

Nieman Reports

July, 1954

Why Five Cents Isn't Enough For a Newspaper

Poynter McEvoy

Handouts to the Country Editor

Evan Hill

Newspaper Bias in '52

N. B. Blumberg

Prejudices of a Broadcaster

Louis M. Lyons

Newspapers in 2204

David M. White

The Responsible Editor in a Dizzy World

Grove Patterson

Broader and Deeper Local News

Edward Lindsay

Nieman Scrapbook — Book Reviews — Science Writers and Polio
— The Nieman Fellows for 1954-55 — Nieman Notes — The
Segregation Decision: Gordon W. Allport, Hodding Carter, Sylvan
Meyer.

12

38

43

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

NiemanReports

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

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

VOL. VIII, NO. 3

JULY, 1954

Broader and Deeper Coverage

by Edward Lindsay

I think I see the beginnings of a new emphasis in second and third generations of publishers in American newspapers. They are coming to be editors first and business men second. During the era of consolidations—which now is reaching its final phase in the metropolitan centers—many successful publishers were business men first and editors second.

In one sense this change could be thought of as a return to the era of the creative editors—the Bennetts, the Pulitzers, and the Hearsts, who were the founders of the modern newspaper. These early giants built their empires upon reporting and, in large measure, upon crusading.

The consolidated newspapers spent much of the money in expanded editorial coverage that they formerly had spent in circulation and advertising promotion. Most of them bought all the available wire services, added wired pictures when they became available, and increased the columns of news published in their larger newspapers. Gradually they did something else, too. In their own staffs, and by their influence on wire service staffs, they developed a generation of reporters who became expert at the handling of official news.

What impresses me is the examples in newspapers and wire services of seeking truth where it can be found, without reference to whether or not news sources are official.

These principles of broader and deeper news coverage are being applied in their local communities by many newspapers.

Here I will illustrate by using our own papers. I hope you will understand that these examples are not the result of flashes of genius. Some of them developed by accident.

Some of them were cribbed from other newspapers. Some of them came from discussions at the American Press Institute seminars and some from newspaper meetings. This. Some were suggested by surveys like the Continuing Study of Newspaper Reading (brought out by the Research Foundation of the Bureau of Advertising and the American Newspaper Publishers Association), and some from special surveys of our own.

Probably our most ambitious effort on a single subject has been our coverage of the road problems of the State of Illinois. Illinois was one of the early hardroad states. In the '20s it was among the top three states in the nation. At the end of the war we discovered that heavy truck travel had broken up our road system to such an extent that we were rated near the bottom among the 48 states.

A number of studies had been made by the Illinois Highway Department, showing the traffic flow on the road system. A comprehensive report had been made by the engineering firm of Griffenhagen and Associates of Chicago on the state's road deficiencies.

This report indicated that the road deficiencies could be met only by an expenditure of 6½ billion dollars over 20 years. This would have amounted to 344 million dollars a year.

In September of 1950 we ran our own 2½ page analysis of the Illinois road situation. We had the assistance, somewhat surreptitiously, of some of the leading engineers in the State Highway Department in developing information about the unit costs of roads of various types, and about the amount of money that would be produced by various kinds of license fees and various amounts of gasoline taxes. We also got information in detail on the cost of maintaining the highway department.

We urged that a 10-year program be adopted to rebuild the primary road system on the thesis that these were the roads that carry the heavy traffic. We proposed that the gasoline tax be increased from 3 to 4 cents and that truck license fees be equalized with passenger car fees on the ton-mile theory. This meant an astronomical increase in the license fees to be paid by trucks. It also meant that the primary road system could be rebuilt in 10 years at an annual cost of 125 million dollars.

The following January, a Democratic governor, Adlai Stevenson, urged the adoption of the ton-mile license fees for trucks, that primary roads be given first consideration, and that the gas tax be increased two instead of one cent so that some additional money would be available for secondary and township roads.

After a bitter battle, a Republican General Assembly adopted substantially this program.

We assigned a reporter to put in his full time to study-

(Continued on page forty-eight.)

The Reader Needs a Ten Cent Newspaper ---

Here's Why - The ABC of Newspaper Economics

by Poynter McEvoy

"I know this game inside and out. You see I used to be a newspaperman myself. . . Now you folks should have guts enough to blast this thing wide open. . ."

When a newspaper editor or publisher hears these words he knows he is trapped. In every community there are "former newspapermen" who have their own angles about community action or even planned non-action.

These ex-journalists are highly articulate. Included in the group are lawyers, doctors, bankers, store owners, professors, farmers, government employees, scientists, and, of course, politicians.

To be fair, think for a moment what a group like this one could bring to newspaper operation: restrained treatment of court news, accurate reports of scientific developments in true perspective, better treatment of schools and school problems, better interpretation of government, enlightened coverage of political problems, more attention to religious matters, entirely new treatment of mass ethics and mass issues—if you had a newspaper of your own.

Well, why not start your own newspaper? Why not put yourselves in position to bring better information and better leadership to newspaper readers?

Today's newspapers are hemmed in by certain economic forces. These forces establish definite limits and only within these limits can a newspaper be either "good" or "bad" by any standards you might want to set up.

To get an understanding of these economic forces, let's go into the newspaper business with your money.

Not just "any" newspaper, however. Making allowance for inflation, you could start a modest weekly newspaper with a relatively small investment.

But a modest weekly wouldn't help you meet the challenge that you see in newspaper operation. If you want to own a newspaper which can serve a high social purpose, you must have the mass audience in the hope that you can reach the mass mind. You need a daily newspaper which approaches 100 percent coverage of its area.

Your first step is to find a city which wants an enlightened newspaper—one which will do more for the community than merely promote the welfare of its advertisers.

You may have some ideas on this subject. Let us assume that you have selected an aggressive small city which

already has a newspaper. Let us also assume that this newspaper refuses to sell out.

Now we can talk about money. How much will you need? How great is the risk? And what will be the ultimate return on your investment if you make the grade?

The amount needed, of course, will depend upon the population of the city you have selected, the economic activity in the city, and, above all, the financial condition of your competitor.

A rounded estimate of the cost of entering the small city field—in a population range of 20,000 to 35,000—is \$25,000 from each of 20 members of the club.

You must pay your money \$10,000 now; \$10,000 in six months; and \$5,000 in twelve months.

You could hope that the other newspaper is so bad that the field would crack before you used up your capital. But until such time as your new newspaper either goes bankrupt or starts making money, your twenty stockholders would need to operate under the following agreement:

1. As long as the operation is in the promotion stage, control of policy must lie in the business office. Your first job is to get mass distribution; and

2. Until the newspaper can live on its own earnings, control must always lie in the last advances of money. First payments into the treasury must be considered only as establishing the right to advance later cash in the same proportion. This is very important—it is the only way to find new money if your cash runs out before the job is entirely finished.

This is your investment: \$500,000, half a million. You may not need that much if you get a break; you may need more. You may find yourselves bowing to expediency in news policy. And you are taking the chance that some rich man might step in to secure ultimate control of the newspaper you have started.

Suppose you, or some of you, stick it out successfully. What then? You, as others have done, will buy out the other newspaper and you will end up with a "monopoly" over the local mass mind not much different from the one which existed when you entered the field. And people will complain of inadequate coverage, unenlightened editorial policy, lack of courage, and various groups will demand a new newspaper.

Before you try for the brass ring on this merry-go-round, let's look at the economic factors that establish the limits within which a newspaper has choice of action.

Former daily newspaper publisher, **Prof. McEvoy** for 20 years has been a newspaper consultant on composing room costs. He teaches journalism at University of Indiana.

Analysis Starts in the Home

The useful service which a newspaper performs takes place largely in the home. And the home is the best place to start an analysis of newspaper economics.

A typical daily newspaper (outside of the large metropolitan centers¹) delivers papers to almost every home in its city of publication and to a high percent of the homes in the surrounding territory designated as the city's retail trading zone.

What do these millions of subscribers want for their money? When they pick up today's newspaper what do they expect to find in it? What do Bloomington readers really expect to get for 30 cents a week?

At this point the group was shown a "webbing up" copy—a blank newspaper run through the folder before plates were put on the press.

You can assume that this newspaper was produced by a reliable newspaper organization, one that has earned your trust for integrity and completeness, and that such a copy was thrown on your porch in good faith as part of regular service.

All of us have had the experience of picking up a newspaper, casually looking at headlines, and saying "There is no news in today's paper."

If this copy were seriously issued by a reputable newspaper it would have been on the day when there was "no news." The question is did you get your money's worth?

And the answer is yes. Done seriously, a blank newspaper page would still give you important and useful information about local, state, national, and world affairs.

Your newspaper reports events that have taken place if these events are significant or interesting or unusual. But the process of gathering news is based on repeated checks of "news beats" that cover every phase of local interest. Wire services report state, national, and world affairs on this same basis of constant check on news sources.

If a reporter checks funeral parlors and there have been no deaths, there is no news. But since no deaths were published in the paper, you know that persons important to you are still alive. In the same way, buildings haven't burned, stores are still open, roads are clear, there are no new taxes, no new parking regulations—you know that thousands of things that might have happened didn't happen. The blank newspaper page gives you this information.

You "hire" your local newspaper to do a job for you. You pay not only for the news you get but also for the assurance that published news is the newsworthy residue of a complete check of all points where things might have happened.

¹ Largest metropolitan newspapers report to the Audit Bureau of Circulations on total city zone circulation without showing details. Home delivery is secondary to newsstands and dealer sales.

You also pay for headlines of the right size—just in case you have the urge to ignore a bit of news that you find necessary but unpleasant. This service isn't available in any other medium (radio and TV don't even pretend to be "complete" in this sense) and you couldn't possibly do it yourself.

This is your 30 cents and your part of the story. But your local newspaper expects some action from you before the economic pattern can pay off.

What Advertisers Expect

Your newspaper realizes only 25 percent of its gross revenue from circulation; this is net after carrier profits are taken out and is a fairly typical figure at this time. The other 75 percent comes from advertising of merchants, national advertisers, and classified advertisers who expect to get an adequate return from their expenditures.

Your newspaper expects you to be able to buy advertised products and expects you to be potential customers for the stores which advertise.

Local stores have purchased merchandise which their buyers believe you will like and want. About 50 per cent of newspaper revenue comes from local merchants and success or failure of this part of advertising depends partly upon the buying judgment of the store and partly upon the ability of the newspaper to get the message across to enough potential customers.

You as a reader pay for news coverage and you are also expected to be responsive to advertising. You could have a metropolitan type newspaper without any advertising for perhaps \$2.00 or \$2.50 a week where you now pay 50 cents. A small city newspaper without advertising might sell for \$1.00 a week.

Or advertising might be able to send you a free newspaper by paying about double present rates.

But efforts to publish newspapers without advertising have not been successful; free newspapers for the present exist only in neighborhood shopping areas. Newspaper readers seem to prefer a "package" which includes both news and advertising.

The newspaper problem is to sell this package at prices to readers and advertisers that will yield satisfactory profits without causing the newspaper to lose its position as a cheap mass medium.

This desire to keep at the lowest mass level has made newspapers reluctant to increase rates. When more money is needed to offset rising costs, newspapers have reached out for more volume which has always meant more machinery and more rising costs.

Newspaper Economics is Mixed

While newspapers are part of mass production and mass distribution economics, their own economic structure is a mixture of activities: wholesale and retail selling, door to

door delivery, creative services, hand craft production, and some true mass production, but not very much.

Manufacturers of true mass production items can maintain a low, popular price by reducing the content of their packages. The 25 cents size shrinks gradually until a giant economy size can be introduced at 37 cents. Then the 37 cents size begins to grow smaller until a new family size can be introduced at 59 cents.

A popular soft drink took about a year to break away from "12 full ounces" when that size became uneconomic at a 5 cent price.

Restaurants can still offer \$1.00 dinners by the simple device of eliminating courses that were once included. Desserts, drinks, salads, soups, and even bread and butter have become extras, available but at extra cost.

Retail stores can drop items that have been priced too high and many of them have "scrambled" their normal merchandise to reach out for extra business—selling drug store fast-moving staples in a grocery store as an example.

Even banks many years too late have finally established bargain basements by recognizing the opportunity for business in the payroll loan and conditional sales fields.

If a particular product is going to die out or if it is running into trouble in its normal class, the manufacturer can reduce the formula or cheapen the design to cash in on reputation and prestige lower down on the scale. Automobile manufacturers have made full use of this device in one way or another.

Newspapers do not turn out a true mass production unit. Actually the product itself is incidental to the services transmitted through the product and the services are subject only in a very limited way to these mass production escape routes from unpopular prices and rising costs.

Newsprint savings from narrower rolls of paper are important to big newspapers because consumption of newsprint is a multi-million dollar item in cost of production. But these savings in perspective—in relation to gross revenue, total costs, and profits—are small.

These big newspapers squeeze into their narrow pages by reducing column widths, running nine-column classified, and using other devices which crowd the same production time and cost into the smaller "package."

All other costs are compressed into the smaller units of space and the economic effect on unit costs is something like adopting a smaller box for corn flakes and then grinding the flakes into smaller sizes so the same weight will fit into the new package.

Newspapers have not yet found a way to divide news coverage into areas of interest in such a way that subscribers can buy society news, sports news, or market news by paying an extra fee.

The automobile technique of offering a "special" at a price low enough to lure buyers from lower priced lines

plus offering a much better value in a "deluxe" or "super" so far has no place in newspaper economics.

Like retail stores which add new lines, newspapers can take on job printing, engraving, and other extra services to take up slack. This is a "must" for weeklies and very small dailies and is fairly common for the very largest metropolitan newspapers which resell such items as comic strips, newspaper columns, mats services, and sometimes have extra equipment to print newspaper supplements for smaller newspapers. For the in-between operations, however, non-newspaper work is usually a nuisance.

And finally, the newspaper balance sheet shows why it would be immediate suicide for a newspaper to sell its prestige and reputation in an effort to "cash in" while it lasted.

Newspaper value is primarily intangible and any move that might destroy reputation and prestige would reduce values to salvage value of physical assets. Loss of "goodwill" would wipe out at least half of a newspaper's book value—probably more.

At this point we need some figures.

Typical Budget Figures

The best source of information about changes in newspaper operation is a series of seven annual reports of one newspaper's profit and loss and production figures, presented by *Editor & Publisher* as a service to newspapers generally. This newspaper is identified only as a "typical 50,000-circulation newspaper."

In 1952 this newspaper received 25 per cent of its revenue from circulation and 75 per cent from advertising. It spent its income in the following proportions:²

To Advertising and Circulation Sales	17%	
To Production	43%	
sub-total		60%
To News Coverage	13%	
To Overhead Costs	12%	
To Income Taxes	8%	
		<hr/>
Which adds up to operating costs of	93%	
And Profits of	7%	

Out of these profits the newspaper must leave enough money in the business to meet problems of increased volume—new machinery, extra working space—or just to build up enough working capital for inflationary levels of business.

The gathering and processing of news copy is a small cost factor compared to the cost of selling, producing, and distributing.

² These budget figures are per cents of gross revenue and have been calculated from data published in *Editor & Publisher*, April 11, 1953.

These budget figures can be regrouped to show another important factor in newspaper economics which explains why newspaper values are intangible in nature:

Salaries and Wages	50% (range 40% - 60%)
Newsprint and Ink	20% (up to 40% or more)
Services and Supplies	12%
Business and Payroll Taxes	3%
Income Taxes	8%
	—
Again Total Costs	93% and
Profits	7%

The main ingredient in newspaper production is payroll time. After you buy necessary machinery and equipment for your new newspaper, at least half of your remaining capital will go into payrolls which have no salvage value at all if the project fails.

With payrolls such a heavy factor, contracts and severance deals add to the penalty of going out of business. A newspaper in California, in the 50,000-circulation class, decided to stop publishing and found that it cost \$1,000,000 to establish the right to quit.³

This is the general picture of newspaper economics. Let's look for a moment at your competitor. How much money is he making?

How Strong is Your Competition?

Assuming that he is operating on par with *Editor & Publisher's* typical newspaper and is earning 7 per cent on his gross volume after income taxes, the real test of his earnings depends upon how long he has been in business.

If he has owned the newspaper for at least 10 years and if he hasn't gone overboard on a program of new building, and expanded equipment, then inflation has been kind to him. In the last 10 years newspaper dollar volume has doubled at the least and may have tripled. At least one newspaper in the country is doing eight times its pre-war dollar volume.

A 7 percent yield on gross volume might be equal to as much as 15 per cent or even more on actual invested capital.

If you finally take over the field and still earn only 7 per cent on gross, your 7 per cent is a much less significant figure—your investment will be made under inflated conditions with costs run up still further by knock down and drag out competition.

Because your competitor is operating on a momentum of reader and advertiser habit, you cannot start out your new newspaper on a small scale and gradually better the product. Your very first newspaper product must be better than the existing newspaper.

³ Oakland *Post-Enquirer*, a Hearst publication, was suspended September 1, 1950. *Editor & Publisher*, in its September 9, 1950 issue, said this sum was largely due to severance provisions in contracts.

In selling subscriptions you will have two main goals. First, to sell as many copies as you possibly can for the revenue and for the moral effect on your competitor; and, second, you must try for a substantial core of "exclusive" customers who read no other local newspaper.

At the start you may find this exclusive circulation in outlying areas but you will get no place at all in selling advertising until city subscribers in large numbers stop the other paper.

In selling advertising, your main goal must be to take accounts away from the other paper. There isn't enough fringe advertising to make your operation profitable. Your competitor can lose about 15 per cent of his volume and still break even; you need more than half of his volume before you can make money.

If you and your money hold out and if you have not interfered with your salesmen, you could hope to hit a break-even point by the end of your fourth year.

By this time, your \$500,000 might represent tangible assets (machinery, equipment, fixtures, net current assets) with a salvage value of perhaps \$150,000. The other \$350,000 will have been used up in payrolls to build "goodwill" or "intangible assets."

This goodwill item has value only if you stay in business and can afford to keep running at your present momentum. If your newspaper is breaking even after four years, chances are strong that your competitor is on the ropes—he may now be ready to sell.

What Comes Next?

Here is your problem—you can't quit now. You can slug it out on a break-even basis and take the chance that some new capital would bail out the other paper. You can buy your competitor and make money from the "monopoly" control—but it means borrowing.

You really have no choice. You must place a first mortgage on the combined operation and you end up with a total investment plus debt of something like \$700,000.

Now after four long hard years, you can sit down and edit the kind of a newspaper you had in mind when you started out.

But first . . . there is a little matter of increasing subscription prices to a money-making level; competition kept prices at a minimum—each newspaper wanted to keep the other at the lowest revenue level while competition was strong.

Then you must do something about advertising rates which also were battered down by bitter competition. Advertisers bought space at ridiculously low rates during the battle.

Now, with these jobs done, you can sit down and give careful thought to publishing a really good newspaper.

But in comes a delegation to accuse you of gouging readers and advertisers because you have been able to

"grab a monopoly." Advertisers will talk of the good old days when the city had a newspaper that charged fair rates when it was the only newspaper.

You will be charged with publishing a high-brow newspaper. You will be charged with publishing a low-brow newspaper. You will be accused of being money-mad. You will be accused of being controlled by advertisers, bankers, lawyers, politicians, farmers, doctors—and perhaps even professors.

In the middle of these discussions you will learn that newsprint prices have been increased, labor contracts are being re-opened, big advertisers are thinking about trying television for a while, a carrier boy was seriously injured, and you are being sued for libel.

And one day some local person will come into your office and say "I know this game inside and out. You see I used to be a newspaperman myself. . . Now you folks should have guts enough to do this. . ."

As soon as you can make enough money from your "monopoly" to finance a trip, you will postpone your thinking about an enlightened product and think only about escape. Florida is a fine spot but California has the advantages of distance.

This isn't as far-fetched as it might sound to you.

Newspapers have been carried along with the rise in retail economics that started around 1900. The trend has forced newspaper operation down to "monopoly" form and at the same time has stuffed daily issues with advertising to the point that news content is over-dominated.

In the 1930's typical advertising content ran 40 per cent to 45 per cent of total space. Many good newspapers believed that an advertiser was entitled to "backing" of news content equal to his paid space: sell an extra page to an advertiser; back it up with an extra page of news.

Advertising content now runs 60 per cent or more and few newspapers have the press capacity to handle today's advertising volume on a 40 per cent basis; even if they had press capacity, newsprint is scarce and is too expensive; labor supply is inadequate.

In meeting the shift from dominance of news to dominance of advertising, newspapers have tended to freeze news coverage into a fixed daily output which is supplied by a newsroom staff of whatever size the newspaper can afford.

Before the depression of the 1930's newspapers generally paid little attention to circulation revenue as a factor in profits. Newspapers in some instances were satisfied if circulation paid its own selling costs. Some big city afternoon newspapers sold for 12 cents a week during part of the prosperity period. Advertisers paid the bills.

When the depression hit newspapers, the big operations lost as much as 50 per cent of their advertising volumes but

only something like 12 per cent of their subscribers. The reader turned out to be a steadier customer than the advertiser when economic conditions got rough.

All newspapers began to re-examine their circulation operations, first for wasteful practices that grew up when circulation was expected only to sell more copies than other newspapers and, later, for ways to look to readers for more substantial economic support.

The Readers Pay More—Get More

A few brave newspapers increased retail rates and others followed—but the typical increases were made in this way:

Increase from 15c a week to 20c—	
the reader pays	5c more
Let the carrier keep	1c
Give back to the reader in new features, more pictures, and better local coverage	2c
Apply to general operations	2c

Since the war, newspapers have been increasing rates rapidly but increases have tended to stop at 30 cents a week for six-day newspapers. This is the 5 cents a copy ceiling that has been a block in newspaper thinking—the "world's greatest value for a nickel," as newspapers have been called, sounds just a little like bragging about not growing up.

Having stopped at this 30 cents level, Editor & Publisher's typical newspaper now loses 18 cents a week on each paid customer.⁴ Advertisers pick up the deficit.

From the standpoint of the newspaper reader, the healthiest period of newspaper publishing came during the post-depression years when it looked as if the trend would lead to a 50-50 split of newspaper costs between readers and advertisers.

The depression newspaper subscriber paid more for his newspaper than the prosperity subscriber but the depression subscriber was a much more important part of newspaper policy and consideration.

Inflation has shifted the accent back to advertising to the extent that the reader has lost status and influence even while paying prices that would have seemed fantastic 15 years ago.

The truth is that subscription prices haven't gone up enough; advertisers are dominating the newspaper scene because they are once again picking up the deficits.

For the present, a 10 cent daily newspaper price would just about perform the miracle of restoring the reader to something like the status he enjoyed during the depression when his money became so important.

The 10 cent newspaper would take the economic heat off of newspaper management, freeing present "worry, worry" time for more constructive thinking about news and news policy.

At 10 cents newspapers would have less need to reach out for ever-increasing volume of new business to keep alive.

And as a check and balance, the 10 cent price would give more encouragement to new newspapers; at a 50-50 level of support between readers and advertisers, competing newspapers could both make money.

The 10 cent newspaper may come anyway (as it has in California) but under present practices the rate will come about three years too late to solve immediate problems.

This may be the answer to the pressure that is forcing one newspaper towns. If readers could be sold on the social implications of a higher price, new newspapers could be aimed entirely at serving needs of readers without necessity of battering down an institution before a new one can be built.

If you start a successful movement, you will get a better break when you risk your second \$500,000 on a new newspaper.

Handouts to the Country Editor

by Evan Hill

Fiction writers have used a broad and inaccurate pen in painting the modern country editor as a grey-haired, old man wearing a green eyeshade, black muslin elastic-banded arm cuffs, and sitting at a battered, cluttered roll-top calmly smoking a curved pipe as he writes brilliant homey editorials.

Today's country weekly editor may be all of these, although it is doubtful; he may be some of these, which is more probable; but almost surely he will have the cluttered desk. That is, unless he has a long arm and a large convenient wastebasket. For the handout, the unsolicited, generally useless press release, is with him always.

Through no fault of its own, the Post Office Department takes more time and space from the country editor than any other single organization. And it does it as systematically as it delivers the mail. Through rain and hail and sleet and snow, by ship and train and bus and sometimes plane, postmen deliver to the cluttered desk of the country editor piles of printed, mimeographed, duplicated and type-written "news" that is utterly useless and unwanted. These are the handouts.

The handout is the written result of the paid publicist who has something to sell, an idea to peddle, a reminder to give, or sometimes (and this is a most wearisome and unfortunate circumstance) a good job to keep.

Thousands of reams of good paper are quickly swept into wastebaskets each month throughout this country. These are handouts. Most of them are useless; many of them are insults to the intelligence of the average man; their waste is criminal.

As an example of what these well-paid purveyors of

information are doing to the editors of the approximately 1800 dailies and 10,000 weeklies in the U. S., let us look into the cluttered office of a weekly paper in a town of 6,000 in New Hampshire. This paper has a circulation of less than 2,500 and serves a community that is industrial, not agricultural. It has a full-time news staff of two, and it publishes approximately ten pages each issue.

In order to get a fairly accurate picture of the handout situation, this writer requested the editor to save the contents of his wastebasket for two weeks. At the end of ten days the editor gave up. He complained that he was running out of storage space. Academic interest and all that sort of thing, he said, were all right and certainly commendable. But you could carry a good thing too far. The editor said the baskets on his desk were full, his wastebasket was overflowing, a cardboard carton of saved press releases was constantly in his way, and could he stop this damned nonsense and send the rest out to the waste paper baler.

So the handouts were gathered from his desk baskets, from the cardboard carton and from the wastebasket and sorted. All these releases were rejects, now; they did not include those which has been put aside for future perusal or which had been used in the two issues published during this ten-day period. Under normal circumstances they would have been taken to the back shop for the waste paper dealer.

After sorting and classifying, here is what was found. In a ten-day period the rejected press releases were equivalent to four printed books of 165 pages each. There were 149 releases from 68 different sources. There was the equivalent of 950 double-spaced typewritten pages or 245,000 words. This was an average of 95 pages of typewritten double-spaced copy each day. And all went into the wastebasket.

Evan Hill teaches journalism at Boston University and has written before on the weekly editor's problems for *Nieman Reports*.

In order to analyze to some extent these wastebasket contents, they were broken down into six arbitrary categories, and each group was sorted for its value to the local newspaper. Some sources might well differ with the choice of category into which they were thrown, but the choices were mainly arbitrary, and it is the amount and content that are important, not the category.

The table that follows gives the picture for the ten-day period.

<i>Type of Release</i>	<i>No. of Releases</i>	<i>No. of Sources</i>	<i>No. of Typed Pages</i>	<i>No. of Words</i>
Business	80	40	532	133,000
Philanthropic	16	9	210	60,000
Government	14	6	83	21,000
Pressure Groups	6	5	71	18,000
Educational Institutions	29	7	41	10,000
Political	4	1	13	3,000
Totals	149	68	950	245,000

The experienced newsman who goes into public relations knows the problems confronting the editor and takes pains to see that his releases are well-written, interesting, easy to use, and with some news value. And, if possible, he adds the local angle or twist that often keeps the release out of the wastebasket.

But some of the authors of the releases listed above were not only completely unaware of these basic principles of editing, but were not aware of the composition of the town to which they were sending the handouts. The worst violator in this respect was the U. S. Department of Agriculture, which sent three unintelligible releases from its Connecticut Department of Farms and Markets. The reports, signed by three agricultural statisticians, told of chick placement in commercial broiler areas of eastern Connecticut. Even if the town to which they were sent were in an egg region instead of being primarily industrial, it is doubtful that farmers would be greatly interested in the number of eggs set and chicks hatched in eastern Connecticut unless these production figures were compared to local production, and unfortunately the country editor just does not have time to do the research and digging needed for that one story.

From the newsman's standpoint, the tables were almost impossible to decipher even if the editor had decided that chick placement was something important to his community. In all probability the chick statisticians are doing a good job, but if they do not consider waste circulation in their distribution, and do not write intelligibly, much of their effort is wasted.

Two other Department of Agriculture handouts came from the New England Crop Reporting Service in Boston,

which apparently blankets New England with its mailing list. One of the releases contained this scintillating, fascinating lead, "The Nation's commercial hatcheries produced 53,078,000 chicks during September, the largest output on record for September. The hatch was 19 per cent larger than in September a year ago and 46 per cent above the 1943-47 average. The previous September high output was during September 1945 when hatcheries produced 51,915,000 chicks."

These reports arrive weekly in newspaper offices, and it is reasonable to assume that if they are sent to a small industrial community in New Hampshire they are also sent to dailies and weeklies throughout New England, or to a total of 536 dailies and weeklies. Weeding out of the useless circulation would result in savings, but it is possible that the cost of sorting the mailing lists into industrial and rural areas would be greater than merely blanketing the area. But the problem of cost must be set against the psychological disadvantage of having the receiving editors convinced that the sources do not know what they are doing.

However, government departments are not the originators of the most useless releases. Pressure groups seemed to send out the least usable, but they were outdone in quantity by business and philanthropic organizations.

While government releases numbered only 14 and came from only six sources, including a New Hampshire senator, UNESCO, the Veterans Administration, the N. H. Department of Health, and the U. S. Navy, they were of generally high quality. Some government releases would have been used, this country editor said, if he had had more time to work with them.

The volume of philanthropic handouts was more than twice that of government, and almost completely useless. The Kiwanis International sent more than 1,500 words to a town that had no Kiwanis Club and therefore no local angle. The USO sent several thousand words in two clip sheets from its USO News Service and several hundred more from the state committee. None were used. None could be used. However, the USO clip sheet does have the frugal sense of enclosing a card which asks editors if they want mats of the pictures in the clip sheet; it does not send the mats without request. And part of a release from the state committee was used. The editor, in reading it, discovered a comment concerning his own county. It was buried in paragraph three. He considered himself fortunate in finding it, yet a red ring around that graph would have insured the publicist originating the handout that the local angle would be called to the editor's attention.

The American Cancer Society duplicated its mailing to this newspaper. One release was mailed to "The Gazette Press, Main Street" and an identical release to "Mr. Gazette,

Main Street." The National Grange, meeting 3,000 miles away from the editor's town, blithely stapled 44 pages of an address set in tiny, six-point type into a booklet and mailed it to New Hampshire where the editor didn't waste time to sigh before he tossed it into the wastebasket. It would have taken at least three hours to read, and several more to digest the facts contained in the report.

The American Red Cross sent more than 20,000 words in the ten-day period. When it was taken from the wastebasket it was found addressed, in a letter of transmittal, to "Public Information Chairman, Disaster Service Chairmen: from Director, Public Information, Director Disaster Service; Subject: Disaster Publicity Kit "Tell the People." The booklet, 59 pages thick, included a section on "Ideas for Publicizing All Phases of Disaster," three radio scripts and tips on getting full news coverage. Also in the wastebasket were found "Contact," an excellent publicity brochure but of dubious value to country weeklies, and a press release from Washington concerning the clothing needs of Italian children.

Most interesting and most numerous was the group which fell into the category of business. Forty organizations sent 80 releases to this country weekly in the period studied. The handouts were the equivalent of 532 manuscript pages, and contained 133,000 words, more than half the total number of words received and thrown away in the ten-day period.

This group included an issue of the Industrial Press Service which is distributed by the National Association of Manufacturers, prepared editorials from known and unknown sources, the wisdom of crackpots, the clever mats of anti-freeze producers and beauty products manufacturers, in addition to No. 23, Vol. XXVIII of "Railroad Data" which begins its lead story with this un-Flesched and unread sentence: "To preserve the strength and vigor of the nation's privately owned railroad system, which in peacetime and wartime has accorded the country greater service than any other method of transportation, the railroads ask equality of treatment and equality of regulation with other carriers and the elimination of subsidies to competing forms of transportation, Fred G. Gurley, president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway System, declared recently." There was also duplication in the mailing of this handout. The editor said it was commonplace to receive two identical releases of "Railroad Data."

Handout artists for five agricultural associations sent nine releases to this primarily industrial community, and some stories originated in offices as far away as Ithaca, New York, and Chicago, giving not even the most imaginative editor the slightest chance of finding a local tie-up.

Such handouts as those from U. S. Steel, The International Nickel Company, the American Road Builders'

Association, The Institute of Life Insurance and the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston apparently are not designed for use in the columns. Their purpose seems to be to inform and influence the editors who will pass on to their readers the attitudes expressed in the releases. Certainly such handouts as those from the "Continental Press Syndicate" which makes available stories or editorials titled "Devaluation Versus Congress," "Life Insurance Income Taxes" and "Devaluation Versus Stability," all by Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U. S., can hardly be intended for reprint in the small weekly press. Nor can the contents of "Pulling Together," which is labelled "A Non-Partisan, Non-Profit Organization to Give Small Business Men a Voice in National Affairs and Preserve Free Enterprise" be intended for verbatim reprinting. Obviously the apparent wide-circulation of such handouts is intended not for reprinting, but to condition the editor's mind. And because there is no way of measuring how many thoughts have been planted by certain handouts, it is possible that such organizations are resigned to a certain amount of waste circulation so that they can influence some editorial minds. But who can tell which way they condition? A new editor, naive and believing what he reads will soon become a skeptic, if not a cynic, after reading two weeks of "non-partisan" claims for the copy and seeing in almost every case that the non-partisan copy has its Republican slip showing. If the editor is Republican, and that particular brand of Republican, he already agrees and no convert is made, but he might lift part of the handout. If the editor is a Democrat, or an opposition-Republican, his mind is conditioned all right, but usually in stronger opposition to the viewpoint of the "non-partisan" publicist. And these statements are true, of course, only if the editor reads the contents before they are swept into the wastebasket.

Only five groups classified in the pressure category sent handouts to the N. H. weekly during this period. Only one, an organization of state employees, was not organized on a national basis. The other four produced the clip sheet of the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church, the news service of the American Legion, a lithographed reprint of editorials concerning highway problems and coming from an unidentified source, and galley proofs "unleashed by R. O. Stearns" in Winthrop, N. Y.

The average weekly editor, unless himself a teetotaler, would rarely reprint from the temperance clip sheet, and only occasionally does the American Legion news service contain a story or a tip that might be useful. The "unleashing" of R. O. Stearns is interesting enough, although it does not take too careful reading to see what row he is hoeing, but the average editor would be hesitant to use it because of its unknown source. Just who is R. O. Stearns

and what is his motive? The editor just does not have time to find out. So he sweeps the handout into the basket. Generally, however, these handouts are handled with more skill than are those of business, philanthropies or government.

Most skillfully distributed were the releases from colleges and universities in the region served by this weekly paper. The Dartmouth news service was especially thorough during football season, and this newspaper was on Dartmouth's mailing list because it had requested the releases. Not all of them were usable because they were written for dailies and the time factor interfered with weekly publication, but advance stories were often used. Small colleges, such as Colby Junior College, Middlebury and the University of New Hampshire have their publicity bureaus organized so that very little waste materials get into the mails. Usually they have a very definite local angle, ringed in red pencil for the local editor, and are therefore almost always used. These releases are usually very well written, and in general the country editor looks forward to receiving their handouts.

An examination of the 149 handouts mailed during a period of ten days to a weekly newspaper with approximately 2,500 circulation certainly gives some indication of what the publicity industry throughout the nation is doing

to U. S. editors and the U. S. mails. There is little wonder newspapermen are jaded individuals who liberally sprinkle salt on every claimed "fact."

And there is no doubt that the publicity industry is deceiving its employers. If organizations hiring publicists would not be so satisfied with the number of releases *mailed*, but made more effort to find the number printed in newspapers and the number discarded, the system would be much more efficient. American business, generally a sensible group, is most guilty of foolish spending in this case. This group more than any other has been taken in by high-priced handout artists who periodically give a report on the number of handouts *released*.

The employers of professional publicists, especially those in American business, could take some time before approving their next annual budgets, to go through a country weekly's wastebasket. And how about the daily's bigger basket?

The newspaper editor doesn't really mind, for he's become used to the situation. A long arm and a large basket are all he needs to clear his desk, and he can recognize the useless handout by the envelope concealing it. And when the wastebasket is full he can sell U. S. Steel, the American Red Cross and Railroad Data to the waste paper buyers.

Science Writers and Polio

By Hart E. Van Riper

Science writing is a difficult profession; it requires a mastery both of the discipline of science and the art of communication. I have the highest regard for the men and women who have mastered this technique and brought it to the service of human understanding. I have had ample evidence of the integrity and persistence of real science writers in bringing their talents to bear in telling the public the truth about polio. I congratulate them for their public service.

Polio is a disease which has public relations as well as medical problems. To the extent that it is an uncontrollable disease, it evokes a panic reaction on the part of the public. So long as it remains a mystery, fear and emotional response are the common reaction.

Research programs, sponsored by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, have removed much of the mystery from the disease. We know now that it is not

unique and separate from other communicable diseases; it is subject to control through rational medical and epidemiological procedures.

Much of the problem of translating to the public the new and sound knowledge of polio acquired through laboratory and clinical research has fallen to the lot of science writers, publishing their material in newspapers and magazines. That they have done their job well is reflected in the fact that polio epidemics in specific communities no longer strike the terror they once commanded. The public attitude toward polio has been changed from wild fear to reasoned precaution by telling the truth about the disease. This is a great gain in public understanding and also makes intelligent medical care and treatment of the disease easier and more effective.

You all know that the National Foundation this spring has sponsored nationwide field trials of a vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk, of the University of Pittsburgh. This great step in public cooperation, bolstering the hope that we have an effective polio preventive, has been generously reported and supported in the press. An undertaking as complex as the polio vaccine field trials could not be ex-

Dr. Van Riper is medical director of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. This is from his talk at the medical journalism awards luncheon of the Lasker Foundation, May 27.

pected to move along without any hitches or apparent roadblocks. It was an admittedly difficult problem to manufacture vaccine quickly in quantities to inoculate between 500,000 and 750,000 children with three doses each. And to triple-test each batch of vaccine for safety.

I must admit that there were times when it seemed to us that we would not reach our objective of getting the field trials under way. In spite of our difficulties, the science writers have always treated us sympathetically. They expected that we would have difficulties; they recognized the magnitude of the undertaking and dealt accordingly with the humanitarian objective of our research project; namely, to prove the value of vaccination against polio at

the earliest possible date so that polio prevention in earnest might begin in 1955. The science writers, on their own initiation, were quick to answer the critics of and snipers at our program.

We had more than one sniper at our vaccine field trial program. Some came from the ranks of science. Others had no qualifications for competent comment in the field of medical research. I think it should be on record that science writers, editorial writers and the press as a whole quickly rose to the defense of our vaccine field trials and were not deterred by the snipers. In the final analysis, I think attacks on us taught us who were the real friends of scientific truth.

A Psychologist Views the Supreme Court Ruling on Segregation

by Gordon W. Allport

We all feel that the Supreme Court decision has deep social and psychological significance for our country, but perhaps we are not yet entirely clear in our minds about what its most important effects will be.

For some years now the walls of segregation have been crumbling. In busses and trains, in housing projects, and especially in the armed services these walls have been weakened. Fair Employment Practice Acts of various cities and states have removed barriers to employment. Massachusetts with its comprehensive laws has simultaneously attacked discrimination in employment, education, in the state militia, and in the use of public facilities.

But it is the recent Supreme Court ruling that gives the greatest push ever given to the barricades of racial discrimination and prejudice. Not only will 17 states suffer a shock to their entrenched folkways, not only will the lives of 11 million children, both white and Negro, be directly affected; but the ruling will reach far beyond the walls and policies of the public school. It will strengthen all the forces that are at work to eliminate segregation in other areas of life: transportation, housing, voting, holding office, churches, places of entertainment, occupations. We can expect Negroes as they become better trained in more adequate schools to hold better positions on the occupational and professional ladder. As their status improves they will lose the stigma of inferiority that has long plagued their position in society.

Gordon W. Allport, professor of psychology at Harvard University, is the author of *The Nature of Prejudice*, *Psychology and Rumor* and other books. This is from a radio talk given over the FM station, WGBH in Boston immediately after the Supreme Court decision against segregation.

It is important to note that the Supreme Court ruling for the first time in history distinctly says that segregation, as such, has a harmful effect on the minds and characters of its victims. Therefore segregation is an evil; it is Un-American; it is unconstitutional. Never before has the conscience of America as a whole, through its most authoritative civil agency, declared clearly and unequivocally that democracy requires desegregation. Even if separate Negro and white schools were equal in excellence, which they never have been, the voice of American conscience says they are still unconstitutional. Unless children can mingle together, play together, get acquainted on equal footing, and have their squabbles together, they are denied their rights as American citizens to learn to rub along and to live together.

Let's look first then at the probable effects of the ruling on children. We all know that children have no racial or ethnic prejudice to start with. As a matter of fact it takes about 12 years for the child to become thoroughly infected. Where segregation is practiced, the infection is easy, because from his earliest years the child sees clear proof that Negroes are inferior, probably diseased and dangerous. If not, why should they be kept in a separate school—as if in a contagious ward? Lillian Smith, the Southern author, describes in *Killers of the Dream*, her own muddled upbringing in these words:

“I do not remember how or when, but by the time I had learned that God is love, that Jesus is His Son and came to give us more abundant life, that all men are brothers with a common Father, I also knew that I was better than a Negro, that all black folks have their place and must be kept in it, . . . that a terrifying disaster would befall the South if ever I treated a Negro as my social equal.”

Such muddle-headedness is in part a direct result of segregated schools. When children study together, recite together, use the same books, play together, and quarrel together they are not likely to develop ideas that are a travesty on biological and psychological truth, or a mockery of their religious teaching. We now know for a fact—on the basis of scientific studies—that equal status contact in a common activity, especially if this equal contact has the support of the social system (as it will now have under the Supreme Court ruling)—under such conditions, we know, prejudice lessens.

Therefore I predict that in a few years, depending on how well the ruling is carried out, anti-Negro prejudice among the younger generation in Southern and Border States, and in the District of Columbia, will diminish.

But people ask, will the South obey the ruling? Will not states like Georgia and South Carolina wriggle out of the situation? Won't there be riots and rebellion? My prediction is No—at least not very serious and not very prolonged. Of course in the papers today and for some weeks to come we shall read of angry protests and threats. But I doubt that the South will secede, either politically or morally.

My reasons for taking a generally optimistic view is this: People approve of, and will obey, laws and rulings that accord with their own private consciences. Southerners as well as Northerners know perfectly well that segregation is repugnant to the American creed as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as well as to the Christian religion. Segregators are really not happy people. They have been miserable for years and years. But so strong have been the folkways, the bitterness engendered by the Civil War, and the sheer apathy of human nature that, left to themselves, Southern States would probably not have abolished school segregation for many, many years to come. Most Southerners, I feel, will be glad to have the issue settled. Suppose a person has an ugly wart on his face, and suppose he is afraid of surgery. He may protest and rationalize, he may defend his wart as natural and God-given, he may fight off his friends and neighbors who want it removed. But when, by some firm action, the ugly wart is actually excised, isn't the person glad? His protests gradually subside, and he feels more human. Our prejudices are all of this type. We hate to give them up; but when we are freed of them, we feel better.

Of course the Supreme Court ruling is not aimed directly at prejudice at all. It is aimed merely at one of the major conditions that make for prejudice. Toward the end of the last century, in affirming the constitutionality of segregation, the Supreme Court argued that it was "powerless to combat racial instincts." It has now reversed its earlier position. The wisdom of social science has been brought to bear upon the matter. The Court now sees that racial prejudice is not instinctive, and that it has it within its power to alter discrimination, and when discrimination lessens, prejudice too will weaken. It is especially noteworthy that Justice Warren in writing the unanimous decision, clearly cited recent researches conducted by social scientists and acknowledged their impact on the Court's ruling.

Finally, there is an important consequence that Americans who stay at home may not fully realize. We feel vaguely that the communists are winning the battle for men's minds in much of Europe and in Asia and in Africa. But do we know the strongest argument of the communist propagandists? It is that the United States is an utter hypocrite. We talk equality but practice segregation that amounts to a form of slavery—so the communists say—13,000,000 American Negroes. Now about three-quarters of the world's population have colored skins. They feel sympathy with the Negro. They do not like our saintly talk when it is backed up only by ugly practices. How can America, they ask, believe in democracy or human rights and yet stigmatize its own largest minority group? The Supreme Court ruling will be a great shock to the complacency of those who call us hypocrites. It will show that the American ideal is still growing and vital and in process of continuous realization.

A student from Africa, after spending a disillusioned year in this country, returned to his native land with a negative impression. He said, "When it comes to race relations you Americans talk like Heaven but act like Hell." This critic, and all other critics must now reconsider their judgment. The highest civil authority in the land has declared in ringing tones that American public schools stand unequivocally for equality, fairness, and respect for each growing child. The decision may be tardy; it certainly will not lead us overnight into a perfect democracy. It will not make our behavior suddenly angelic. But it will at least show the world that the American dream is not only still very much alive, but is in fact now more than ever in the process of realization.

Newspaper Bias in the 1952 Presidential Campaign

by N. B. Blumberg

A study of 35 large daily newspapers in 35 states during the month preceding the 1952 presidential election has been completed by this writer and will be published in late summer by the University of Nebraska School of Journalism.

The sampling employed in the study was based on an attempt to obtain a geographical distribution of newspapers which were most likely to have a significant influence in their respective states. The original plan was to examine newspapers with the largest circulation in each of the 48 states, but for various reasons, primarily the difficulty of obtaining copies or microfilms of desired papers, it was not possible to include newspapers from 13 states. In six cases it was found necessary to substitute another large newspaper, usually with the second highest circulation in the state.

This sample resulted in a representative distribution of newspapers on the basis of editorial political preference in the 1952 election. According to a poll by Editor and Publishers covering 1,385 daily newspapers, 67.34% of the papers with 80.24% of the circulation supported Eisenhower, 14.52% with 10.88% of the circulation supported Stevenson, and 18.14% with 8.88% of the circulation declared an independent policy in the election. In this study, 74.29% of the newspapers with 78.71% of the total daily circulation supported Eisenhower, 20% with 17.76% of the circulation supported Stevenson, and 5.71% with 3.53% of the circulation announced an independent editorial policy in the election. Although the 35 newspapers comprise only 1.97% of the total number of daily newspapers in the United States, they have 13.89% of the total daily circulation.

The sample, by chance, included one newspaper from each of five major chains—Hearst, Scripps-Howard, Gannett, McCormick-Patterson and Knight.

The final 30 days of the campaign preceding the election was the period selected for the survey. Front pages of the newspapers were carefully examined and a study of inside pages on three selected dates (Oct. 16, Oct. 24, Nov. 3) was made. When inside page coverage on one of the dates was influenced by local conditions, usually the visit to a city by one of the principals in the campaign, another issue was substituted.

In the statistical analysis, stories and headlines were

measured by column-inches to the nearest half-inch. Thus a three-column headline one inch deep and a 7 1/2-inch story would be tabulated as 10 1/2 column-inches of space. Photographs, including caption and outline, were similarly computed. Microfilms were used in 33 of the 35 cases, and when more than one edition had been preserved an effort was made to select the home delivery edition.

Three major general conclusions emerged from this study:

1) Of the 26 pro-Eisenhower newspapers examined, 11 gave the Democrats more front page space, 15 gave the Republicans more front page space.

All seven pro-Stevenson newspapers gave the Democrats more front page space.

One of the two newspapers which announced an independent editorial policy gave the Democrats more space, the other gave the Republicans more space.

2) After both quantitative and qualitative judgments were made, 15 pro-Eisenhower newspapers were regarded as showing no bias, four were determined to have demonstrated bias in favor of their candidate, and seven provided no conclusive evidence of bias.

Among the pro-Stevenson newspapers, two showed no bias, two showed definite bias, and three gave no conclusive evidence of bias.

Of the two newspapers which took an independent editorial position, one showed no bias and one provided insufficient evidence to warrant a conclusion of bias.

3) Six of the 35 newspapers examined, therefore, provided definite evidence of bias in their news columns.

The published study will contain an analysis of the performance of each selected newspaper.

To arrive at the conclusions in this study, evaluation first was made of the categories of the statistical table: number of stories, column-inches of news space, number of photographs, column-inches of photograph space, number of multi-column headlines and total column-inches of space. Then the statistical results of inside page coverage in three issues, including the same categories, were examined to see whether there was any significant difference between front page and inside page treatment. Display (primarily banner headlines or top play headlines) and position of stories were then appraised. Finally, consideration was given to special circumstances (for example, the visit to a newspaper's city by only one of the presidential candidates) which would justify a subjective judgment altering the statistical findings.

N. B. Blumberg, former associate editor of the Lincoln (Neb.) *Star*, is assistant professor of journalism at the University of Nebraska.

Each newspaper was placed in one of three categories:

1) *No evidence of bias*: Newspapers which more extensively covered the activities of the candidate they editorially opposed or were above reproach for their coverage of the campaign.

2) *No conclusive evidence of bias*: Newspapers which may appear to have given more extensive coverage to the candidate of their editorial preference, but for which there were extenuating circumstances or special cases which would not justify a charge of bias against them.

3) *Evidence of bias*: Newspapers which clearly showed favoritism in the news columns for the candidate of their choice.

There were, of course, numerous problems involved in both the quantitative and qualitative sections, and they will be discussed in detail in the published study. Attention can be drawn here, however, to a few of the difficulties. Some headlines and stories do not fit easily into categories established for the purpose of quantitative analysis. How, for instance, should one tabulate the headline, "Jersey Workers Boo Eisenhower"? Certainly the headline could not be listed as favorable to the Republican presidential candidate, but the story, following a lead on which the headline was based, reported in favorable terms a speech delivered by Eisenhower.

An egg is thrown at Stevenson, and the incident makes an interesting feature story. The Democratic National Committee reports that its fund drive is lagging. Nixon becomes angry at some hecklers. Democratic National Chairman Mitchell fires an assistant for allegedly helping to negotiate a government contract for a Portugese tungsten firm. Republican officials gleefully report a train platform slip of the tongue by Truman, in which he is reported as thanking his listeners for coming "to look at the—the man who is running the campaign for president."

Or this one:

"SAN FRANCISCO (AP)—Sen. Estes Kefauver, arriving here to speak in behalf of the Democratic presidential ticket, said Wednesday he thought President Truman's whistle-stop tour has had a 'negative effect' for Governor Adlai Stevenson."

Obviously a subjective judgment had to be made in each case. The fundamental consideration at all times was whether a story could be included in good conscience in either the Democratic or Republican column. Critics may quarrel with the decision made in some cases, but the interpretation of news reports has always been a subject of debate and it will neither surprise nor disappoint the author if there is honest disagreement with his evaluations. In any event, the study was sufficiently extensive so that

the final statistical tabulation for each newspaper would not be altered appreciably if all—or none—of these stories were included in the computations.

The qualitative appraisal presented difficulties of a different kind. Proximity is a major determinant of news, and the visit of a campaign principal of either party to any city normally would result in heavier coverage in the newspapers of that locality. There was no special problem when both presidential candidates spoke in cities where newspapers included in this study are published. On the contrary, a comparative analysis of treatment accorded visits and speeches of the two candidates often served as an excellent guide in determining whether bias was present. But complications arose when only one presidential candidate appeared in a particular locality during the period under study. Every effort was made in the analysis of individual newspaper performance to compensate for an understandable statistical imbalance which would result from a situation of this kind.

Closely related is the problem of special local interest in one of the major principles. Certainly the utterances of Nixon generally are of greater interest in California than in Florida. A newspaper in Missouri might be expected to devote more space to Truman than would a newspaper in North Dakota, and southern newspapers possibly would follow the activities of Sparkman with more than ordinary interest. The fact that Eisenhower made his campaign headquarters in Denver understandably would influence coverage of a newspaper published in that city. These factors, and others similar to them, were utilized to make an evaluation of the statistical findings whenever possible. Many subjective decisions, some of them made only after months of study, were necessary before the conclusion of this survey. Special attention should be drawn, for example, to the fact that stories related to two events during the months preceding the election—the release of figures on Eisenhower's income over a 10-year period and Stevenson's emergency flight to help quell the Illinois state prison riot—were not included in this study. A pilot survey, made before this study was undertaken, revealed that most newspapers played these stories in addition to or separate from the main body of campaign news. A check of the statistical results shows that even if these two stories—each involving one of the candidates—had been included in the study it would have made only a slight difference in the final tabulations.

It should also be pointed out that editorial page items, syndicated or special columns, "roundup series" by the wire services or the newspapers, and results of professional polls were not included. Similarly, news accounts pertaining to state or local campaigns were not counted unless they clearly applied primarily to national issues involving the political fortunes of the presidential candidates.

Newspapers examined were the Birmingham (Ala.) *News*, Phoenix (Ariz.) *Gazette*, Los Angeles (Calif.) *Times*, Denver (Colo.) *Post*, Hartford (Conn.) *Times*, Wilmington (Del.) *Journal-Every Evening*, Miami (Fla.) *Herald*, Atlanta (Ga.) *Journal*, Boise (Idaho) *Daily Statesman*, Chicago (Ill.) *Tribune*, Indianapolis (Ind.) *Star*, Des Moines (Ia.) *Register*, Louisville (Ky.) *Courier-Journal*, New Orleans (La.) *Times-Picayune*, Bangor (Me.) *News*, Baltimore (Md.) *Sun*, Detroit (Mich.) *News*, Minneapolis (Minn.) *Star*, Jackson (Miss.) *Clarion Ledger*, St. Louis (Mo.) *Post-Dispatch*, Great Falls (Mont.) *Tribune*, Omaha (Neb.) *World-Herald*, New York (N.Y.) *Times*, Fargo (N.D.) *Forum*, Portland (Ore.) *Oregonian*, Philadelphia (Pa.) *Bulletin*, Sioux Falls (S.D.) *Argus-Leader*, Memphis (Tenn.) *Commercial-Appeal*, Dallas (Tex.) *Morning News*, Salt Lake City (Utah) *Deseret News*, Burlington (Vt.) *Free Press*, Richmond (Va.) *Times-Dispatch*, Seattle (Wash.) *Post-Intelligencer*, Charleston (W. Va.) *Gazette*, Milwaukee (Wis.) *Journal*.

This study was an experiment, an attempt to discover whether it is possible to determine the existence of bias in news columns. It has defects and limitations of which the author is aware, but it proved to his satisfaction that it should be only the first of such studies of newspaper performance on a national scale. Those persons who have contended that it is not "feasible" to subject newspapers to a critical analysis performed no service for the press. Bias, like love, cannot be measured, but it is not impossible to determine whether it exists.

The Nieman Fellows for 1954-5

The Nieman Foundation at Harvard University has announced appointment of twelve newspapermen as Nieman Fellows at Harvard for the college year opening in September. They make the 17th annual group of newspaper men awarded fellowships for a year of background study at Harvard under the bequest of Mrs. Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*. Mrs. Nieman's bequest, in honor of her husband, was "to promote and elevate standards of journalism in the United States." The first Nieman Fellowships were awarded in 1938. Two hundred newspapermen have held these fellowships at Harvard.

Three newspapermen from the British Commonwealths are appointed Associate Fellows without stipend. They are sponsored and financed by the Carnegie Corporation, which has supported three such fellowships at Harvard each year since 1951. A special Associate Fellowship without stipend was awarded Henry Shapiro, United Press correspondent, recently returned from assignment in Moscow.

Nieman Fellows for 1954-55

Piers B. Anderton, 36, telegraph editor, San Francisco *Chronicle*. Native of San Francisco, graduate of Princeton (1938), Mr. Anderton began newspaper work as a copy boy on the *Chronicle* in 1939, went on the copy desk in 1941, has been its telegraph editor since 1950. He served in the Navy from 1942-46. He plans to study U.S. foreign policy and modern European history.

Robert L. Drew, 30, is a midwest correspondent of *Life Magazine*, and has developed some of *Life's* major picture stories. Born in Toledo, he served in the Air Force, 1942-46, as pilot and finally captain. He has been with *Life* since 1947, as assistant picture editor in New York and as correspondent in the field, directing photographic assignments.

He plans to study U. S. history and certain of the problems of cities.

Selig S. Harrison, 27, has just returned from three years' foreign service in the New Delhi, India, bureau of the Associated Press. Born in Wilkinsburg, Pa., he was graduated from Harvard College in 1948 and went to work for the AP in its Detroit bureau a few months later. During a 14-month hitch in the Navy, before finishing college, he was editor of the Great Lakes *Bulletin*, organ of the 9th Naval District Command. He was president of the Harvard *Crimson* in 1948.

He plans to work in Far Eastern studies to prepare for further foreign service.

Carlton M. Johnson, 28, is city editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*. Native of Alabama, he started newspaper work with the Columbus *Ledger*. In 1946, after three years war service in the Navy, he served as general assignments reporter, political writer and assistant city editor until he became city editor four years ago. He has campaigned effectively against the Ku Klux Klan and for a recreational program and slum clearance in Columbus. The last won the AP award for best reporting in Georgia in 1953.

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

Thomas G. Karsell, III, 34, is managing editor of the *Delta Democrat-Times* of Greenville, Miss. Native of Bloomington, Ind., he studied in art institutes to become a cartoonist, later shifted to reporting. He has been on the *Delta Democrat-Times* since 1946 and became its managing editor last year. He served from 1942-46 as private to captain in the Army; recalled to service in Korea, he was chief of news and features for the 8th Army from 1950-52.

He plans to study municipal government and writing.

Albert L. Kraus, 33, is a financial writer on the Providence *Journal*. Born in New York, he was graduated at Queens College in 1941 and earned a master's degree at

Columbia School of Journalism in 1942. After four years naval service, he worked at radio news for a year and joined the Providence *Journal* in 1937. He has been specializing in business and financial news since 1950.

He plans to study economics, accounting and statistics.

Guy E. Munger, Jr., 30, is assistant editor on the Greensboro (N.C.) *Daily News*. Native of Ottumwa, Iowa; after war service in the Air Force he graduated from Northwestern University and earned a master's degree in journalism there, in 1949. He has since been on the Greensboro *Daily News*.

He plans to study economics and government.

Arch Parsons, Jr., 28, is the UN correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune*. Native of New York, graduate of the University of Michigan in 1947; then studied public opinion surveys and propaganda techniques there for a year. He served a year on the New York *Age*, joined the *Herald Tribune* in 1949, served 2 1/2 years as general assignments reporter, and since 1952 at the UN.

He plans to study American history and international affairs in preparation for a foreign assignment.

Mortimer P. Stern, 28, is night city editor of the Denver *Post*. Born in New Haven, he graduated from the University of Arkansas in 1949. He worked on Arkansas newspapers until he joined the Denver *Post* in 1951. After working on many investigations for the *Post* he became night city editor a year and a half ago.

He plans to study problems of public administration.

Henry Tanner, 36, is foreign news analyst on the Houston *Post*. Born in Bern, Switzerland, educated at the Sorbonne and the University of Zurich, he began newspaper work in Europe for the United Press, then served as correspondent for *Time* and *Life*. After six years of extensive news experience abroad, he came to America in 1948 and has since been on the staff of the Houston *Post*, where he does a daily column of background on foreign news.

He plans to study American foreign policy and Russia.

William J. Woestendiek, 30, is Sunday editor of the Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel*. Born in Newark, he graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1947, Phi Beta Kappa, and was editor of the *Daily Tar Heel*. He earned a master's degree at the Columbia School of Journalism in 1948. He has been since then on the Winston-Salem papers as reporter, assistant city editor, and since last year Sunday editor.

His college work had a 3-year interruption in the Army during World War II. He was called back in the Korean War to serve as intelligence officer for 15 months. A

weekly column he sent his paper from Korea won the 1952 North Carolina Press Association award for feature writing.

He plans to study literature and the arts.

Samuel D. Zagoria, 35, reporter on the Washington *Post*. Native of Somerville, New Jersey, he graduated from Rutgers University in 1941. He served three years in the Army and Air Force, then a year as night city editor on the San Bernardino *Sun*. He joined the Washington *Post* in 1946. His reporting on District of Columbia affairs and city development has attracted wide attention and won him the Washington Guild award for public service for 1951.

He plans to study history and government.

Associate Fellow (without stipend)

Henry Shapiro, 48, foreign correspondent, United Press. A graduate of the City College of N.Y., 1929, and Harvard Law School, 1932, Mr. Shapiro has spent most of the past 20 years as correspondent and bureau manager of the United Press in Moscow. Succeeding last Fall in getting his wife and daughter out of Russia, he wrote, in Europe, a series of articles on Post-Stalin Russia and returned this Spring with his family to the U.S.

Associate Fellows (without stipend) Sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation

Ian Cross, 28, chief reporter, Wellington *Dominion*, New Zealand. Educated at Wanganui Technical College, he joined the *Dominion* staff in 1942. He left the paper for travel and newspaper work abroad in 1947 but rejoined it in 1950. He directs the reporting staff.

He plans to study the history, government and foreign policy of the United States.

Fred C. Flowers, 35, special correspondent for the Melbourne *Herald*, Australia. He served five years in the Australian Army, from private to captain; and after earlier radio and news work, joined the Melbourne *Herald* staff in 1949. As senior reporter and feature writer, he covered the Queen's tour in Australia this Spring, and Vice President Nixon's visit last winter.

He plans to study American history and government.

William H. French, 28, reporter on the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, Canada. Born in London, Ontario, he graduated from the University of Western Ontario in 1948, and then joined the *Globe and Mail*, where he has reported on education and municipal government.

He plans to study government and economics.

Prejudices of a Broadcaster

About the Problem of Being Informed

by Louis M. Lyons

The only thing that disturbs the charm of this commencement season is the penalty of having to listen to commencement speakers. Their tribe increases year after year. And now we get them twice—rebroadcast a few nights later on that wonderful instrument, the educational FM radio.

Little did I think, as Mr. Joseph Welch would say, when as a young man I went into newspapering 35 years ago, that I would end up a public speaker. The miracle of the FM radio has done that to me, and now to you.

In my palmier newspaper days, I needed only to master spelling, and after 25 years under editorial criticism, I almost did learn to spell, at least the common journalistic words. I never needed to pronounce them. That was a simpler day and I sometimes feel for those who would turn the clock back.

But as an old dog I have been thrown into a new trade which involves pronunciation. One Cambridge lady has almost made a career of telling me how to pronounce Hawaii. Somebody sent me a pronouncing gazetteer. When I tried to get the Harvard regional studies pronunciation of Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh forces into my reports, a listener remonstrated that I ought to know it was Vietnam, and he spelled it out for me. Since then I have circumvented him by saying "the rebel forces" and "the government forces." A charitable naval officer wrote me from his ship in New York—where our limited FM has no business reaching anyway—that it was too bad that his favorite broadcast was marred by mispronunciation of *Spanish* names. This was after McCarthy's Texas speech. I should just have said Texas speech. But strange words suddenly confront you on a news bulletin when you have your mouth half open, and you have to close down on something. He sent me a list of such Spanish place names as he thought I might need. One of the many kind acts of patient listeners. But alas, McCarthy has made no more Texas speeches. The news has come from Indo China and Egypt and Iran, and I still long for the security of a peaceful city news room.

I have learned that there is a much more intimate relation between speaker and listener—by radio—than be-

tween writer and reader via the newspaper. My mail shows that—lots of it, even from the limited audience of a small, local, amateur, FM broadcast. In a newspaper, and a big one, if a reporter was doing front page stuff on major affairs, he might receive two or three letters now or then and he felt he had heard from public opinion. If I was away for weeks with daily articles on a political campaign or a Pearl Harbor hearing, one of my neighbors would ask solicitously on my return: "Where you been; I haven't seen you around." But let the same reporter talk to a much smaller radio audience and his mail is often greater in a day than on a newspaper in a month.

Much of this mail has been quite stimulating to me. What runs all through it is the earnest effort of many people to be informed. It is a hard job to be informed. Never harder than now. Never more important than now. The complexity of affairs increases. The difficulty of getting at the facts behind the news grows greater. All our time we have been befogged one way and another, by war censorship, security restrictions, the Iron Curtain cutoff from many sources, the new science of propaganda, the necessities of certain areas of secrecy—to say nothing of the murkier fogs of demagogic distortion of the facts.

Our confusion is further confounded by the very proliferation of the modern engines of publicity. Radio and television bombard us with stuff that makes its multifarious impact on our senses and projects its varying images into our heads. Yet such an historic fact, such a benchmark on our times, as the fall of Dien Bien Phu stuns us with surprise, because those who controlled the news—in this case the French military censors—kept the developing situation from us for their own purposes.

When we hear a broadcast by a high spokesman of our foreign policy we don't know whether he is speaking to frighten our enemies abroad, or to appease the enemies of his policy in his own party, or to warn our allies, or to justify a budget cut in our defenses, or, just possibly, to inform *us*. Weeks or months later, *events inform us* of the interpretation we *should* have placed on his speech. Sometimes one feels, as Wellington said he did on reviewing his troops: "I don't know whether they frighten the enemy, but by gad, they frighten me."

Yet, like Mr. Well's British character, we do generally bumble through. I don't wish to frighten you.

This was a commencement talk to the Radcliffe Management Training Program graduates, June 11, by the news commentator on FM Station WGBH of Boston.

Old President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard used to say that anyone who fulfilled his full duties of citizenship would not have time for anything else. That was a convenient alibi for many who took no time at all for it.

It might almost be applied today to the problem of being informed. And let me make no claim to have solved it. But I have found that it leaves no time for anything else.

We have many responsible professionals trying to inform us, perhaps the most competent corps that our journalism has ever had. They are of course outnumbered and outprinted by others who do us no service. But they are available to us if we choose to exercise enough discrimination to select and read their factual reports.

One of the ablest is James B. Reston of the *New York Times*, chief now of their Washington bureau—the single most important news spot in the world.

Reston the other day, speaking to the Nieman Fellows, noted another side of this problem of information. That is the problem of holding attention, against all the diversions people have—even against the diversions of the competing demands of the news. His point was that the news man must be prepared to put everything he has into a story the one day when it strikes the front page. Next day will be too late. It may have moved inside. The audience he had yesterday has had its attention caught by something new. Though he explore and research and interview and increase his information overnight, the effort is largely wasted, because he has lost the first flush of attention.

That is a terrifying thought. And I say in all soberness and after many years at this most fascinating work of journalism, that it describes an impossible job. No one can always be prepared in this kaleidoscope of unpredictable news breaks to furnish the reader *all* the facts in the one moment that focuses attention on the hot headline.

I return to Pres. Eliot. He was still around in my cub days and an interview with him made a deep impression on me.

Pres. Eliot, from his different approach to this same problem of Reston's, said to a reporter: "You are in the worst job in the world." The reporter assumed he meant having to deal with so much of the seamy side of life. News is so often bad news. But No. That was not it. "You never have time." Pres. Eliot said.

You never have time.

That is it, of course. The pressure of the daily deadline. Even of multiple editions a day, and the news convention that the latest thing is inevitably the most important, merely as latest. Well, that is the definition of news.

Many good men and good minds are so enslaved by this convention in its extreme form that they have to devote their energies to developing new leads for each new edition, to rewrite the basic facts enough so that, if there's

no new development, it at least must look new. So we have the silly fact that what newspapermen call the *overnight*—that is, the lead for the early afternoon editions, is written before most of the *morning* paper reporters have filed their stories for the *morning* editions. The job of the reporter doing the *overnight* is to find a new "angle," which often means only to dramatize for afternoon some point that will not be elaborated in the *morning* paper because it isn't important enough.

Interviewing newspapermen as candidates for Nieman Fellowships just last week, one of my committee colleagues amused himself by asking a candidate from one of the great wire services how many new leads a given foreign news dispatch would have within the cycle until the next day's dispatch came. The answer was *eight*. That is, eight reworkings of the same original report, to freshen it up, as we say of a drink. In short, to hold attention.

Don't misunderstand me. I do not condemn this form of enterprise. It is far less wasteful of human talent than dreaming up fancy words and gimmicks to make synthetic cereals or cosmetics sound like wonder drugs. But it is part of the waste from the competitive effort to get attention.

And the greatest loss in it is that this enormous energy output is contrived just to catch our attention. Not to give us more information. Not to reveal to us the facts behind the news. Not to try to explain to us the meaning of those facts. Not to make a more *informed report*. But just to sell us a paper on a *new* headline.

Walter Lippmann once explained to me that no one could write an informed column *every* day, and he never tried to do more than one every other day, with a day between to think and read and find out about things. But he stands unique, in a position to mutiny successfully against the pressures and demands of daily journalism.

Try to follow the development of a situation that has enlisted your interest. Try to find out what happened to that situation disclosed yesterday. It is as much as your life is worth to capture any *continuity* in the news. The competition of the *new* squeezes out the development of the old. They tell us how the game came out, but how the case came out is often left in indefinite suspension.

These cruel pressures of time, space and interest, account more often than intentional unfairness—and I mean in the honest newspapers—for the failure of the answer ever to catch up with the charge, for the reply to be carried inside today on an attack that was sensational on page one yesterday, or last week.

The press throughout my time has been under much criticism. This I hold is healthy, whether the criticism is justified or not. Much of it is. But it is a wholesome thing for the press in its vital function that people take

so almost a proprietary interest in it. It used to be said in my boyhood that most people thought they could keep school, tend store or run a newspaper better than the people doing it. Often they could. Indeed a basic problem certainly for keeping school or running a newspaper is to get a fair share of the best talents on the job.

But we must not blame the press for all the distorted images we get in our heads.

Some distortion is inevitable. News is by definition the unusual. All editing is selection. At its best this is distortion.

Edward R. Murrow at a recent commencement used the neat image of holding a mirror up to the world. A pretty metaphor. But not realistic. The *New York Times*, to begin at the top, at the best, collects a million words a day and can print 100,000 of them. What about the other nine-tenths? Our best hope, and justified in the *Times*, is that they selected the most important and interesting tenth to print. But of course the reporter at the source selected, from the whole stream of events, the one or two things that most interested him that day. That is all he could do. Some days, with no striking occurrence, he could discuss some quite ordinary events. Other days he must choose from among a number of significant events, all competing for interest.

Anyone living in *this* community of Cambridge, and aware of the vast stream of creative activity in our universities, must have recognized the distortion of headlines focused on one teacher, accused of having espoused an alien doctrine. Those headlines did not in any degree reflect the productive normal activities of his 3,000 colleagues. Because they *are* the normal.

This is elementary. But worth reminding ourselves.

This is without adding the *deliberate distortions* of the lying by the headline-hunting demagogues or the prostitution of the irresponsible elements of the press to further that lying, either just for sensation's sake or to sow confusion and suspicion to further the reactionary objectives of some owners.

But there is no excuse for our depending on such papers. It is one of the advantages of this area that the greatest newspapers published anywhere are available to us the day of publication—the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Herald Tribune*.

One of my freshmen advisees asked me—I suppose to make conversation—what news magazine to read to keep up.

I told him—None. The two pages in the front of the *New York Times* Sunday Review of the Week give more and more accurately, and in shorter time, besides everything else he would get for the same 25 cents in the four and a quarter pounds of the Sunday *Times*,—sports, mag-

azine, book review and all. James Reston and William S. White in the *Times*, Joseph Harsch in the *Monitor*, Homer Bigart and Walter Lippmann in the *Herald Tribune*—to cite a few of the best, serve us with information, unmatched anywhere.

On the radio we are less well served than formerly when Elmer Davis and Raymond Gram Swing were voices of sanity in the surrounding babel. On television we are not, in Boston, served at all. But this should be corrected in the Fall when two more channels, one educational and one commercial, will add to our chances.

But we must not blame the press for all the confusion in our world. It has become a confusing, convulsive world in our times.

What are the images about it in our heads and how did they get there? Do we visualize a world of swirling chaos, most other continents swept by revolution or rocked by surging independence movements, so that our once revolutionary democratic pattern is now the most conservative political element in the world?

Or have the politicians replaced this with a picture of somebody in Washington having lost China for us—and of somebody in Washington now having responsibility lest we lose Indo China? The press has carried such notions, but it did not originate them.

Walter Lippmann once described the responsibility of a columnist, such as he is, to be conscious of a pattern of events and to write within this pattern in such a way that his readers would not be too surprised by the news.

This is a high responsibility, even for a commentator of great experience. It is not a reporter's responsibility. He is an agent adrift with the changing tide of events, simply flashing his signals from wherever they carry him.

But even such a patternmaker as Lippmann can have his pattern pushed out of shape by such an unpredictable change as Dien Bien Phu, which he could not bring within the shape of his orbit because the basic information was kept out of the news until it crashed through as history.

And he has had his pattern warped by the rise to power of demagoguery of such reckless force as to undermine the very fabric of American self-confidence and to make us seem to ourselves weak and uncertain and distrustful at the very moment in history when we had attained the peak of strength without parallel.

The President said to the American Newspaper Publishers Association the other day that they should feel an obligation to give an equal weight to the news that unites us that they give to news that divides us.

I recalled then a story of Al Capp's in the late presidential race. Al was doing a radio show with character-

istic quips. He made one, one night, about Sen. Taft. One of Al's sponsors was also sponsoring Sen. Taft (a hazard of radio performane—this was the Sun Oil Company). The sponsor suggested that next week Al should say something nice about Sen. Taft. Al's reply, in character, was: "If Sen. Taft will do something nice next week, I will say something nice about him."

Walter Lippmann replied to the President in about that way. It was not the responsibility of the press, said Lippmann, to present a picture of unity, if the facts were of disunity. And if we are to change the picture from disunity to unity, the President himself is the one man who has the power to unite us, said Lippmann. He urged him to do it.

Well, it was a large order. One of the educational gains in this recent televised carnival in the Senate caucus room is that we have learned that the Administration has no friends on this committee, where a majority are Republicans. This is our political problem in a capsule. It tells why Mr. Dulles' hands have been so tied in foreign policy that he had to take a walk at Geneva, where the world crisis sought solution. It explains why he has had to spend his energy appeasing the right wing deviationist senators in his own party. It explains why the Bricker Amendment, sponsored by Republicans to tie the hands of the Republican President in foreign affairs, was only a vote shy of passing. It tells why Mr. Joseph Welch's Republican lips can convince only Democrats; why the Republican Secretary of the Army turned for advice to Democrats.

And the President with all his power is not to be held wholly responsible for this. He might have fought McCarthyism to such a bitter result as would have paralyzed our legislature as completely as the legislature of France and Italy are paralyzed; and that is the chief danger and weakness of parliamentary systems that have made them the prey to the strong arm systems of totalitarianism.

Those whose purpose is paralysis for the sake of the anarchy that Sen. Symington pointed out, the confusion that Sen. Flanders pointed out, may get it anyway.

The political balance is so precarious everywhere that it is touch and go on any political program. In the Senate the Democrats have shown they can control when they choose and in a pinch they have taken charge to stop turning the clock back. The intransigent right wing extremists of the Republican Party are the real opposition party. When McCarthy talks about the *left wing press*, he means of course the Eisenhower press. The normal party differences have all but melted away since so recently as 1952. All the great papers, with a trifling few exceptions, are backing the President, whenever he gives them a lead, as against the confusions, the disruptive attacks, the undermining sus-

picious, the falsifications and the wholly negative and repressive reactionary assaults from the Right.

Name them. Go right around the list, *New York Times*, *Herald Tribune*, *Washington Star* and *Washington Post*, *Minneapolis Tribune* and *Star*, *Des Moines Register*, *Denver Post*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Portland Oregonian*, *Philadelphia Bulletin*, *Milwaukee Journal*, *Providence Journal*, *Toledo Blade*. Wherever you look, the great papers. Except only Chicago, Los Angeles, Tulsa and parts of Texas.

Why is this—that these great papers, both those that were for Stevenson and those that were for Eisenhower, are now nearly all supporting the President?

Well, obviously, this is responsible journalism. They support national policy against nihilistic obstructionism. The Brickers, seeking to prevent any foreign policy, the McCarthys, seeking to alienate us from all our allies, the Knowlands and Radfords, seeking to force us to go it alone in Asia, the McCarrans and the McLeods and the rest who would so distort and exaggerate the problem of simple security as to make any effective government program all but inoperative—all alike are putting a chock under the wheels of the program of this Administration. For the most part they want no part of this Administration. It is Republican, but not theirs. For twenty years they were political outcasts and then it was not their candidate who won, nor their program that was endorsed at the polls. They are, some of them, as far from this Administration as DeGaulle from Laniel. (Laniel lost his vote of confidence today.) It is a fiction of politics that blurs this over. But given the system we have, it seems imperative that the fiction be maintained as much of the time as possible, to get a minimum of coherent action.

Responsible conservatism is what this country greatly needs. The need is no new thing. Theodore Roosevelt saw the problem and tried to meet it. He tried to civilize, to modernize, to educate a rational American conservatism within his Republican Party. He failed. They abandoned him in 1912 and everything progressive that he personified, and the shell that fell away from him has been as uninspired since. The effort of some modern conservatives to inject vitality and leadership into American conservatism was a noble one. They had an example in England where the conservatives accept the great changes which time and dire necessity have wrought. They saw it also in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, in all of which conservatives have taken over from labor movements in the cycle of change since the second World War. In none of these has sheer reckless negativism run amok as in this country.

It has by now, by Geneva, all but brought us back to the isolationism of Harding's time, when we abandoned the League of Nations and left the world to stew in its

own juice until our own world crashed in depression and then war. Our new reactionaries have learned from this nothing, and they know nothing, except the crassest, greediest reaction and denial of *any* social responsibility, of *any* public obligation toward the soundness and development of that society in which they seek only a special privilege to exploit, and to frighten the people against joining in support of their own interests and future safety.

Only the great power of the Presidency, upheld by the people and inspired with the genius of leadership, can keep a course against these nihilists.

It seems almost more by good luck than good management that we do periodically get such leadership.

Some people talk as though everything would be all right if you stopped certain newspapers from publishing. Well, it wouldn't.

There's more to it than that. In Wisconsin, the greatest paper in the state, the *Milwaukee Journal*, and both the Madison papers, fought McCarthy with great vigor and enterprise. But they failed. He swept along with the rising tide of reaction that was in the air.

The farthest reach of destructive reaction we have seen comes from the strange, dark recesses of a corner of Tennessee whence Representative Carroll Reece seeks to wipe out even the advance in *knowledge* of the last epoch, to undermine the great foundations that have supported the American progress in research and the advances against ignorance and poverty and disease. These foundations—the brightest fruits of American capitalism, distributing its gains for the advancement of human kind—the Reece effort would besmirch, and their gains in knowledge cancel out as subversive. For is it not different from what our ancestors knew in their day—ergo un-American?

All intelligently edited newspapers have lampooned this modern outbreak of Know-nothingism, which has the status of a recognized committee in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives.

We would seem to have struck the bottom of something this second week of June. Sen. Symington recited to us our descent toward anarchy—his word. "It would appear that some want to end up in just plain anarchy."

Symington summed up McCarthyism:

The loyalty of our armed forces has been impugned. We have been told that the Justice Department cannot be trusted. It is charged that our Central Intelligence Agency is infiltrated with communists. That our H-bomb and A-bomb plants contain communists. And that it would be no use to tell the Secretary of Defense about communists in our defense plants.

"Where," he asked, "do we go from here?"

Nowhere, one would say, but up, from inferno.

Sen. Flanders had shown us the headline hunters convulsing the country in a national anguish to retrieve as their ultimate quarry "a pink dentist"—his words.

But this week we saw an end point of the limitless diffusion of charges and suspicions—in the attack on a rising young Republican of Newton—former president of the Republican Club in Sinclair Weeks' home town—surely a reconstruction before our suburban eyes of the Frankenstein myth in actuality.

And the most diabolical part of that is that it was done casually. It was by mere accident that young Mr. Fisher, who had no role at all, happened to be the bystander who got hit. The only purpose was a tactical one—to break up a cross examination that was scoring a point. Any diversion would have done. Any target would have served the need of the moment.

Parenthetically, Sen. Flanders, who so far stands alone in his party, was called senile. Mr. Welch, who delivered a classic castigation of indecency, calls himself an old man. Elmer Davis, in his last book, writes of the advantage of age. That it is expendable. The old man can risk, having little to lose, says Elmer, who by this definition was born old, for he never calculated the risk of speaking out.

But make no mistake. Youth can never afford to fail to accept that challenge. The only old men who risk are those who in youth were never afraid. We would be *done* if it were true that only old men will risk their futures.

Perhaps a large part of our problem of communication is sheer indigestion from the speed with which we must absorb the pace of events.

In the last century revolution was followed by counter-revolution. But in our own time, revolution in half the world is directly reflected in counter-revolution in the other half—our half. Since 1948 every progressive or Labor or Democratic government in America, Europe and through the British world, has been replaced by conservative governments. This began, by my dates, with the 1948 election in New Zealand, ending the long labor regime there, and moving around the map.

If you see in this some reaction of frustration, anxiety, anger, fear, from war fatigue and the rise of communist revolutions, you will see that it is no mere contrivance of the press; and that the confusion is real. Though the fears and anxieties have provided an open season for demagogic exploitation and for exploitation also by their journalistic stooges, which are very familiar to us.

But the demonstration of the Army-McCarthy hearings has shown us how hard it is to keep the facts right side

up. We see Sen. Mundt correct McCarthy from the record, and McCarthy goes right on saying it over again to his TV audience the same way .

We have seen day after day the repeated declamation that black is white and the assumption that enough people are going to be fooled by it to justify it.

Reporters have been up against this for years covering the McCarthy story. It has been the chief headache of the press—how to deal with someone who breaks all the rules, who exploits the news conventions of objective reporting to distort the result.

We have had more education in distortion and demagoguery in the last three years than in a century. We should have learned enough about the booby traps and slants that can be infiltrated into the news by a clever crook, to last us all our lives.

The one-man hearings brought this to its height. Then the readers were helpless. Now the listeners and viewers need only common sense to make their own score. But when McCarthy came day after day to the door of a closed room in the Fort Monmouth hearings to say to the reporters, who had not heard any testimony—Well boys. Espionage—Spying, Communism—they had to take it or leave it. Oh, some wrote in, "Sen. McCarthy *said* today." And some remembered to put in parenthetically the contradictions from what he said yesterday or last week. But that doesn't matter very much in the total impact, and the headline slurs it all over.

In effect McCarthy had added himself to the staff of every newspaper in America. They took his story without check.

One of the great things in these hearings is that the intelligent listener, the viewer who doesn't let himself be brainwashed by hokum or theatrical distortions, can check up. The testimony checks up. And the housewife in Peoria, if she has her wits about her, can find out from the witnesses what at least was the other side of the story on Fort Monmouth.

Now if she lived not in Peoria but in Cambridge or New York or Washington, she could have arrived at that months ago. For the great newspapers of New York and Washington and also the *Christian Science Monitor*, sent in their reporters to check up on the Monmouth story weeks and months later, when they found they had been taken in—when even the amiable Secretary Stevens was trying to tell the public there was *no* espionage at Monmouth and nothing new at all about the headlined security cases that in some instances were hauled out of files ten years old, about people long gone from there.

This news distortion in these one-man hearings was a new low in public information. That was the inevitable

journalistic reflection of the one-man committee itself; of power run amok, of the Senate rules misused; of senatorial privilege abused; of the Senate failing to assume responsibility.

The reaction that led to these hearings brought the Senate around to reasserting rules. Sen. Symington told us the rules the Democrats insisted on to return to the committee. He told Mr. Stevens that the other senators were now feeling responsibility for what went on. That restores responsible reporting. For not only the witness will have someone else to ask questions to bring out his side, but the public through the press will have some other source than one that is dedicated wholly to spreading confusion and distrust, as Sen. Flanders has described it.

We have seen in the reporting of these hearings that a full report is available when the event commands the public attention to force it.

Radio and TV are useful as competitors to secure reader service—useful even as latent competitors—and they go some distance to counter that constriction in the channels of public opinion which the shrinking number of newspapers has caused Morris Ernst to worry about in his *The First Freedom*.

We had a recent instance of this.

Almost every week the President holds a press conference. He states his views on many issues. He answers questions. This is at times the most important conference in the world. From it proceeds most of the news of the day. I have counted seven or eight front page stories that all came out of one press conference.

Only one paper—the New York *Times*—prints the full verbatim record of it, which is available to all. It takes most of a page. But it is the most important and interesting information of the day. You get not only what the President said on each issue, but the questions as they were asked, and who asked them, from what paper. And it makes a lot of difference what the question was, in the shape of the answer.

Only the *Times* prints it regularly Thursday after the Wednesday conference. But one week the White House allowed it to be transcribed for radio. The next morning every paper I read, Boston *Globe* and *Herald*, and the New York *Herald Tribune* as well as the *Times*, all carried it in full. Through the radio, their readers knew they had it and could serve it up; they felt obliged to give this service.

These press conferences have been dynamic forums of public opinion at times. The Washington press corps got the President on record about McCarthyism; they brought him to disown the subpoena of Pres. Truman and the Brownell charge of disloyalty, and within an hour Brownell had climbed down.

Arthur Sulzberger says the New York *Times* is published for people who need to be informed. That surely is all of us. But as we all know, the less informing papers get most of the readers, and this despite our steadily rising level of education. It is a paradox.

The *Times* news editor, Theodore Bernstein, told a New York teachers forum that the schools should educate better readers.

Dartmouth, you know, has been trying to. Their Great Issues course is at bottom a course in how to read a newspaper. Required for seniors. I would have it for freshmen and save four years. But they are unwilling to turn loose graduates unprepared to cope with the job of being informed—of keeping up with the score.

It is a two-way responsibility. The reader has some obligation to pick a paper in which he has some chance to find out the score, and then to know how to look in it for what counts as information.

Christopher Rand—who is in *The New Yorker* this week and often, from Asia, makes this connection between reporter and reader in a piece he did for *Nieman Reports*.

He is talking about the problem for a reporter to shed national preconceptions enough to report a true picture of a profoundly different people.

He says, "The reporter must find ways to be as detached as he can, almost to denationalize himself. To open his senses and learn to float free from place to place and say as best he can what the people there are up to. Let his readers make the judgments, if they must.

"Yet," he says, "a reporter who reached that stage might be in for a bad time from his readers and editors, both. He would be accused of being more Chinese than the Chinese, and be rushed home to be reindoctrinated in what America was like. If he learned detachment, his readers would think him cold and negative. They would be disappointed not to be stirred up one way or another about things, and the reporter would be lucky to survive. So reporters are probably no more to blame than the man in the street who values his dream world and wants others to help maintain it.

"Reporting indeed," he concludes, "may not get better until everything else does."

American Newspapers: the Next 250 Years

by David Manning White

In the annals of a relatively young nation, 250 years is an impressive birthday. Discarding Ben Harris' abortive attempt to establish a newspaper in 1690, our press was established 250 years ago when the first issue of John Campbell's *Boston News-Letter* appeared on April 24, 1704. The time-leap from the day when Campbell grumbled editorially because he couldn't sell 300 papers a week to the 3,000,000 circulation of the *New York News* on Sundays is admittedly quite a jump.

[From that small bookshop on Cornhill where Campbell also sold a few papers our press has grown into a gigantic aggregate of property and machinery, with all the tangible manifestations of wealth. At the same time its methods, its traditions, its characteristics that make it distinctly American have slowly evolved. Stimulated at key times by such men as Bennett, Greeley and Dana, and later by Pulitzer and Hearst, our press has kept pace with the vigorous growth of our country. As Frank Luther Mott recently wrote, "There have been many noble newspapers in our history, and many that have been disgraceful. Some of our editors have been blackguards, and some have been high-minded idealists." I suspect that the ratio of noble

editors to disgraceful ones correlates rather closely with the ratio of noble statesmen, financiers or labor leaders to unscrupulous members of the respective groups. By its very nature the press has reflected the times when our national spirit was mature and the times when America was muddled and weary. The press has been a revealing and candid mirror of American life and manners from the dry, genteel accounts of Campbell's day to Luella Parsons' screaming account of why Sandor Glutz beat up Wendell Whiplash at *Ciro's* last night.]

With full cognizance of all that the press has meant in the development of American culture, let's take another look, this time into the future, 100, 200, 250 years ahead. The first question that comes to mind is: will there even be newspapers in 2204. Won't there be new communications devices to take the place of the prosaic newspaper?

To be sure there will be new inventions in the next hundred years or so which will effect the mass media. The availability of such devices as Photon even today hint at the revolutionary changes in store for the printed media such as newspapers. As for the press' great competitor, television, after it exploits the advertising potential of color, then three dimensional projection, next will come such accessories as *olfactory stimulators* (which will quickly

David Manning White is professor of journalism at Boston University.

be dubbed smellelevision). And who knows but that some future tele-smellelevision set will provide a set of clamps (similar in appearance to our psychogalvanoscope) which when placed over our frontal lobes will provide us with *feelelevision*. We should expect such gadgetry to become increasingly plentiful in a land that worships the gadget with more fervor than any Golden Calf of antiquity ever received.

The one significant question, however, is whether any gadget can change substantially the nature of man with his basic needs, fears and aspirations? Because of its almost barometric sensitivity to the world as it *is*, not as we would ideally visualize it, the newspaper will be superior to any gadget that the next 250 years can produce. The lace-bedecked dandy of 1704 and the plexi-domed dude of 2204 share the same basic anxieties: who am I? What am I? Where did I come from? Where am I going?

Will the parapsychologists of 2204 know any more about the mystery of life and its corollary, death than the philosophers and alchemists of John Campbell's day? Will Americans of 2204 have solved the problem of war and peace? Nothing in the past 3,000 years would indicate that a solution is in the dawning. As for mankind's perplexing sexual problems, Moses tried to cope with them about 4,000 years ago, but we're still at sea for a definite solution. There will be accidents and disasters in 2204 the same as today, and when our descendants read about them they will be filled with the same sense of awe that we feel today.

If anything, as we spin along into a world of more complex gadgets, more terrible weapons of destruction, more precise instruments of analysis (pscho and otherwise), Americans, along with the rest of mankind, will feel the pressures of everyday living. And they will turn, as we do, to their daily newspapers so that they can better understand the drama of their existence, or if not understand it, perhaps better rationalize it.

For the newspaper is the whole intelligible world of events brought into the reference orbit of each of its readers. Here the whole range of human activity is spread before the reader for him to select the day's events which will help him to understand himself better in relation to the external world. Isn't that one of the main reasons we read newspapers: to understand ourselves better and act accordingly if we can. We read about the criminal who shoots it out with the police and say to ourselves, "There but for the grace of God go I." Or if we are criminals ourselves we say, "Whatta fool that guy was to try that job! He shoulda known that the place would be lousy with guards."

The newspaper provides each reader with the chance to check his personal fears, hopes and aspirations against the macrocosmic events that result when two billion in-

dividuals live another 24 hours. Granted that the news report is fuller, better written and edited today, the basic needs that the newspaper filled in 1704 are the same as 1954, and I doubt that 2204 will be different.

As long as the newspaper does its job well it will not have to fear a death-struggle with television. Television is primarily an entertainment medium, although its potentiality for educational purposes may be very important as it matures. Television's special event handling of important news has not cut materially into the number of newspaper readers thus far. There are many indications that television coverage of news stimulates desire to read about the event in a newspaper afterward. Television and its related media of the future will compete with newspapers most on the advertising side, and here the struggle will be intense. If this means that instead of having 60 page newspapers in the future, (of which 45 pages are filled with advertisements with an occasional recipe for Aunt Tilly's pickled popcorn balls) we have only 12 or 18 page newspapers full of essential news, the loss will not be too catastrophic.

If we expect the average newspaper of 2204 to have the authority of the *New York Times*, the maturity of the *Christian Science Monitor* and the crusading spirit of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, I'm afraid we will be disappointed. There is nothing about the future that suggests the great bulk of Americans would find in such a paragon of a newspaper the picture of the world they seek. The tabloids and "sensational" newspapers of today will find their counterparts in 2204 unless the whole basic structure of American sociology changes. To look at the readers of newspapers which do not print all the news that's fit to print with *nobless oblige* is to misunderstand the role of the American newspaper as it has developed thus far. The key to reader's interest in 2204 will still be the external manifestations of our inner anxieties and insecurities, our hero-worship (whether it be Wanda Wiggle, the 4-D starlet of tomorrow, or Major Toby Quanch, who will fly faster than the speed of light), in short, the resolution of our eternal, basic questions.

The pattern for the American newspaper was set in 1835 when James Gordon Bennett started his *New York Herald* and changed the emphasis of the newspaper from the few to the multitude. As Professor Mott points out, Bennett sincerely believed in the doctrine *vox populi vox dei*. With Bennett's success, John Doe became as important in the cast of American life as Governor Blair or Senator Puffington, or maybe more important because there were such an infinite number of John Does and so few Puffingtons. And because the newspaper in 1954 is still the only "history" that chronicles the exultations and sorrows of all of us John Does, it fills an important psychological need in our Culture. By the same token, local news will still

be the back-bone of newspaper content in 2204, and I can see the typical story of the future quite clearly:

Jonathan Doe, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Jonathan Doe of 1235 Main Street, Everytown, has been selected by Commander Quentin Quicksilver to be a crew member of the "V-164", America's latest model rocket ship. The "V-164" will attempt to reach the Moon during the first week of June.

Young Doe is a graduate of Everytown Polytechnical Highschool in 2202 and was awarded a scholarship to United Nation's University in New York, where

he is now a junior. While still in high school, Jonathan's model of an inter-planetary ship won first place in the "Moon-or-Bust" contest sponsored by this newspaper. His father is block chairman of the "Americans Vigilant" committee of Everytown and holds the Purple Heart medal as a veteran of World War VI.

Will Jonathan Doe make it to the Moon? Will every heart on Main Street beat faster that moonless night in June as the silvery cigar-shaped rocket thrusts into the unknown? Quo Doe et Quo vadis? Read your newspaper, bub, today, tomorrow—and 250 years from now.

The Responsible Editor in a Dizzy World

by Grove Patterson

How many Americans stop to think that this freedom of the press is not something granted to and possessed by editors and publishers? It is a vital boon and privilege granted and guaranteed to all the people by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. "Free press" is not a meal ticket for editors and publishers; it is the precious possession of every citizen. It is his protection against ill-meaning masters who would, if they could, forge the chains of slaves in secret.

But this freedom imposes upon editors great and increasing responsibilities in a turbulent world where life becomes day by day more complex and more bewildering.

Today's newspaperman faces a heavier task than ever before in the history of America. First, in this day of passionate controversies, he is called on to hold with new conscientiousness and firmness to the ideal of objectivity in the news columns. Second, on the editorial page, he needs to lift the levels of his thinking and push out the horizons of his imagination and rise above partisanship. Third, faced by the competition of other media, he must give new attention to the improvement of techniques, to the creation of a more attractive and convincing product. Fourth, today's newspaperman owes to a society, often unappreciative, a lesser concern with the trivialities of the news and a greater concern for a new national conscience, social, economic and political, and for international relationships which can lead to peace. Peace is the major objective in this changing world. Furthermore, today's newspaper should be definitely mindful of a greater responsibility in the field of religion and indicate a better understanding of

those aspirations of the spirit which lift man above his of an upset world.

In an address some time ago, Sir Winston Churchill said there is one thing that goes far beyond the advance of science, that reaches beyond the field of logic, that transcends all material attainment, and that is the dignity and the nobility of the human spirit. Journalism is in need not only of an aristocracy of intelligence, but an aristocracy of spiritual awareness. Morale always trickles down from above; it is not something to be built up; it comes from leadership.

It is the responsibility of editors to learn to make a more important employment of those unique facilities which the newspaper business furnishes for reaching into the lives and stimulating the actions of men.

The institutions of democracy rest upon the foundation tiresome involvement in all the urgent but lesser concerns of a free press. The thoughtful editor of long ago came to the conclusion that he faced the opportunity of making a newspaper into something more than a newspaper. He seized the opportunity of making it into an institution for constant service in the community. He should know now that he faces an even greater opportunity, the profound duty, of making the newspaper the chief agent for enabling representative government to function. From my observations in Europe I am convinced that practically all the evils inherent in totalitarianism, in whatever nation they have come to pass, could have been prevented or destroyed in 60 days if there had been a free press.

Democracy has been too often superficially defined as the rule of the majority. The glory of democracy is not that it is the rule of the majority. The glory of democracy is that it is the one type of government upon the earth which provides for the continuing rights of a minority not in power. What could be more despotic, more tyrannical

Grove Patterson, editor emeritus, Toledo *Blade*, gave this as a talk to the New York State Publishers Association at their last Autumn meeting.

nical than a majority in power, without provision for the rights of the minority? The American newspaper is peculiarly the medium for the expression of the minority because it is not under the control of government. Free expression is the most important and sensitive attribute of democracy, and a free newspaper is its most vital medium.

The average American citizen does not think through the meaning of a free press, its significance in representative government. It probably occurs only to a minority that the institutions of democracy do indeed rest upon a system which opens and keeps open a channel for human expression, a channel through which flows, from the center of government, the stream of information which makes it possible for democratic organization to function over the farflung territory of a nation. H. G. Wells once said the Roman Empire could not endure because there were no newspapers—no method of appraising the outlying peoples of the behavior of the center.

Democracy, then, can continue to function only so long and so far as this channel is not tampered with or damned or used exclusively by the state, as in dictatorship countries. Through it also must flow, from border to center, a stream of analysis, criticism, praise and, if necessary, condemnation.

After nearly 50 years in journalism, I venture to write somewhat critically of editors, of myself and of others engaged in the business of making newspapers. Daniel Burnham, great architect, once said: "There is no magic in little thoughts." We editors in these difficult times are called upon to have a renewed faith in the calling to which we are devoted.

The most constructive suggestion that can come to any man is the idea of personal responsibility for corporate action. Our newspapers can rise no higher than ourselves. We must impose upon ourselves the censorship of good taste. We must be restricted—but only by truth and decency.

If we are to have a free press, we must furnish a responsible press. With other publications and with the radio, we are largely responsible for the creation of that irresistible giant which is public opinion. It is a terrible responsibility. We are engaged in widening the horizons of men's thinking. There is surely something of human progress, something eternally purposeful in this effort. I wish editors would write over their doors those words of Thomas Jefferson, carved in stone and set above the entrance to the University of Virginia: "Enter by this gateway to seek the light of truth, the way of honor, and the will to work for men."

I have the faith to believe that this is the spirit which animates the better part of the leadership of American journalism. May we ever speak freely, but God give us to speak only after thinking, with common sense and with true tolerance. I say "true Tolerance." I am beginning

to think that much of what passes for tolerance is overrated. It is merely the total absence of convictions. It is so easy to be a good sport in matters we do not care about. The truly tolerant person, it seems to me, is one who has no lack of positive conviction. He stands for something and says so. But at the same time he freely accords all others equal privileges.

I see four major responsibilities of the American newspaper. The first is simple, obvious, accepted in principle, but too often departed from in the heat of practice. I refer to our moral responsibility to adhere, as near as humanly possible, to objective writing in the news columns. To purvey uncolored information is the newspaper's first job. It is our first business to make certain that the people have the facts, freed from the writer's bias. There is no crime committed in the field of journalism, not even super-lurid sensationalism, not even inaccuracy, that is more subversive of the principle of a free press, more indefensible, than the crime of slanting the news to meet a publisher's policy. I am sorry to say there are a few newspapers in this country, the publishers of which contrive to have their slants, their angles, their special hopes and fears and aspirations, woven into the fabric of what ought to be an objective news story. Although total objectivity will always be an unattainable ideal, facts being what they are and writers being what they are, a deliberate departure from a sincere effort to be unbiased can make a tragic mockery of a free press and create an unholy weapon in the hands of journalistic gangsters.

Now as to my second item, the moral responsibility for rising above partisanship in order to deserve, to earn, the freedom of the press. The political organ is a small conception on the part of a small man. I believe in the two-party system and uphold its great contribution to the functioning of the American democratic process; but I do not believe in the party newspaper, blinded by prejudice and hamstrung by tradition.

Today's newspaper, if the opportunity and the expectation of a free press are met and realized, if an informed public opinion is to be created, must go beneath the seething top of a dizzy world in order to explain, to interpret, and to lead in every field of man's proper endeavor. Never in the 164 years since America became a nation have its newspapers been called upon for a more vital task of interpretation and leadership on a plane above political partisanship. It is a task difficult, needful, and profound.

In this day of the full use and power of propaganda, the contribution which a newspaper makes to public opinion entails a stunning responsibility. What the people think of government, how they act toward government, toward American ideals, is heavily determined by what they read in newspapers. Public opinion indeed, is the irresistible

force in a democracy. Public opinion is the single most powerful thing upon the earth. It can make and unmake; it can build and tear down; it can create and destroy. With its power to create and modify public opinion, the newspaper has no right to be wholly or even principally partisan.

Just as we are called upon to depart from partisanship, so are we called upon to be honestly representative of the people as a whole, and not of special interests. The failure of some editors and owners to make their papers truly devoted to the public welfare, to earn the right to the freedom of the press, lies in the fact that they too, like so many of their critics, think this freedom of the press, derived from the Bill of Rights, is something that inherently or by seizure or in some other fashion belongs to them and to them alone. As Mr. Ralph McGill, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, wrote some time ago in the *Atlantic Monthly*:

"It is not their property as publishers and editors, and I know that it can be taken away. What is more, I know that it can be taken away casually. I know that the people, to whom it is granted, can sweep it away with one great burst of antagonistic opinion, or that they can stand by and see it go inch by inch. The press is free only so long as it exists in that status in the minds and affections of the people."

And now to the third major responsibility: The hour has come for the publishers of this country to sense the high desirability of making a specific, constructive, practical effort to raise the standards of American journalism. I am happy to say that such an ideal, such a purpose, is right now being translated into actuality. The American Press Institute, a project of American publishers, is in its eighth year of service to the working press, to the men who determine the standards of our journalism.

As an affiliate of the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University, and supported by the contributions of publishers, the seminars of the Institute, I am convinced, are having profound effect on the thinking and product of editors, managing editors, city editors, reporters, publishers, and others fortunate enough to participate in the courses. Ordinary, uninspired newspapers can no longer do what needs to be done in a confused world. Journalism needs new techniques, new spiritual conviction and new inspiration.

Now as to the fourth and, perhaps, the most important conception of the newspaper's responsibility. We Americans, along with others, have lived in recent years, through two world wars and another only somewhat less limited, and what have we learned from them? Only one thing—how to make a superior preparation for a third. Sometime ago I was privileged to have a talk with General Lucius Clay in London and later in Berlin. He said: "There is only one guarantee of peace—a mighty America, a strongly

armed western Europe and the continuing consciousness on the part of Russia of our striking power."

This is not peace. It is only an armed truce. So long as our productive power remains greater than that of Russia, it may last for some years. But so long as the two mightiest nations on the earth build higher and higher their stockpiles of guns and bombs and men and ships, the day of the explosion will surely come. I am profoundly convinced that true peace can never come to rest upon the race track of competitive armament.

I share the profound conviction of far wiser men than I that durable peace can come only through a workable form of world federation with powers adequate for the prevention of war. Without it, such temporary peace as we may be able to maintain will be possible only by a military program that may conceivably lead America down the road to national bankruptcy. From the most selfish and materialistic point of view, and yet with a great ideal forever in mind, we must devise a far stronger United Nations organization than we now have. Our major opportunity will confront us in 1955 when the charter of the United Nations comes up for amendment.

Do we shrink from the idea of even the smallest degree of abandonment of national sovereignty? Just what rights should we give up if the United Nations should be equipped with enlarged powers—powers actually to prevent war? Only one right, the right to commit suicide in a new and immeasurably more devastating conflict. Those who fear a slight delegation of sovereignty are those whose patriotism is mostly a brass band complex.

It must be perfectly obvious to anyone who thinks about it carefully, as it was to President Eisenhower who put it in a speech, that durable peace can finally come in but one way, namely, by universal disarmament. The fact that there is a United Nations commission devoted to the study of the ways and means of guaranteed disarmament must give great satisfaction to all but cynics and those whose imaginations are dead. Furthermore, Americans can take comfort and, indeed, inspiration from the resolutions that have been introduced in the Congress which call upon the United States government to make disarmament the definite and continuous aim of its foreign policy.

These efforts to find the way to peace, led by some of the most distinguished figures in American public life, have received scant attention from newspapers so far. We have fallen too hard for bright trivialities. We are losing our sense of news perspective. We have gone Hollywood-happy. Our space is more and more allocated to the Miss Americas and the swimming pool set; the Ali Khans and their picture brides.

Charlie Kettering of the General Motors once told me that he didn't want experienced men in his laboratory, because when there was an improvement to be made, they

knew why it couldn't be done. He wanted inexperienced men who didn't have sense enough to know that it couldn't be done. They just went ahead and did it. So I wonder if some of us oldtimers don't need a new kind of young man in our newspaper who is so dumb that he doesn't believe that circulation comes principally from second-class performance by second-class people. We need some new ignorance about our business.

We must talk about the four freedoms, but the one we need most desperately is the fifth, the freedom of the imagination. For lack of imagination too many editors do not sense the vitality of those projects looking to world federation and disarmament. In my opinion, newspapers, in the call to promote peace by methods other than the

preponderance of arms, face the heaviest responsibility in our history. True peace can come only if we are able "to create an ocean of public opinion on which to launch the ship of a great idea." This is the new and greater responsibility of American newspapers in this changing world.

That sharp southern editor, the late Bob Quillen, once said, "The press has the right to be free, but the more free it is, the less right it has to be wrong." I happen to be a newspaper realist who still believes in ideals.

"Ideals are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands but, like the seafaring man on the desert of the waters, you choose them as your guide, and following them reach your destiny."

Scrapbook—

Liberalism and the Labor Press

by Max Awner

One of the most frequent laments of liberal leaders in America today is the lack of means to get their ideas across to the general public. The big daily newspapers, popular magazines, and other media of mass communication, with pitifully few exceptions, run the gamut from what might roughly be called center to right; outside of letter-to-the-editor columns (usually limited to 200 words or so per letter), they are practically closed to expressions of genuine, informed liberalism.

The handful of liberal journals have a combined circulation of about a quarter of a million. Of that number, at least 90 per cent need little persuasion of the rightness of the liberal cause. Liberals, it's often said, have a hard time because they are always talking to themselves.

Is there no way out of this liberal dilemma? Must the democratic left-of-center point of view forever be confined to the pages of periodicals seldom exposed to the scrutiny of those who need them most?

No doubt it will come as a surprise to many of these ruminating, inbreeding liberals that there *is* a medium which, would they but awaken to its potentialities, could carry a liberal point of view to millions of their fellow citizens who must be the heart and the hide of any concerted, popular liberal movement.

I am talking about the American labor press. Yes, the labor press, that vast, amorphous, rough-hewn, ambivalent, often shrill and cantankerous mass of periodicals with a total circulation estimated at between twenty and thirty million. What more fertile field could any remaker of the world seek? What more fertile and yet what more fallow?

A recent state-wide public opinion survey by a University of Colorado social science professor, seeking to discover just how much people actually knew about "democracy," turned up the disheartening intelligence that of all four groups studied—businessmen, farmers, freshman college students, and union members—the union members were by far the most ill-informed and politically backward. A recent Gallup Poll, for example, showed that McCarthy received a greater vote of confidence among workers than among the other three major occupational groups—business and professional, white-collar, and farmers.

Roughly speaking, there are three types of labor publications: the "official" journal of a national or international union (nearly all the 215 such organizations listed by the Department of Labor issue some publication which passes for an official journal); the local labor paper owned and operated by a city or state central body or group of local unions (more rarely a

single large local); and the privately owned paper that is "endorsed" by one or more union groups. (There is also a growing, and to "official" labor publications increasingly troublesome, group of independent sheets—privately operated periodicals not endorsed by any labor group. Some are sincerely devoted to an ideological cause, but many merely exploit their self-adopted labor label for unscrupulous and often outright anti-labor purposes. Excluding media like mimeographed local union newsletters, there are about 800 to 1,000 labor publications.

II

The international journals normally go to each and every member of every local affiliated with an international union, which means total circulation numbers upwards of fifteen million. Circulation of local, state, or regional publications is, unfortunately, more nebulous. Some are received automatically by every member of the body or bodies operating or endorsing them; some are circulated on the voluntary subscription principle. Many, if not most, union members receive at least two labor publications—their international journal and their local paper—so that the "20 to 30 million" circulation figure undoubtedly represents considerable duplication. On the other hand, many copies go to persons who are not union members.

Journalistically, the average labor paper leaves much to be desired. The international journals, particularly, seem to run to extremes. Perhaps half of them are brightly edited and physically attractive, with much pictorial and human interest

material in addition to their strictly union features. On the other extreme are many—especially the organs of the old-line AFL crafts—that are as sparkling as a telephone directory. Most of them carry no advertising and are subsidized entirely by the labor union.

In the area of content and presentation, there are a few labor organs that measure up to the highest standards of comparable trade or class publications. Most of them, however, would do little credit to a high school journalism class. Almost anyone familiar with the labor press believes there has been a vast improvement over the past ten years or so. That only proves how bad it was up to a decade ago.

Few indeed are the labor papers that will take an independent, thoroughly thought-out stand on important national—or, for that matter local—issues. The policy is set, willy-nilly, by the owning or controlling union group. Since the American labor movement in general finds itself somewhat to the left of center on most political issues, it cannot be said that the labor press is reactionary or even conservative. But its whole tone sounds too much like a mere parroting of pronouncements and policy laid down by the top brass. There is just not enough real thinking done and communicated by labor editors. How could it be otherwise? The labor press is the official spokesman—the less charitable would call it mouthpiece—of the union hierarchy. The hierarchy calls the tune; the labor press follows. It is not built to lead.

III

This sketchy outline of the state of the labor press underscores the obstacles facing those who would transform it into the voice of the liberal movement. It is all very well to say that the answer lies not so much in regenerating the labor press as in reawakening the labor movement to the role it could play in our national life. That, indeed, should be the long range objective (and the subject of another article). But what can be done in the meantime to help the labor press become more the molder, the leader, the gadfly of progressive thinking among the rank-and-file?

For purposes of this article, let me confine myself to the local publications. International journals are, and must perforce remain for the foreseeable future, instru-

ments of the particular union they serve; only as the union alters its outlook or policies can they be expected to change. Moreover, for all practical purposes, they are beyond the reach of the community forces to whom this article is primarily addressed. Only by a sort of “trickling up” process will they be influenced.

First, I think it must be recognized that labor leaders, at least on the local level, are generally *not* the most advanced or the most active in the causes of general political or social progress. It is far more often the social agencies, the civil liberties bodies, and frankly political groups, that take the lead in promoting the ideals identified as liberal. Most labor leaders may be expected to “go along” on forward-looking projects. Community leaders must take this into account in their plans.

To make the labor press more genuinely liberal it will be necessary for genuine liberals, including those within the trade union movement, to change their attitude towards it. Rather than ignore it, or at best tolerate it as an obscure if mildly salutary appendage to the body politic, they must take an active interest in its everyday activities and welfare. They should urge their members to subscribe to it—not so much, at least at first, for their own benefit, as for the purpose of gently prodding the paper to assert itself more independently and positively in community affairs.

If the editor of the paper is timid, or disinclined to “crusade,” or just politically backward, what better way of encouraging or educating him than for a group of his fellow citizens tactfully to gain his ear and, by showing a sincere interest in his work, help him to do a better job? In addition to the essential personal contact, an occasional article suggested or contributed (free, of course!), letters to the editor, and other aids can do much to make the local labor editor a real spokesman for the liberal forces in the community.

Somewhere in this campaign of enlightenment, the mission-to-the-editor may expect to run into a roadblock thrown up by the “old guard” element in the local labor movement that believes the labor paper should reflect only the narrow wages-and-hours interests of the worker. In such a circumstance the password is “tact;” the current situation and the rela-

tive strength of the conservative and progressive blocs will of necessity dictate the strategy to be followed in each case.

IV

My own experience in editing a local labor paper has resulted in a general policy of “When in doubt, dare.” Whether it is an index of more political maturity than the rank-and-file is normally given credit for, or merely of monumental apathy and indifference, I predict that the average labor editor will be amazed at how few subscriptions he loses through a policy of keeping his neck steadfastly protruding from his collar.

Obviously, this sort of arrangement must be a two-way street—the editor or directors of the paper must cooperate. In many cases, local labor editors will be found more than willing; indeed, some make the actual overtures. In other instances it will be a long tedious process of cultivation, a challenging project in public relations—which may, in the end, fail.

The paper, in addition to being reinvigorated politically, must be made more than a mere propaganda sheet. A certain portion of its space must be devoted to lighter, popular features that will have universal appeal. Women’s, children’s, sports, humorous sections are suggestions to add spice. The goal, in other words, is to become a *family* newspaper.

Does the project seem visionary? It is no more so than the dream of Samuel Gompers who, besides being the founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, is credited with inspiring the creation of the labor press as we know it today. With understanding, vision, and persuasiveness—and the requisite sense of urgency—on the part of community leaders, and the intelligence, flexibility, and basic integrity of most labor editors, the task should not be an insurmountable one. And the potential dividends are incalculable.

—From the *Progressive*
June, 1954

Max Awner is editor of the *Colorado Labor Advocate*, which recently won first award for editorial excellence among local papers in the annual competition conducted by the International Labor Press of America.

Nieman Reunion - June 23-24-25

A three-day reunion brought 46 former Nieman Fellows, with 26 wives and nine children, back to Harvard June 23-24-25. They stayed in the new Graduate Center and held meetings in Phillips Brooks House. The program opened with an hour's talk by President Nathan M. Pusey and closed with a clambake at Crane's Beach, Ipswich. The Nieman families met faculty friends at a tea and cocktail party, heard a talk by Dean McGeorge Bundy at a dinner at the Signet Society, and gave Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger a sendoff for his retirement and a gift of a soundscriber. Victor O. Jones (1942) was toastmaster.

The program at Phillips Brooks House was:

Wednesday afternoon

Report by the curator.
Informal talk by Pres. Pusey.

Thursday morning

Talk by Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School on Congressional investigating committees.

The Segregation decision:

Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, Harvard Law School; Neil Davis, editor, Lee County *Bulletin* (Ala.); Sylvan Meyer, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times*; Clark Porteous, Memphis *Press-Scimitar*.

Thursday afternoon

On reappraising policy on Asia:
Chester Bowles, former ambassador to India; Profs. John K. Fairbank, Edwin O. Reischauer, Benjamin I. Schwartz of Harvard's Far Eastern Studies program.

Friday morning

Some problems of a newspaper monopoly:

Paul Block, publisher, Toledo *Blade*.
Official restrictions on news:

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington Bureau of the Cowles publications, and James Daniel, Washington Bureau of Scripps-Howard papers.

Friday afternoon

Taxes, tariffs and employment:
Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, Harvard economics department.

Guests at Reunion Dinner:

Dean and Mrs. McGeorge Bundy; Prof.

and Mrs. Arthur M. Schlesinger; Prof. and Mrs. Merle Fainsod; Prof. and Mrs. Frederick Merk; Prof. John K. Fairbank; Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.; Lawrence L. Winship, managing editor, Boston *Globe*, and Mrs. Winship; Paul Block, publisher, Toledo *Blade*, and Mrs. Block; Forrest Seymour, executive editor, Worcester *Telegram and Gazette*.

Guests at tea and cocktail party:

President and Mrs. Nathan M. Pusey; Mr. and Mrs. John Erskine; Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Morton; Prof. and Mrs. John Gaus; Prof. Elliott Perkins; Prof. Daniel Cheever; Prof. and Mrs. Leigh Hoadley; Prof. and Mrs. Perry Miller; Miss Virginia Proctor; Mr. Robert H. Haynes; Mr. and Mrs. David W. Bailey; Dean Paul M. Herzog; Prof. and Mrs. A. Chester Hanford; Prof. and Mrs. Donald C. McKay.

Nieman Fellows attending reunion:

1939

Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Fuller, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass.

1940

Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Nixon, Detroit, Mich.; Volta Torrey, New York City.

1941

William J. Miller, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. William M. Pinkerton, Cambridge, Mass.

1942

Mr. and Mrs. Neil Davis and children, Auburn, Ala.; Victor O. Jones, Boston, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.

1943

James M. Daniel, Washington, D.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Elliott, Oakland, Calif.; James P. Etheridge, Tampa, Fla.; Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Griffith, New York City.

1944

Robert Bordner, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. John W. Shively, Washington, D.C.

1945

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Edstrom and daughter, Washington, D.C.; Charles Wagner and son, New York City.

1947

Paul Evans, Knoxville, Tenn.; Clark Porteous, Memphis, Tenn.

1948

Charles Gilmore, Toledo, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. Justin McCarthy and daughter, Washington, D.C.; Robert Shaplen, New York City; George Weller, Rome, Italy.

1949

Robert R. Brunn, Boston, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. David B. Dreiman, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence G. Weiss, New York City.

1950

Mr. and Mrs. Max Hall and children, Washington, D.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Clark Mollenhoff, Washington, D.C.; Melvin S. Wax, Claremont, N. H.

1951

Mr. and Mrs. Bob Eddy, St. Paul, Minn.; Mr. and Mrs. Edwin O. Guthman, Seattle, Wash.; Cdr. William J. Lederer, Pearl City, Hawaii; Mr. and Mrs. Sylvan H. Meyer, Gainesville, Ga.; Mr. and Mrs. Hoke M. Norris, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Mr. and Mrs. Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.

1952

Mr. and Mrs. John Harrison, Toledo, Ohio; Shane MacKay, Washington, D.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Molony, Washington, D.C.; Lawrence K. Nakatsuka, Honolulu, Hawaii; John Steele, Washington, D.C.

1953

Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Janson, Milwaukee, Wisc.; Robert E. Lee, Washington, D.C.; Mr. and Mrs. Watson S. Sims, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. John H. Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.

1954

Robert Bergenheim, Boston, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.

P.S. Mr. and Mrs. Edwin J. Paxton (1939) of Paducah, Ky., Mr. and Mrs. Hodding Carter (1940) of Greenville, Miss., Nat Caldwell (1941) of Nashville, Tenn., Robert J. Manning (1943) of New York City, Carl J. Larsen (1948) of Chicago, Ill., Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Fleming (1950) of Chicago, Ill., Mr. and Mrs. Donald J. Gonzales (1950) of Washington, D.C., and William Gordon (1953) of Atlanta, Ga. had made room reservations for the reunion but were prevented from attending by last minute emergencies. The emergencies ranged from children getting measles to Winston Churchill's coming to Washington.

Nieman Notes

1939

The New School of Social Research conferred an honorary degree on **Irving Dilliard**, editor of the editorial page of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

The first part of a week in May found **Edwin A. Lahey** of the *Chicago Daily News* in South Carolina reporting the reaction to the Supreme Court segregation decision. The end of that week found Ed in Guatemala where he stayed to cover the war and was the first to report the active role the U. S. Ambassador, **John Peurifoy**, had in calling the turn on the revolving governments of Guatemala the last week in June.

Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., director of Radio Station WKYB, explains his failure to reach the Nieman reunion as planned:

"I've been in the middle of an FCC hearing for a television station ever since early in May. The newspaper application is being opposed by the local movie monopoly, and we've been in the damndest fight you can imagine. I was on the stand myself for 11 days, and we only adjourned June 25, to reconvene at Washington August 3."

1941

After two and a half years in the United States Information Service in Afghanistan, **Charles Edmondson** returned to Washington in June for reassignment. He describes the climate in Afghanistan as the most comfortable he has found.

John H. Crider, Jr., was married on Nantucket to Ruth Gardner, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George Eddy Gardner. Crider is a student at Harvard. His father represents *Barron's Weekly* in Washington.

Alexander Kendrick, CBS correspondent in Berlin, furnished Edward R. Murrow a Soviet pamphlet on good manners in eating which Murrow broadcast July 1. It recommended against eating with the knife, eating with the mouth open, slurping the soup, or talking with one's mouth full. It took occasion to deny that good manners are an invention of aristocrats, claiming instead they are for hygiene and good

digestion, but nevertheless suggesting habits of eating that do not take away the appetite of other eaters.

1942

Harry Ashmore, executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, had supreme author's luck in having his book, "The Negro and the Schools" published within a few days of the Supreme Court decision that made segregation an instant issue of highest interest. It is based on a study by the Ford Foundation, published by the University of North Carolina Press.

Robert Lasch, editorial writer on the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, saw his son Christopher graduate, summa cum laude, from Harvard College, one of only 27 to receive the highest honors in a class of 990.

1943

Thomas H. Griffith finished a tour in Asia April 15 and immediately did a piece on Indo-China for *Time*, where **Robert J. Manning** (1946) sat in for him as foreign editor during his Far East trip.

Ken McCormick, *Detroit Free Press*, won the top prize for individual reporting in the Detroit Newspaper Guild's "Page One Awards." His stories were based on his investigation which brought freedom to a prisoner serving life after conviction on flimsy evidence.

John F. Day, since June, has been assistant managing editor of the *Newark Star-Ledger*.

Mr. and Mrs. **Robert C. Elliott** came on from California for the Nieman reunion, then took a plane for Dublin to start a vacation in Europe. Elliott is in public relations for the Henry J. Kaiser Corp.

1944

Lawrence A. Fernsworth, recovered from a long illness, started operations in Washington this spring as correspondent of several New England newspapers. The June issue of *The Progressive* published an article by him.

1945

A. B. "Bud" Guthrie went to Hollywood in June to work on the production of a

film play from his Pulitzer-prize book, "The Way West."

1946

A third son, **Robert Brown Manning**, was born April 2 to Margaret and **Robert J. Manning** in New York where Manning is an associate editor of *Time, Inc.* Two of his cover stories this spring were on Native Dancer and Chou-en-lai.

1948

The New Yorker articles by **Robert M. Shaplen** on the famous Tilton-Beecher case, will be part of a book that Shaplen expects to have published this fall. He continues to write for *The New Yorker*.

1949

Christopher Rand's American friends were able to follow him through his *New Yorker* articles in May and June through India and Pakistan toward Afghanistan.

After covering the war in Vietnam for years, **Tillman F. Durdin** was assigned by the *New York Times* to the Geneva Conference and reported the efforts there to end the Indo-China war.

George Weller managed an efficient commencement season. He came home from his Rome station for the *Chicago Daily News*, to attend his 25th class reunion at Harvard and, the following week, the reunion of former Nieman Fellows. The intervening week-end gave him a chance to move his mother's plants from Brookline to Annisquam for the summer, and to visit around.

1950

To observe its 25th anniversary, The Emory University Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa held a series of discussions on "The American Mind—1929-1954." One of the addresses was given by **Max Hall**, on "The Public Mind." It was published in the Emory University Quarterly for June.

Winston Churchill's conference with President Eisenhower kept **Donald J. Gonzales** of the Washington bureau of the *United Press* from the Nieman reunion, and cut short his vacation in Nebraska.

A number of Nieman Fellows covered the Army-McCarthy hearings, but the every-day veteran of these proceedings was **Murrey Marder** of the Washington

Post. He had been covering McCarthy literally for years on his *Post* assignment to investigations of subversive activities. A tourist from Cambridge reported that the way to get into the hearings was "just to mention Murrey Marder." McCarthy also mentioned him, along with Joseph Alsop, Homer Bigart and Alfred Friendly, who shared the crime of having good news resources. They were not, however, writing the news releases. That was reserved for McCarthy's newspaper friend, George Sokolsky.

1951

If you were in the American consular service in Bombay, like **Angus Thuermer**, vacation would be in May, and if you had a wife like Alice Thuermer to describe it, it would run, in part, as follows:

We are currently vacationing in Mahabeshwar, a hill station 200 miles from Bombay. It is woodsy and cool. Nobody but us seems to think it strange that the hotels have no running water. I wash baby bottles in a pail and boil the children's water over a charcoal burner. And when I think of the months I spent sterilizing everything in sight!

Angus plays golf every day. Besides a caddy you hire an *aggiewala*, whose sole job is to chase the balls and retrieve them from the jungle on one side or the Moslem graveyard and race course on the other.

The children have a daily hour's horseback ride which they love. I just sit on the verandah and admire the scenery.

This is Bombay's hottest month and we are lucky to be out of it. The rains start in mid-June, which means that for three months we won't be able to get the desk drawers open and everything we own will be rusted or mildewed but at least it will be cool.

Last month Angus and I made a four-day trip to Agna to see the Taj Mahal. Nobody could possibly tell you how beautiful it is, and seeing it is a lifetime experience. We kept going back for one more look and hated to leave. We were also fascinated by Fatehpur Sikri, the deserted city built by Akbar the great Mogul, and by the various forts, mosques and tombs of the Mogul days. Angus was thrilled to see all these things he had been studying about under Profs. Ingalls and Rowland. The Indians we meet are always

surprised at what he knows about their history, all of which he learned you know where. It has made everything we see twice as interesting.

Our biggest treat recently was when a TWA friend got a Sunday New York *Times* off the plane and gave it to us on the following Thursday. We saved it till the next Sunday and read every word, even the grocery ads.

Angus and I are studying Hindi twice a week. It is fun but requires much concentration. The ayah sits and giggles whenever Angus tries out a sentence. Our tutor comes at teatime so we keep pressing sandwiches on him whenever he tries to find out what we've learned.

1952

Robert S. Crandall of the New York *Times* telegraph desk received an A.B. degree from Columbia University in June and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa for the quality of the work he has been carrying for years as a part-time student, outside of his full-time newspaper job.

Shane MacKay has been appointed editor of the Canadian edition of the *Reader's Digest* and is moving to his new post in Montreal. He has been serving the *Winnipeg Free Press* as its Washington correspondent since last fall.

Last minute telegrams to Cambridge announced that **Lawrence K. Nakatsuka**, secretary to the governor of Hawaii, and Commander **William Lederer** of the U. S. Navy in Hawaii, were on the way to the Nieman reunion. They ended up as roommates in a graduate dormitory.

1953

John Strohmeier of the Providence *Journal* stirred up the animals by a series this spring that named Boston newsmen who were on the payroll of race tracks and State House agencies. This resulted in some changes in some news offices and in a tortuous semantic effort of some news executives to define the legitimate bounds of outside employment by newspapermen for news sources. The *Associated Press* stated flatly there could be no employment of a newsman by news sources. The debate continues.

1954

Richard Dudman was assigned from Harvard to the Washington bureau of the

St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* and almost immediately sent to Central America just as revolt began in Guatemala.

Hazel Holly, of the San Francisco *Examiner*, was the main speaker at a meeting of the New York Newspaper Women's Club in New York April 8. Rebecca Gross, 1948, arrived in a wheelchair, still hospitalized after her New Year's Eve automobile accident. Mrs. John Robling (Charlotte Fitz Henry), 1946, went down for the meeting from Darien, Connecticut.

During their Nieman year Mr. and Mrs. **Alvin Davis** arranged to adopt a French baby. This spring Mrs. Davis, who was born in France, went to France to receive the little boy into her care. Before returning to the New York *Post* in June, Al Davis went over and brought back his family. They named the baby, Marc.

CARD

415 Widener Library
July 1, 1954

To the Editor:

If you think it is proper, I wish you would insert the following card in the next number of the *Nieman Reports*:

I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Nieman alumni, present and absent, who did me honor at the dinner during the recent June reunion. It is an occasion I shall never forget and the gift is one I shall long cherish.

Faithfully yours,
Arthur M. Schlesinger

Letters

Berlin Conference Reports

To The Editor:

A friend has forwarded to me a copy of Lawrence Fernsworth's article in *Nieman Reports*, which appeared under the heading, "The UNESCO's Two-Point Indictment of the Major News Services."

Mr. Fernsworth complained that an AP dispatch from Berlin Feb. 14 on the four-power conference was "distorted" and had a "lurid and misleading opening."

Mr. Fernsworth is a man with strong opinions, and with writing ability to express them. But if one is contributing an article to a periodical like *Nieman*

Reports," shouldn't one take time for research?

I would counsel Mr. Fernsworth to "look at the record," the record on Feb. 14 being principally of Mr. Dulles' and Mr. Molotov's speeches that day at the Berlin conference, together with notes on that day's press briefings by Mr. Henry Suydam of the State Department and Mr. Leonid Ilyichev of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. I assume that such record is readily available for Mr. Fernsworth's study at the State Department and the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

In the light of such record, I feel confident that Mr. Fernsworth, as a man of open mind, would wish to revise his "morning after" complaint. He knows, of course, that wire services do not write the headlines for their dispatches. That is done by newspapers.

The large Associated Press staff covering the Berlin conference included correspondents of British, Swiss and German nationality, as well as American. AP dispatches went to a greater number of newspapers abroad than in the United States, and were written for world readership.

Every press briefing by each of five delegations, including Austrian, to the Berlin conference was covered by at least one AP correspondent and frequently by two; AP news leads presented material gathered daily by the combined efforts of 12 correspondents. Every newsworthy development reported by AP while the conference was in progress can be confirmed in official records.

DANIEL DE LUCE

Chief of Frankfurt Bureau, A.P.

Newscasts Dropped

DENVER, Colo., June 3 (AP)—KFEL TV, Denver's first regularly operating television station, announced it was discontinuing news programs because it was convinced the public does not watch them in sufficient numbers to justify them.

Why not try putting news on?



Hits and Misses

Some crotchety genius on the *New York Times* watches the paper with a hawk eye and issues an occasional bulletin to the staff that picks up both the boners and the bright bits of headline and writing. It is the kind of thing that must keep a staff conscious of style.

The bulletin is named "Winners and Sinners." Here is a sample:

No. 62

WINNERS & SINNERS

May 12, 1954

The Compleat Malaprop. An item about a fishing almanac began: "The Brown-Forman Distillers Corporation of Louisville has definitely established the often-rumored connection between its product and the gentle art of Isaac Newton." (April 19) What's so gentle about being conked with an apple?

Gobbledygook. "Comic books are exercising a vitiating influence on recent progress toward easing racial tensions, Dr. Frederic Wertham, psychiatrist, said yesterday," (April 27, proof) Translation: "Comic books are hampering progress, etc."

Inviting leads. 1. "A police sergeant who had pounded the pavement for many wearisome hours objected to someone else's tearing it up." (May 8; Ralph Katz) 2. "Robert Bannister's feat of cracking the 4-minute barrier for the mile run is more than just epic sports achievement. It dramatizes man's eternal efforts to run longer distances in faster times, to leap higher and to throw farther." (May 7; Joe Sheehan) 3. "Attorneys for Robert R. Young spent four and a half hours yesterday in proving that it costs a lot of money to conduct a proxy fight." (May 4; Bob Bedingfield with a copyediting assist from John Hess) 4. "Governor Dewey's program to keep horse-racing and government in separate stalls has scratched a \$7,000-a-year state publicity writer from a bid for glory in the sport of kings—in New York, anyway." (May 5, Warren Weaver, whose effort was complemented by Jack Randolph's appropriate headline: "New Law Scratches State Worker's Filly.")

Marine intelligence. "Mr. Wilson took these suggestions under advisement and left the matter of Colonel Schwable's future assignment to the discretion of the Navy Department, which includes the Marine Corps." (April 28) W & S is reliably informed that it should have read "Department of the Navy." The Department of the Navy is composed of two co-equal services: the Navy Department (confusing, isn't it?) and the Marine Corps. In other, and perhaps clearer, words, the Navy Department is something different from the Department of the Navy.

Human building blocks? "Operator Buys Home on King St. Built by Astor From the Assumption Nuns." (April 23)

Unanswered question. Story: "The first gray winner in the history of the Kentucky Derby. . ." Head: "Determine Becomes First Gray to Win." (May 2) What is the significance of the horse's color? For the answer readers had to wait for Arthur Daley's column of a week later.

Tearing down the "El." W & S does not ordinarily concern itself with 1st edition typos but feels impelled to share the comments of two wags who wrote in about the head, "Museum Reviving El Fresco Dining." (April 27) John Randall, a free-loading W & S subscriber at Station WXLW, Indianapolis, asks, "May taking luncheon here be likened to doing so at Al Morocco?" And Glad Hill, the multilingual word-slinger of Los Angeles, writes: "This of course should have been 'Al Greco' (meaning, in free translation, to dine at a Greek restaurant). El Fresco is the Italian restaurant operator whose minestrone was so superb it was known as 'The Last Sopa.'"

UNESCC. ". . . an 'insidious plot' to infiltrate the school system with propaganda on behalf of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Commission." (May 4; 1st edition and as per copy) it's "organization," not "commission."

Short doublet. "It is not only new, both in the sense of being a completely fresh project dealing with a new century, but, more importantly, it approaches the times in a new spirit." (May 2, Book Review) The "not only" idea is completed after the "but." But where is the other member of the "both" team? Incidental note: the "not only" should have been at the beginning of this sentence. (See W & S Nos. 9, 18, 41 and 60)

Deadhead. "Ceremonies Today Open Vast Center." (April 28)

New records. "By stroking five home runs in his trips to the plate Musial established a new major-league record. . ." (May 4) "New" is superfluous with "record" except where a direct comparison is being made with a previous record.

Cutting remark. ". . . the modernization of the four roads bisecting the big park." (May 5; proof) "Bisect" means "cut in two," which is not what four roads do to the park. Make it "crossing."

Trophies of a head-hunter. "Man Your Stations, Men! There's a Small Boy Loose." (May 4; Frank Bailinson) "World's a Stage, Including Alleys." (May 1; Chick Butsikares, based on a good lead to the same effect by Lew Funke) "Point of Order Becomes Notable Point of Disorder." (April 28; Joe Durso) "Welch Tosses 'Em to McCarthy; a Big League Catcher Watches." (May 6; Tom Daffron) "Publicity ist in einer Party Bid Hidden." (April 28; Bob Dinsmore) "Lionel Grinds to a Halt." (May 4; Sherman Davis)

HELPFUL HINTS FOR HATCHET MEN. A "who" clause that is preceded by designation of two individuals can often be ambiguous and sometimes even libelous. Example: "Louis Waldman, attorney for Ryan who is charged with stealing \$48,000 in unions funds. . ." (May 1; 1st Late City edition) The writer or the editor apparently recognized the pitfall here and thought to avoid it by omitting the comma after Ryan, intending thus to tie the clause closely to that name. The comma is necessary, however, if the punctuation is to be correct. The only ways out of the difficulty are either to insert an identification ahead of the "who" (e.g. "the former union leader") or to make the "who" clause a separate sentence. Once again the need is for precision.

Nieman Scrapbook

Washington Post, July 1

Colonel Wants Cut . . .

Slogans Won't Pay Rent

by Edwin A. Lahey

GUATEMALA CITY—Communist influence in Guatemala seemed reasonably flattened today, in pursuance with the wishes of the U. S. State Department. The only remaining "international issue" in this situation was how to cut Col. Carlos Castillo Armas in for a piece of the operation.

The new military Junta, headed by Col. Elfege H. Monzon, took over Guatemala early Tuesday in place of the Junta headed by Col. Carlos Enrique Diaz, who in turn had bumped President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman on Sunday. The new mob was deemed necessary because the Diaz Junta was not in the right frame of mind to negotiate peace with Col. Castillo Armas, who led the invasion that toppled the Red-infested government of Arbenz.

Castillo Armas slogan is "God, Country, and Liberty," but he has another important principle not printed on his banner. He wants his end of the operation. The invading colonel has been off the pay roll since 1949, when he took it on the lam, and can't pay the rent with his high-

sounding aspirations.

Castillo Armas indicated that the matter of being cut in at the national palace was important to him. He sent one of his rented P-47s over the capital Monday and plastered a few bombs around to emphasize the point. Diaz got the point, and turned the government over to the new mob early Tuesday. There were reports that the new management would shortly be in touch with the Castillo Armas forces, directly or through intermediaries.

The Diaz Junta, in its brief span of authority, began the job of cleaning out the Communists. The Guatemalan Labor Party, which was the Communist organization, was outlawed, and Reds in government departed hastily in all directions.

An amnesty for political prisoners was proclaimed, and the jails disgorged of hundreds of anti-Communists who had been arrested by the Arbenz police agents in the last three weeks. The prisoners were let out of jail speedily because the new government will be needing the facilities.

—Chicago *Daily News* Foreign Service.

The A.P. Spreads Gloom and Doom

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in its investigation of the manner in which the Associated Press has reported on the various internal combustions of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I wonder if the committee has also made any effort to determine whether, under the guise of reporting news, the Associated Press is guilty of that much-discussed leftwing tendency to spread gloom and doom.

I do not ask this lightly, Mr. Speaker, for I understand that throughout last week prominent leaders of the Republican Party assured us there was no basis for either gloom or doom in the current economic situation—a self-correcting inventory adjustment, and that anyone who believes that we are not enjoying remarkable prosperity is possibly subversive and certainly mistaken.

Under these circumstances, I was surprised, not to say shocked, that the Associated Press, already suspect of exercising some rather uncomplimentary objectivity in its coverage of congressional activities, had the effrontery last week to report the fact that business failures in the preceding week were the highest for any week since April 1942.

This is, without doubt, a typical piece of gloom and doom reporting and I wonder if we should not investigate to determine if some hidden fear dealer wrote it.

The use of the April 1942 date is particularly suspect, Mr. Speaker, because as I understand it, many of the business failures of that wartime period were due to the inability of the businesses involved to obtain either materials to process or goods to sell or labor to do the necessary work.

On the other hand, those businesses which the AP included last week in its tabulation of those which went broke were not bothered by any shortage of goods or materials or by any inability to find people to employ. They must have gone under, then, for entirely dif-

Scrapbook—

ferent reasons from those which went out of business during the previous record-high week of business failures in April 1942.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that businesses in so shaky a condition should have had the good grace and consideration to fail at some other time and not right in the midst of those assurances from the White House and the Republican National Committee that only gloom and doom spreaders see anything but the rosiest economic rainbows over our shoulders.

I suppose we cannot expect the Associated Press to suppress news of this nature, since the news services in this country make something of a fetish out of reporting just about everything that happens that anyone might be interested in reading about. Nevertheless, when next an investigator from the Committee on Un-American Activities does a rundown on how the AP handled some item involving the committee's affairs, it might be worthwhile for him also to examine into the authorship of such gloom and doom pieces as this one on business failures.

The *Congressional Record*—
House—Feb 16, p. 1727

The Denver Post, April 12 Teaching Thinking

"If this be subversive," said Harvard president Nathan M. Pusey, echoing Patrick Henry in a speech the other day before a college association, "then make the most of it." Harvard and its president have been the targets of smear innuendoes of late that might lead some people to think they were both up to no good. But the ideas Dr. Pusey was promoting are vigorously in conflict with the ideals of Communism.

It is the Pusey thesis that the most important work a college or university can do is to make students think originally. "The aim of the teacher . . . is to make individuals, individuals who will think for themselves."

It's tough going right now, too, says the Harvard prexy, because since World War II we have had a strong growth of public pressure to make people conform. But

the tendency was notable long before the war, Pusey declares. From about 1870 on "we have come more and more, not only to think, act, talk, and even look alike, but also, it would seem now, increasingly to want to do so."

One thing that would distract an entire nation once proud of its individuality of citizens as well as of its independence, may be the growth of the mass production idea since Ford. The idea works fine, except when applied to human beings.

It is significant that the Communists started out revering it highly, too, in order to produce commodities for their masses. But they are the ones who have raised conformity of the people to the nth degree. The greatest anathema of the Communist state is the individual who cooks up his own ideas rather than accepting without question those that have been predigested for him by the ruling commissars.

"Individuality does not mean eccentricity. What it calls for rather is genuineness," Pusey explains. "Anyone who has ever taught knows that it is not easy to get students to think for themselves. They almost invariably want to give back what they think the teacher wants."

Does that ring a school bell in everyone's own scholastic memory? College students, and even those in high schools, are smart enough to figure out their teachers' own eccentricities and attitudes and conform, for classroom purposes at least, their ideas to the professor's. That is more diplomatic than courageous. As it becomes a habit it endangers the training of the mind and defeats the very purpose of education.

"Original thought is not necessarily novel or strange thought; certainly it need not be destructive thought, but only thought that one has made one's own. . . The aim is to get the student to break out of the conventional circle which seems both to characterize and contain the cerebrations of his whole generation."

The Pusey idea is, of course, that once the student is capable of thinking he will reject such phony philosophies as Communism teaches without need for indoctrination against them.

Yet we have statesmen today, as well as many a man-on-the-street, who seriously, loudly, and sometimes even eloquently proclaim that anyone who has ideas that don't

strictly conform to their own—as, for instance, on the question of what is Americanism—is not only a dangerous type, but probably a downright traitor. No wonder educators like Pusey have a tough time teaching their flocks to be brave, and stay free!

Broun Award

The 1953 Heywood Broun Award for the year's best journalistic work in the Broun spirit will go to Ralph S. O'Leary, a reporter for the *Houston Post*, for a series of articles on the Houston chapter of the Minute Women of the U. S. A., Inc.

The award, \$500 in cash and a citation, is given annually by the American Newspaper Guild, C. I. O., in memory of its first president, the crusading New York columnist who died in 1939.

Announcement of the award said Mr. O'Leary's articles disclosed a growing climate of fear in Houston that the Minute Women were helping to build with a new technique of "individual" chain telephone calls. Pressure was thus brought to bear, it said, on expression of liberal thought.

The runner-up in the contest was a series on "Facts Forum" by Ben H. Bagdikian of the *Providence Journal-Bulletin*. Entries selected for honorable mention were:

A series in the *Chicago Daily News* on slum conditions in the city.

Four series of articles in the *New York Post* on the Fort Monmouth Investigation by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, blacklisting in radio and television, deportation of aliens and problems of Puerto Ricans in New York.

A series by William E. Gaines of the *Greenville (S. C.) News* describing prison systems in the Carolinas.

A story by Douglas Collins of the *Calgary (Alta.) Herald* exposing as a hoax the story of George DuPre in the book, "The Man Who Wouldn't Talk."

A series on police brutality and violation of civil rights in New York by Frederick E. Woltman of the *New York World-Telegram* and *The Sun*.

Judges of the fifty-six entries were Eric Sevareid of the Columbia Broadcasting System, A. H. Raskin, labor reporter of the *New York Times*, and Leo Lerner, editor of a group of Chicago community newspapers.

N. Y. Times

Scrapbook—

Littleton (Colo.) Independent, March 5, 1954

Houstoun Waring, Editor

Thought Control for Colorado

The sale of KFEL-AM to an out-of-state newspaper, and *Time Magazine's* plan to operate several radio stations in this and nearby states do not make us rejoice.

It is healthier for America when local newspapers, radio stations, and television outlets are home-owned. For many years, the West has been a colonial possession of the East, economically. Centralized ownership of newspapers or broadcasting stations will complete the colonialism, politically.

With 1,700 dailies and 9,000 weeklies, America has had the benefit of nearly that many independent expressions of opinion. We wish the same could be said of the 2,400 radio stations, but the deadly efficient hand of the network system has stifled individuality almost from the start.

One of the projects of our State Department has been the encouragement of home-owned newspapers and radio stations

abroad. If this is good for other lands, it is certainly a valuable goal here.

We look upon individual ownership of newspapers and radio stations as good insurance for this nation. Sooner or later—and there are signs even now—some mountebanks and demagogues will secure such power in Washington that they will attempt to control the thinking of the people. If communications are in the hands of a few men in New York or Chicago, these would-be dictators can put the screws on them and “suggest” that they follow a given line of thought—or else.

It is necessary that we have automobile giants, telephone giants, and steel giants. Efficiency requires these operations to be on a large scale. But it is not necessary or even desirable, for the sources of our news and interpretive comment to be thus concentrated.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 18

More Powerful Than All the Bombs

There is no need to try to say now just how historic this decision is. There is no point in evaluating it today as the most momentous since the Dred Scott slave case decision, handed down almost a century ago, on the eve of the Civil War. Although that would not be overstatement, it is enough to say the words read by Chief Justice Warren for himself and his colleagues are of transcendent importance.

The Chief Justice's words will have their impact in one way or other on every community in every state. Their import will flow in less time than we are apt to think around the world.

For it is not just the states of South Carolina, Virginia, Kansas and Delaware and the District of Columbia, in which the associated test cases arose, that are affected.

It is not just other states like Missouri which have had a constitutional or legal requirement of separate educational systems for the two races. It is not just cities such as St. Louis that have followed the same practice and that now will need to accommodate themselves to a principle of justice and fairness which they long ago should have applied themselves.

The greater significance is the affirmation in the eyes of millions of people in India, Pakistan and Africa, in China, Japan, and Burma, in Indochina, Thailand and Indonesia that the pledge in the United States of the worth and dignity of the humblest individual means exactly what it says.

Had this decision gone the other way the loss to the free world in its struggle against Communist encroachment would

have been incalculable. Nine men in Washington have given us a victory that no number of divisions, arms and bombs could ever have won.

But it is not a victory of the present Supreme Court alone by any means. Justice John Marshall Harlan was one of the victors. When he cried out nearly 60 years ago against the injustice of the decision in *Plessy vs. Ferguson*—the Jim Crow railroad car case—it was in lone dissent. When he denied “that any legislative body or judicial tribunal may have regard to the race of citizens when the civil rights of those citizens are involved,” he spoke for only himself on the Supreme Court.

* * *

When that old Civil War veteran said in 1896 “the thin disguise of ‘equal’ accommodations for passengers in railroad coaches will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done,” when he said “the Constitution is color blind,” he raised his voice and lifted his eyes in an appeal that was to be heard and adopted a half century later.

A long line of decisions has now been discarded, including Missouri's 1938 Gaines case, which led this State into the unfortunate and wasteful error of setting up a separate tax-supported law school for Negro students. The faults of the mythical “separate but equal” concept are set forth in a Ford Foundation book, “The Negro and the Schools,” by Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, and published by the University of North Carolina Press, through notable coincidence on the very day the Supreme Court acted.

* * *

This declaration of basic principle in conformity with the Constitution does not solve the problem in all its aspects. But it puts the matter of solution squarely before those whose responsibility it is.

There is work to do now in St. Louis, throughout Missouri, in the 21 states that have either required segregation or have permitted it in varying degrees, in the other states that have prohibited segregation but have winked at the practice.

The Supreme Court has used the best of judgment in allowing an interval in which to thresh out the means of applying the principle that it proclaims.

Scrapbook—**The Delta Democrat-Times, May 18, 1954****Hodding Carter, Editor and Publisher****The Court's Decision**

The Supreme Court's decision that segregated schools are unconstitutional was expected by almost everyone who has followed the course of the historic struggle between defenders and opponents of racially separated school systems. More significant than surprising, too, was the unanimous nature of the decision. The justices who made it are men from every section of the nation, men of varied social backgrounds and beliefs and political outlook. That they should be so united in this case can be interpreted only as meaning they were completely convinced that morality and the democratic tradition were on their side.

What is important to find out is where we go from here? Actually, as has been pointed out, this decision means only that Negro students in the four cases before the Court must be permitted to attend non-segregated schools. If the thousands of other school districts in the South continue to bar Negro students from white schools—as is likely—they can be forced to change their policies only by further court action in each instance. That means a long delay in most areas of the South in any widespread implementation of the decision.

It seems to us that it is the height of folly to think now or even later of doing away with the public school system in the South as a means of evading the decision. If the Court's intent is to be evaded—as it undoubtedly will be for a long time to come in most Southern states—it is not necessary to destroy the public school system. Mississippi's plan of assigning students to a certain center offers one way out. There are others.

But we need not and should not be as concerned here with the problem of nullifying the Court's decision by local action as with the positive challenge that has been made to responsible Southerners. If ever a region asked for such a decision the South did through its shocking, calculated and cynical disobedience to its own state

constitutions which specify that separate school systems must be equal. For seventy-five years we sent the Negro kids to school in hovels and pig pens, and even now we kid ourselves when we say we are approaching equality. And if we are to effect a workable and fair compromise at the local Southern levels, we have to spend dollar for dollar, all down the line, for every educable child.

It is not possible to predict now what the overall and longtime results will be. But we can be sure that they won't be the same everywhere in the Southern and border states. Negro children will attend white schools in some areas where only a handful of Negroes live. Some may be permitted to attend white schools, without court action, in larger cities with sizable Negro populations. But in the deep Southern states with the densest Negro population there will be little change in the immediate future, nor—if we actually equalize facilities—will there be much change for years to come. Most Negroes want only the same opportunities for their children as we white people want for ours. They want fair play.

There's no point now in listening to the professional politicians and the hot-heads. Let's keep our shirts on. The decision has been made. It is a momentous one. Whatever the South thinks of it, there is no doubt that it will raise American prestige in the world, and especially in the world of brown and yellow and black peoples. And to us in the South it gives a challenge to replace trickery and subterfuge in our educational structure with an honest realization that every American child has the right to an equal education. How that equal education will be given will remain largely a local matter, and one in which local customs and pressures will dominate for a long time to come. Let's use that time for fairness and adjustment, not in angry and fearful debate.

**Minneapolis Morning Tribune,
May 21, 1954****Gideon D. Seymour**

Gideon D. Seymour, whose death we announce with a profound sense of personal loss, brought to these newspapers and this community rare gifts and limitless devotion.

He was an exceptionally able and widely experienced newspaperman. He was an extraordinarily alert, forward-looking and conscientious citizen.

During his 35 years of newspaper work, Mr. Seymour served in many capacities and many places. He could cover a national political convention, an international diplomatic conference or a prize fight with equal distinction. He was equally adept at writing an incisive editorial and at editing someone else's copy. He could select a winning picture or write a captivating headline with equal facility.

When Mr. Seymour came to Minneapolis to edit the editorial page of the *Star* in 1939 he brought a remarkable background acquired as *Associated Press* correspondent and news executive in Latin America, Europe, Africa and Australia. He supplemented this with subsequent trips and wide contacts abroad.

Mr. Seymour quickly identified himself with community affairs. No good cause sought his aid and counsel in vain. He was not content to give only editorial support to the causes and institutions he deemed worthy of help. He gave of his time and personal means without stint. He served on committees, accepting chairmanships when no one else could be persuaded to take on those responsibilities. He spoke far and wide for the things he believed in.

His monuments are all around this community as well as in these newspapers whose editorial direction has been in his hands for more than a decade. The YMCA, the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, the Minneapolis Council of Churches, the Community Chest, the Society for the Blind and a host of other endeavors owe to him much of their present ability to serve community needs.

These newspapers, however, are the principal beneficiaries of his talents and energies. He expended himself unceasingly

Scrapbook—

to make them better written, edited and produced. He introduced many new features and fresh ideas. The *World Affairs* program is his creation. The *Minnesota Poll* owes much to his leadership. He constantly reviewed what was being done with a view to better serving the needs of the people of the Upper Midwest. He constantly exchanged ideas with editors of other newspapers here and abroad to make sure that nothing was being overlooked that would make for better newspapers.

That was the professional and civic side

ANNE O'HARE McCORMICK

N. Y. Times Editorial Board, 1936-1954; died May 29, 1954

For the last two decades I have viewed Anne O'Hare McCormick with personal pride and affection. I shall continue to do so. When I asked her to join the editorial staff of the *Times*, now almost twenty years ago, it was my first important official act as Publisher. It's a pretty scary thing to be a brand-new publisher of the *New York Times*, and to score a bull's eye when your trigger finger is still trembling helps vastly to establish confidence. That's what Anne did for me and it's only fair to say that I followed her writings and career with closer attention because of it.

She and her husband were our friends. They shared intimate joys with us, such as the marriage of our children. They passed quiet week-ends with us in the country. A bond of affection was built, induced by trust in this agile, facile, profound, happy mind and generous heart. I summed up the feelings of Mrs. Sulzberger and myself when, under the stress of emotion induced by the news of her death, I wrote a tribute to her which I repeat here:

"With the death of Anne McCormick, a brilliant, sensitive mind and a warm and gracious heart are taken from the world. The extent of her interests, her keen analysis of events, her buoyant spirit, her depths of perception, the clarity of style with which she presented her views of the changing scene, all contributed to placing her in a unique position to serve her fellow man. This she did untiringly until the end. Those who knew her, loved

of Gideon Seymour. In addition to those qualities, Mr. Seymour had a great capacity for friendship and a great zest for living. He knew personally many hundreds of the men and women who work on these newspapers. He knew their problems and tried to help them to cope successfully with them. He knew their aspirations and tried to help fulfill them. He was an entertaining companion as well as a strong and courageous leader.

For all these qualities and for others we might mention Gideon Seymour is deeply mourned and will be long remembered with admiration, gratitude and affection.

her. Those who read her writing relied upon her."

—Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

Those who worked in offices near the editorial council room could tell when Mrs. McCormick was at council meetings—from the laughter of her colleagues. Her good cheer colored any discussion in which she took part, however grave the subject.

Her letters from readers, which I handled as they came into her office, most often spoke of the hope, the lift her articles gave to people unknown to her who counted her a wise, encouraging friend. European visitors, often exiles, left her office visibly cheered by her comprehension of their difficulties. "She is the best friend my country has," they all said.

Mrs. McCormick wrote with terrific concentration, without apparent hurry and almost without sense of time. If this method caused any delay in appointments, no visitor ever seemed to mind—at least not when his turn came and she gave him sympathetic attention.

All that can be said of Mrs. McCormick's brilliant mind, fabulous memory, unerring judgment is too little. But I believe these heroic qualities were strengthened and made so extraordinarily effective by humbler (but no less real) virtues; by imperturbable good nature, infinite patience, gaiety, courage, unflinching kindness and unceasing interest in all human affairs.

—Marian B. Andrews.

Times Talk for June.

Washington Post, June 28

On Balancing Risks

Unquestionably it is difficult for Americans who have not read the entire 992-page transcript of testimony in the security case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer to arrive at an informed judgment of the issues. *Time* magazine, in its current issue, reproaches "many" of the Nation's editors for "lazily" following the line offered them by Dr. Oppenheimer's lawyers without digesting the transcript itself. *Time* carefully selects testimony unfavorable to Dr. Oppenheimer, and winds up its article with quotations from John J. McCloy, who was Assistant Secretary of War from 1941 to 1945 and now is chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank.

Roger Robb, counsel for the Security Board, asked Mr. McCloy whether he had any bank employee "who has been for any considerable period of time on terms of rather intimate and friendly association with thieves and safecrackers." Mr. McCloy naturally said: "No, I don't know of anyone." Mr. Robb then drew from him an acknowledgment that he would be concerned if one of his branch managers failed to report or delayed in reporting to him a suspicious incident about a plan to rob the bank. If the branch manager later asserted that his report about the plan to rob the bank "was a lot of bunk," Mr. Robb asked, would not Mr. McCloy be puzzled about why the manager would tell such a story about his friends? "Yes," replied Mr. McCloy, "I think I would be."

This inexact analogy, of course, was intended to parallel Dr. Oppenheimer's admittedly foolish behavior in the incident involving an approach to him in 1943 by Haakon Chevalier on behalf of another man interested in obtaining technical information for Soviet scientists (which Dr. Oppenheimer did not furnish). "The majority of Gordon Gray's Security Board," concludes *Time* as a clincher, "wound up feeling about Oppenheimer the way McCloy felt about Roger Robb's hypothetical bank manager."

Perhaps the editors of *Time* themselves should have taken a closer look at the transcript. For, at the end of his testimony, Mr. McCloy added:

But let me say, suppose the man in

Scrapbook—

charge of my vaults knew more about protection and knew more about time locks than anybody else in the world. I might then think twice before I let him go because I would balance the risks in this connection . . . I can't divorce myself from my own impression of Dr. Oppenheimer and what appeals to me

as his frankness, integrity, and his scientific background. I would accept a considerable amount of political immaturity, let me put it that way, in return for this rather esoteric, this rather indefinite theoretical thinking that I believe we are going to be dependent on for the next generation.

A Gentleman Closes His Typewriter**James A. Hagerty**

Many years after the New York *Herald's* demise in 1920, Carr V. Van Anda, then managing editor of the New York *Times*, said to me:

"If there were no other reason for the *Times* being happy over the *Herald's* folding, the fact that we got Jim Hagerty would be enough."

He never ceased to marvel at Jim's phenomenal familiarity with political trends and at his exclusive news sources in all sections of the city, state and nation. On some election nights incoming bulletins and dispatches from news services and correspondents made Jim's estimate of the votes seem by comparison almost like the flight of a lone, lost eagle. V. A.'s anxious eyebrows nearly reached the retreating wisp of his sparse thatch as he pointed out the conflicting incoming vote figures, arguing earnestly at "Mr. Hagerty's" shoulder, above the rat-a-tat of Jim's typewriter. But Jim's quiet smile of reassurance was infectious as he explained which important counties or districts were still to be heard from, how he knew what the votes of each of them might be and how they would affect the total. Jim's estimates were always amazingly close to the actual vote cast. Except on Truman in 1948. But at that time Jim was not a lone eagle; and C. V. V. A. was (probably) running a celestial city room.

Van Anda knew his reporters as Jim knew his private news sources and, like Jim, just how safely he could depend on each. When he spoke to Jim, it was to "Mr. Hagerty." But when he spoke of

Mr. Hagerty, it was "Jim." That was sufficient proof of the respect and proprietary affection the usually aloof and sometimes sub-Artic M. E. had for the invaluable reporter he had so promptly and shrewdly snatched out of the swirling sea when the *Herald* plunged down to Davy Jones.

The ripening apple does not fall far from the tree. It was inevitable that our Jim Hagerty and Tom Dewey's and Ike's Jim should have many qualities in common. We saw with what admiration and respect Jimmy's eyes shone whenever he spoke of his Dad; and the affectionate pride in the eyes of the elder Jim whenever we or he mentioned Jimmy or watched him grow into the golden mintage of his sire. It is because of their resemblances that the two Jims have won the friendship and trust of all who know them; their instinctive kindness and courtesy, their deep sense of responsibility, and the quiet satisfaction both of them derive from rendering true service to their fellow men.

* * *

Jim may think he is retiring, but he cannot take himself out of the New York *Times*. He has woven himself inextricably into its texture and spirit these thirty-four years and will remain there as a tradition, willy-nilly, throughout the future.

* * *

—David H. Joseph.
Times Talk, June.

Reviews —**Does Meteor Rise?**by **Richard Dudman**

THE ART OF NEWS COMMUNICATION. By Chilton R. Bush. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York. 246 pp. \$2.50.

Too many journalism classrooms and too many newspaper city rooms enforce writing styles according to their own peculiar accumulations of rules.

Professor Bush pays little respect to rules but aims instead at the basic matter of how to get information across to the reader. That has been his approach for the last 20 years at Stanford University, where he is director of the Institute for Journalistic Studies, and now he has organized his thoughts into a textbook on news writing.

In writing the book, Professor Bush tackles news writing as a problem in the new science of communication—how to reduce semantic noise" by using words, sentence-structure and style that will make understanding easy.

Redundancy, for example, is no bad word to Dr. Bush, but a respectable method of making the meaning clear, a method well known in public speaking but sometimes ignored in news writing. "The problem for the news communicator is how to make his message sufficiently redundant without making it offensively monotonous," he says. "Readers may want 'more news in fewer words,' but they also want to know what the words mean."

He has the same tolerant view of cliches: "News writers should have more freedom to use cliches than writers who address only a sophisticated audience. A cliché that is not too outworn is a more effective symbol of communication for many readers and listeners in the newspaper and radio audience than are more carefully chosen words."

However, he does rule out a list of some 26, including "sickening thud," "wave of optimism," "innocent bystander" and "meteoric rise." In a footnote to the last of these, he asks, "Does a meteor rise?"

Dr. Bush describes in some detail the readability formulas of Dr. Rudolf

Reviews—

Flesch, for the most part approvingly. But, in an important qualification, Dr. Bush points out that an unfamiliar word can be made clear to the reader by building in a context that will define it.

The question of attribution of statements in a news story leads quite naturally to the question of evaluation of sources. With a nice sense of historical perspective, Dr. Bush says, "Some newspapers began in 1953, when a fear of Communism was prevalent, to go even further (than giving an accused person a chance to answer in the same story) in protecting the reputations of accused persons: they inserted in parentheses after an accusation that was known to be false a statement about the falsity or the evidence of the falsity."

In a more general discussion of so-

called interpretive reporting, Dr. Bush points out that "the news medium that explains every major event must pose as being omniscient;" when the writer does not have an accurate explanation, he must invent one.

Dr. Bush concludes that, "except for news that reports an accusation, it is better to let some of the news go unexplained *on the day it is published* than to risk departure from the traditionally-established attitude of keeping news and opinion separate. Certainly the news agencies cannot afford to tilt the lid of Pandora's box."

The book is dedicated "To Palmer Hoyt (editor and publisher of the *Denver Post*), "who should be a professor whenever there is established a school for publishers."

Doubting All Dogmas

by Lawrence Fernsworth

BOTTLE IN THE SEA, by Albert Guérard, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1954. 160 pp. \$3.50.

Being a rationalist—within reason—is the most serious business of life to Albert Guérard who explores this thought to the verge of infinity in the latest of his books wherein he testifies to what he has learned from his experience of life as a teacher. *Bottle in the Sea*, he takes pains to underline, is not a treatise but a testimony.

The Swindlers of life are Authority, Orthodoxy, Loyalty, Tradition, Common Sense. Here this set of Swindlers are arraigned and found guilty before the bar of a proof-seeking mind. It is a mind whose only dogma is the urgency of doubting all the dogmas and fixations of thought as imposed by the yesterdays and become meat for the todays. This kind of thinking leads him to goals transcending all reason—faith. It is the kind of faith that assents to the acceptance of miracles from which reason dissents.

Every paragraph of this beautifully presented 160-page book has its aphorisms: "There can be no honesty of thought without a conscientious, i.e. a fearless critique of every established opinion, however hoary and massive it may seem."

All the breakers of image from Aquinas

to Marx have merely set up new idol-policemen to serve warrants of arrest upon on-marching thoughts. Yet science itself has learned that there are no immutable verities; truths are discovered and revered and then challenged at the right moment; the prospecting for larger and larger nuggets of truth reaches out from here to eternity.

From among the philosophers Guérard chooses René Descartes as a guide, not because Descartes was immune from palpable errors—for he was not—but because this man of doubt and decision, who insisted that thinking must start with a decision—with an act—"gave a great example and opened a perilous path." This path Guérard himself follows along to its illimitable consequences rather than taking the pathway of the finitely logical. Back of the process of willing stand hope, dread and finally pain. "The key of life is suffering; no dynamic philosophy was ever evolved by contented cows; and there is no steadfast bliss except in Nirvana." And again: "Descartes made himself doubt and he made himself think his way out of doubt."

It is in such proffers of testimony that you have the key to Guérard's own doubting, and thinking his way out of doubt.

Early in life that thinking led him away from the religious home of his youthfulness—Roman Catholicism. At a later period it led him to the Episcopal church—and then led him away from that too.

He views religion as something more than those versions of tribalism which Israel has passed onto us; it is more than an institution; it is more than a code of ethics; it must be factually and historically true or remain a fantastic poem. A church divided is a church self-condemned; Christianity is such a divided religion. "Protestantism and Catholicism must unite before they can hope to win the world." But the gulf between them is wide; there must be no return to the past. "The clashing sects can only merge by transcending themselves." The universal religion which Guérard envisages must transcend all faiths; it must provide ample room for the faith that lives in honest doubt.

Guérard's deepest objection to all the creeds is "their inveterate, their irremediable materialism." And: "The fight of religious free thought against orthodoxy is the fight of spiritual truth against material pseudo-scientific knowledge." The existence of separate churches is forever a menace to peace and good will. His goal of the Universal Church can only be reached "through a converging evolution that will transcend them all."

In a concluding chapter entitled "What I Believe," he tells us "I am now attempting to meet the challenge which has never been out of my mind for these forty years." As a rationalist within reason, "I feel certain, with the full force of Cartesian evidence, that the key to our existence lies beyond human reason." He has just told us, "I should like to call myself a Christian. I am bound to explain why I do not feel at liberty to do so." His reasons fly at you like the sharp, rapid crackling of rifle shots—almost a volley fire. He tells you:

The sects do lip service to the ideals of Jesus; their essential purpose is to expound and maintain a doctrine. They fear they will be purified out of existence. He accepts the universe and does not rebel "at the possibility that tomorrow I may be transferred to another sphere or allowed to rest forever;" he scorns even to discuss the dogma of eternal punishment which

Reviews—

he rejects out of hand. The idea of personal survival is naive. Our duty is to challenge dread which lies beyond fear.

"My ultimate faith is that there is some sense to this universe." . . . "In order to become reliable, conscience must be stripped of all prejudices of race, caste, party, nation or sect." . . . "Perhaps there are among us, and have been for the few thousand years of recorded history, pioneers of a new stage, stray units of a humanity in process of transcending reason, as once did reason transcend instinct." (One of Bergson's favorite themes, —and this writer's.)

Thus in this final chapter his rifle shots sweep over the range from bullseye to bullseye. "The quest for the good implies a natural selection;" it is pure science to take things as they are, but: "We must not leave them as they are. . . . Science is

an inventory; religion is a campaign." And so he is "inexorably driven to faith, the substance of things hoped for. . . . My guide must be more of a living force than the God of the philosophers; more of a mystery than the God of Abraham. . . . Our ultimate loyalty is to the highest: I cannot give unconditional allegiance to sect, party, country, 'right or wrong.' "Love for a faith, a land, a cause, can be ardent and holy without being exclusive. . . . I love all countries. . . . I can love all great causes. . . . And this means that I do not, that I cannot belong to any one of them." And so he closes "with the great lyric notes of St. Paul, in the thirteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians"—the great hymn to charity. "Charity never faileth. . . . For we know in part and we prophesy in part. . . ."

On this note the bottle is sealed and tossed to the waves.

Prejudice and the Press

by **Houstoun Waring**

THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE. Gordon W. Allport. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. Cambridge, 537 pp. \$5.50.

Some psychologists believe that if we are to build a tradition of fair play, we must do this wholesale. Little good results from trying to alter the attitudes of an individual because he becomes an outcast in his group if he speaks out for better treatment of Jews, Negroes, or Socialists in time of crisis.

By changing the climate of a city, a labor union, or a profession, we often see results in a reasonable time. The average man thinks very little about civic liberties. He is like a chameleon that takes on the color of his surroundings. If he lives in a community that is anti-Catholic, then he is anti-Catholic. If he belongs to a union that welcomes Negroes to membership, then he finds it easy to do the same. Basically, what he wants is personal status. If following the brotherhood teachings of Jesus or the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution will give him status, then he naturally comes to uphold equal rights.

If psychologists are right that attitudes must be changed wholesale, then it is obvious that here lies the challenge of the free press. For newspapers deal with masses of people, and they can best establish the climate for fair play.

To do this they must learn the nature of prejudice. A book by this title, "The Nature of Prejudice," made its appearance last month. It is written by Gordon W. Allport, the eminent social psychologist, and I commend his volume—and a previous work, "The Psychology of Rumor," to all those in the communications field.

Allport, in discussing riots, a form of violence which concerns all students of civil rights, says: "Hot weather favors violence, both because it increases bodily discomfort and irritability, and because it brings people out of doors where contact and conflict can occur. Add the idleness of a Sunday afternoon, and the stage is well set. Disastrous riots do, in fact, seem to start, most frequently on Sunday afternoons in hot weather. The peak of lynchings is in the summer months. . . . A dozen wild rumors bruited around Detroit were the immediate touch on the trigger of

overcharged passions. But for months before the fateful Sunday, Detroit had been fed on racial rumors. One tale to the effect that carloads of armed Negroes were heading for Detroit from Chicago had even been broadcast over the radio."

Whether Detroit newspapers could have forestalled this riot is debatable. It would be interesting to know whether any newspaper or radio operator had consulted psychologists, anthropologists, or sociologists while these tensions were building up.

Newspapers, when it comes to race relations and civil rights, can do their most effective work. A couple of years ago, I talked to a prominent Detroit Negro who was attending a convention in Denver. We discussed the Detroit riot and what could be done to prevent similar invasions of the Negro's rights. He said the thing the Negroes feared most was unemployment, as resentment builds up among white men if they are laid off while any Negro retains his job. On the other hand, if the employers retain the whites and discharge all Negroes first, the colored population suffers badly. Hence, mass unemployment for Negroes in Detroit or other industrial centers, is dangerous for them whether they keep their jobs or lose them.

This question of employment is closely connected with civil rights. Allport declares that "no civil rights law has been approved by the senate since 1875," but he quotes Gunnar Myrdal to indicate that FEPC legislation is probably the most readily accepted among all the laws passed in regard to Negro-white relations. Allport writes:

"Myrdal asserts that there is a 'rank order of discrimination.' Whites, at least Southern whites, have greatest opposition to intermarriage; next, to social equality; then, in order, to equal use of public facilities, to political equality, to legal equality, and LEAST objection to equality in jobs. The Negroes own order rank is almost precisely reversed. He craves first and foremost equal job opportunity (because his economic plight is basic to many, if not most, of his troubles). It follows that FEPC legislation, by attacking the issues of discrimination in a way that will give maximum satisfaction to Negroes and minimum dissatisfaction to whites, is psychologically central."

The South Faces the Decision

by Sylvan Meyer

THE NEGRO AND THE SCHOOLS
by Harry Ashmore. Univ. of N. C.
Press.

Modern sociology in America has been summarized as follows: "Industry's moving South, cotton's moving West, cattle are moving east and the Negro is moving North."

Harry Ashmore, editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, finds the element of truth in that saying in his book. Backed by exhaustive studies of the Fund for Advancement of Education, Ashmore examines the history of the Negro's march toward full integration in America. He discusses in a manner so impartial as to be sometimes dry the entire problem of racial separation in American schools and analyzes factors bearing on the United States Supreme Court segregation decision.

That the Court has declared segregation unconstitutional since the Ashmore study was written does not impair the value of the book. Except for a brief listing of eight predicted decisions, the seventh of which hit the court's action on the button, the material is pertinent and should provide continuing reference to anyone concerned with the problem of living a new racial relationship in this country.

Emigration of the Negro, for one thing, has changed the perspective on racial studies. He has indeed moved North to jobs in industry. He has also moved from the farm to the cities and in the cities has gravitated to the older central sections.

Not only has this trend changed educational needs drastically, it has made the problem of integration of the Negro a national problem, and not just one for the South to tackle.

Ashmore's report, a tightly written exposition, bristles with statistics. They add up to an eminently fair presentation. The South's efforts to equalize educational opportunity, though they came tardily, are granted with full acknowledgement of the huge proportion of income being spent in Dixie to comply belatedly with the Plessy vs. Ferguson doctrine of "equal facilities," a philosophy that lasted from 1896 until this year.

Non-South states face decisions, also,

despite an historically different approach to Negro education. Because of residential patterns, most Negro children still go to schools predominantly Negro. In the South, Ashmore takes cognizance of wide disparities from city to city, county to county and school district to school district. He avoids the mistake of over-generalization.

He manages to dispel several assumptions. He shows that integration of school systems in New Jersey did not result in mass loss of jobs by Negro teachers, a nagging worry confusing the hopes of many Negro Southern educators. The South will not economize appreciably by eliminating its double system of schools, a fact that will not help make the transition any easier in the South.

The report, in its first half, looks into court history, the development of America's educational system, early tests of racial segregation, the crucial cases which led to the 1954 decisions. The second half is a statistical study. It charts figures showing population changes, school changes, school costs, etc.

The figures show the trials and the failures, the results of population change, the South's effort and the Negro's approach to political independence and therefore power. Differences exist in educational standards between city and rural students, white and Negro students.

Ashmore notes that the status of the Negro has changed. The old master-servant relationship is gone. The fight for equality has passed the point where most liberal white Southerners carry the banner of racial progress in the Negro's behalf. The Negro is on his own and must make his own way, not only in the South but everywhere. For discrimination is regional only in a statutory sense. Bars to integration exist everywhere.

Despite the South's lower income and relatively higher educational load, it has made significant progress. That progress has been toward the "separate but equal" goal.

Sooner or later the South must realize that it has to appraise its goals. When that time comes, the book appears to point, the "gradualism" of Southern whites who

have helped the Negro cause will be shown up as well-intentioned but outdated. Tables, progress and a better economy do not change the fact that one day colored and white children will sit together in school. School is a social mixing ground, a community center. Parents and teachers meet together; projects are planned and carried out. Mixed composition of classes, Ashmore says, "is hardly likely to foster the spirit of unified effort essential to learning." The present transition, he says, may well make martyrs of the young children who "must bear the brunt of spiritual conflict."

There is some consolation in Ashmore's insistence that previous predictions of trouble in school systems in transition from complete or partial segregation to none at all invariably have overestimated the intensity of the storm.

Racial integration is not achieved overnight, of course. The Supreme Court ruling may climax long years of strenuous litigation, but it is not the glorious end to that difficult battle. It marks the commencement of a new phase in which the major protagonists are armed with the most powerful weapon they have yet enjoyed.

The South, under protest, is losing its peculiar institutions. Cultural isolation no longer exists and old standards are preceding old mores into history. The general Southern attitude prevents any sweeping and immediate change in outlook or educational patterns, but the break is made.

Our colleague Harry Ashmore deserves a lot of credit for undertaking this study, interesting as it may have been. He has digested a bellyaching dish of statistics in a presentation that should provide valuable resource material for writers and scholars for many years. On a subject about which he may well have strong feelings he has maintained a true academic calm and in dealing with the South he has managed a fair and complete expression of the range of regional sentiment without undue assumption and speculation.

The study itself is a significant contribution and is a part of democracy's process in such times.

Sylvan Meyer is editor of the *Gainesville, (Ga.) Times*, and, like Harry Ashmore, a former Nieman Fellow.

Reviews—

Armageddon and All That

THE LETTERS OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT. Vols. VII and VIII—The Days of Armageddon—1909-1919. Edited by Elting Morison. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. \$20. 1510 pp.

Many a man now sixty cherished a boyhood idol known to headlines as "Teddy" or "T.R." Long after, he chuckled at the quips of the early New Deal days that Theodore was in danger of being remembered as the cousin of Franklin Roosevelt. T.R. is now, indeed, the other Roosevelt, the first. Yet of more than merely romantic interest. He personified the American nationalism of the opening of this century. His strenuous vocabulary, his gleaming teeth, the intensity of all his activities stood for red-blooded Americanism in a day when that was innocent of venom. The title of this final pair of books in the monumental series of the Theodore Roosevelt Letters suggests the ways and words of T.R.: "The Days of Armageddon." He called his Bull Moose insurgents together with the biblical allusion to those who "stood at Armageddon and battled for the Lord." He never doubted whose side the Lord was on. God would be perceptive enough to know that Roosevelt was right. It was easy for him to choose the words of the Prophets, and in a generation that still knew its Bible, T.R.'s flaming vocabulary was admired. "Fear God and take your own part." He formed the "Ananias Club" of those who contradicted him. It was a euphemism for liar. He rebuked the reformers with "muckrakers," when their reforms proved inconvenient to him. He preened himself as a naturalist among many other talents and classified the more flamboyant competitors in this field as "nature fakers." He reproved the small families of his Old Stock Americans with "race suicide." He epitomized a foreign policy of negotiating with strength by the phrase "speak softly but carry a big stick."

Somewhat like Justice Holmes after the Civil War, T.R.'s career was colored by his war service—in 1898—rather over-colored some thought, with Mr. Dooley who satirized it once as "alone in Cuby." The youngest of our Presidents, due to

the accident of assassination, he had vigor and glamor, which he dramatized. He had education, of which the Presidency had been short for some time. He knew America and awakened his countrymen to the needs of conserving its resources. He pitched into that with the crusading zeal that characterized him. "He thought he discovered the ten commandments," a rival scoffed. But his zeal was infectious, and even though his acquaintance with the West had been on a dude ranch in an interlude from Harvard, it served. He understood the needs of the West; he annexed it to his own constituency which otherwise had been in danger of effete and parochial restriction. He was ever conscious of class and his political philosophy was less rampant than his vocabulary as LaFollette and other more confirmed rebels were to find out. His "trust busting" looks pretty limited now. But he sought a strong America and strove despite the resistance of his party, to correct the abuses of long exploitation and privilege.

Had his class and its party had the capacity to share his dynamics, he might have led it in a great epoch of the unfolding America of the 20th century. But the greedy elephant had not cottoned to reformers nor desired a master. T.R. became a political maverick, leader of that American anomaly, the 3d party. That he also at times wore the colors of a charlatan was part of the price of trying to stay too long in the political ring. But his achievement was rated high in his time. He stole the thunder of Bryan and applied all that was acceptable of it as his own. He told the Kaiser where to head in and sent the Navy around the world to scare the Japs into holding their peace. He even tried to tell President Eliot how to handle football at Harvard.

He was a personality, as these letters show, and a versatile, vivacious and formidable personality. He was a natural politician too. Adding his talent to FDR's and not forgetting the cunning of Van Buren "the old Fox," the record suggests a special political acumen in the Dutch strain. Part of this with both Roosevelts was a talent to dramatize issues and iden-

tify themselves with the drama. FDR in his New Deal was remembering T.R.'s Square Deal.

These voluminous letters on every subject under the sun, to a vast range of correspondents, suggest that T.R. may well have been the only modern President who needed no ghost writer.

The range of his interest was prodigious and he wrote with verve and enthusiasm on hobbies and interests, family, political, international, historical, labor, literary, scientific.

These are less than a tenth of the letters the editors winowed for these volumes. But their more than 6,000 large printed pages is an impressive outpouring of the thoughts and feelings, principles and prejudices of a dynamic and many-sided American. He was writer, author, journalist, and knew the trenchant use of language. He had a large family and shared the interest of all their juvenile activities. He had immense pride in the war service of his four sons. He had an unquenchable zest for combat, only slightly sublimated by its channeling to politics. He had humorless ability to assimilate all righteousness to his side and in politics he was without peer as a hater of the first water (of Woodrow Wilson for instance). The intensity of his feelings pushed him to extremes, so that between the radicalism of the 1912 campaign and his later denunciation of every reform under Wilson, he swung through as wide a cycle as American politics afforded in a day before McCarthy and Jenner. Had he peered at them through the pince nez of a gentleman and a scholar, he would have regarded them as mucker and fleabrain and invented descriptive terms of appropriate contempt.

The vastness of this work of his letters is its own chief limitation. To spend an evening with any of the eight fat volumes is to enjoy a fascinating ramble through a splendid panorama of American history; to glimpse many an insight and sometimes an "inside" on ancient issues that have not lost their interest. It is also to appreciate the capacity of a well equipped public man of half a century ago to comprehend the whole gamut of our national issues and deal comprehensively with each of them. In a day before the insistent pressure of our age of communication, before the fireside radio chat and the TV

Reviews—

lens on the White House, a statesman communicated by long-hand letters to leaders of opinion, and had to meet them at their own intellectual level. T.R. carried the national affairs in his head or his personal files. He did not depend on a battery of secretaries to explain the questions to him. These were simpler days, but also more complex men, if you mean the Roosevelts.

The editing of these letters by Elting Morrison and John Blum and their competent colleagues at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is a solid contribution to history and letters, an impressive job of scholarship. The notes to the letters recall the events they discuss and the political and private persons who people the pages. The letters are drawn from the Theodore Roosevelt collection in the Library of Congress and from 135 other sources. But the editors have scanned the newspapers of the period, studied the Congressional Record, and investigated the biographies and letters of a whole generation of politicians and statesmen of this country and also abroad, chiefly England, where Roosevelt had many longtime and confidential friends, like Cecil Spring Rice.

As John Blum notes, T.R.'s letters to his English friends often registered opinions he considered indiscreet for American eyes. The man of the letters is much more sophisticated than the Bull Moose of American politics.

It is not too much to say that these letters and the surrounding scene so luminously supplied by the editors add up to a rich biography of an extraordinary American and a history of his time. The fine clear printing in these handsome volumes is a triumph of publishing by the Harvard University Press.

These final two volumes cover the years after his Presidency. The three earlier pairs of volumes were titled "Years of Preparation, 1868-1900"; "The Square Deal, 1901-1905"; "The Big Stick, 1905-1909."

The years of this devoted editing have developed a remarkable literary team of Elting Morrison and John Blum. They have added a distinguished new dimension to an early great Institute. And their

work continues there. We shall hear from them again.

* * * *

A journalistic footnote from the modest notes on method by John Blum suggests the extensive use of newspapers in this work:

"The New York *Times* in the first decade of this century was not for editorial purposes the comprehensive source of information that it is today. The *Tribune* regularly reported more fully, and analyzed more perceptively, New York affairs. On national matters the outstanding newspaper source for 1901 to 1909 was the *Washington Star*. It was less useful thereafter, partly because its reporting fell off, but primarily because Roosevelt had left Washington." [The *Star's* reporting has come back in the era of Ben McKelway. From 1913 to 1919, when their task closed, a period when Carr Van Anda was managing editor of the N. Y. *Times*, the *Times* and its Index satisfied editorial needs. Of magazines the *Reviews of Reviews* and the *Outlook* proved most useful, but the old *Independent* was also valued and *Harper's Weekly* "the latter because of its critical attitude toward Roosevelt."]

Roosevelt himself was at one period an editor of the *Outlook* and at another did a column in the *Kansas City Star*.

"For incisive editorial an outstanding source was the *Wall Street Journal*. Its analyses of political as well as financial and industrial issues rested continually upon extraordinary objectivity and breadth of view. The New York *Tribune*, *Outlook* and *Review of Reviews*, edited as they were by personal friends of Roosevelt, and the *Washington Star*, tended axiomatically to accept his dicta and automatically to applaud his actions; the New York *Evening Post*, the *Sun* and *Times*, and the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, thundering from the right, and the New York *Journal* and the *World*—equally loudly thundering from the left, tended automatically to attack his words and deeds; the *Wall Street Journal* to assess them. The *Journal* deserves an imaginative and informed historian of its own. Sporadic examination of the *Evening Post* revealed that its news columns were more objective than its editorial page; so doubtless with the *World* . . ."

—LOUIS M. LYONS

T. R. as Politician

THE REPUBLICAN ROOSEVELT by John M. Blum. Harvard University Press. 170 pp. \$3.50.

This is a byproduct of John Blum's work on *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*. He has squeezed out the essence of Roosevelt and produced a very practical and useful little book which seeks chiefly to get at Roosevelt's political philosophy. But it is also a neat job of adding up what the Roosevelt interlude in American politics was all about. Blum shows how Roosevelt's mind worked on the issues of his time and how he operated as a practical politician to get what he wanted. One chapter on Roosevelt's railroad measures brilliantly illuminates his strategy in dealing with Congress. This helps immensely to appreciate the perennial problem of a President to get a legislative program through Congress, and shows T. R. a master politician. L.M.L.

The Editorial Writer

To the Editor:

I have no intention of detracting from the marvelous rhyme, "The Editorial Writer," included in Lindsay Hoben's piece in the January, 1953 *Nieman Reports*.

However, I cannot help remembering "The Pious Editor's Creed" which was the sixth of *The Bigelow Papers* written by James Russell Lowell more than a century ago.

Consider the first stanza:

I du believe in Freedom's cause,
Ez fur away ez Payris is;
I love to see her stick her claws
In them infarnal Phayrisees;
It's wal enough agin a king
To dror resolves an' triggers,—
But libbaty's a kind o' thing
Thet don't agree with niggers.

Lowell was bitter, but his Pious Editor had no thought that he would be unread.

Thus, though the more things change the more they remain the same, there are differences.

Theodore Long
Salt Lake City 2, Utah

Scrapbook—

Mr. Reston Moves In

This is the piece that smoked out Langer. That day he called the hearing on Mr. Warren.

Langer v. Warren

Senator's Case for Jobs in North Dakota Delays Confirmation of Chief Justice

By James Reston

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17—Chief Justice Earl Warren, being both a politician and a Californian, thought he knew something about the peculiarities of human nature, but he's learning some new things down here.

He was sworn in as Chief Justice of the United States on Oct. 5, 1953, and he hasn't been confirmed by the Senate yet. President Eisenhower is annoyed by the delay. So is the Attorney General, Herbert Brownell Jr., and Mr. Warren himself is slightly dismayed.

One reason for his dismay is that he is looking for logical reasons for what is happening—never a wise procedure in Washington. Another—and probably the main reason—is that he doesn't know the man who is responsible for the delay, Senator William Langer, Republican of North Dakota, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The boys who chase the elusive low-down in this town have been telling Mr. Warren that the delay is due to the spasm of suspicion now sweeping the country; that his enemies in California are after him for opposing the loyalty oath at the University of California; and that one or two Southern Senators oppose him because they think he will vote to end racial segregation in the nation's schools.

All this may be true, but if the Chief Justice will just look up a few citations in the Congressional Directory and the Congressional Record under the heading of "Langer" he may pick up one or two clues to what is really going on.

For example Senator Langer's self-composed biography in the new directory out this week, starts as follows:

"William Langer, Republican * * * of Bismark and Wheatland, N. D., R. F. D. 1; farmer and lawyer; at age of 15 was

hired hand of neighbor farmer, where as a result of his ability to handle large crews of men he was appointed foreman; attended School 102, later grade school at Casselton, N. D., where his first teacher was Alice Rutledge, a cousin of the sweetheart of Abraham Lincoln, Ann Rutledge * * *.

The biography goes on to assert that Mr. Langer is a member of Sigma Chi fraternity and is "the only person ever to be arrested in any English speaking country for filing an affidavit of prejudice against a judge * * *.

A Matter of State

The Chief Justice will find even more interesting reading in the accounts of Mr. Langer's speeches in the Congressional Record. On page 16314, Vol. 96, Part 12 (Eighty-first Congress) for example, the following appears:

Mr. Langer: Mr. President, last evening when the calendar was called I did not object to the confirmation of the various individuals who had been nominated to office. Time and again on the floor of the Senate I have called the attention of the Senate * * * to the fact that no citizen of North Dakota has been named to head any important office.

"Year after year has gone by without any citizen of North Dakota being nominated to any such office * * * and you all know that there is no better group of people anywhere than North Dakota people * * *.

"Mr. President, I am serving notice that the next time the Senate is called on to confirm anyone to head any office I propose to oppose the confirmation * * *. I want the Senators to know exactly how I feel on the subject. I have taken up the matter time and time again, and if in order to get results I must cause delay and take the time of the Senate, even in these critical

times, I propose to do it * * *."

That was on Dec. 8, 1950. On March 22, 1951, the Senator kept his promise. When the President sent up the nomination of Richard C. Patterson to be Ambassador to Switzerland, he filed an objection.

Never since North Dakota had been admitted to the Union in 1899, he said, had a person from North Dakota been made an Ambassador.

There has been only one consul, and this, he said, in spite of the facts that North Dakota produced more barely and more wheat than any State in the Union; had more recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Spanish-American and First World Wars than any other state (per capita); led the paper drive in the World War II; and was first in the steel and iron drives as well.

Mr. Langer asked the Senate to remember that if they got ill and were taken to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., for treatment, the chances were that they would be placed in the hands of a man from Inkster, N. D.; that if they wanted to buy a really good electric refrigerator, they would probably buy one manufactured by George Mason of Valley City, N. D., head of the Kelvinator Company.

Moreover, he concluded, the women of North Dakota were as good as the men of North Dakota, and still nobody appointed them to top jobs in the Federal Government.

On Jan. 23, 1951, the Senator had some more information for his colleagues on this same subject. He read out the names of the states that had received appointments for the post of Secretary of State, from George Washington's time to the present.

He read out the states that had got Treasury appointments; ditto Postmaster Generals, and so on through the entire Cabinet without once calling out the beloved name of North Dakota.

On Feb. 12, 1951, Senator Langer returned to the attack, pointing out that North Dakota was in the Seventh Judicial District, yet had never had a man on the Circuit Court of Appeals. So long as a man stayed in North Dakota, he did not seem to be recognized by the Federal Government, but when he went away,

Scrapbook—

it was not unusual for him to receive recognition at once.

How to Escape Such a Fate

"Mr. President," said the Senator, "I may say that when I was Governor of North Dakota, a man by the name of Dave Nolan escaped from our penitentiary. He was serving a life sentence for murder. It took us three years to find him. And do you know, Mr. President, when we located him, in Arkansas, we found that he had been elected public printer of the State of Arkansas."

The Senator from North Dakota, of course, says that he has nothing against Chief Justice Warren. He got the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff of Baltimore to be Solicitor General on Jan. 21, and the nomination was confirmed by the Senate on Feb. 9, but the chairman says there has been no delay in handling the Warren case.

He just wants to be careful he says. He believes in tidiness, he adds. He is merely checking the facts and looking at the Federal Bureau of Investigation record, and listening to the complaints, and he thinks that in due course Mr. Warren, undoubtedly a fine gentleman, will be confirmed.

His first interest, however, is still North Dakota and frankly it's not doing so well with appointments. Even under the Republicans it has had only one Eisenhower appointment important enough to be sent to the Senate: Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Aandahl, and this, the Senator feels, is a consarned outrage.

New York Times, Feb. 18

Our Reviewers

The book reviews in this issue are by: *Houstoun Waring*, editor, Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*; *Lawrence Fernsworth*, political writer, Washington, D.C.; *Sylvan Meyer*, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times*; and *Louis M. Lyons*, curator, Nieman Fellowships, Cambridge.

Jenkins Ruling Dangerous

by **Walter Lippmann**

Last Wednesday Mr. Jenkins advised the chairman of the committee, of which he is counsel, that government employees, including officers of the Army, are not bound by their oath or by the laws or by any ties of loyalty to their superiors and to the service if—in their own private and secret opinion—it would be a good thing to break the law.

Mr. Jenkins could not have realized what he was doing. For the doctrine that men may break their oath and violate the law secretly is the very principle of disloyalty.

It was in accord with this very principle—that their own consciences were superior to the laws of the land—that Fuchs and Allen Nunn May and the Rosenbergs acted.

What happened was this.

Senator McCarthy produced what he said was a copy of a letter written by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to Maj. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling of the Army Intelligence.

This document was fabricated or at least prepared with the collaboration of an officer in the military intelligence. It is based on a confidential and genuine document which the fabrication misrepresents.

When the counsel for the Army, Mr. Welch, asked for a name of the officer who had participated in this lawless operation, Senator McCarthy, who was under oath, refused, saying that "you will never get that information."

Senator Dirksen then intervened to ask Mr. Jenkins and chairman Mundt for a ruling as to whether it would "be required of a witness, consonant with his oath, that he reveal the source of a document when he had pledged himself to respect the confidence and not reveal the source."

To this Mr. Jenkins replied "It is elementary that the Senator does not have to reveal the name of his informant. That is one of the most elementary principles engrafted in the law. Otherwise, law-enforcing officers would be so hamstrung and hampered as that they would never be able to ferret out crime. I unhesitatingly rule that Senator McCarthy does not have to reveal the name of his informant."

Mr. Jenkins would have been wiser to have been less unhesitating and less cate-

gorical. For he has put himself and the committee and the Senate in the position of protecting a government employee who knowingly violated the law. This is an untenable position for a law-making body. The Senate cannot make laws, and then rule that it will support a Senator who is protecting a violator of the law.

* * *

Where did Mr. Jenkins lose his way?

Mr. Jenkins' error—which is the fundamental error at the root of the McCarthy problem—is to assume that a committee of the legislative branch of the government are "law-enforcing officers" who "ferret out crime."

It is precisely this error of Mr. Jenkins—that Senate committees may act as "law-enforcing officers"—which has caused all the violence, the confusion, the injustice and the demoralization.

The American system of government is founded upon the separation of powers, and the McCarthy problem has been created by his invasion of the powers of the executive to resist the invasion and to defend its powers.

This affair of the fabricated letter is a demonstration of how the violation of the fundamental principle of the Constitution leads to lawlessness and anarchy.

* * *

Is it necessary to spell out for Mr. Jenkins and Chairman Mundt why the doctrine is indefensible and intolerable, the doctrine of which they are—I believe—the thoughtless and unintentional authors?

Let them try to realize what they have done.

They have told each and every man to use his own judgment as to which of the secrets of the United States Government he will disclose secretly to any member of the Legislature.

If Army officers can fabricate documents based on material in the secret files for the use of McCarthy, then who is to say what some other employee may not disclose to some other legislator, secretly and according to his own private views?

(Continued from page two.)

ing the road problem in adjacent states and in following highway legislation in Illinois.

Partly as a result of this experience, two years later we did a similar study of the arterial street system in Decatur.

This proposal was accompanied by maps showing the arterial street plan, maps showing the traffic flow on existing streets, and a master map showing every proposed improvement and its estimated cost.

The city council adopted substantially this program and is working toward it with its share of the state gas tax and with the cooperation of state and township government.

Less spectacular efforts at broader and deeper news coverage are handled on a day-to-day basis. A story in the works when I left was one on the community institution: summer picnic in the park. We are attempting to get a striking picture of a typical family at a picnic table in one of the parks. We may use additional pictures showing the activities in which the kids can participate. This will give us a chance to tell all about this family and its use of the parks, and to use this point of departure to tell about how many people use the picnic tables, fireplaces, and recreational facilities in all of the parks during a typical summer season.

Other features on living in our town have been a series of picture pages and stories on unusual business enterprises: the kite factory, the only home cleaning firm in town, the window washing business, the seed corn business, etc.

Decatur's first Negro schoolteacher was introduced with a closeup picture showing her conferring with two white children, an interview with her, with the principal of the school, with the superintendent of schools, and with parents and pupils. This treatment gave us an opportunity to button up in one piece all of the facets of the complicated adjustment toward the end of race segregation.

A 25-year-ago item suggested a picture page in the development of the Gunhild Johnson room for handicapped children in the public schools. This gave us an opportunity to tell again of the patient work and new techniques that go into the education of children who are physically handicapped.

We have redone our Sunday society section in Decatur out of inspiration that came from an American Press Institute seminar. We came to the realization that in a newspaper of more than 50,000 circulation we still were trying to publish at least a 2-column picture of every young woman in our circulation area who was engaged and later another picture when she was married.

This gave us space to introduce stories on women's activities, on home-making, and fashions.

A recent front page was a picture story on how it is to

be an airline hostess, with pictures of four Decatur girls going through training and in action as hostesses. This let us carry a story on how you get to be an airline hostess.

Another page was Decatur young people on university campuses across the country.

Another was how it is to live in a sorority house on the University of Illinois campus.

Another was how big kitchens in new homes become the center of family living.

We had an interesting experience with the local medical society, which had progressively given us less and less news.

A new public relations committee in the society persuaded the AMA to make its first survey of public opinion in its 105-year history. The survey in Decatur and surrounding county was surprising, especially to the doctors.

It showed that 90 per cent of the people thought their medical and surgical service was "good to excellent," that their doctors took a personal interest in them, that doctors' secretaries and technicians were courteous.

We gave this report banner play on the front page of a Sunday issue. Following this, the public relations committee of the local society held a number of meetings with our editors in an effort to develop a press and radio code. I was astonished to discover the extent to which the local medical society—which included many of my personal friends—feared the press and suppressed as much news as possible.

The meetings cleared the atmosphere and we did work out a plan that has been subscribed to by the local medical society, the staffs of local hospitals, and the hospital administrators to liberate medical news never before available. We now get routine medical news promptly and effectively. We are beginning to get news of new treatments and new techniques first revealed in papers read to hospital staffs and the local society.

This local news activity is largely the result of the operation of that instinct that we call "news judgment"—of our own people and of others.

So far as I know there is no adequate scientific approach to building a good newspaper—a newspaper that will fill its present opportunities to get under the skins of readers who have already heard the flash news by audio and visual communications.

It seems to me there is a job to be done, partly by newspapermen themselves and largely by the universities like Colorado—where there is a strong journalism department that can collaborate with a strong department of sociology—in discovering what elements of human interest are omitted in today's newspaper.

This is from the Crosman Memorial Lecture, given at Boulder, Colorado, May 15 by Edward Lindsay, editor of the Lindsay-Schaub newspapers of Decatur, Ill.