewed by Paul H. Trescott of the Philadelphia Bulletin, split the conferring editorial writers into concurrent discussions. Such ideas fell into the hopper as the use of editorial pictures and illustrations, tying in book reviews with editorial comment and news coverage, feature stories filling in the background of editorials and news, and the development of new techniques for discussing social and political movements in terms of the individual reader.

Editorial writers should be men filled with curiosity and the eagerness to know, they should work ahead of the news instead of behind it, and, as they gain specialized knowledge, they should fight to keep their vocabularies free of the jargon

of that specialized knowledge—and given these qualities, they can produce the varied, informed editorial pages the American press should offer. On that, the speakers got together—with Mr. Trescott tossing in the sage comment that editorial writers could do worse than note the variety of subject matter and the human literary style of those who write letters to the editor.

Women writing editorials received kudos from half a dozen voluntary witnesses, who said the gals do know how to get readers interested in editorials. One gallant editor reported that he had a woman on his staff who "could think like a man." The lady probably waylaid him when he got back to the office to ask "what man?" and suggest a raise.

The editorial writers did not leave Washington without the customary off-the-record sessions with the president and other government officials which are part of nearly every capital convention. They heard a discussion of atomic energy and talked about background on foreign policy with State Department spokesmen. Other odd corners in the conference program were filled in with informal powwows on the one-man editorial page, what to do with columnists and the value of readability studies. From these sessions, it seems, may develop some of the agenda for the second annual conference.

Three grass-roots suggestions popped to the surface in the fre-for-all discussions. Some of the editors want an avenue for the exchange of their editorial opinions, some want a more concentrated source of information than they feel is now available for developing their own background on major affairs, and some would like to see some sort of between-sessions contact maintained for carrying on discussions in the off-season.

No very satisfactory plan for exchanging editorial viewpoints was offered—the best that came to light was the suggestion that the AP and UP should gather editorial comment from their members and clients. It would seem more practical for an organization like the Conference, when it becomes better established, to set up a committee to get out a periodical mimeographed bulletin covering outstanding editorial comment from the nation's press, large and small, and perhaps, in time, making it available on a subscription basis to the public.

The conference discussion of sources of information for editorial writers failed to bring out the important point that independent editorial viewpoints cannot be developed by editorial writers who seek the

standard source. It did point up the inescapable truth that the editorial writer who wants to be well-informed has a difficult self-education job to do daily. Mr. Grimes, who was leading the discussion when this subject came up, left it the only way it could be left—with the admission that there is no fact-fountain where an editorial writer can drink to make himself infallible.

The value of an organization like the Conference of Editorial Writers, particularly if it can develop a between-conventions method of communication for its

members—including those who can't get to the sessions—is potentially limitless. Between a hundred and 150 editorial writers showed up for the first meeting, representing a fair proportion of the large newspapers of the country and a sprinkling of the smaller ones. From dailies alone, there should be a potential membership of 2,500, for whom the Conference could do an excellent job of stimulating, educating, arousing and jacking up. The people who write the editorial opinions of the nation not only need to get out of the ivory tower to rub shoulders with

opinion-in-the-making, but to strike sparks from each other to engender the variety, the diversity and the originality some critics rightfully claim is lacking in certain segments of the American press.

Just guessing at the possibilities, one can hope and expect that the Conference can accomplish a great deal, too, in earning proper prestige for the newspaper opinion of the country, and in convincing the business and news departments of the newspapers themselves that adequate editorial leadership is a vital part of the job for a democratic free press.

Ralph L. Crosman--Crusader for Responsible Journalism -- 1885-1948

Ralph L. Crosman

The University of Colorado never had a more conscientious faculty member, nor the newspaper profession a more devoted friend than Ralph L. Crosman. The death of the college of journalism's director creates a sorrowful impact throughout the state. The void will not be filled easily.

Mr. Crosman was equally forceful as champion and critic of the nation's press. Both roles went effectively hand-in-hand. His critical observations of the Fourth Estate were sometimes so biting as to elicit strong objections from editors and publishers, but those who knew Ralph Crosman best realized that his censure of certain policies and practices sprang from a heart full of love for newspapers and newspaper people. So sincere was he that he dared to risk the ire of the industry in order to try to elevate its stature.

In his thousands of students over a quarter-century, Professor Crosman inculcated not only a valuable technical knowledge but a splendid idealism. He did as much as any journalism educator in the nation to enrich the character of the press. Indicative of his nature and aims was that the course in which he seemed to take the fondest interest was one on newspaper ethics.

From a single professional course 25 years ago, Mr. Crosman developed a full-fledged college of journalism. He lived to see his department observe its silver anniversary and then, the very next day, died with what must have been an immense and deserved sense of pride. In his service to the University of Colorado and to the press of Colorado and the

nation, Ralph Crosman erected an enduring monument to his memory.

Editorial by Robert C. Looney in Boulder (Colo.) Daily Camera, May 3.

Professor Crosman's Work

Twenty years ago Ben Hecht and Charles MacArthur wrote "The Front Page," a play which accurately portrayed newspapermen's anti-social practices in Chicago and other American cities. Curtis R. MacDougall of the Medill School of Journalism, speaking at the Newspaper Week in Boulder, stated that the play was recently revived and proved a failure. It no longer rang true.

It is Dr. MacDougall's contention, and we agree with him, that schools of journalism have elevated the standards of the profession since 1928. We no longer tolerate the behavior of old-time big-city reporters and city editors. We do not even recognize "The Front Page" as ever having been accurate, so marked has been the improvement in newspaper standards.

The day following Dr. MacDougall's speech, death came to Prof. Ralph L. Crosman, director of the College of Journalism at the University of Colorado. Mr. Crosman sent his first graduates out into the world 25 years ago, and he has inspired countless young journalists every year since. Thru his teachings he set a standard of ethical journalism which none of his students has forgotten or ignored.

But this is not all. Mr. Crosman did not hide himself in a classroom. He stormed about the nation, calling upon the oldsters—both publishers and editors—to mend their ways. That he struck close to home was evident by the fury which his preachments met in some quarters.

A few other hardy professors of journalism joined the crusade. One does not have to be very aged to realize that a new attitude of public trusteeship now exists in most newspaper offices.

A man as active in mind and body as Prof. Crosman always has another job ahead. Yet it seems to us that he must have felt on the eve of his passing that he had reached the climax of his career. He had started a college and a stream of thought in motion which will be a monument to his memory. He leaves a thousand men and women imbued with the philosophy that journalism can help make democracy operate by providing reliable news and proper interpretation.

Editorial by Houstoun Waring in Littleton (Colo.) Independent, May 7.

Ralph Crosman's Loss

I thought you might be interested in the death of Ralph Crosman, director of the University of Colorado school of journalism. You may remember I called your attention to Editor & Publisher's attack on him about a year ago after he had spanked the lords of the press at the ANPA convention. His demise is a great loss to liberals and honest journalists in the Rocky Mountain area. He was one of the few men with courage and ability to stand up in public and tell the press what ailed it and make recommendations. As a result some of the people at the Denver Post and a good many others called him a "radical." It was after his address to the Wyoming Press association that an old moss-back made the remark, "I'd rather be punk than pink."

Ernest H. Linford
Salt Lake Tribune

Review--

One Man's Story of Tito's Land

by George Weller

The SILENT PEOPLE SPEAK. By Robert St. John. Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 397 pp. \$4.

They don't pretend in Yugoslavia that they have a one hundred percent democracy, and Bob St. John doesn't pretend it either. His book has taken a general pasting from the most ardent anti-Communists among the reviewers. The pro-Communists have found its soft impeachment of the dictatorship of Tito wholly palatable, thus pinning another red tag on it.

It seems to me a warm and generally reasonable treatment from a point of view about ten degrees right of Wallace, far more colorful, and considerably more candid. Wallace went to Palestine as the guest of the Jewish Agency and came out what you would expect. At least St. John paid his own way in Yugoslavia.

Our postwar honeymoon was shorter in Yugoslavia than elsewhere. St. John went around in the country of his longest experience as a foreign correspondent while UNRRA (72% American money) was being strewed generously across the landscape. He didn't quite catch the period of support of the Greek guerillas by the Slavs, so there's no mention of Bulkes—if there is I missed it—Tito's training ground for the Greek Communist guerillas.

But there is an industriously gathered hoard of flow-of-consciousness stories about literally every part of Yugoslavia. There are scores of anti-Mihailovic stories, about the horrors worked by the Chetniks. They will rile Ray Brock and set R. H. Markham's teeth on edge; they will please Connie Poulos. I don't think Bob looked under every rock to find the complementary record of Tito's partisans. If he didn't, it's not only because the opposition is in jail. It's also because the fire of the Partisans, their self-conviction, their Slavic lack of doubt and their buoyancy carried him along with them.

In the Stalinist struggle to convert the world war into a class war, successful in Eastern Europe because of America's political indifference and economic generosity, Yugoslavia came out a military dictatorship, like Poland. But we are in some danger of thinking of these countries as purely police states, as though the atmosphere of terror is alike for all. The youth

armies, the zeal of the ex-partisans themselves, are a denial of this view. The Slav satellites have also a hard, earnest drive fundamentally anti-western, yet progressive in an Asiatic sense. St. John has captured it.

It is the practice of Communist apologists, including the minority on the faculty of Harvard, to take advantage of the general ignorance of the Balkans to pretend that Yugoslavia never was a democracy in any sense. St. John doesn't quite try to sell this fiction. But he certainly lets it be understood that the bourgeois business men's state that built Belgrade was no better than Tito's and he implies that it was a lot worse.

And the word "Communist" is avoided everywhere. St. John's enemies would consider this a Machiavellian device, I guess. My impression is that the reason is simply that the label has been avoided in Yugoslavia itself, and to flaunt the term would be like using "capitalistic" over and over in describing America. (In Poland the Communist Party does not exist, officially.) The Communist Party is there, all right, but nobody mentions it.

St. John tickles up the ikonism of Tito, the stupidity of the untrained bureaucracy, the labyrinthine meandering nature of a Serbocrat conversation. But he forgives all their gumshoeing because they have ardor.

He loves Yugoslavia as much now as he always has, probably more. He seems to feel that a great new power has been released here and that the progress is worth the price. He has travelled hundreds of miles over Yugoslavia before making up his mind. How he wangled his visa, I don't know; I got plenty of cordial promises but no visa after repeated efforts in Washington and Prague last summer. I don't exclude that St. John may not be right about Yugoslavia until I find out what pull you have to possess in order to get a visa.

Personal note to Bob; Those things that gave you the 79 bites two inches across in Uzice weren't fleas. They were b-d-b-gs.

Regrets To the Chicago Daily News

Professor Zechariah Chafee Jr. and the editor of the Nieman Reports were both distressed to learn that the editor of the Chicago Daily News interpreted a passage in Prof. Chafee's article, "The Press Under Pressure" in our April issue as a slap at that paper. It was not so intended and both Prof. Chafee and the editor of Nieman Reports were surprised to discover that it could be so read. The passage in point read: "Comic strips, colored cartoons, boiler plate editorials,—we don't know what will happen next." This was intended by Prof. Chafee as a general criticism of newspaper tendencies. But it followed hard on the heels of a sentence that referred to the Chicago Daily News and it was unfortunate that it was not separately paragraphed. So far as either Prof. Chafee or Nieman Reports know, colored cartoons and boiler plate editorials cannot be ascribed to the Chicago Daily News and the remaining item—comic strips—could be ascribed to most newspapers. It is a matter of regret to both author and editor that the unhappy sequence of sentences made it possible to read the passage as a slight to the Chicago Daily News, a paper toward which Nieman Reports entertains only pleasant and respectful feelings.

A Clearer Guide To Chilton Bush

In its last issue Nieman Reports used a clipping from the New Yorker under the head "A Clear Guide" which dealt sharply with Dr. Chilton Bush, head of the department of journalism at Stanford University for a quoted observation of his that "A publisher is smart to take a poll before he gets his neck out too far." A friend of Dr. Bush urged us to read more of his talk about the uses of polls. We did and now feel the New Yorker clipping was less than just to Dr. Bush, who also remarked "Don't get the idea that I advocate picking a winner." That is the idea the New Yorker did get and that Nieman Reports got from them. It is pleasant to find that Nieman Reports needs to correct its record and report that Dr. Bush is not advocating what the New Yorker called "a clear guide to the life of expediency."

THE NEWSPAPERS' BLIND SPOT

Closed to Criticism of the Business System Says a Liberal Writer

by Nathan Robertson

There probably is no more futile occupation than attempting to "prove" charges against the press. Offer as much evidence as you will, someone will come up with evidence on the other side, which is convincing at least to him. There are too many newspapers, and too many stories in each newspaper every day to permit any final proof that is beyond rebuttal.

It's a little like trying to prove that steel prices are monopolistically fixed. Name a dozen big companies that raised prices the same amount at the same time and someone will come up with the name of one that didn't. For him that one company is conclusive proof there is no monopoly. You haven't "proved" anything.

Yet, despite the futility of the thing, I have some evidence I would like to offer on the way the press handles certain kinds of news. In offering it, I recognize that "proof" is impossible. I am only offering it for what it is worth. Let each man judge that for himself. Furthermore, before I even offer my evidence, I want to make clear that along with other critics of the press, I concede the American newspapers are the best in the world. We have a free press in the sense that phrase customarily is used.

But while our press is free from government control, I contend it has a dangerous blind spot that prevents it from being the avenue of public enlightenment it should be. That blind spot blanks out, or tends to blank out, any criticism of our economic system and the way it works, or of the powers that be in that system. In other words, our press is free from government control, and in that sense is a free press, but it is not free from the influence of vested capital and concentrated economic power.

The Freedom of the Press Commission said as much last year without offering concrete proof to the disappointment, I might add, of many working newspapermen.

Perhaps it didn't bother because it recognized the futility of trying to convince those who don't want to be convinced. But many individual newspapermen have the evidence to offer and have not offered

it publicly either because their jobs were at stake or because they had no public outlet. The Nieman Reports offers such an outlet, and as one working newspaperman I want to take advantage of it in the hope—probably vain—that public discussion will lead to a better press.

I have felt that the nation's greatest single need was a fairer and more broad-minded press—a press that was willing to tell the truth on economic issues even when it hurt—or might hurt—the newspapers themselves. I don't know how a democracy—in which the people make the decisions—can work unless the people are told the truth, or the facts on both sides of an issue—so they can make their decisions on the basis of all the facts, rather than on one-sided facts or mere prejudices. For many years—as a result of working for the Hearst papers, Paul Mallon, the AP, the UP, PM and the New Republic,—I have been convinced that the newspapers of America were not telling the people the truth, or at least the whole truth, on economic questions. Sometimes this was the result of ignorance, or carelessness, but often I have felt it has been the result of a deliberate policy. Because of this deep conviction I worked with all my heart to make PM a success, believing it marked the dawn of a new day in journalism. Unfortunately it lacked the proper leadership to do the job.

So the battle still goes on to make America's newspapers really free to tell the public the truth. I believe I have ammunition for that battle. It involves some of the stories I have written recently and tried to sell to newspapers and magazines. One of these stories, to my mind, was a perfect illustration of the kind of news the newspapers are failing to tell their readers. What happened to it is important only because it is typical of what is happening to such stories day in and day out.

The story disclosed how the National Association of Manufacturers is setting the pace for a nation-wide campaign by big business to kid the public about profits. Quotes from NAM's own material were used to show it was in effect advising its members how to do this. In distributing to its members suggestions for handling advertisements on the profit question the NAM told them that the public "does not distinguish between profits

on sales or profit on net worth." The obvious hint was to use the one that sounded best, as NAM itself does.

As I explained in the story this distinction makes all the difference in the world, and NAM knows it. The percentage of profit on sales is a measure of the margin of profit. It is an interesting statistical figure and nothing more so far as measuring profits is concerned. The percentage of profit on net worth, or invested capital, is the real measure—the measure businessmen and investors themselves use. Armour and Co. can advertise under NAM's formula that it is making less than a two per cent profit. But that two per cent profit is not what the investor looks at—because it is only a measure of the margin on sales. On its two per cent margin on sales Armour, in 1946, made a profit of \$30,000,000 or 15.7 per cent on its net worth—the rough measure of invested capital. That is what the investor looks at in determining whether to put his money into the company.

My story then demonstrated how big business is using the NAM formula to kid the public. It quoted a full page advertisement General Electric had run a few months ago, with a fancy chart indicating that its profits were way down from past years and were only seven per cent in 1947. My story included a similar chart showing GE's profits in 1947 were actually about 22 per cent—not seven per cent—on its net worth—the biggest profit in its history, and big enough to double its net worth, or invested capital, within five years. The story also exposed how GE's ad used misleading evidence to indicate that its profits were smaller than even the "anti-business" New Deal administration had approved.

That the substance of my story was correct is proved, I believe, by the price cuts announced by GE at the turn of the year. The price cut announcement also had its phoney elements, too, but I won't go into that here.

Now my profit story, it seems to me, carried documented proof of a serious abuse in our economic system—the insistence by big business on earning a big "margin" of profit, instead of relying upon volume production at a small margin to bring in big profits, which, by the way, is the only way the system will work proper-

Nathan Robertson, veteran reporter of national politics, was a Nieman Fellow in 1945. After a long illness, his friends will be glad to know he is again active.

ly. The evidence I presented was well documented from Moody's investment manual. It carried facts the public should know but doesn't because big business is spending millions of dollars to muddy the issue. It showed one clear case—typical of many others—in which a corporation apparently was deliberately trying to mislead the public on the basic facts involved. Some people may quibble whether my "facts" or the "facts" carried in big business ads are nearer the truth. I won't argue here—though I could back up my side with testimony from many of the country's leading economists—but merely assert that the public is entitled to both sets of "facts" and not just those on one side of the issue, paid for by interested parties.

My experience in trying to sell this story confirmed my belief—based on 25 years experience in the newspaper business—that the newspapers are not interested in exposing the mistakes of big and powerful business. As a test case I offered the story to one of the leading liberal papers in the United States—a paper which I felt would use the story if any newspaper would. The circumstances were all favorable—I knew the editor and he knew me; the paper was unquestionably one of the most liberal in the country; I already had assurance from the paper's own conservative editorial writer who handles all of its editorials on economic issues that my facts were correct and my exposure justified; and the newspaper itself had carried the GE ad that I was exposing. Furthermore, in making the test I gave the editor a break by telling him I was using him as a laboratory experiment. It definitely was a challenge, and he accepted it as such. He said he was interested, but asked for a few hours to confer with others on the staff.

I have no way of knowing, of course, with whom he conferred, but I suspect one was the owner of the paper. At any rate when I returned a few hours later, the editor had two points to discuss with me. First, he felt that I didn't have enough examples of industry's misrepresentation to prove my case. I offered to get more—pointing out I could cite similar examples by US Steel, AT & T, and General Motors, but I felt GE was sufficient because my story was based on the activity of NAM which speaks for big business generally. He quickly dropped that point but then suggested I re-write the story in a way which I felt would have resulted in a mere essay on efficient methods of figuring profits without disclosing what business was doing or correcting the figures broadcast in that paper by GE. I refused to do it—objecting that what he was proposing

would kill the story.

With that he handed the piece back to me, displaying what seemed to me a sickly smile, and explaining:

"Nate, you can't expect a newspaper, which is such an integral part of our distribution system, to attack that system."

I jotted down those quotes as soon as I left his office (and so am sure they are what he said) because to my mind they were a confession of what I'm trying to prove. I had expected to get the evidence, but never the confession. My reply to him, of course, was that I was not attacking the system, but only its abuses. I told him I believed in the system as much as he did; but felt it was being endangered by such abuses. During our discussion the editor admitted, or at least did not deny, that if my expose had involved labor, and had disclosed an abuse as significant and far-reaching as this one by capital, he would have been interested in using it.

It is perfectly obvious that this single experience with a single story does not prove anything about the press as a whole to an outsider. If I tried the other half dozen or so liberal metropolitan papers in the United States I might find a sale. I did, however, approach the head of the Washington Bureau of one of them, aside from the one I had already tried, and got such a cool reception that I didn't bother to go any further. He said the sale would have to be negotiated with his managing editor in another city but warned me it probably would be turned down. As a close friend he gave me an explanation that makes sense—that the newspapers themselves have a vested interest in the wrong way of figuring profits—because if they had to figure them on their invested capital, as my article said they should, most of them would be shown up as huge profit makers—and they don't care to have their unions, or the public, know about that any more than other businesses do.

So while I don't claim the turn-down of this story is final proof of anything to anybody else, it, together with my past experience, is to me. I'm convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that if I had to make a living selling stories to the press exposing the faults of our economic system as it exists today I would starve to death. The real danger in this situation is that it weakens our whole democratic effort at a time when democracy is in a death struggle with totalitarianism throughout the world. Censorship of criticism under any kind of government is dangerous because criticism breeds improvements. But it is doubly damaging in a democracy where the decisions are made by the people at

the top. How can proper decisions on such issues as price control, taxes, and wages be made when the people who make the decisions are told the facts on only one side of an issue?

Furthermore, I'm convinced that even in the magazine and radio fields there is a very limited market for this kind of news, which happens to be the kind I'm best at writing. It can be sold to a handful of liberal magazines, none of which pays enough to provide a decent living. But the big paying magazines don't want it any more than the newspapers.

I finally sold the profit story described above to the revived *Progressive* at Madison, Wisconsin, and it was given a good play. Thomas L. Stokes, the noted newspaper columnist, used a couple of paragraphs from it, and a Madison newspaper based an editorial on it. But otherwise the newspapers continued to ignore the story. And what I got out of the *Progressive* for the piece was not enough to carry my family during the time it took me to do the necessary research and put the story together. Those who write for the *Progressive*, the *Nation* and the *New Republic* do it primarily for "love" and not for money.

In recent months I have had additional evidence to back up my view about the magazine field. There are some very good economic stories kicking around Washington that no one has written. I have tried selling them to a variety of magazines, ranging from the big-paying slicks down through the intellectual monthlies to the low-paying weeklies. The only place I have found any market at all is in the liberal, but unucrative, weeklies.

One of these stories should be described, because it again involves the newspaper business. It was a story showing how the issues between the Knutson tax reduction bill and the President's alternate tax program have been misrepresented by the politicians and the newspapers. This story disclosed that the President's program came—not from his political advisers, as the politicians and the newspapers would have you believe—but from the President's Economic Council, created under the full employment law enacted two years ago.

The story showed how the tax program—shunted aside in Congress as mere politics—was based on the economic findings of the Economic Council and was designed to correct a fundamental unbalance in our economy which jeopardized the future of full employment. It was an historic tax program, as I showed, marking the first time a President had ever submitted a major tax bill not for the purpose of rais-

ing or lowering taxes, but to correct economic maladjustments which threatened our industrial machine. It also was the first major test of the vital full employment law.

These are facts that have not been told in America's newspapers. The story should have been big news for the magazines. I have offered it to a good many of them without a sale except to the usual low-paying weeklies. I would think it was the way I had written it except that I have had better luck with other stories about less touchy subjects.

This story on the tax program finally was used by the American Newspaper Guild Reporter—which reaches newspapermen, but not the general public. But so far as I know the story has never yet been told to the average citizen. I could cite many similar examples of the way newspapers and magazines have turned down certain kinds of material. In the political field I recently wrote on an analysis of the support back of Henry Wallace's third party, showing that virtually none of the old New Deal was in the movement. This story was designed to show liberals how Wallace is now a "captive" of the com-

munist and is not speaking for the forces that elected Franklin D. Roosevelt. But of course confusion among liberals is a benefit to the conservatives, and I found the conservative magazine would not use the story. One of the biggest of them turned down my piece, and printed in place of it a story falsely indicating New Deal ranks were badly divided between the Wallace movement and the Democratic party. The American Mercury finally printed my story.

So I'm about convinced that the magazine field is almost as unucrative for a liberal free lance writer as the newspaper field. Again in the magazine field I have a "confession" to present as evidence. I recently wrote an old friend of mine who is managing editor of one of the most widely read magazines telling him of the kind of stuff I could write, and asking him if his magazine would be interested in any of it. He replied with a friendly letter offering one excuse or another on each idea I had offered, but winding up with this:

"I think you are, in a general way, right about your kind of writing being directed toward other than mass circulation magazines. As you know, we try to approach

an article with a strictly objective viewpoint except for those signed by some person prominent enough to be permitted to express his opinions."

I took this hint and went to a high public official and asked if I could write the tax story, mentioned above, under his by-line—figuring that way I might get it into print in a popular magazine. He discouraged me—telling me that was not the answer. He had been asked by one of the top magazines to write a similar piece. He did, after getting assurance it would be printed if he took the time to write it. The magazine, after asking him for it and promising him it would use it, turned it down. It was too hot. That busy official won't bother again trying to get a liberal viewpoint into that magazine.

This recent evidence, on top of 25 years experience in the newspaper business, has about convinced me that it is not possible to tell the public the "liberal" side of the economic situation through our newspapers or popular magazines—which is about all the general public reads. What is the answer to that from those who are always so vigorous in defending the press?

Another View of the Problem--

Is There Enough Demand for Better Handling of News?

From "Pressure Groups and the News"

by Ferdinand Lundberg

in *The New Leader*, Dec. 27, 1947

Dr. George N. Shuster indicates, I believe, the direction in which future inquiry must go into the reasons why the American press is as it is. He says that the American press "is on the average rather superior to the poorly educated country which it serves." I'm not sure that it is a matter of "poor education," but I'd certainly agree that it is a matter of wrong public orientation.

Anyone who has ever started a newspaper, or tried to start one, has come quickly up against certain harsh facts. The first fact is that he must have buyers in order to remain in business. How then, can he attract buyers? The experience of publishing history has shown that buyers will not, except in certain special instances, accept a high-class product; the publisher who attempts to put out such a product will usually go bankrupt. There are in the country ten or fifteen outstanding examples of the special instances I

have in mind, conforming more or less to the outlines of a good newspaper even after everything that could possibly be said in criticism of them has been said. But even those papers must adhere more or less closely to the "survival formula."

In order to attract readers, an American newspaper must do the following things: it must devote a disproportionate amount of space to the reportage of commercialized "sports" events; it must devote a disproportionate amount of space to the reportage of isolated crimes of violence and sexual scandals; it must give heavy emphasis to the entertainment world—Hollywood and Broadway; it must discuss important political affairs in the same juvenile terms it devotes to sports, crimes and sex; and it must devote a disproportionate amount of space to "comics" and to various entertainment. "Serious" news it must almost invariably present in terms of the most primitive

sort of conflict: "Vandenberg Flays Byrnes," "Economists Scorch President," "Pope Slashes Communists," and "Republicans Nail Democrats."

In all this the press falls down most seriously, both in its news reports and in its editorializing, in its failure to convey underlying significances. It conveys, at most, very crude significances. Elsewhere I have pointed out that the American press from time to time engages in vast black-and-white propaganda campaigns as though an invisible commissar were directing operations behind the scenes. Virtually all organs of the press play the same note: Permanent Prosperity Is Here (1920's), Inflation, Bureaucracy, Government Ownership and Ruin are Coming (1930's), etc.

Right now a similar campaign is in full tide, with scarcely a newspaper failing to take part in it. One might title this

campaign "Free Enterprise Is Responsible for Everything Good in the World." And it is as much of an historical falsehood as the stock campaign of the Russian press that "Capitalism Is Responsible for Everything Bad in the World." There are at least 500 items of unchallenged scholarship that prove that what is misleadingly termed "free enterprise" is something that is directly subsidized by the community through the instrumentality of government: by means of supporting institutions and laws beginning with the Constitution; by means of tariffs that keep out competition from abroad; by means of public operating franchises and charters; by means of gifts, gratis, of huge tracts of land as to the railroads; by means of postal subsidies to ship and airplane lines; by means of the building of billions of dollars worth of public roads as a free gift to the automobile industry, and by means of the direct gift or loan of public money to private enterprises such as banks, insurance companies, railroads and the like when they get into trouble. The panegyrists of free enterprise also overlook the fact that it was on three occasions in American history when government orders were great that "free enterprise" industry made its greatest forward strides. Those occasions were the Civil War, World War I and World War II.

I think the facts indicate that free enterprise has played a tremendously creative role, so that there is no need to apologize for its achievements as a whole. But it has always been a role in the shadow of government protection, help and

even subsidy. It has been a strong role precisely because it has been enacted in interaction with the community through the medium of government. But this latter qualification—an important one—is not suggested by the newspapers. It would "complicate" the story too much for most readers. It would be said by way of defense, and I think the publishers would be correct on the whole in so saying. To the extent that they'll accept anything serious at all most readers of newspapers will accept it only in simple blacks and whites—and they get what they'll take.

The failure of newspapers to point out significances, especially when they tend to become a bit complex, shows up most strongly on the dreary editorial pages. But, again, the successful publisher knows full well that he cannot indulge in significant editorializing without incurring the wrath of large numbers of readers. Significant editorializing must of necessity be critical. So far as significant editorializing is concerned the American press, it is well to note, is at its best in editorializing about something distant in time or place: the Nazis, Russia, China, the medieval world, the American Indian, etc. The closer the subject-matter is to home the more cautious grow the remarks. For any newspaper publisher knows that anything said on the subject of business, labor and agriculture is being said about the three largest pressure groups in the country. And anything said about religion, education, medicine and any number of other spheres similarly affects pressure

groups, the membership of any of which is always fanatically glad to help penalize the candid and truly democratic publisher.

There is one exception, however, and on this exception the newspapers go to town critically. The exception is the government, which is constitutionally forbidden to do anything about the press, and just about every newspaper in the United States tries to outdo itself in arguing that "government" is the big menace in the world. Government, according to the newspaper idea, is run by thoroughly unscrupulous politicians who through "bureaucracy" are trying to "enslave" virtuous "free entrepreneurs" and bring society down to ruin. Such sentiments, which one can see in practically every issue of a high-class paper like the *New York Times*, cannot but give powerful justification to law-breakers who argue simply: The government makes the law. The government consists of crooks. All we do is to outwit crooks." Sociologists have long seen the "frontier tradition" as the main source of the big streak of lawlessness in American society. I think they are wrong, and while I don't believe the newspapers are the main source I do believe that they are chiefly responsible for justifying lawlessness in the minds of lawbreakers.

The reason we don't give more perfect expression to the concept of press freedom, then, is that the citizens at large in society won't support a more perfect expression. Maybe they will some day. But they give no indication of doing so.

The Human Nature of Newspapers

From "Great Newspapers, If Any"

by Gerald Johnson

in Harper's for July

For the newspaper itself is contradictory, which is one way of saying that it is a very human enterprise. The newspaper is a social force. That is indubitable. It is also a manufactory. That is just as certainly true. Like the school, it purveys information, but its information, unlike that of the school, must be fresh, which is to say, it handles a product that deteriorates with unparalleled speed. The very conditions of its existence, therefore, are impossible of perfect fulfillment; for information to be sound must be true, and to be fresh must be disseminated at high speed. But in the process of learning and informing others, high speed and perfect accuracy are incompatible. It follows, therefore, that, judged by the ideal stan-

dard, all newspapers are bad newspapers and can't be anything else.

The tendency of investigators, however, is to overlook the necessary conditions of the newspaper's existence and to measure its distance from the ideal standard absolutely. Many of them would eliminate, for example, the newspaper's status as a profit-making enterprise. The necessity of showing an operating profit every year, they assert, inhibits any real freedom and only a newspaper subsidized, either by the government or by private funds, can enjoy liberty.

There is a certain plausibility in this, but the people who argue along that line, overlook the fact that a subsidized newspaper, like a subsidized man, is no longer

to be identified with the common herd, and is therefore no longer a structural unit in the common culture. An American who doesn't have to work for his own living may be very valuable, and very admirable, but he is not very typical. A newspaper in similar circumstances may be both useful and ornamental, but it is inevitably a little apart from the craft of journalism; for a craft is a means of livelihood. Hence, a newspaper that cannot pay its bills is not a typical newspaper; whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, it tells us little about the possibility of journalism as it is and must be practiced by the great majority of newspapers in this country. A subsidized press is a controlled press; whether it is controlled by holy angels or fiends in

human form it remains a controlled press, exactly as the Russian and Spanish newspapers are controlled, and its experience has few lessons applicable to a free press.

A man who cannot stand on his own feet, or a newspaper that cannot pay its own bills, enjoys freedom only on sufferance. If its unearned funds are cut off, its merit will not save it. Hence in a capitalistic economy the ability to make a profit, or at least to stay in the black, is one of the indispensable elements of a great newspaper.

Considering the environment in which they live and the pressure to which it subjects them, the marvel is not that American newspaper proprietors are so conservative but rather that they are not all reactionaries. It is much easier to be a howling Communist in Greenwich Village than it is to be even a Cleveland Democrat in the stately midtown clubs, yet respectable numbers of American newspaper owners manage it.

For one thing some of them, but not all, have gained some, but not an adequate, conception of the responsibility that is irremovably attached to a monopoly position. Every respectable newspaper in the country now acknowledges its duty to

print the news, even when the news is unfavorable or possibly ruinous to the policy it advocates.

But the notion that opinions, also, are news is one that is by no means universally accepted. Many newspapers regard it as no part of their duty to present their readers with a summary of all shades of opinion, even when they hold a monopoly position in their towns. A conservative paper that reported faithfully the election of Wallace's candidate in the Bronx may have never printed a line of the argument by which that candidate won the election. Such a paper's readers therefore know that the man was elected but, as far as their paper is concerned, they have never been told why he was elected. They are not well informed and the paper is not accepting the duty that lies upon every monopoly, whether of goods or of services, to serve all classes of its constituency without favoritism. To paraphrase David Harum, there is as much human nature in newspaper men as there is in others, if not more. And as they are, so are their papers. The question is, are these types prevalent in journalism? And the answer is, look at America. As the population from which it is drawn, so is the craft.

As Paracelsus used to discuss the Alkahest, so newspaper men are given to talking about a conceptual absolute that they call "impersonal journalism." It has no real existence. Journalism is and always was as intensely personal as taste in neckties. Personalities may be concealed by institutional organization as the fire is concealed in an automobile engine, but it is there, or the thing doesn't move. If you find a great newspaper, rest assured that somewhere in the works it at least one great man. He may be the owner, or the chief editorial writer, or the managing editor, or any of a dozen other executives, but he is there and he has authority. Extinguish him and the paper instantly ceases to be great, even though it may remain for some time successful as a business.

But this intensely personal craft necessarily turns out an intensely personal product. The result is that it is as difficult to apply objective standards to newspapers as it is to people, and the greatest newspaper is as difficult to identify as the greatest man. It all depends upon what you require. The greatest doctor cannot help you win an intricate lawsuit, nor will the mightiest of attorneys help much toward getting you into heaven.

Civil Liberties Quest In South Curtailed By Atom Bomb's Shadow

by Thomas Sancton

Former press association staff writer, holder of a Nieman Fellowship and magazine editor, Thomas Sancton is now living in Mississippi, where he surveys the "southern problem" at first hand.

JACKSON, MISS.

Throughout the south today, in every background, the emergence of a large class of serious-looking neatly dressed intelligent Negroes has become increasingly apparent.

Southern Negroes ate better food and lived a freer life during the war. A whole generation of Negro children has grown up in improved economic circumstances. The slovenly dress that not so many years back was the frequent result of wages of \$2.50 or \$3 a week for a woman cook, \$1 a day for a laborer, has become a rare sight in the places where the average southern white person sees the average southern Negro.

During the war many whites were frightened by this growing economic emancipation, and they managed to convince them-

selves that it was some sort of spontaneous Negro upheaval. But now that the war is over, the average white person, it seems to me, unconsciously approves the results. At the same time, the old, popular assumptions about Negro inferiority have less evidence to rest on. And as a consequence, I believe southern whites, if left to their individual thinking and initiative, would accept without much excitement the extension of the rights of U. S. citizenship to Negroes.

Yet no group that holds great political and economic advantages is likely to sit by doing nothing while fundamental reforms are worked which are certain to challenge their control. The southern influential classes are brilliant and ruthless at this business, and they have a repertory of methods that have been perfected through a century of intensive use. Their achievement in maintaining their position generation after generation is something of a political miracle. Eighty-five years after the emancipation proclamation, for example, southern Negroes have still to

achieve all the basic political and economic rights, except release from actual slavery. Today the southern leadership has set itself the task of trying to turn back the clock on the Negro's wartime and New Deal development.

What is missing in southern thinking generally—and perhaps it is missing in thinking all over the world—is an awareness of the extraordinary nature of the age we live in. It is possible today to discover in speeches in southern legislatures, or even on the floor of Congress, basic ideas about race, economics, education, law courts, penology, etc., that can be found almost word for word in the speeches of John C. Calhoun and other politicians who fought out these primitive battles of U. S. politics 100 years ago.

In the current session of the Mississippi legislature, for example, a bill to revise a 140-year-old blue law in order to permit movies to be shown on Sundays between 1 and 6 in the afternoon was defeated. Not long ago a bill to abolish the lash in the state penitentiary was defeated. The

lash statute describes in detail how a prisoner is to be whipped—laid over a table in such and such a manner, whipped with a six-foot strap of such and such a width (a strap known to prisoners and ex-prisoners all over the state as "Black Annie"). In most southern states packs of well-trained bloodhounds are still maintained, and every few weeks or so the dogs are sniffing and barking along the trail of some suspect or criminal, or innocent victim.

Too Much Propaganda

Such scenes as this illuminated and horrified readers of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and Whitman's slavery poems before the civil war. As a matter of fact, one of the most universal experiences of southern life, the spectacle of a neatly dressed individual automatically hanging back at the rear of a crowd, or standing hat in hand waiting to be noticed, or going through a special door marked for the lower caste, is an astonishing anachronism.

This great abyss which has opened between the world of antiquated theories and the world as it is, still the devil's caldron where the old-time formula of race hate, militarism and states' rights. This brew has served to poison human sympathies and drug intelligence sufficiently in the past to set the southern people, the majority of whom are almost as poor as the Negroes, against the very political and economic developments which would help them.

The dominant aspect of life in the south today is the blasting volume of propaganda which has been turned loose through newspapers, radio, politicians, "service" clubs, chambers of commerce, the person-to-person contacts of the barbershop and street corner. Its objective is to prevent economic and racial democracy from sweeping into the south and to erect new psychological levees behind the legal ones that are crumbling.

I believe that if by some miracle the average white southerner could be free to form his views of race relations out of the experiences of his own life, the race problem would quickly fade. But the enforced servility of the Negro people—automatically holding at least as many poor whites in a degraded role—has been the brick and mortar from which the whole economy was built. Therefore in the south no white man has the right not to fear the Negro. He is made to understand, from beyond the memories of childhood, that any suggestion of Negro humanity and worth is a threat against something called race purity. By the time he grows old enough to see that it is

rather a threat to factory investments, to cotton profits, to cheap servant labor, he has lost the capacity to see it.

Other fundamental complications have also been at work. For 20 years or so he has been looking at the result of Negro poverty. When he reaches maturity, he can no longer distinguish the results of poverty from the causes. By this time life has made him an official and conforming "southerner." He adheres to the religion of race purity in a deeper psychological process than he adheres to his actual religion, or to his belief in democracy. He, too, has made himself into a kind of mortar to keep old economic and political institutions stuck together.

If he is the average southerner—I do not mean the average middle-class southerner—he does not benefit from this economy. His income is low in comparison with that of other regions. His schools, his hospitals, his living standards are poorer. It could be demonstrated to him that an open political democracy for white and Negro, bi-racial unions, high minimum wages for both races, would create a producing and consuming south that would immeasurably improve his own lot. Every experience of his life, unemotionally interpreted, and particularly his contacts with Negroes, tends to teach him this. But his logic usually can be swept away by an opposition which evokes the race fears injected and re-injected since childhood.

Southerners Maturing

The realities of world developments of the past 15 years have brought many stimulating influences into the south and into the thinking of many southerners. Political reactionaries are now faced with increasing popular lethargy about the race question—even sympathy for extending citizenship to Negroes. This growing maturity on the part of many southerners has combined with recent far-reaching Supreme Court decisions to present entrenched political and financial groups with a serious challenge.

The depression and the war boom brought federal agencies and government money into the south, reaching a flood tide during the war. This loosened the old economic pattern in which a small group sat by eager to work for \$1.25 a day. The war also carried millions of southerners, white and black, to other parts of the country and the world, to return with a broadened outlook.

Hundreds of northern factories have moved southwards—most of them primarily to exploit the surviving feudalistic advantages of the region—but organizers of a vigorous union movement, often bi-racial in principle, followed in their path. Su-

preme Court decisions, fair-employment directives, similar documents of page-one importance in the south, have carried some fundamental facts and ideas about race relations even into the remotest counties.

Atom Bomb Casts Shadow

During the general turmoil of the war years, there was a sharp retrogression in race outlook among the whites. Propaganda of extreme viciousness swept the region; race-riot rumors flared occasionally in every big city; and many well-meaning whites were stampeded back to racism. But many others—a smaller group—were only confirmed in their growing racial understanding by the senselessness and destructiveness of this wartime development. Peace brought a general moderation of the hysterical element.

If war had been followed by a clean and general settlement, I believe that inevitable and long-delayed civil rights concessions to Negroes would have gone forward in the south rather quickly. But, instead, we have passed into the cold war with Russia. The psychological results of this conflict are already overwhelmingly evident in southern life.

There can be little doubt that these expedient results of militarism—the increased facility for steam-rolling and shouting down honest U. S. and democratic and constitutional developments—are not accidentally by-products of a foreign policy but, so far as southern politicians are concerned, a part of foreign policy.

Frightful images of "Russia," "communism," "the atom bomb," are blasted at the southern mind from every quarter. Every public utterance and every second editorial comes up with fresh warnings about the onslaught being prepared in the great, ominous world beyond the Mason-Dixon line against "white civilization."

On the whole, people in the street remain indifferent for a long time to the white-hot crusades of governors, senators and other embattled champions. But any issue, no matter how unrelated to the tranquil and humble realities of town life, eventually gives the citizen's mind its coloring when it is all his mind has to feed upon. And so this agitation has succeeded, in the case of great numbers of southerners, in making a cruel mixture of the Russian question and the race question, and has convinced many that the cure for "democracy" and for keeping Negroes in their place, for high prices, for scarce housing, is a war with Russia, which is somehow causing all these difficulties.

The quest of civil liberties in the south—like every other question, and perhaps

the very existence of a habitable planet—lies under the shadow of the atom bomb and the future. If it were unrelated to this stupendous element, its development might be fairly predictable. I have seen Negroes standing in line to vote in Mississippi and not a man in the crowd seemed upset by the fact or even overly conscious of it.

The whole civil rights program hangs upon the right to vote. Once that right is established, politicians will adjust to it, as they are adjusting in places where it

has been won. And by adjustment I mean the cessation of malignant and irrelevant agitation of an emotional question which is utterly remote from the economic and political needs of southern people.

There is a final point that must be touched on in any discussion of civil rights, though theoretically it is irrelevant. And that is the question of social equality and "race purity." The more one sifts day-to-day realities from the jungle of legends and suppositions, the more it is apparent that a fundamental extension

of civil rights could take place without loss to the white southerners of one scintilla of the "race purity" they now have. There can never be intimate social relationships or intermarriage between two groups when one is profoundly and emotionally determined that it shall not take place. But keeping the other group from any exercise of the citizenship which organic law guarantees them, or barring them from educational opportunities which their tax dollars help provide, is not necessary to keep the races separate in their social choices.—Toronto Star, April, 24.

"Where Do You Draw the Line?"

A QUESTION ON A MEDICAL ADVERTISEMENT

21 Alpine Street
Cambridge, Mass.
27 April, 48

It is suggested that I forward the enclosed advertisement and letters to you. The attitude of the managing editor seems wrong to me, and I wonder where you people would draw the line in medical advertising. It certainly seems odd to me to suggest that people with no power over the situation take the responsibility—e.g. the AMA or the Better Business Bureau.

The enclosed ad appears regularly and attracted my interest because of the emphasis on "no questions," which might well indicate an attempt to attract the V.D. clientele.

But the one thing which really seems amazing is the extreme humility of the managing editor in refusing to censor advertising. My wife informs me that the same paper cuts out Walter Lippmann every once in a while when he gets out of line.

At any rate, I hope this proves of passing interest to you, as I would like the problem to be further aired.

Charles T. Munger

[The advertisement which gave rise to the correspondence is of the Basic Diagnostic Foundation of Pasadena, Calif. The peculiarities of type and illustration in the advertisement make it impossible to reproduce here. Its features are: "INVISIBLE RAY—Scientific Diagnosis—Thru and Thru Examination for \$2—Without asking you a single question regarding your sickness, we will show you the cause of your trouble, where it is, and show you what to do." The advertisement runs two columns wide and five inches deep.]

28 March, 1948

Publisher,
Pasadena Star-News,
Pasadena, Calif.

Dear Sir:

I am a mail subscriber to your paper, being married to a Pasadena girl and planning to live in Pasadena when I finish the Harvard Law School in September.

This is written to ask you what policy you follow in turning down advertising, i.e. where you draw the line. I don't ask this in any carping tone, am simply curious as to the factors which influence your decision to print medical advertisements like the one enclosed. My interest in the matter has a twofold aspect.

First, I am not used to seeing such ads. The local paper in Omaha (which my father represents as attorney) has made it a firm policy never to print ads like this—on the theory that so doing would probably work a public disservice in helping quack medicine to exist. They also feel that the ads would lower the paper's standing in the eyes of a considerable and important segment of the community, doctors and the better-educated group in general. This always seemed sound to me, and I wonder if it might not be true that such advertising will in the long run be an economic detriment to a paper. Now it may well be that I am way off on all this, and if so I would appreciate your taking a moment to set me right.

Second, I have been interested in the legal problem of the possibility of newspaper liability for death or damage at the hands of the advertiser, treatment having been induced by the representations of the newspaper. The last decade or two has seen some striking tort decisions, and

I shouldn't think it inconceivable for a modern lawyer to argue very convincingly for liability. For instance, a newspaper can't safely print advertisements which it has reason to believe contain false and defamatory statements. Should it be able to safely print representations which it has reason to believe are false when those representations are as likely to hurt a sick and ignorant man as the libel is to hurt the person defamed?

The enclosed ad has been shown to doctors and laymen here, the uniform reaction being one of shock and disapproval.

On the whole, I have enjoyed reading your paper, pass along my reaction to a single ad (which may have slipped through) in the hope of finding out your policy on the question discussed above.

Very sincerely yours,
Charles T. Munger

April 2, 1948
Our 62nd Year

Dear Mr. Munger:

May I acknowledge with pleasure your thoughtful letter of March 28 inspired by the Basic Diagnostic Foundation advertisement which appeared in the Star-News.

First, let me state again how much I admire your fine attitude, honest and inquisitive, and yet showing to considerable degree a sympathetic understanding of the problems involved.

Before all publishers always is the delicate question of where the line should be drawn in the censorship of advertising.

All of us who believe in democracy recognize that freedom of speech means the right either to speak folly or wisdom. It is, for instance, fundamental that news columns, if they are to escape bias and censorship, must carry many absurd state-

ments as well as sound fact. In no classification of news does one encounter this stark truth more frequently than in the interview. Democracy requires that the reader or listener shall for himself discriminate between truth and folly.

While the newspaper has the right to bar from its columns any individual advertisement, publishers generally, are loathe to be accused of abusing this right. It is admitted that barred from the newspaper are those ads which violate the law or which offend public good taste, or which, without foundation, attack others of good name. But to my mind there is considerable question as to whether the newspaper is the correct judge of what is sound or unsound medical treatment, or examination. It is a matter of regret to me that the American Medical Society has not across the years exercised a policing influence, vigilant in character, in connection with the whole field of medical advertising.

Again, where misrepresentation is the basis of the complaint, it is logical that the Better Business Bureau should exercise vigilant initiative. But the newspaper is read by all kinds of people, each entitled to exercise his own convictions as to what service is or is not helpful in his own case. Violently as certain theories are attacked by one group, with equal violence others spring to the defensive. The suppression of any ad such as this may secretly be applauded by doctors of medicine, but loudly denounced by many other persons as a plot to deprive the poor of an economical examination.

The paragraphs above may serve to indicate the fog through which editors and publishers endeavor to guide their newspapers soundly in the over all public interest.

I am in no sense defending this individual advertisement, which frankly I had not seen until your letter arrived, but I have been endeavoring to indicate why medical ads objectionable to many may occasionally creep into newspapers.

While no responsible newspaper desires to be a party in the spread of unsound advice, it remains true that any individual's only safeguard, whether advice be good or bad, lies in the working of his own discriminating mind and judgment.

May I thank you again for writing as you did, and assure you that the points which you raise will be borne in mind. I have endeavored to reply to your letter in similar spirit and similar thoughtfulness.

Sincerely yours,
Lee M. Merriman
Assistant to the Publisher

This Was Bill Townes' Last Editorial in Tacoma

What Should a Newspaper Be Like To Serve Its Community Well?

An informed people are a free people.

This basic thought goes far back into the history of man.

It places a high trust in the hands of all agencies disseminating information to the public.

It is relatively easy and painless for a newspaper, for an example, to disseminate information from afar—from Switzerland or Boston or Bizonia. It takes little effort or risk to wax indignant or to write platitudes about remote subjects.

It is not so easy or painless to strive to live up to the highest ethics and responsibilities of a newspaper in the public affairs if its own home community.

Yet the responsibility to do so is the same—or greater.

The newspapers which are doing so have made notable contributions to the progress, general level of civic-consciousness, honesty in government, law enforcement, justice and overall attractiveness and development of their cities and regions. There are many examples of such newspapers, among them the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Louisville Courier-Journal, Cleveland Press, Atlanta Journal and Washington Post.

And a newspaper does not overnight attain full respect and understanding in seeking, by new methods, to serve its community honestly and impartially and—where it is needed—aggressively. Nor should it. A newspaper, its policies and methods, like an officeholder's performances, should be tested by a reasonable length of time.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there has been honest misunderstanding by fair-minded citizens of what their Tacoma Times has been attempting to do recently.

It is not surprising at all that certain officeholders and others whose activities and attitudes have been under the spotlight of publicity have reacted in a manner which their own character permits or dictates.

You cannot accomplish anything worthwhile as an individual or as an institution without principles and the willingness to put them into practice. This, of course, applies to a newspaper.

This newspaper's motives and goals are not mysterious or sinister secrets. This editorial is written in the hope that what we are aiming at will be better understood.

This newspaper is striving, within the limitations and errors of human effort, to live up to the principles and responsibilities of a good newspaper. We want to exercise fairly and honestly and energetically the trust which every newspaper, by its nature, holds for its readers and its community as a disseminator of information and ideas.

We believe that a newspaper—every newspaper—has the obligation to seek and publish the truth; to live up to ethics such as abiding by release dates placed upon information submitted by organizations originating it; to initiate civic betterment and development and to co-operate with others who seek to improve their community's trade, local government, law enforcement.

We believe a newspaper should devote itself to justice and fair treatment of the underprivileged and inarticulate and to freely open its columns to opinions with which it disagrees.

It is easy for a newspaper to publish and comment upon only the good in its community and to close its eyes to the bad. But, we believe you can't sweep civic dirt under the rug of darkness and expect anything but the continuation and accumulation of that filth.

We don't think diverting the attention of the people, who can do something about it, is sound. The most corrupt bosses of other American cities have done some things well to gloss over their corruption.

Communities, like individuals, must face their shortcomings squarely and then work to correct them. We think it is a newspaper's duty to show the bad so that the people can correct it, and the good so that it may be encouraged.

We think a newspaper should be a good citizen. It can, by its nature, help arouse an all-around community loyalty and spirit of co-operation with which greater progress can be made. Groups of divergent interests can be rallied to the overall and mutual interest of community building.

We think minority groups should be permitted and encouraged to participate in their community and to contribute to it. We think they are entitled to be heard in a newspaper.

We want to contribute our part to Tacoma and this region. We think, selfishly, that the greater the service of a community—or a newspaper—the greater will be its economic returns.

We believe the more this community contributes to its area and its state the more it will share in their further development. This goes, as well, for Alaska, the Pacific Northwest as a whole, the islands and countries of the Pacific for which Tacoma is a logical trading and shipping center.

We believe there is plenty of room in Tacoma for two good newspapers. And we believe it is overwhelmingly to the interest of any city to have two good newspapers.

For our part we want to produce the best paper of which we—all of us—at The Times are capable of producing. We want our readers' help and criticisms. We want Tacomans and Washingtonians to be justified in feeling this is THEIR paper whether they agree or disagree with editorial opinions. We want them to know we will be zealous in defending their right to their own opinions however contrary to our own.

We believe that the spirit of fair play, which is an American and especially a Western characteristic, will erase honest misunderstandings of motives.

We want this to be a newspaper which helps to keep the public informed on affairs at home as well as outside so that the public may act in the light of such information honestly gathered and fairly presented and commented upon with sincerity and vigor.

Is this the kind of newspaper you want for Tacoma and the Pacific Northwest?
—Tacoma Times

The answer of the Tacoma Times was "No." So Bill Townes moved on to Santa Rosa, Calif., where he is general manager of the Santa Rosa Press Democrat, morning, evening and Sunday. That was April 1. By May 1 Townes had enlisted his old Nieman Fellow colleague, Oren Stephens, to be editor of his evening paper, Santa Rosa Evening Press.

Monitoring the Sub Scare

The Christian Science Monitor on April 19 devoted a whole page to ribbing its contemporaries about their sudden wave of headlines on the submarine scare that followed in the wake of Navy Secretary John L. Sullivan's statement to a Senate Committee March 25. The Monitor printed photographs of a dozen scream heads of "Russian Subs Sighted Off West Coast" and followed through to show how "Headlines Submerge" as the story drops into the back pages when "Navy officials acknowledge that three recent reports of foreign submarines off the Pacific Coast were not conclusive." The Monitor's story, amiable but barbed, had a little difficulty distributing responsibility between the newspapers and the Navy Secretary. But its correspondent, Joseph Harsch, did not. He pinned it right onto Secretary Sullivan. "Presumably the story was disclosed this week to help persuade Congress to appropriate more funds for the armed forces." The San Francisco Chronicle, in an editorial reprinted on the Monitor's page also chided Mr. Sullivan: "The moral: Think first how it's going to look in print to the casual reader . . . In times like these hysteria feeds on trivial things. We counsel all those in high places to particular care . . ."

Journalism Quarterly for June

The Journalism Quarterly for June has as its major articles:

The Role of Criticism in the Management of Mass Media

PAUL F. LAZARSELD

Rivals in Conformity: A Study of Two Competing Dailies

STANLEY K. BIGMAN

The Fight of William Hone for British Press Freedom

TED PETERSON

Facsimile Broadcasting: Problems and Possibilities

BURTON L. HOTALING

Can Mass Audiences Read Institutional Advertising?

PHILIP WARD BURTON and CHARLES EDMUND SWANSON

Propaganda Techniques Employed in the Women's Army Corps

JEANNETTE HODSON

The Work of UNESCO in the Field of Mass Communications

RENE MAHEU

The Foreign Press, Edited by RALPH D. CASEY

Germany's Cultural Heritage Impedes Free Press Program

WAYNE JORDAN

Journalism Teaching, A Forum for AATJ Members

A New Approach to Teaching Courses in Editorial Writing

A. L. HIGGINBOTHAM

The June issue contains, besides book reviews:

Press and Communications—An Annotated Bibliography of Journalism Subjects
in American Magazines, February through April 1948

Edited by WILLIAM F. SWINDLER

A Selected Bibliography from British Journals, January through March 1948. Edited by J. EDWARD GERALD

News Notes. Edited by DOUGLASS W. MILLER

Plans for 1948 AATJ—AASDJ Conventions in Boulder, Colorado

It is \$4.00 a year; \$1.25 a copy. Address: Journalism Quarterly, Emory University, Georgia

The Death of George Polk

The mystery and complications attending the murder of George Polk may be solved before this quarterly is published. A fearless and able reporter, George Polk would have been a Nieman Fellow this Fall at Harvard. It was that prospect which started him home with the blessing and staunch support of his editors at CBS who held his Middle East service in high distinction. The circumstances of his death have brought into sharp focus the difficulties of the foreign correspondent in most parts of the world and have especially spotlighted the conditions of news gathering in Greece where the government has hindered candid reporting in every possible way and sought to discredit American reporters it could not control. It is satisfying to find the Overseas Press Club and the New York Guild, to both of which George Polk belonged, vigorously demanding that the American government insist on a full investigation into his

death. The Guild resolutions demanded that the investigation be made by "a qualified team of correspondents and government officials sent out from the United States."

The Guild further resolved "that immediate efforts be made to put into effect the Geneva (UN Commission) proposals guaranteeing unrestricted movement and protection to all foreign correspondents." Foreign correspondents with the qualifications and courage to do the job that public information requires in the most troubled parts of the world are all too few and none can be spared. George Polk was one of the best. The growing literature about his death should bring home to the reading public the strategic importance of our narrow channels of foreign news and the vital necessity to protect them as reliable sources of our global information.

LML

"Outstanding Alumnus" Award To Houstoun Waring

The Faculty of the College of Journalism of The University of Colorado hereby recognizes as an outstanding alumnus
HOUSTOUN WARING

Under his editorship, The Littleton Independent 8 times won the Arthur A. Parkhurst trophy for community service—in 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1940, 1942, and 1943.

Under his editorship, The Littleton Independent has been on the John H. Casey "All-American eleven" in competition with weekly newspapers of the United States.

As editorial writer and donor of a trophy for excellence in editorial writing for eleven years, he has stimulated the conscience and the quality of editorial pages in Colorado.

He is author of the Code of Ethics of the Colorado Press Association.

He was in 1945 a Nieman Fellow in Journalism at Harvard University, the first from the Rocky Mountain region, and the second editor of a weekly newspaper to be so honored.

Under his leadership a group of Colorado newspapers, weekly and daily, created in 1945 an Editorial Advisory Board, a significant step in raising standards of professional performance and in helping newspapers to make democracy work.

With imagination and conscience he has helped to make his community aware of its problems and interested in solving them. He has kept abreast of the times and encouraged his readers to do so. He has been an able interpreter and leader.

The Colorado Editor, May, 1948.

NIEMAN NOTES

Mary Ellen Leary, a Nieman Fellow in 1946, was the subject of the "cover" story of *Fortnight*, the news magazine of California, March 12, as the first woman State House correspondent for a San Francisco newspaper. Hers is the News.

Oscar Buttedahl, a Nieman Fellow from Bismarck, North Dakota, in 1940, has become publisher of the *Meridian* (Idaho) Times, ten miles from Boise. He had been for a number of years in the Interior Department in Washington. *Meridian* is a town of 2500 in an irrigated dairy farm country. His staff numbers six, not counting the publisher and his wife, Hazle "who's developing into a crackerjack of a bookkeeper." Oscar writes "Our determination of long standing bore fruit when we came out here to take over the Times.

The West is a much better country to live in, and a small town is a better place to raise kids . . . We drove out in the car and landed the day before Christmas after an eight day trip. Two days later they hauled me into a Boise hospital for an emergency operation for a perforated ulcer. So I spent the first ten days of my editorship flat on my back. But I am feeling fine again. Am doing all the news, editorial (what little) and editing myself. We also do 'quality' job printing. It's a great life and a lot of just plain hard work. Susan, now six, went wading today in an irrigation ditch and fell down and came home with her first live frog . . ."

The new PM of Bartley Crum and Joseph Barnes will have the attention of newspapermen as Barnes' editorial direction works toward his announced goal to make it a "NEWSpaper." One of his first moves was to acquire two experienced news handlers from outside to be "senior editors but functioning as managing and city editor"—Jay Odell of the Philadelphia Inquirer copy desk and Wayne Adams, who was bureau chief in New York of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Jay Odell was a Nieman Fellow in 1946-7, whose newspaper work has been with the St. Paul Pioneer-Press as reporter and since 1937 all around the copy desk of the Philadelphia Inquirer. He was a naval air intelligence officer during the war.

According to Editor & Publisher, "Odell and Adams work as a team. Odell sits at the ME's desk and Adams bosses the city desk, but often at PM their duties overlap and they operate 'as in a pool.'"

Joe Barnes has told friends he will let them know when he wants them to tell him if they see improvement in PM.

Ed Allen was appointed chief of the public information section of the International Labor Office on April 29. He left the International News Service where he was United Nations correspondent. As a Boston Herald reporter, Allen was a Nieman Fellow in 1940.

Herbert Yahraes, a Nieman Fellow in 1944, is author of Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 138, "Good News About Diabetes."

The first of the year Leon Svirsky left Time, Inc. to join his old colleague, Gerard Piel, on the newly organized editorial staff of *Scientific American*. Svirsky had been science editor and, more recently, editor of the medical department of Time. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1945-46, and is the editor of the recent book, *Your Newspaper*, by nine Nieman Fellows.

NIEMAN NOTES

Ben Yablonky joined the faculty of the Journalism Department of New York University the first of the year as full-time assistant professor. Yablonky had been on the editorial staff of PM since its start, and was awarded a Nieman Fellowship from PM in 1945-46. He represents that year's group on the Council of the Society of Nieman Fellows, and is one of the nine Nieman Fellows who wrote *Your Newspaper*.

Charlotte Fitzhenry Robling, a Nieman Fellow in 1946, is president of the League of Women Voters in Des Moines where she is instructor in journalism at Drake University.

Hodding Carter's *Delta Democrat-Times* in Greenville, Miss. broke a political tradition of that State this Spring by coming out for Stassen for President, the first Mississippi paper since the Civil War to support a Republican. Carter was a Nieman Fellow in 1940.

George Chaplin became managing editor of the *San Diego Journal* in May. A Nieman Fellow in 1941, from the Greenville Piedmont in South Carolina, he returned from the Army to become managing editor of David Stern's *Camden Post & Courier* and continued there until Stern sold his papers.

Just before going to San Diego, the Chaplins sent out announcements of the arrival of a daughter, Jerry Gay, whose brother Stephen is now seven.

Fred W. Neal left the Russian Desk of the State Department April 1 to become coordinator of public relations of the New York State Department of Education under Commissioner Francis T. Spaulding.

The annual meeting of the Council of the Society of Nieman Fellows found two new Council members, elected by their groups. Lawrence Fernsworth of the *New York Daily News* is the new member for the 1944 group, succeeding Paul J.

Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger will be lecturing in American History at the University of Leyden the coming academic year. To fill his place on the Nieman Committee, President Conant appointed William M. Pinkerton, a Nieman Fellow in 1941, now director of the Harvard News Office.

Hughes of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. Justin McCarthy is the first Council member for the 1948 group of Fellows.

Kenneth Stewart, professor of journalism at New York University, is back on PM this summer, one of the original staff of that paper, now taking a hand in its rejuvenation under the editorial direction of Joseph Barnes. Stewart was a Nieman Fellow in 1942.

John W. Shively, a Nieman Fellow in 1944 and since then with the National Housing Administration, is now their legislative liaison representative.

Two Nieman Fellows have a hand in the Presidential campaign. Frank K. Kelly of the 1943 group finished a novel for Little, Brown Co. in May and joined the writing staff of the Democratic National Committee. Stephen M. Fischer, a Fellow in 1947 left the *San Francisco Chronicle* staff to direct the press work for Henry Wallace's campaign.

When Justice William O. Douglas took himself out of the Presidential nomination race, he did it by way of a letter to Irving Dilliard, editorial writer on the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Dilliard was one of the first group of Nieman Fellows, 1938-9.

Mrs. Hodding Carter, wife of the publisher of the *Delta Democrat-Times*, and herself an active force in that paper, was chosen Woman of the Year in Greenville, Mississippi.

Her husband at the same time was tickling the risibilities of the country with a race between a mule and the local train of the Illinois Central, conducted with elaborate ceremonies. The mule won—a relay of mules. This was Hodding Carter's way of dramatizing a case to the ICC to get better train service for Greenville and the rest of the Delta.

Jacob Qualey joined the copy desk of the *Chicago Sun-Times* the first of June after the *Minneapolis Times* folded. Qualey was a Nieman Fellow in 1944.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for July has an article, "PM" Post Mortem, by Robert Lasch, a Nieman Fellow in 1942 and since then chief editorial writer on the *Chicago Sun*, now merged into the *Sun-Times*. His analysis identifies the failure of PM largely with Ralph Ingersoll, holds that under the new direction of Bartley Crum and Joseph Barnes PM still has a chance to do what it originally set out to do.

LETTERS

From Leigh White

% American Embassy
Tehran, Iran

"As you may have heard, I've been out in the Middle East for the CDN since last November. What began as a four months' trip will probably consume eight months or more before I get back to the United States. I've got to visit East Africa before wending my way homeward from Cairo across North Africa, and I've also got to take another look at Palestine, which won't be pleasant. In fact, though highly instructive, none of the present trip has been the least bit pleasant; indeed, it's been the roughest trip I've ever made so far. I had dysentery in Turkey, sandfly fever in Arabia, and now I've got acute gastritis in Iran."

Leigh White was a Nieman Fellow in 1944.

Fills Need

Your efforts have produced a really fine organ of information for the working newspaperman and the student of journalism.

I think the criticisms made of the press and its sponsors, are good, valid, and constructive ones, and lack the vindictiveness, the sense of outrage that so frequently constitute press criticism.

Nieman Reports ought to be required reading in journalism schools. I'm quite certain that as more and more newspapermen see the Reports, your circulation will rise. I'm certain because I feel it fills a need long neglected.

Yours cordially,
Leslie H. Horn
Brighton, Mass.

The Paris "Trib"

Your friendly invitation to come to Cambridge to talk with your Nieman Fellows was forwarded to me in Paris. I was home a scant three weeks.

By the way, do you ever take a look at our European Edition? By actual check, we publish more world news than any other paper I have looked at, with the exception of the *New York Times* and the parent paper. We consistently publish 50 percent more than the *London Times* and far more than papers like the *Washington Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Daily News* and the *San Francisco Chronicle*. Of course, we don't have to bother about strictly local news and we carry few space-consuming features. But it is interesting to see that in a

four or six-page paper you can get most of the essential news of what is going on in the world. It raises the question why as much of this essential news cannot find its way into a 48-page paper.

Geoffrey Parsons, Jr., Editor
European Edition
New York Herald Tribune

Zephyr-Blown Bull

Dear Mr. Lyons:

Several articles in the April Nieman Reports find me in heavy disagreement.

First, if the South had more men of liberal integrity like Hodding Carter and Harry Ashmore, the policy of gradualism they advocate might work. But gradualism seems so slow as to be imperceptible. With Carter and Ashmore, I believe in States' rights and States' responsibility, but when a State fails its responsibility it forfeits its rights.

The Trenton Times led the successful battle to wipe out segregated schools in Trenton and the equally successful fight for a New Jersey FEPC. As a concession to gradualism, our State FEPC is part of the State Education Department and stresses education rather than force. But an FEPC without sanctions is a watchdog without teeth. So long as the States refuse to enforce equal civil liberties for all, the Federal government is forced to act. The United States is in a strange position, indeed, insisting on civil rights everywhere in the world before we have taken the beam out of our own eye. So much for civil rights.

Dean Mott and Sam Eubanks both sound off-key notes in discussing "professional" journalism.

While I agree with Eubanks that a newspaperman is "for all his dreams a hired hand," setting a \$500 monthly figure as the dividing line is no solution. A man isn't a member of a profession because he gets \$500 a month. That pay doesn't even guarantee that he is an executive. There are metropolitan reporters and editorial writers who are paid more than \$500 monthly who are not executives. And there are small dailies out in the sticks where the editor and the publisher don't get \$500 a month. The dollar mark is not necessarily a criterion, unless it is tied on a sliding scale to circulation or gross revenue or some other gauge of size,

Dean Mott cites three essential qualifications for "professional" practitioners, (1) services, (2) preparation and (3) ethics. Let's take his qualifications in his order.

Services. It's necessary to agree with Dean Mott that newspapers "perform an inestimable service to the American polit-

ical system" by informing the people of current events. But in modern society there are "inestimable services" performed by railroad trainmen and engineers, milkmen, gas and electric workers and dishwashers. Services are a poor gauge of a man's "professional" status unless they are individual and personal in a narrow field of training.

Preparation. There is no doubt education is needed to make a newspaperman. But it is not the academic qualification necessary for the bar or medicine. On the "rim" at the Times today are five men, three of whom attended but never finished college. Their qualifications as newspapermen can best be attested by the fact that metropolitan papers have within the last few years offered jobs to all of them. The newspaperman without an academic background must get his education the hard way, but to claim that there are essential academic qualifications is zephyr-blown bull.

Ethics. This is a word which gags most newspapermen, for most of us have seen professional ethics abused in the legal and medical businesses. Ethics is a code of behavior and no decent newspaperman would behave as some doctors and lawyers I have known. As for the Canons of Journalism adopted by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, it is a nice statement for the Pollyannas. It is observed as a matter of tradition by most editors. But those who desire may and do violate it without punishment of any kind. The ASNE has set up no board of judges to hold hearings when ethical principles are broken. Perhaps we need a court of honor such as Norway has, manned by newspapermen, empowered to deliver a verdict with at least moral weight. Meanwhile, we have no ethics committees like the bar associations and the medical societies. We are not organized along those "professional" lines.

Dean Mott, furthermore, omitted to mention the fact that it is almost impossible to have a "profession" without an examining any licensing board. Any such organization could hardly fail to violate the "free press" clause in our Constitution. It seems hopeless that newspapermen will ever be professionals in our kind of political system. And God forbid the other systems. It is quite likely that Dr. Lyman Bryson of Teachers College at Columbia is right when he says that, believe it or not, newspapermen are artists. Many newspapermen I know have the same liberalism, integrity, temperament, low pay, pride in performance and skepticism which artists seem to have. (Notice, please, I am not opening old sores by

commenting on the "bon vivant" side of life.)

As a personal note, I might add that I would not change jobs with any lawyer, doctor, banker, broker or other kind of thief or whore in the world. Not even if I was to be known as a "professional."

As you may judge from the above comments, I must have been wearing a hot collar when I read the Nieman Reports. You may print, edit, excise or throw away as much of this letter as pleases you. I feel better for having got it off my chest.

Faithfully yours,
James Kerney Jr.
Publisher, Trenton Times

The Pulitzer Prizes

A good deal of outspoken criticism of Pulitzer prize awards had sprouted in conspicuous places in the months just prior to the 1948 awards. Whether or not the many published sharp words had anything to do with it, the awards for 1948 were such that they have found general acceptance among newspapermen. One who had deplored last year's score said "There weren't any stinkers this year." Perhaps that is as close to commendation as any board can expect from a tribe as skeptical as newspapermen of any judgment handed down by the Brass in the business. Most newspapermen were glad to see such first class practitioners as Bert Andrews, Paul Ward and Virginius Dabney honored. They didn't have any colleagues on the board either. It is doubtless as unfair as it is inevitable that Kent Cooper and Arthur Krock should be criticized whenever the board on which they serve makes awards to AP or New York Times people. It would certainly be unfortunate if they felt it necessary to eliminate AP and Times people from any awards because of their board membership. This is a dilemma that exists only in respect to the newspaper awards because the Pulitzer board is made up of members of that craft. When they pass on plays and books they do so as consumers not producers. So long as the Pulitzer board is made up of producers rather than consumers of journalism, the members are going to be on a delicate spot with their critics. But the latter seem pretty largely to have laid off from this year's awards, which is a good sign. The previous criticism is a good sign too. The jealous concern that very many newspapermen have that these prizes should always go to distinguished work marks the high place the Pulitzer prizes have and is their best safeguard.

Nieman Fellows for 1948-9

Nieman Fellowships were awarded twelve newspapermen for the college year opening in September at Harvard. In announcing the list the Nieman Foundation stated that George Polk, CBS correspondent murdered in Greece in May would have been awarded a fellowship but for his untimely death. Two China correspondents, two editorial writers and eight reporters, of whom one specializes in science, one in labor and one in politics, make up the list.

A Nieman Fellowship entitles the holder to a year of resident study at Harvard, on leave from his newspaper, to follow studies of his own choice. One hundred twenty-two newspapermen have held the fellowships since they were started in 1938 on a bequest by Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of the founder of the Milwaukee Journal.

The new Fellows are:

Alan Barth, 41, editorial writer, Washington Post. A graduate of Phillips Andover Academy and Yale, 1929, Mr. Barth began newspaper work in Beaumont, Texas, later served the McClure Newspaper Syndicate as a Washington correspondent; did war work for the Secretary of the Treasury and later with OWI; and has been on the editorial page of the Washington Post since 1943. His editorials won him a 1948 award of Sigma Delta Chi "for distinguished service in American journalism."

He plans to study history and political science.

Robert R. Brunn, 30, San Francisco correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. A graduate of the University of California, 1939, he served in the Army Air Force as 1st lieutenant and squadron navigator, was shot down on a bombing mission over France and was a prisoner of war in Germany for two and a half years. He ran a camp newspaper for the prison camp and served as educational officer of the camp and later wrote its history for the Army Air Force. He was awarded the Purple Heart, Air Medal and Bronze Star.

On the Monitor he has specialized in California's problem of migrant farm labor. At Harvard he plans to study this and other regional and agricultural problems.

Grady E. Clay, Jr., 31, reporter on the Louisville Courier-Journal. A graduate of Emory University, 1938, and Columbia School of Journalism, 1939, he began newspaper work in Louisville in 1939. He was

a tank officer for two years in the Army and then served 17 months on "Yank" as assistant officer in charge of the European edition, later as officer in charge of the Alaskan edition. On the Courier-Journal he has been photographic editor, daily reporter and now Sunday feature writer.

He plans to study regional problems of the South.

Robert de Roos, 37, reporter on the San Francisco Chronicle. A graduate of Stanford University, 1934, he has been a California newspaperman for 14 years, with the Merced Sun-Star, San Francisco News, manager of the San Francisco office of Time, Inc., and since 1945 on the San Francisco Chronicle, where he has done regional and feature articles including series on the Central Valley Project and on Hawaii.

He plans to study American history and American social problems.

David B. Dreiman, 31, feature writer on the Minneapolis Star, has worked on Minnesota newspapers since 1935 and on the Star since 1937 except for two years in the Army where he was editor of an Army newspaper. His recent work has been largely in educational and science news, including a series on "The Hospital Dilemma" in Minneapolis which won him the Twin Cities Newspaper Guild Award for "the best public service effort" of a Twin Cities newspaperman in 1947 and election to honorary membership on the Minneapolis Public Health Conference.

He plans to study science at Harvard.

Frank Tillman Durdin, 41, chief correspondent in China for the New York Times. A newspaperman for 20 years, Mr. Durdin began as a reporter on the San Antonio Express and served for six years as managing editor of the China Press in Shanghai. With the Times in China since 1937, he covered the Chinese-Japanese war, and later served as war correspondent in Malaya, Java, India, Burma, China and the Southwest Pacific.

He plans to work at Harvard in the China Regional Studies program.

Elmer L. Holland, Jr., 29, editorial writer on the Birmingham News-Age-Herald. A graduate of Birmingham Southern College, 1940, he has worked on the Birmingham newspapers, since 1941, except for two years in the Army where he served in the historical and public relations section of the South Pacific Headquarters, the Philippine Command and in Tokyo and Korea at the beginning of the occupation.

He plans to study political science, economics and philosophy.

Peter Lisagor, 32, reporter, Chicago Daily News. A graduate of the University of Michigan, 1939, his newspaper work has been with the United Press and, since 1941, the Chicago Daily News, first as sports writer, later on general assignments. His three years in the Army included 11 months as managing editor of the London edition of the "Stars and Stripes" and a later period as editor of the "Stars and Stripes" weekly magazine in Paris. Since the war he has covered major news events and has done special series of studies of the state mental hospitals, and other welfare and public administration problems.

He plans to study in the field of social relations.

Christopher Rand, 36, China correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune. Graduate of Groton and Yale, 1934, his early newspaper work was on Time Magazine and the San Francisco Chronicle. During the war he served the OWI in Southwest China, and since 1946 has been correspondent in China for the Herald Tribune.

He plans to work in the China Regional Studies.

Aldric R. Revell, 38, political writer on the Madison (Wisconsin) Capital Times. He has been a reporter on the Capital Times since 1935, specializing in state politics and of recent years writing a political column.

He plans to study in the fields of political science and social relations.

Lawrence G. Weiss, 27, reporter on the Boston Herald. Graduate of Harvard in 1942, he has been on the Herald since 1944 and has specialized in labor reporting.

He plans to study labor and economics.

Charles D. Willis, 33, Captain U. S. Army, reporter on the Fort Worth Press (still on military leave, in Walter Reed Hospital learning to use an artificial leg). He was a reporter for ten years on the Fort Worth Press covering city hall, politics and the courts until he volunteered for the Army in 1942. Severely wounded in the Pacific, he has been three years in Army hospitals, but is now ready for work. A rugged reporter, he has proved an indomitable character and has lost nothing but a leg in his long hospitalization.

He plans to study political science and public administration.