

# Nieman Reports

July, 1959

## Report on Africa

William Gordon

**Whatever Happened to the Country Press?**

John C. Obert

**Chicago Newspaper Concentration**

Milburn P. Akers

**Small Town Stuff**

B. J. Laeufer

**Tom Stokes**

Richard L. Strout

**The Magazine Competition**

Charles E. Scripps

**The Science Writer and the Doctor**

Frank Carey

**Is the Press Necessary?**

Evans Clinchy

***Mis-trial by Newspaper — Text of the Decision in John Powell Case***

Reviews — Scrapbook — Nieman Notes

Nieman Fellows for 1959-60

# Nieman Reports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown Providence, R. I.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Iowa City; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; Charlotte F. Robling, New Canaan, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, London; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 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. XIII., NO. 3

JULY 1959

## Nieman Fellows for 1959-60

Harvard University has appointed 11 newspapermen to be the 22d annual group of Nieman Fellows at the University for the academic year opening in September. A special award as an Associate Fellow without stipend was made to an American magazine photographer who covers international events.

Three associate fellowships were awarded to an Indian, a Japanese and a Taiwan newsman, sponsored by the Asia Foundation.

The Nieman Fellows will attend the University on leave of absence from their jobs, to pursue studies of their own choice as background for journalism. The fellowships have been awarded annually since 1938 under the Nieman Foundation at Harvard, established by a bequest of Agnes Wahl Nieman in honor of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*.

The 1959-60 Fellows were selected by the following committee:

John B. Johnson, editor and publisher of the Watertown (N.Y.) *Times*; Edwin A. Lahey, chief of the Washington bureau of the Knight Newspapers; Robert G. McCloskey, professor of government at Harvard; William M. Pinkerton, Harvard news officer; and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The 1959-60 Nieman Fellows are:

Dominic D. Bonafede, 34, reporter on the Miami *Herald*.

Native of Buffalo and graduate of Rutgers, Bonafede started newspaper work with the United Press in Washington in 1950. He was on newspapers in Syracuse and Buffalo before going to Miami in 1953. In 1955 and again

in 1956 he received the Florida AP public service awards for investigative reporting.

He will study government and economics.

Peter Braestrup, 30, New York *Herald Tribune* reporter. Native of New York and graduate of Yale, he was on the staff of *Time* for four years before joining the *Herald Tribune* in 1958 as assistant news development editor, and has done a number of newspaper series on problems of urban living.

He will study social, economic and political problems of urban life.

John F. Burby, 34, city hall reporter, San Francisco *Chronicle*.

Born in Michigan, he settled in Hawaii after war service, and began newspaper work with the Honolulu *Advertiser* while studying as a GI at the University of Hawaii. He was a war correspondent in Korea for the United Press, then returned to the *Advertiser* for five years, covering labor and general assignments until 1956, when he joined the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

He will study American history and government.

Thomas L. Dearmore, 31, co-editor, co-publisher, *Baxter Bulletin*, Mountain Home, Arkansas.

After editing an Air Force base paper during the second World War, he returned to his home town to develop the weekly he had inherited from his grandfather, a pioneer newspaper editor in the Ozarks. With his cousin Peter Shiras, as co-owner, the paper has grown to the largest weekly in northwest Arkansas.

He will study American history and government.

William G. Lambert, 39, reporter, Portland *Oregonian*.

Born in South Dakota, he began newspaper work in Oregon City in 1945 after war service in the Pacific. He has been with the *Oregonian* since 1951. Investigations with his colleague, Wallace Turner, of teamsters union officers and their connections with Oregon politicians won them the Pulitzer and Heywood Broun awards two years ago, and set off the McClellan Committee investigations into labor-management corruption.

He plans to study government and law.

Neil V. McNeil, 31, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers in Texas.

Native of Houston and graduate of the University of Texas, he began newspaper work with the El Paso *Herald-Post* in 1949. He went to Washington in 1952, working first for the Washington *Daily News* and in 1954 for the Scripps-Howard news bureau, serving their three Texas papers, *Houston Press*, *Fort Worth Press* and *El Paso Herald-Post*.

He will study Latin America.

(Continued to page 30)

# In Newest Africa

## Three Nationalisms Compete for its Emerging Peoples

By William Gordon

**The former managing editor of the Atlanta Daily World has returned from a year in Africa, exploring the new political patterns and explosive social forces in the changing continent.**

In December, 1958, a tired, yet determined young African walked slowly across the stage of a hall in Accra, capital of the new nation of Ghana, and spoke to a tense, eager audience. "Africa," he said "is no longer the continent to be recognized, but one to be reckoned with."

Mr. Tom Mboya, head of the Peoples Convention Party in Kenya and elected member of the Legislative Council, was making his closing remarks to the Accra All African-Peoples Conference. Its more than 600 delegates represented almost every country on the African continent, all the way from Cape Town to Tunis, from the celebrated French Ivory Coast to Cairo on the Nile and the Red Sea.

For more than a week, these Africans met. They were mostly blacks mixed with Arabs of North Africa, sprinkled with a few Chinese, and even a small delegation of Russians, who came along to take part and observe. This was nationalism, black nationalism. It was not my first introduction to African nationalism, one of the three types I shall attempt to discuss briefly.

I first met it when the boat on which my family and I were traveling landed at Algiers, where we saw soldiers, and police standing guard in the streets with machine guns; this was north of the Sahara and they call it Arab nationalism, but also African. You had only to talk with Algerians briefly to learn that it was raw, emotional and determined.

I talked with Algerian rebels in Tunis.

"Each one of us here," said a large, rough-talking Algerian acting as the spokesman for five others, "has lost at least one or several members of his family. They died fighting the French who want to dominate our country. We all will die first before turning back."

But nationalism became more meaningful to me when we reached Dakar, the low end of the Sahara, the beginning of Black Africa. It was the kind I later met in Ghana.

Ghana has set the pace for black nationalism all over Africa. This nation of 5,000,000 people got its independence March 6, two years ago. Its leader Prime Minister Nkrumah went to jail to force the hand of the colonial powers to grant the country independence. Ghana is rich

in resources, the world's largest producer of cocoa. It has gold, diamonds and reserves amounting to more than four hundred million dollars.

More than its wealth of cocoa, gold, diamonds and bauxite, the new nation of Ghana has established a spirit of unity. It is perhaps the best disciplined country in Africa, rising out of a seasoned and dedicated type of leadership. It is true that the country is dominated by the personal magnetism of its Prime Minister Nkrumah. But it has taken this to unite the Ashanti, a very proud and warlike tribal group, with the rest of Ghana.

Under the Convention Peoples Party, headed by Nkrumah, the people of this country have advanced much more rapidly than any other of the former colonial areas in West Africa.

When Nkrumah came back from his tour of the independent African Countries, there was a touching scene at the Accra airport.

Long before noon, school children lined streets along Independence Avenue, all the way from the airport to Government House, standing in the African sun, holding small flags of Ghana. Crowds of women and men gathered at the airport. When the Prime Minister arrived, the women poured bottles of perfume in his path. Some threw down their robes for him to walk on. Police fought to keep the crowd back. The reception ended at Government House with a party to which more than 10,000 were invited.

I later grasped the meaning of all this when I stood in the office of a British businessman in Accra.

He pointed to a group of modern buildings, rising in the distance. There were also streets recently paved. The national bank of Ghana was housed in a new, ultra-modern building, and construction could be seen almost everywhere.

"This was a different sight two years ago," he said. "Almost overnight, slums have been turned into modern structures. Investments are coming in. The white population has shown a sharp increase since independence."

This is only part of the spirit one feels on his first trip to Ghana, and back of it is the force of African nationalism. It is interesting to observe its impact on the rest of Africa.

Moving across French Togoland, Dahomey and into Nigeria where 35,000,000 people will become independent in October 1960, African nationalism is at work molding

together literally three nations into one. Nigeria is the largest of the African countries, but divided into three regions, with three major tribal groups, different in cultures and background. But black African nationalism has cut across tribal lines to knit together the Yuorabas in the West, some 7,000,000 people; the Ibos in the east, 10,000,000; and the Hausa in the north, 18,000,000 people.

An articulate leadership recognizes the vast tribal and ethnic differences and has moved swiftly to meet the necessary needs. The greatest task will be conquering illiteracy and the health problem. In many parts of Nigeria, an African baby still has less than a 50 per cent chance of living to be five years of age.

Across the rest of West Africa, and down into a country of 13,000,000 people with a white population of 125,000, the rich Belgian Congo, we find an uneasy, jittery and anxious colonial government, seeking to implement within a short time a program that should have started years ago.

The Belgians were frank about African nationalism. They admitted that their timing was off by many years, but the health, education, and employment program they started recently could have been far more meaningful if it had come earlier.

The Belgian Government was trying a new kind of colonialism. The plan was to superimpose on the Belgian Congo the same type of welfare program in effect in Belgium. So it is not surprising to see one of the best health and employment programs for Africans anywhere.

I saw far more public school integration in the Congo than I have seen in many of our Southern states. The Belgians proclaim their friendliness to Africans. A striking feature in the Congo in October was a large poster placed about in schools and businesses showing two friendly youngsters, an African and a Belgian standing together.

It was commonplace to see Africans operating the most intricate machines in the Katanga mining area near Elizabethville.

However, against this background of paternalism, Africans and Whites in the Congo remained the largest group of disfranchised people anywhere in Africa. The first election was held in 1957. Restriction on movement was as severe as in the Union of South Africa. No African could leave the Congo without first depositing with the government the equivalent in Belgian francs of \$1,000 to guarantee his return. Even those who got out of the country were closely screened and their movements were restricted between the Congo and Brussels. A visit to the United States was out of the question.

Few people were surprised when the riots came in December. They were holding elections when I reached the Federation of the Rhodesias—Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland—in November. But the barely

2,000 registered African voters, out of a population of 7,000,000 people stayed away from the polls. They were protesting against the "Partnership" policy, of the 250,000 whites in the Federation who literally run the country. The white Prime Minister, Roy Welensky, a former boxer and prize fighter of little fame, vows that "this is a white man's country;" that Africans can share in it only on a Partnership basis.

The Federation is the beginning of white nationalism. Here is where the white settler element in Africa begins to take root and has moved itself in position of direct competition with the African. On the Copperbelt in Northern Rhodesia, the richest of the countries in the Federation, no African is given a job above that of a semi-skilled laborer. More than half of the near 3,000,000 Africans in Nyasaland migrate to South Africa and other part of Africa to work.

"I only hope we can do something to keep the Africans quiet for another 20 years to give us time to meet their demands," a prominent European journalist told me in Salisbury.

He said he was disturbed at the rising restlessness of the Africans. His newspaper, however, failed to campaign to increase voting rights for Africans in the Federation.

For an African to qualify in the Federation, he must earn at least \$2,000 a year or have the equivalent in property. He must also have at least a secondary school education. But the average income for Africans in the Federation is less than \$30 a month. Consequently, only the chiefs and the relatively few businessmen obtain the right to vote.

The limitations on the freedom of Africans, imposed by entrenched white nationalism caused the more thickly populated African country of Nyasaland, part of the Federation, to revolt, last January. More than 50 Africans were killed and hundreds injured. Several hundred have been arrested in the Federation.

Under the leadership of Dr. Hastings Banda, American trained medical doctor, Nyasaland has been the center of black African nationalism in the Federation. Under the white-dominated Federation, Africans fear two things: the further extension of British colonialism that may grant independence under white leadership and the immigration of whites from the Union of South Africa who may eventually impose on them the rigid Apartheid policies of that country.

Africans at the moment are without a strong leader, for Dr. Banda was arrested during the riots in Nyasaland. The present leadership is working to pull both Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland out of the Federation of the Rhodesias as independent African countries.

In the wonderful land of Tanganyika, African nationalism takes on a more moderate form. There is sympathy

for even the more progressive elements, and Africans seem unified with the small white population bent on building a multi-racial government. Led by the very sauve and brilliant young Julius Nyenere, TANU, the Tanganyika African National Union, hopes to establish unity among Asians, Africans, and Europeans to make this country of 10,000,000 people, 98 per cent African, the first independent white and black country on the continent.

But even here, one cannot overlook the influence of Ghana. My first visit to Tanganyika took me to the small office of two young African journalists. I was struck by the pictures of Nkrumah and his cabinet lining the walls of the office. The two young editors had just returned from prison after serving five months of a six-month sentence for attacking the British Government for what they called "sapping the blood out of Africans in that country." It was here that I learned that in Africa it is an honor to go to jail if in the cause of nationalism.

Moving from Tanganyika into Kenya takes one to a more crucial area of Africa. Conditions in this beautiful country of moderate climate have been modified only slightly by Mau Mau activities of 1954. Before this, non-whites lived and sweated under restrictions only slightly less severe than those in Central Africa. Kenya also has its white nationalism, 50,000 whites, out of a population of 7,000,000 people. The 6,000,000 Africans in Kenya are growing in population. They are not all illiterate, but an emerging force that must be reckoned with.

Led by the young, vigorous, articulate Mr. Tom Mboya, Africans are demanding universal suffrage and an increase in the representation in the Legislative Council in Kenya. They are demanding that the so-called White Highlands, rich Kikuyu territory, be opened up to Africans. The chief crop is coffee, but Africans are getting a small share of the abundant returns.

Caught in the middle of black and white nationalism in East Africa are the Asians, mostly East Indians and people of Indian descent.

"Black African nationalism does not include the moderate whites, nor the Asians in its wake; it's identification is purely black," an Indian official said in Nairobi. Asians in Kenya are frightened of black African nationalism.

Over in rich Uganda, sister country of Kenya and Tanganyika, Indians are eager to be accepted by Africans in the political parties. But the Kabaka, ruling head of Buganda, the largest tribal group in this small country of 4,100,000 is working to suppress all political parties but his own. In this beautiful little country near Lake Victoria and the source of the Nile, there are rich Africans, many with their own large coffee and sugar plantations. They are not plagued with the white settlers' problems and won't allow whites to buy or acquire land in their country.

Farther north is Ethiopia. For a long time it was one of the two independent black republics of Africa, the second being Liberia. Ethiopia for a long time tried to disassociate itself from the rest of black Africa. The leadership believed its orientation was white. Since Ghana became independent in 1957 and African nationalism has emerged as a force, Ethiopia has joined forces with that part of the continent south of the Sahara.

Ethiopia's big problem, it seems, will be getting along with, or pulling into its orbit, the countries east of its boundaries. The sensitive and touchy parts of Africa for this little empire of Biblical heritage are Italian Somaliland and British Somaliland. Italian Somaliland gets its independence in 1960. Britain has promised self-government for British Somaliland following independence celebrations for Italian Somaliland. The two countries are talking of joining up instead of linking themselves with Ethiopia. But Ethiopia feels vaguely that it should be the true leader of Africa; that whatever happens in this area of Africa should be its concern. It will be interesting to watch developments under African nationalism with Ethiopia furnishing the leadership.

At the northern and eastern borders of Ethiopia, extending into the lower areas of the former Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, black nationalism begins to fade into a new kind of nationalism. The more emotional Arab nationalism runs north into Egypt, over into all of the Middle East and across the top of North Africa. But Arab nationalism as it affects Africa begins in Cairo under the Nationalist Union, with Radio Cairo and the Islamic League as instruments to spread the influence of Nasser.

Cairo had become the haven for many African political refugees, and a center for students of Arab nationalism.

It is too early to measure the direct effects of Arab nationalism on the rest of Africa, but one would imagine that parts of the northern Sudan, Somaliland, and even parts of northern Kenya are being influenced by Nasser. The two centers of power for the control of Africa rest in two areas, Cairo and Accra. Odds at the moment favor Nkrumah.

Under the present-day African leadership, African nationalism below the Sahara operates in a less emotional and non-violent climate. Unlike Arab or white nationalism it can be dealt with; it is not against compromise.

Even the hard-core Boers, the Afrikaners of the Union of South Africa, recognize the significance of African nationalism.

Two questions from white journalists in South Africa could always be expected: How rapidly is black nationalism growing? What does the African think of whites?

South Africa is perhaps the most segregated place in the world. In no other part of Africa is white nationalism

more deeply entrenched. It began as far back as 1652, when a group of Dutch settlers landed at the Cape of Good Hope under the command of Jan van Kiebeeck. With religion as an influence and the Bible as their companion, the people of Dutch descent, now the Afrikaan speaking people of South Africa have spread like a fan throughout South Africa, and the practice of rigid segregation has spread with them. They represent nationalism of the dominant and most difficult type to cope with. And they fear African nationalism.

After a few days in the Union, I could see the reason for the fear. Out of a population of 13 million people, there are more than 9 million blacks. Their numbers are growing, not decreasing.

Under the rigid Apartheid laws, these 9 million Africans are placed in an area comprising only 13 per cent of the land space in the Union while less than 3 million whites occupy the remaining 87 per cent.

Under the "locations in the Sky Law," no African is allowed to reside within the city limits of Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town, Durban or any other large city. He must live in a reservation or location, five to ten miles away from town. So the few remaining Africans living in Sophiatown of Johannesburg are expected any day to be removed from these premises.

Africans have never had any real franchise in the Union. They had slight representation back in 1933. Under the racial classification laws, a special committee is set up in various sections of the country to do a breakdown on races. There are four major groupings in the Union: the blacks, the native Africans, who Afrikaans say are not Africans but natives; the Cape Coloreds and Cape Malays, both of mixed bloods, between the whites, the Malays Bushmen and the native Africans; the Asians, mostly East Indians and the whites mainly of Dutch and British descent. Under Apartheid, each racial grouping is placed into a separate and distinct category, the absolute separation policy.

"It never was and has never been intended for the blacks in particular to be a part of South Africa. We are the true South Africans not the native blacks," A nationalist editor told me in Cape Town.

There are only a few areas where native Africans can buy property, hardly ever any land. Africans can own the house, but not the land.

One might ask: "how" is it possible to segregate, suppress and enslave so many people for so long?"

In South Africa, the divide and conquer method is most efficiently applied. The government picks and chooses the chiefs, especially those in the locations and reserves. These chiefs are given special rights and privileges. They are non-political of course, but are handpicked to impose restrictions on the illiterate masses. And it has worked.

For a long time, the Coloreds were used as favorites by the government; they could run businesses, had some degree of franchise and were allowed to live within the city limits, given better schools, better jobs and enjoyed a greater degree of social distinction.

A colored man held a top job on one of the newspapers in Cape Town. He has moved with complete freedom. But under the new law enacted by the South African government, men like this will probably lose their previous rights. They will be moved farther away from the downtown section, soon to be occupied by Whites.

White nationalism is built on fear, hysteria and insecurity. It is rooted in the doctrine of white supremacy. Born in an atmosphere of hatred, it is nursed on dogma of pigmentation and religion. As the concept of freedom continues to grow, and it must if a free world is to survive, the position of racial domination becomes more and more untenable. The 5,000,000 Whites who make their home in Africa, mostly South Africa, sense this. They know a day of reckoning is rapidly emerging and are desperate to prevent it.

One of the first moves made by Nkrumah of Ghana was to remove racial tags from buildings, clubs and public places. "We will not tolerate racism anywhere in this country," he said at a press conference in June 1958. Examples point to his statement.

Almost half of the civil service force of Ghana is white and works with Africans without a stigma. Some of Nkrumah's top advisors have been white, including the developments commissioner and the attorney general. A climate of freedom without color consciousness has been established in the country.

"I feel freer here than in any place I've been, even in my own country," a prominent white man from England said.

I saw interracial firms that are big businesses established in Ghana, and white and black work together without the slightest incident. The same thing is taking place in Nigeria, in Liberia and Ethiopia. The white population in these countries is increasing. Africans are offering them a genuine hand of friendship.

In the voice of one of the leaders of this vast continent of uncommitted peoples, "It is not that Africans won't get their freedom: it only depends on how and when we will acquire it. And beyond this," he concluded, "we hope to extend this concept of freedom and help build a world where all can share and share alike, not allowing one race or group to dominate the other."

---

William Gordon was a Nieman Fellow in 1953. His African travel was on a Reid Fellowship.

## Small Town Stuff

By B. J. Laeuer

"What can you learn about newspaper work by burying yourself on that two-bit farm paper?" a friend jeered. More than once since then I've wished he was around to try my general assignment duties on the Marysville *Journal-Tribune*, a five day-a-week publication with a circulation of around 6,000.

If he thinks I'm buried and not learning anything, he's got another think coming.

There's almost too much to learn. As for being buried, I'm anything but that. In fact, I'm the prime target for the readers, because they usually know who wrote the stories; I'm the only general assignment reporter on the staff.

The office into which they jammed my desk that first day isn't as big as the broom closet on a metropolitan paper. Yet that cubby hole is where most of the writing is done. Stuck in there with me are the publisher, the news editor, the society editor, the wire machines, the scan-o-graver, the morgue, the picture files, coffee pots, cups, spoons, and what seems like a never ending stream of visitors.

These visitors point up the differences between a small town operation and a larger one. They are not hesitant nor afraid to storm up to your desk, call you by name, (not always your given one,) and demand to know where you got your information or how in tarnation you dare print such a thing about their cousin Joe.

On the other hand, these same people will stop while they are in town to give you a tip or offer to lend a hand with a story. And what do you do? Blow your stack? Threaten to have the janitor throw them out the nearest window? You do not.

If there's any merit to the irate reader's complaint, you do your best to correct it. And when a would-be Westbrook Pegler takes up your time stumbling and stammering, trying to write "his" story or tip, you just sit there and let him go to it, remembering that it's these folks who are keeping you in business and with whom you must maintain a personal, close, human relationship.

Just a few days ago, I found a new pen and pencil set on my desk with a scribbled "thank you."

They came from a subscriber, who is also an advertiser, after a 25th anniversary story was printed on the firm he

heads. Six months before, our paper had misspelled his name. He was like a bull in a warehouse full of red flags then. He yanked his advertising, dropped his subscription and became very uncooperative. The anniversary story wasn't done in an attempt to woo him back, but because it was felt his employees and the company's stockholders merited it and that it was newsworthy. Everything is sugar and cream now and probably will be until the next time his name gets goofed up, and then the same procedure will start all over again.

You're working with individuals on the small paper. Not a voice at the other end of a telephone or the initials at the bottom of a type-written public relations release. The news sources on the street, in their places of business or at the local drugstore, are people you see every day. You make and try to keep these friendships. A slight today may mean that the gang in the court house won't be so anxious to answer your questions tomorrow.

My workday starts at 8 a.m. For the first couple of hours I usually can count on typing up my notes from the previous night's session in the mayor's court, developing pictures, writing football, basketball, track or baseball stories, depending on the season, and writing obits.

By ten, I'm usually out on the street and making use of those friendships.

First stop on the tour is the city building which houses our fire and police departments, the emergency squad, the sanitation department, the offices of the township trustees and the cemetery board.

It's a good place to start. If you can get the fire chief off the subject of his grandchildren, he usually can tell you just about everything that went on in town during the night. He's also the building janitor, and I've learned never, never to leave without telling him how nice and clean his windows look or how well his African violets are doing.

From the city building it's only a short run over to the sheriff's office. On the way, three or four of the local hot-shots stop to pass the time of day or pass a news tip.

At the sheriff's, you light up a smoke, sit back and wait for him to get around to telling you about the juveniles he caught stealing gas, the drunks he has in the tank or how serious that accident on route 161 was.

It was at the sheriff's office on my first day in Marysville

that I noticed a big hole chunked out of the 57 year old brick wall. Novice that I was, I took it for granted, thinking it had always been there. Stuck for polite conversation, I asked about it anyway.

It hadn't always been there. Just the last few hours. A prisoner had grown tired of being the county's guest and had dug out of his second story cell with a broken broom handle and a spoon. Then he jumped 30 feet to the ground, stole a car and got away.

The sheriff hadn't missed the prisoner, nor had a local man missed his car. The 16-year old fugitive was found two months later in Florida, living in a tree house, a second story man to the bitter end.

In handling this story, a deserved blast could have been leveled at the sheriff's office. Laxity, ineptness and 25 other things could have been cited. On a bigger paper they probably would have been.

Wiser counsel, the publisher, pointed out that the sheriff was going to be a daily contact for me, and in a small town, pressure tactics wouldn't work. We played it straight with no editorializing, and the sheriff, perhaps out of gratitude, has been very helpful ever since.

Included on my rounds, and I mention them because each one represents both a source of news and a human being are: the recorder's office for real estate transfers (ask him how he liked that article on wide lenses in *Modern Photography*); the probate court office for wills and marriage licenses (ask the clerk how her mother is); the clerk of court's office for judgments, settlements, divorces, custody cases, and hearing dates (ask her if she found a dog to suit her); the office of the county superintendent of schools (agree with him that all newspapermen stink); to the auditor's office for the activities of the county commissioners and county money expenditures (tell him a dirty joke); the county court for the records there (you don't have to say anything. It's so rare that you catch the judge in, he simplified matters by giving you a key to his office and carte blanche to all his data).

In three hours you try to have everything gathered up and you scurry back to home base for a bout with the typewriter.

By 2:30, the presses are rolling and you grab a sandwich before starting to work on that feature story and the 4:30 appointment with the mayor.

It's a razzle-dazzle rat race, to put it mildly, but you never learn anything by sitting on the back of your lap and waiting for it to come to you.

To add a little excitement to the day, you might be threatened with a law suit by a man convicted of driving while intoxicated who took issue with the fact that it was in the paper; menaced with bodily harm by a husband whose wife committed suicide and who was quoted by the sheriff in your story as saying that they had been fighting up until the time she pulled the trigger; thrown off a front porch by an angry son who doesn't want you interviewing his father about his hobby because he doesn't want you to find out the old boy once served a term in the penitentiary.

Before I came to Marysville I didn't know a Holstein from a Jersey, and still don't, but now I can bluff with the best of them. I try to write the stories accurately because all those friendly townspeople know who writes the stuff they read and they know exactly where to come when it's not right.

I had always heard that working on a small town paper is one of the best ways in the world to prepare for a job with a larger one.

Even though I haven't yet worked on a metropolitan daily, I think I can see how my experience in Marysville will be extremely useful to me when I do move on.

As I see it, the task of big city reporting is much like mine: digging out the news and then building a story that is as clear and interesting as the reporter can make it.

But one of the main things small paper reporting has taught me is the value of people as news sources. Each is a person who has his problems just as you have yours. He's trying to do a job just as you are. And the more you realize this, the better off you are and the easier and more satisfying the job becomes. Perhaps most important of all, the small town reporter learns to get his news at the source: the people who make the news. If he tries to live on handouts, he won't live.

The newspaper in many cases means more to the people in a small town than does the big paper and the wide area it serves. In a small town there is no other voice, no other reliable source of information.

The fact that the city council decided to buy some lights for the ball diamond or that Mrs. Miller wasn't injured when her frying pan caught fire, is big news to our readers.

---

B. J. Laeufer enjoys the life he describes on the *Journal-Tribune* of Marysville, Ohio.

# Tom Stokes: What He Was Like

By Richard L. Strout

Every now and then some exceptional new reporter joins the Washington press corps, some crusader, some hell-raiser, and it's funny how after the years the experienced newspaperman can generally spot him. He may be aggressive, like the late Paul Y. Anderson, or Bob Allen, or he may start out relatively young and shy and mild as Tom Stokes did.

These men are a little different from their fellows. Journalism to them isn't just a business. They would shudder at the word but it's a kind of lifetime crusade. It's a way of tilting at the smug and mighty, and of somehow yanking out the truth against obstacles. That kind of reporter when he hits Washington is likely to stay, and die, in harness: You can't somehow imagine a Nate Robertson or an Ed Lahey or a Ray Clapper or a Clark Mollenhoff ending up in a fat-cat public relations job for General Motors or U.S. Steel. They don't necessarily have to be radicals though a lot of them are; Joe Alsop is a good Republican but it's hard trying to imagine him toeing some Chamber of Commerce line or passing out hand-outs for some corporation.

These men have a purpose in life, a goal, a fire in their bellies; they are not using journalism as a step-ladder to something else; they are generally here to stay. That's what Tom Stokes was when he came to Washington way back in 1921, 38 years ago.

He was 23 years old. Outwardly, I am told, he looked mild and shy and amiable. He was bright, he had got a Phi Beta Kappa key at the dreamy old Confederate university town at Athens, Georgia. I arrived in Washington three or four years later and ultimately came to know Tom. He liked to tell how he was in the SATC camp at college and one day was told to report to the 6-foot regular Army officer. Tom presented himself with a snappy salute. "What's your name?" demanded the officer crisply.

For the life of him Tom couldn't remember. It was part of Tom's personality both that this incident actually happened and that later he could look back on it without mortification. The officer dismissed Tom kindly and told him to come back some time when he could remember his name.

Once as a youngster Tom volunteered in church to go as

The first award of the Thomas L. Stokes Award Committee was made posthumously to Tom Stokes. His friend, Richard L. Strout of the *Christian Science Monitor*, made the address at the awards dinner at the National Press Club, May 5.

a missionary to China and though he didn't go he remained a bit of a missionary all his life. His mother died when he was 13 and his world seemed to crash about his ears. He came to Washington from a small town newspaper in Georgia where a hideous lynching had occurred. He was a sensitive, imaginative person and I think the sickening affair haunted him. There was that element in Tom under his gaiety. I guess that most of us, whether we admit it or not, feel some degree of guilt over the state of the world and some go their quiet way, as well as they can, trying to expiate it.

I asked some of Tom's old friends what was the single characteristic that they thought differentiated him from anybody else?

He was a liberal, of course; not a namby-pamby liberal but rather a fierce liberal when he discovered what he considered to be injustice. But there are a lot of liberals. He was also cheerful, and intelligent, and good company. Granted all that, there are other people like that, too (not enough, but some).

It got to be funny, the way I constantly got the same answer to my question, expressed in different ways but meaning the same thing.

"It was the way he managed to hold his own strong views and yet managed to retain the affection of people whose views were harshly antagonistic to his." In my lifetime I have never seen anyone who had this attribute to a stronger degree than Tom Stokes. He liked people and he was gay and companionable.

I don't mean that Tom didn't have critics—or perhaps even enemies. But consider the fact that Tom never hesitated to lecture the South on civil rights and that he yet remained one of the few columnists the South would listen to on that subject. It was the same with most people of all shades of opinion. I have seen it many and many a time. When he sat down at the press table in the Senate restaurant, or at his favorite place in the National Press Club, others would always crowd in. They would sit down and not go away.

People who weren't on speaking terms with one another would drop down if Tom were there, chat amiably and then go off and perhaps not be on speaking terms again. It was really something to analyze. He was a warm, comfortable stove; he was a walking truce, and yet he would not yield his liberalism an inch in the festive atmosphere. I really can't explain it: I suppose part of it was that he had no malice at all, and no arrogance at all.

Tom richly deserved the Pulitzer prize which he won. But it is ironic that he got the award not for exposing reaction (as he did all his life), but for his equally fair and determined crusade against the political use of WPA relief funds in Kentucky in behalf of the New Deal Democrats, in the 1938 mid-term election. Tom was right in his expose, and it represented a splendid bit of reporting though it made some of the "liberals" mad at the time. But it is a chance which the progressive reporter must take. Stay on your own side of the fence and things will tend to remain quiet and you probably won't get many prizes. But stray out briefly and attack fellow liberals and you run the risk of being tagged with a Pulitzer.

Like every old-time newsman I have a metal file cabinet of clippings by my desk. How often when I turn to it I still find some first-rate clipped item from the Stokes' column! These columns remind me that Tom was one of the few who kept his balance of objectivity in the otherwise all-but-universal paeans from the press after the 1953 inauguration.

I have always felt that the American press—or a good part of it—deprived the Administration for several years of something to which it was legitimately entitled, a virile opposition. Every president needs this unending, critical press scrutiny. The Administration and the country loses them at their peril.

Tom's normal style in these columns was simple, direct and unpretentious. He had a grim concern with many matters which other columnists found too humdrum to explore.

I think he was the one who first brought to my attention the role of the *regulatory agencies* in Washington—the great "fourth branch" of the American government. It was something that back in 1953-1955 hardly any other writer seemed interested in.

I think that more than any other man Tom was responsible for Sherman Adams' departure. In a column as early as 1955 Tom charged flatly that Adams was "directing the fight against power development." In later columns he spoke out on the drearily complicated Dixon-Yates giveaway. Sherman Adams, he charged, "meddles constantly in the business of these regulatory commissions, which is really none of his business."

In the last column I have of Tom's, Nov. 20, 1957, (six weeks before he stopped writing for good) he came back to this same subject and Sherman Adams. "Anybody," he declared, "who is constantly around Congress during this Administration finds his tracks all over the place."

Well, that's where Tom signed off. But a man named Sam Rayburn took notice of these and similar columns and got the House to appropriate \$300,000 for the first investigation of regulatory agencies in history. The inquiry followed. You know how it unexpectedly snagged Sherman Adams. I am interested in this because in a piece I wrote last summer for *The New Republic* entitled, "Tom Stokes and Sherman Adams," I argued that Tom had sparked the inquiry. I added sadly,

"I suppose a posthumous prize is out of the question."

Well, I seem to be wrong.

## Invention Needed

The world needs more than inventions in chemistry, physics, and engineering. It needs an invention in communications. If we could achieve this, the path of existence would be enormously simplified. When communications are real, we can disagree violently without danger; when they are poor, the result can be a catastrophe.

We are moving into a world that is highly scientific. Now it is not enough to say you are physicist—you have to explain what kind of physicist. Essentially every one of the many small areas of science has direct impact on society as a whole.

Scientists used to say that it was no use trying to interpret their work to the layman, but in the last 15 years

the achievements of science have become the cornerstone of life, and the old idea has to be abandoned.

Christ, in trying to explain a philosophy beyond the comprehension of the people, resorted to parables in an effort to bring his listeners to respond. As a means of making the layman grasp his meaning, Christ's use of the parable represented a major invention.

What we must have in this era of scientific and social frustration is this kind of invention. This becomes probably the highest priority item of our day.

---

Dr. Norman Hilberry, director, Argonne National Laboratory, to World Press Congress, March 7.

## What Editors Ask About Atoms

The World Press Congress toured the Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago, March 7. Its director, Dr. Norman Hilberry and his staff made a panel to answer questions of the editors from all over the world.

What the editors wanted to know about atomic energy developed this question and answer period:

**Question:** Does the problem of atomic waste disposal threaten the future welfare of society?

**Answer:** I can't believe man is so lacking in ingenuity that he can't solve the problem. I believe the difficulty is overemphasized.

**Question:** What is the potential of radio-botany work in the improvement of agriculture?

**Answer:** The use of radioactivity to study the behavior of plants will be helpful. For example, by creating mutations, we can develop plants that may grow where they can't now. We may be able to produce wheat in areas farther north than those now generally used for this crop.

**Question:** How soon will we see tangible evidence of success?

**Answer:** We have learned a good deal about nutrition of the soil; within five or ten years we will be growing very large species of grasses and other plants.

**Question:** Can you describe the progress made through atomic research in the treatment of disease—especially cancer?

**Answer:** The use of radiation to treat cancer is promising but is limited to special fields, especially brain tumors. However, these are relatively rare.

We hope to find an element to go into the tumor and leave the rest of the tissue undisturbed.

We are making use of tracers. With them we can study the body's mishandling of salts, the biochemistry of cells, etc.

New types of radioactive elements bring additional possibilities of a cancer cure each year.

**Question:** How many Free World countries are doing effective work in atomic energy?

**Answer:** All are doing something. One gets an over-all picture of widely distributed effort, with various international agencies coordinating much of the work. And one of the encouraging things is that scientists are an international group; they do work together. It also is true that countries tend to specialize as a result of their economic needs, geographic characteristics, etc.

**Question:** Have you found out the basic rules of matter?

**Answer:** We have better guesses than a year ago, but they're still guesses.

**Question:** How many places in the United States are conducting research on atomic power?

**Answer:** Many government laboratories and private industrial firms are doing this. We, in some respects, are doing more than others. Among industrial firms Westinghouse, General Electric, and many others are very active. There are many places in the world right now where nuclear power would be practical, but we are working toward a goal of achieving nuclear power competitive with conventional power in five years in high-cost areas of the world, and in 10 years in the United States.

**Question:** Would you compare the nuclear power achievements of the United States, Britain, and the USSR?

**Answer:** It's hard to say because of different approaches. Britain already has a fuel shortage and is under constant threat of having its imports cut off. They had to find a new source of power fast—cost was secondary. And they have done this.

Russia and the United States are more alike in their approach. Neither needs nuclear power now, but the United States will need it in about 20 years. I believe we'll be ready just about then.

The U.S. has stuck more to small-scale experimental plants, but the Russians like to do everything big. Other nations have more kilowatts than we have, but don't worry about that. There's no reason for us to make more kilowatts now.

**Question:** What is the potential of atomic energy for peaceful uses versus war uses?

**Answer:** This is hard to evaluate. My own faith is that peaceful uses can prove to be just as important as war uses already have proved to be. What will come out of all this is presently unknown, but I believe the potentials for peaceful use are as great if not greater than the potential for war.

**Question:** In America, what is the ratio of women to men in science?

**Answer:** I don't know the exact ratio, but I know it is too small. It's clear America is not developing 50 per cent of its best brains. This problem must be explored by the United States if we are to maintain our leadership.

**Question:** Is it possible there can be contamination from a reactor such as the one used in the Nautilus?

**Answer:** The Nautilus—no; it's completely contained.

## Mis-trial by Newspaper

*Decision in U. S. vs. John Powell et al.*

**In the District Court of the United States  
For the Northern District of California  
Southern Division**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. JOHN WILLIAM POWELL, SYLVIA CAMPBELL POWELL, and JULIAN SCHUMAN, Defendants.	No.35,065
---	-----------

**On Motion For Mis-Trial  
Opinion**

GOODMAN, CHIEF JUDGE

The indictment in this case charged the three defendants with conspiracy to violate the provisions of 18 U.S.C. §2388,<sup>1</sup> and the defendant, John Powell, with substantive violations of the same statute. By its terms, §2388 provides that it shall apply within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States.

During the trial, the United States offered the testimony of one Baylor, a United States soldier who was a prisoner of war in one of the Chinese communist prisoner-of-war camps during the Korean conflict, to show the distribution of the magazine "Chinese Monthly Review," published by defendants, among the United States prisoners of war, and also to show the effect of articles in the Review upon them. The Government stated that this evidence was proffered in proof of the intent of the defendants with respect to the offenses charged in the indictment, and as evidence of the tendency of the magazine as dangerous to the United States. At the time of the proffer of this evidence, the United States Attorney announced that other similar witnesses were in waiting to be called as Government witnesses. The defense objected to the proposed testimony on the ground that it was immaterial and inadmissible because of the provision of §2388 which limits its application to the United States and its admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, and also because of the prejudicial and inflammatory nature of this evidence in creating an undue prejudice beyond its legitimate probative weight. Upon request of defense counsel, and because the Court deemed it in proper protection of the rights of the defendants, the Court ordered the argument on the

objection to be held in the absence of the jury and excused the jury.

The argument was then had in the absence of the jury. Representatives of the press and other members of the public were present in the courtroom during the argument. In the course of the argument, the United States Attorney stated in effect that, in his opinion, the evidence objected to was admissible pursuant to the conspiracy count of the indictment, and since it established actual treason on the part of the defendants, it was admissible even though the overt act, with which the evidence was concerned, was committed outside the United States.

The Court stated that, while it was not passing on the merits of the matter, the evidence so far presented would be *prima facie* evidence of treason because of the area of admissibility of evidence under the Treason Statute, 18 U.S.C. §2381,<sup>2</sup> was much broader than under §2388. The Court further stated, however, that since the defendants were not charged under the Treason Statute, in its opinion, the jurisdictional limitations of §2388 required the Court to sustain the objection and exclude the proposed testimony, which it did. The trial of the case then proceeded before the jury. These proceedings occurred on January 29, 1959. The next day, Friday, January 30, the defense tendered a motion for mis-trial upon the ground that the newspapers in the San Francisco area had published articles and headlines indicating that the trial judge had declared the defendants guilty of treason. The motion was based upon an affidavit of one of the attorneys for the defense and accompanying it were copies of the newspaper articles and publications referred to. The United States Attorney stated in effect that the defense need not press the motion, that the Government had no desire to try the defendants in anything but the fairest atmosphere, and that the publications and headlines, relating to the Court's remarks upon the hearing had in the absence of the jury might have some tendency to effect some of the jurors, and that accordingly, the Government had no objection to the Court ordering a mistrial. The Court thereupon granted the motion for mis-trial.

The record shows that counsel for the defense based the motion for mis-trial not upon any statements made by the Court but upon the newspaper publications and the prejudicial effect created by them.

There follows hereafter a brief statement as to the reasons and grounds upon which the order of mis-trial was based:

Some newspaper headlines stated that the judge declared

the "Powells guilty of treason," and that "the judge had flayed the Powells." Some of the newspaper accounts were written in such fashion as to indicate that the Judge had characterized the Powells as being guilty of treason. The record shows the falsity of such newspaper accounts. In the discussion between Court and counsel on the admissibility of the evidence, the record shows that the Court clearly stated that it was not indicating any opinion on the merits at all. Its reference to a *prima facie* showing of treason was, as the record shows, made solely to point out the gravely prejudicial effect of admitting evidence of treason in a case where no such charge was made. Consequently, the inaccuracy and prejudicial character of some of the newspaper accounts tended to violate the fundamental concept of fairness in a criminal proceeding. No act and no conduct of the Court or counsel on either side was cited as a basis for mis-trial. The motion was solely on the basis of the conduct of the press. It needs no argument to show that a defendant in a criminal case could not have a fair trial in the face of the newspaper publications such as in this case.

There is a further and even stronger reason for the granting of the motion for mis-trial. Courts, particularly in criminal cases, are zealous in protecting the rights of a defendant against the possibility of the jury being influenced by non-evidentiary matters. Consequently, it has been traditional to excuse the jury, and to keep from their ears arguments on legal matters such as the admission of evidence. This we did in this case. Nevertheless, the press in disregard of the worthy purpose above stated, published and disseminated that which the Court had kept from the ears of the jury. In this respect even those newspaper accounts which in whole or in part accurately reported the discussion between Court and counsel in the absence of the jury in respect to the admissibility of the proposed testimony created a danger of an improper and prejudicial influence upon the jury.

The constitutional right of freedom of the press is vital to the maintenance of our form of government. Without it there is a serious question as to whether we can maintain in our society our form of government. The doctrine of freedom of the press is not for the benefit of the press but for the benefit of the people. Newspaper publishers, therefore, have a high degree of responsibility to preserve the

doctrine of freedom of the press for the benefit of the people, not for their own benefit.

The mistrial ordered in this case may well point the way to a better understanding on the part of the press as to the importance of cooperation between press and court in the administration of justice. This Court would gladly participate in any effort to further that purpose.

Dated: February 3, 1959.

#### NOTES

1] §2388. Activities affecting armed forces during war  
 (a) Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; or

Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so—

Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

(c) Whoever harbors or conceals any person who he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, has committed, or is about to commit, an offense under this section, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

(d) This section shall apply within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States. June 25, 1948, c.645, 62 Stat. 811

2] §2381. Treason

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 807.

# Whatever Happened To The Country Press?

By John C. Obert

Far too many of the nation's 9,000 country editors share a grand illusion. They think they run the country. They write and produce hometown newspapers read by 75,000,000 people, and the irony of the illusion lies in the fact that a good many of the duly-elected officials who actually do run the country are as beguiled as the editors. They, too, believe, or pretend to believe, that the country press runs the country.

This mutually-held illusion is just that, for the once-unquestioned influence of this segment of the press in national affairs began to wane a quarter of a century ago and today is all but gone. Moreover, the editors have only themselves to blame, for it was their failure to keep abreast of the ideological times which ultimately cost the country press the ear of the public and politician alike. Yet the myth, nourished as it is by the naive or calculated utterances of the politician, persists to this day.

Twenty-five years ago, John Perry, then president of the American Press association, declared that:

"The force that controls this country of ours in the long run is the rural editor in his capacity as spokesman for sixty million Americans who live and earn their living on the farms and in the villages and towns of 5,000 population or less. It is not necessary to take my word for it. Ask any politician whom you know well enough to tell you the truth. . . . The politician, if he is above peanut size, will tell you that he worries little about what the big city papers say; but let even half a dozen weeklies in his home town or district open on him and he pulls down the lid on his desk in Washington, Springfield, St. Paul or Jefferson City, and takes the next train home to see what he has done."

This was said in 1933, perhaps the last year it could lay claim to any validity. For the depression, the inauguration of Franklin Roosevelt, the ominous stirrings overseas were ushering in a new era. The bottom had fallen out of the national economy, the world had begun to shrink and, somehow, the pre-Rooseveltian American ethic, an ethic anchored in concepts of property rights transcendent and Fortress America, seemed suddenly inadequate. It was. And the majority of Americans found it prudent to move into the new era behind the gallant man from Hyde Park. Not so the country press.

---

John C. Obert is a country editor, of the *Park Region Echo*, Alexandria, Minnesota. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1957. He received the top N.E.A. award for editorials in 1958.

Shrewd enough to take advantage of technological advances in publishing, hometown editors adopted new and lively formats, developed lucrative job printing sidelines, struggled through the depression and successfully fended off latter-day sorties into their trade territories by big dailies, radio and television. But all the while the country press was keeping its business head above water, it was floundering in the floodtide of the ideological revolution of the thirties and forties by cleaving to an era which departed, for better or for worse, with Calvin Coolidge. And thus was lost the country press' cherished prerogative of "running the country."

But neither the rural editor nor the politician seems ready to surrender the grand illusion. Listen to this Midwest Congressman discussing the subject a few years ago:

The power of the country press in Washington surprises me. During my two terms I have been impressed with it constantly. . . . The lobby, the big railroad lawyers and that class of people, realize the power of the press, but they hate it. I have heard them talk about it and shake their heads and say 'Too much power there!' The press is more powerful than money.

The politician who still talks about the alleged power and influence of the country press does so for one of two reasons—neither of them valid. Either he's inherited this hairy bromide from bygone politicians and has never bothered to examine it in today's context, or he's been unduly impressed by this admittedly startling statistic: 75 per cent of the membership of the United States Senate, 61 per cent of the House membership and 60 per cent of the nation's state legislators are put into office by voters in towns of under 10,000 population. Now the one thing virtually every small town has is a newspaper, and the politician seeking common denominators within his campaign territory woos the hometown editors by paying lip-service to the mythical power of the country press.

But paying lip-service to a myth is one thing and reality another. The time has come to force the question of what the politician and the country editor have been smoking for so these many years, for sometime long ago they began blowing smoke into each others' eyes. The country press does not run the country—and thank heaven it does not. The elected official who writes or administers the laws which rule the nation is concerned only with keeping the country editor quiescent. He is neither particularly interested in nor influenced by the editor's opinions on the issues of the day, for the average country editor's opinions

are so anachronous that no politician could afford to heed them and do right by his constituents—much less keep his job.

Exceptions there are, to be true. Every section of the nation boasts some influential country newspapers, newspapers edited by enlightened, lucid, articulate and courageous people who have kept abreast of the political, social and economic times and whose ability to communicate effectively with reader and lawmaker is the envy of many big city papers. But these rare exceptions serve only to point up the inarticulate ineffectiveness of that vast majority of the country press which still deals in ideas as outdated as celluloid collars and high-button shoes.

Recently the *American Press* magazine paid dubious, albeit sincere, tribute to the archaic attitudes of the country editor by describing these attitudes as manifestations of a "stubborn Americanism." The magazine used the results of 25 opinion surveys it has made since 1953 to prepare "An Authenticated Portrait of America's Typical Country Editor" and said:

Of course, we do not pretend to believe that all country editors are alike. . . . But when we think in terms of majorities—and it is majorities which dictate government policy and social mores—it becomes increasingly obvious that the majority of country editors in all sections of the country think alike to the extent that we know before a poll on a controversial subject has been launched how the majority of country editors are likely to vote. For example, we know that they will oppose any legislation calling for increased welfare activity on the part of the federal government; that they will favor any move to curb labor union activities; that they will fight hand-outs to any groups. . . . and that they will back any moves to shift power from the federal to the state governments. In general, their roots are firmly embedded in the America of a past era—an America which thrived on such words as self-reliance and independence, and they stubbornly resist all movements wherein social groups might be benefited but at the expense of the individual's freedom. 'Mollycoddling' by government is one of the pet hates of the country editor. His heroes are the founding fathers of our nation who believed in a minimum amount of government and a maximum amount of individual freedom. He has swallowed hard to accept Social Security; he accepts foreign aid with many misgivings (Note: 49 per cent would have all foreign aid terminated); farm supports are contrary to his philosophy; he is a champion of free enterprise and the freer the better.

Were it consistent, one might find the very hoariness of this opinion pattern admirable. But it is not. The prime

inconsistency, of course, is found in the country editor's dedicated resistance to "big government"—except as it relates to organized labor. Here the country editor wants the federal government to move in fast and move in big.

Eighty per cent of the country editors favor more government control over unions. Ninety-one per cent support compulsory publication of union financial statements; 86 per cent urge the government to poll union members before a strike is called; 54 per cent believe in outlawing strikes in communications industries; 81 per cent oppose "guaranteed annual wage;" and 86 per cent back "right to work" legislation.

Country editors stand in awe of business and industry. Sixty-four per cent of the editors would like to see business taxes reduced, but almost all of them would like to see taxes on cooperatives increased. No less than 73 per cent contend that private industry would do a better job of running the Post Office Department than the government. Their manifest scorn for the government sometimes reaches ridiculous proportions. Witness the fact that 77 per cent of the editors oppose fair trade price-protection laws which would seem to benefit most those small merchants with whom the editor lives and does business.

The most fascinating incongruity, however, is to be found in the country editors' opposition to any moves which would shift power from the state to the federal government. This seems logical on the surface, for if there is one area of government in which the country press still wields some influence, it is in the state legislatures. Yet the influence it has here, ironically, has boomeranged to build up the federal government.

By opposing reapportionment measures which would grant equitable representation in state legislatures to helplessly underrepresented metropolitan districts, the country press has helped perpetuate rural control of legislatures. Thus it has been instrumental in forcing the metropolis to turn to the federal government for the aid it must have to provide minimal services for its residents. Discussing this situation recently, United States Municipal News said: "We respectfully suggest to those who deplore local dependence on federal aid that they address themselves to the state legislatures, for therein rests the power to permit the city to become financially independent."

Moreover, it would seem axiomatic that dominance of state government by conservative rural legislators, a dominance achieved long ago through calculated gerrymandering, forced the frustrated Democratic party to take its zeal for governing to Washington and ultimately helped create the "big government" bogey which the country press deplors and decries today.

Though these seeming paradoxes in motive and result

have been pointed out to the country press, the press continues to turn a deaf ear. To understand why, it is necessary to examine the provincial chauvinism which characterizes so much of this segment of the press.

Much has been made, for instance, of the rural editor's "closeness to the people," his accessibility to grass roots opinion, if you will. Yet it is this very closeness to the everyday affairs of the people, his people, which has given the country editor political myopia and has left the forest of many trees completely out of focus. Historically geared to serve only the community in which it functions, the country press turns its eyes away from the world beyond. Insulated, by geography and by personal inclination, from the broadening influences which lie outside his circulation area, the country editor too often moves in a cramped sphere populated by Main Street Babbitts who mirror his own opinions. The country editor is suspicious, almost paranoically so, of the "outside world," and foremost among the many alien objects of suspicion is the city slicker in government. The rural legislator is "one of us," a known commodity. So long as the rural legislator controls state government, the world will continue as the provinces want it to continue—or so the country editor believes. This is why he stubbornly ignores the cogent, morally-justified arguments for reapportionment—even when he is shown he is cutting off his political nose to spite his political face.

But if the country editor is consistent in one thing, he is consistent in his readiness to wield the face-spitting knife. Examples abound. Last year, for instance, the Minneapolis *Tribune* assigned its crack Negro reporter, Carl Rowan, to do a series of articles on the status and the future of Minnesota's small towns. Rowan spent weeks touring the state, talking with farmers, bankers, businessmen and civic leaders. When he returned, he wrote a series aptly titled "Grow or Die"—and promptly kicked loose an outburst of denial and protest which was to leave the conscientious Rowan bereft of even his own editors' support. Yet Rowan was right, and no one should have known it better than the country editors who led the attack upon him.

For what with depressed dairy prices in this dairy farming state, with the number of farm families which traditionally provide the trade foundation for the rural community rapidly diminishing, with fewer and fewer on-the-farm jobs, and with an improved road and highway system bringing the lure of the big city ever nearer, a good many of Minnesota's small towns are moribund. Rowan concluded that the small town can save itself only by admitting that farm trade alone can no longer sustain its economy, that new industry, developed at home or imported, must be encouraged, and that the small town businessman must pay higher wages to stimulate local buying and to discourage his employees from moving to the metropolis.

From the cries of outrage uttered by the country press, one would have thought Rowan himself had struck the blow to kill the small town. Yet the reaction was predictable, for few country editors would stand still while a city reporter told them what was wrong with their towns. The country editor is convinced that the farmer's troubles would be over if he'd just "get more efficient." He fears that industry will bring labor unions and that labor unions will bring strikes, violence and hoodlums. And he suspects that higher wage standards will make employees uppity and disturb the comfortable, if decadent, social structure of his community.

The editor is inclined to ooze treacle about the virtues and blessings of small town living, but the sincerity of his interest in preserving rural Americana must remain unfortunately suspect so long as he maintains his stubborn opposition to the very things which can save it—specifically, a program which would keep farmers on the land and in the Main Street stores and a program of industrial development and higher wages to take up the slack in his town's economy.

Fortunately, in the Midwest at least, the politician once again has ignored the country editor and has generally supported legislation which would help save the rural community the editor seems hell-bent to forsake. And still the myth persists that the country press calls the tune and the politician dances.

In concluding its portrait of the typical country editor, the *American Press* magazine says:

In general, the country editor is a modest man. But of one thing he is very much aware: the Congressmen from his district listen to him, and read what he has to say, with the closest attention. They visit him when they are home to find out 'what the people think.' And practically all rural Congressmen subscribe to the newspapers in their home districts. . . . The country editor is 'a big frog in a little puddle.' Politicians, both local and national, seek his favor and support. . . . His support is vital to their causes.

Perhaps Congressmen do listen to the country editor. Perhaps they do visit him when they are home. Perhaps they do subscribe to his paper. But if they do, the gestures are empty. One look at the federal legislation passed or extended in recent years and another look at the country editor's opinions on the same issues should lay once and for all the ghostly myth that the country press runs the country, for Congress has pointedly ignored the legislative recommendations of the country press in virtually every instance.

Our overseas commitments have become more and more binding. Foreign aid has been continued, Social Security benefits liberalized and extended, and oppressive labor bills

defeated. Expanded federal aid to education seems both imperative and imminent. The government still operates a farm program of sorts, and private industry hasn't yet taken over from the Post Office.

Moreover, the country press, reflecting the almost poignant conviction of the late Senator Robert Taft that the nation is basically arch-conservative, was repudiated once again last November when liberals scored another convincing victory at the polls. The election lesson was lost to the editors, however, for the consensus of those polled by the *American Press* in December was that "the people voted for Santa Claus and against inadequate Republican leadership."

The influence of the country press on federal legislation and national elections will remain negligible until that segment of the press relaxes what one alliterative observer calls "the rigidity of rural ratiocination," broadens its ideological

horizons and reassumes its place as a realistic, imaginative and informed molder and mobilizer of the opinions of 75,000,000 readers. This does not mean that the country press must abandon its traditional conservatism. It does mean that its conservatism must be brought into step with the times.

After all, the most influential of all country editors was, except for a brief flirtation with Progressivism, a life-long Republican. But William Allen White once asked "What's The Matter With Kansas?" in an editorial which should be required reading for today's benighted editors. White saw the challenge of "Grow or Die" even then, and though he remained a spokesman for the rural community to the end of his days, he left the door open to the outside world, kept Emporia and Kansas in proper perspective and by so doing never surrendered his considerable influence in national as well as local affairs.

## The Magazine Competition

By Charles E. Scripps

Direct newspaper competition has diminished considerably. Increased operating costs seem to get the blame. I don't believe it! Every industry has had increasing costs.

Our share of the total economic support has been reduced to some extent by the advent of new media, and by competition from other media. For one reason or another, our industry has not increased its revenues proportionately with expenses. The problem, in my opinion, is more of a revenue problem than an expense problem.

Merger and consolidation have taken place in autos, banks, steel, merchandising, and many other fields—as well as in newspapers. This seems to be the normal pattern.

From the economists' point of view, the newspaper industry is reaching the stage of economic maturity. The era of new enterprise and rapid expansion in an expanding market for newspapers ended 30 or 40 years ago. We have practically completed the era of consolidation and adjustment to the fully developed market.

Reduced competition has enhanced our financial security and our power as advertising vehicles. But, has it been good for journalism?

Certainly, in recent years of fantastically rapid change, radio and TV have taken over the major role of in-the-home entertainment. The social pattern has changed vastly in respect to the use of leisure time in which most newspaper reading time falls.

Radio and TV may not have been good for the publishers' business, but I think they have been for journal-

ism. Not that we shouldn't entertain any more—we should. But a newspaper can't major in entertainment and succeed today. We, therefore, are giving increased attention to the primary editorial function.

There are some things we can control, though, and in the next few years, I think we are going to learn a lot about controlling them. We may have lost a great deal of healthy stimulation in the decline of direct competition among newspapers, but we are just beginning to understand the significance of journalistic competition from other media—magazines, radio, and television.

To the degree that we newspapermen fail to hold the attention of our readers, these competitive media get their attention, their circulation money, and the advertising dollars that go with it.

The newspaper is a better bargain at today's price than it was 20 years ago. Are papers worth less today? I don't think so.

Have we done enough to communicate to the public the important but intangible value of service provided by newspapers? Intangibles are difficult to communicate and require considerable intelligent effort. I think we overrate the effectiveness with which the important intangible values communicate themselves, and we underrate the importance of what is communicated by the tangible product.

The tangibles are cheap paper (I hasten to say com-

paratively cheap), only moderately good printing, ink that soils hands and clothes, and, in addition, the necessary haste of our daily routine which produces typos. The breaking story, reported as it develops, is never complete and fully satisfying to the reader.

We understand the necessity of these things, but, does the reader get all we should give him and does he understand why his newspaper is the way it is?

I feel sure that competition from the other media is going to force us to learn how to handle the problem of communicating the intangibles of service to the reader.

Our research in Scripps-Howard indicates that, for the country as a whole, newspaper circulation, taken as a ratio to households, has been very steady for many years. The picture falls out of pattern downward for the last four years. The amount isn't great, but is enough to be a warning light. As of now, I can't explain it. Perhaps it is entirely due to a reduction in duplicated circulation. Again, here is a trend that enhances the power of a single newspaper in a given home in both editorial and advertising power. But does the trend toward only one newspaper to a home represent journalistic progress?

One curious thing that popped out of research was that advertising content seems to have a positive relationship to circulation up to the point where advertising content reaches 51 per cent. Beyond that, the relationship becomes negative. I think this illustrates the complexity of research. I don't believe this can be a case of simple cause and effect. There is no magic number of 51 per cent—or any other per cent—that will tell us how to edit newspapers. But we do know that people complain when their newspapers begin to look like shopping news.

There has been a steady increase in the proportion of our revenue that comes from the advertiser, and a steady decrease in the proportion that comes from the readers. This, I think, is a bad thing for journalism, and is certainly a factor in reducing competition. The fat cats get the advertising cream, and the thin ones get skim milk.

Let us remember that our advertising revenues come from our readers' pockets, too, or else the advertisers don't know what they are doing.

I think it is important to point out that reader habit is stronger than advertising habit, and that reader loyalty is stronger than advertising loyalty.

Reader habit and reader loyalty are something we can do something about. The more we can place our economic dependence upon a direct relationship with the reader rather than on an indirect relationship with the reader through the advertiser, the better for journalism—and I don't think the publishers would hear any complaints from the advertisers.

The only thing we can do about greater economic dependence on the reader is to do what we are trying to do all the time, make our newspapers more satisfying in every way. We should expect the reader to pay a fair price for that value. I think the standard price will soon be ten cents and that that will be good for journalism and the newspaper will still be the biggest bargain in the country. But will our readers know that?

I believe editors should be vitally concerned with the techniques used by the circulation departments in promoting and selling the editorial product. Certainly circulation promotion can be designed to enhance respect for the newspaper—not take away from it.

We shouldn't be misled by total circulation figures. Since 1940, newspaper circulation in this country—taken by copies per household per year—is down slightly. Maybe we can rationalize this as the elimination of duplication and the fact that most of the available readers read at least one paper.

But let's take a look at the major magazines—since 1940, annual consumption, per household, of news magazines is up 150 per cent; business news magazines—up 67 per cent; general monthlies—up 49 per cent; fashion magazines—up 200 per cent; movie, romance, radio and TV magazines—up 50 per cent; home magazines—up 50 per cent; men's magazines—up 246 per cent; youth magazines—up 350 per cent; mechanics and science magazines—up 80 per cent and farm magazines—down 30 per cent.

The average over the entire group of major magazines is a healthy increase of 29 per cent.

Where has the reading time come from for people to read these magazines, and why do more people turn to them?

We shouldn't be misled by our total circulation figures. We should know more about the time readers spend with each of the media and why.

Newspapers can do one of two things about newspaper reading time. We can accept changes in the American social pattern as changes that inevitably reduce our value and significance to readers. We can shrink down our level of operation and accommodate the change and the competition and place our dependence on advertising power. Or, we can turn around, meet the challenge, and take positive steps to earn more attention and time from our readers.

I sometimes hear journalists say that certain types of coverage are magazine stuff and don't belong in newspapers—because magazines have a week or more to prepare a story and we have to work on a day-to-day basis. But our shops are open six or seven days a week, too! Some ask where we would get the money to pay reporters and writers to do better, more interpretive and

expository reporting. I say we can get it the same place that other media have been getting it—in the time of our readers and the circulations and advertising dollars that go with that time.

Suppose every newspaper reader in the country were to find in his paper things that would cause him to spend ten minutes more a day reading it. I have no way of telling what it would mean to daily journalism in terms of editorial influence, public enlightenment, and wherewithal to do a better job. But I will say that I think there would be an economic upheaval in the whole mass media field.

Price doesn't seem to be a factor in the trend toward more magazine reading. Magazines have gone up more in price than newspapers, and still they have had greater circulation growth percentagewise.

The answer must lie in consumer satisfaction, which means content! An important factor, I think, is that the large circulation weekly magazines have direct and intense competition with each other. They stay on their toes—or they die.

A more important factor for newspapers is the fact that in recent years magazines have been stepping more and more into the field that used to belong exclusively to daily journalism. A recent study by the Indiana University department of journalism indicated increased magazine use of foreign and national reporting; science, sports, and crime stories. Magazines are coming into more direct competition with us—both editorially and economically. They have found that people want to know and understand this terribly complex time in which we live.

Newspapers, in spite of our problems, continue to have a tremendous circulation advantage, and we have reader habit and daily reader exposure. Anything anyone can do in the journalistic field, we can do at least as well if given the tools with which to understand our editorial

market. I have seen no indication that people do more reading or less reading than they used to do. The questions for us in the newspaper field are what they read and why.

Our modern world is getting almost hopelessly complex and confusing. The people want someone to help them not only to know the events of the day—but to help them understand and relate them. This job of helping people understand is the journalistic area that magazines have been moving into in recent years.

Whether we believe they are doing it well or not is beside the point. The important thing is that many people think they are and have turned to them. Apparently, the daily newspaper has not completely satisfied the need of many people to know and to understand. I suggest that we should note these trends and ask ourselves if we are doing our job as well as we might.

I believe we are ceasing to kid ourselves with the idea that no other media can compete with us, or that we can compete with no other media. All media compete for the consumer's interest, his time, and his economic support.

To become more effective in this competition, newspaper people must know more about their own consumers. I like the term "editorial market research."

We have to know how editorial and news matter is consumed and used. We have to know what readers expect of us today in terms of satisfying their need to know and to understand today's news.

The worst mistake we could make with research would be to try to discover formulae for editing newspapers. Journalism is an art and a craft. But, I do suggest that the more journalists know about readers and the way they use their mass communications, and what they need and want, the better job newspapers will do.

---

This is from a talk to the University of Wisconsin Journalism Institute, May 1.

# Chicago's Newspaper Concentration:

## "An Ex Parte View"

By Milburn P. Akers

The two most recent changes in ownership of Chicago newspapers, changes which reduced ownerships of daily newspapers from four to two, have caused a number of questions.

I am asked why these consolidations took place—the *Tribune's* acquisition of the *American* and the more recent purchase by the *Sun-Times* of the *Daily News*. Also inquiry is made as to whether these consolidations will result in the elimination of several points of view. And, additionally, the question is raised as to whether these consolidations will be good for Chicago.

I will seek to answer these questions as forthrightly and as adequately as I can. I know, of course, that my answers will probably be regarded as *ex parte*. Still, I hope to give you some factual information on which you can base your own conclusions if you chance to disagree with mine.

Why did these consolidations take place?

The answer to that question is simple.

They resulted from changing newspaper economics.

These economic changes have affected newspapers outside of Chicago as well as in Chicago. In 1910, for example, there were approximately 2,600 daily newspapers in the country. Today, with a population double that of 1910, there are approximately 1,750 daily newspapers.

In 1930 there were 305 metropolitan dailies. And in 1958, at the time of the study on which I am basing my remarks, there were 230, a decrease of 75 metropolitan dailies in 28 years.

So it is readily apparent that the trend toward consolidation or fewer newspapers is national. It has been underway a long time. A generation or so ago there were eight daily newspapers under seven different ownerships in Chicago. And now there are four daily newspapers under two ownerships in Chicago.

In fact, Chicago is one of the relatively few metropolitan centers in which there are at least two ownerships. For the trend toward fewer dailies has resulted in an increase in the number of so-called monopoly newspapers.

We do not have a monopoly situation in Chicago. And I doubt if we ever will.

---

Milburn P. Akers has been reporter, political writer, managing editor, now editor of the Chicago *Sun-Times*. This is from a talk to the Chicago City Club after the sale of the Chicago *Daily News* to Marshall Field, publisher of the *Sun-Times*.

The declining number of papers—daily newspapers—has not resulted in a similar decline in readers.

Take Chicago, for example. In 1910, eight English language daily newspapers were published in Chicago: the *Tribune*, *News*, *Journal*, *Post*, *American*, *Examiner*, *Record-Herald*, and *Inter-Ocean*. These eight newspapers had a combined daily circulation of 1,354,745. The combined circulation of the four Chicago daily newspapers in 1958 was 2,417,871, or an increase of 78.5 per cent over that of the eight Chicago newspapers of 1910. Meanwhile, the population of Chicago increased 73.9 per cent, rising from 2,185,000 in 1910 to 3,800,000 in 1958.

I am aware of the phenomenal popularity increases in our suburban area. And I know that these suburban increases should be taken into consideration in any valid comparison. I know also that the comparisons I have given you would not be quite so favorable if the suburban population were taken into consideration; the suburban population of 1910 as compared with that of today. However, the data on suburban circulation of 1910 is not available. So I must rest my argument on the comparison of today's total circulation of four Chicago newspapers as against that of the eight Chicago newspapers of 1910.

Despite the slightly downward revision in the percentages that calculation of the suburban situation would entail, I submit this as a phenomenal record—four Chicago newspapers today have 78.5 per cent more total circulation than eight Chicago newspapers had in 1910. And Chicago's population increase since 1910 has been 73.9 per cent.

This situation was not confined to Chicago. For total daily net circulation in the United States and Canada rose from 27,000,000 in 1920 to 57,000,000 in 1957.

Let me give you another statistic. The eight Chicago newspapers of 1910 carried that year a total of 49,013,151 agate lines of advertising. In 1958, the four Chicago dailies carried 107,211,449 agate lines of advertising, an increase of 118.70 per cent.

In addition, I will assert that all four Chicago newspapers today do a much better job, both as news mediums and as vehicles for advertising, than was done by the eight Chicago newspapers of 1910.

The newspapers of 1910 did not carry the volume of news—not even a good percentage of the news—that is carried in Chicago's present newspapers. Chicagoans of 1910 were not nearly as well informed as Chicagoans of 1958. The newspapers in Chicago of 1910 were neither

significant nor as informative as those of 1958. In addition, they carried far less in the way of features and far less in the way of advertising.

Chicago newspapers—the four that remain—have made the circulation and advertising gains I have mentioned, and have vastly increased their coverage of the news, and have become responsible and mature in their treatment of the news, despite the competition of new media.

Radio, TV and news magazines have all come upon the stage during the fifty year period I have been discussing. And there has, during the same period, been a phenomenal increase in the number of suburban and community newspapers.

Few other industries have had to meet the challenge of so many new forms of competition as has the metropolitan newspaper industry.

Despite all these new forms of communication, and hence new forms of competition, the Chicago metropolitan press has remained the chief medium in this community for the dissemination of news and the chief medium for the distribution of advertising.

I am not saying that fewer newspapers are necessarily good for this or any other community. But I am asserting that the economy, at any given time, will support only so many newspapers adequately. And only adequately supported newspapers can be good and enduring newspapers.

The Chicago metropolitan press—and by that I mean the *Tribune*, the *American*, the *Sun-Times* and the *Daily News*—has greatly improved its position in these areas despite the advent of new forms of communication and the competitive nature of each.

If that be so, and it is, you have a right to ask:

Why then the consolidation? Why the reduction, in a few short years, from four ownerships to two ownerships?

There are factors other than total circulation and the total advertising volume that enter into the cost of producing newspapers.

One of these is newsprint.

In 1930 Chicago newspapers paid approximately \$60 a ton for newsprint. Today, the price has more than doubled; in fact, it approximates \$135 per ton. And indications are that it is likely to go higher. Newsprint is one of the major cost items in the production of a metropolitan newspaper. In the case of the *Sun-Times*, newsprint, at current prices, requires approximately 30 per cent of our gross revenue.

The steadily increasing price of newsprint over the years is one of the factors that has caused newspaper consolidations and newspaper eliminations throughout the nation.

Another factor is labor.

At the *Sun-Times*, approximately 50 per cent of gross revenue is required to meet the costs of labor. Here the increases have been even greater than in newsprint.

The average hourly rate of newspaper production workers has risen from approximately \$1.30 an hour in 1942 to approximately \$3.15 an hour in 1959. And salaries of white collar workers have gone up proportionately.

Newsprint and wages, our two biggest cost factors, have spiraled rapidly upward. And so have the many other expense items. Of course, newspapers have increased their gross revenues meanwhile—increased them by increasing both advertising and subscription rates, and, to some extent, volume. But we have not been able, and I know of no other Metropolitan newspaper that has been able, to increase revenue at anything approaching the rate of increases in labor and newsprint. Consequently, the percentage of revenue retention has fallen sharply. It has fallen so sharply for so many newspapers that the Waldorf Astoria in New York, scene of the recent convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, reminded me of the stories of the great wailing wall in ancient Jerusalem.

The inflationary spiral of the past several years has been especially severe insofar as newspapers have been concerned. This has been true because of the unusually high percentage of gross revenue required for our raw product, newsprint, and the high percentage of the gross revenue required for labor.

Some industries confronted with similar problems have been able to meet them with better technology and a consequent increased degree of automation.

That has not been true of the newspaper industry. And currently I see little prospect of it becoming true.

Perhaps I can better illustrate this situation by citing the recent annual financial statement of the *New York Times*.

That newspaper, one of the nation's greatest in all respects, reported gross annual revenue of \$85,576,162 and a profit, after taxes, of \$162,052.

You will, I believe, agree with me that a retention of but \$162,052 out of a gross of \$85,576,162 is an unusually low earning. I should note, of course, that the *Times'* earnings were cut somewhat by a strike. Still, the *Times'* earnings would not have been appreciably higher had there been no strike, as the margin of retention was already drastically low.

*Editor & Publisher* has, since 1945, been making an annual study of a daily newspaper in the 50,000 circulation category. In 1945 that newspaper had a profit, after taxes, of \$191,826, or a 15.35 per cent retention of total revenue.

In 1958 the same newspaper, according to *Editor & Publisher*, had a profit, after taxes of \$94,918 for a 3.29 per cent retention of total revenue. And this despite the highest revenue intake in its history.

Vastly more business. Vastly less profit.

I might add that a retention of 3.29 per cent of revenue

would be a welcome relief to most metropolitan newspapers today.

More business and less profit appears to be the economic order of the day in many industries and is causing consolidations in many of them.

The *Tribune's* acquisition of the *America* and the *Sun-Times'* acquisition of the *Daily News* greatly strengthens and stabilizes the newspaper situation in Chicago. Various economies are possible in a morning-evening combination. A better utilization of facilities, especially mechanical facilities, is possible. Economies are possible and no doubt will be resorted to in many other areas.

These economies of operation are, to a measurable extent, a safeguard against any further reduction in the number of Chicago newspapers.

That conclusion presupposes, of course, that these newspaper combinations will both continue, as they now are, editorially separate, although financially, mechanically, and otherwise linked together.

I can speak only for the *Sun-Times*.

It is Mr. Marshal Field's expressed intention to maintain the *Sun-Times* and the *Daily News* as separate editorial entities. That has been done for the past several years by the ownership of the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Chicago American*.

So long as this situation prevails—and I predict it will prevail for many years—I doubt if there is cause for any apprehension over the possible loss of points of view.

Consider the *Sun-Times* and the *Daily News*. These two newspapers have both long been politically independent. I am certain it is Mr. Field's intention that they remain so. Each of these newspapers carries columnists of various and, frequently, conflicting points of view. I am certain that it is Mr. Field's intention that they will continue to do so.

Now, even more important, in my opinion, than positions taken on the editorial pages, or by columnists, is the fact that both the *Sun-Times* and the *Daily News* have long sought to be fair to all points of view in their news columns.

Editorial pages usually reflect the views of publishers and editors, and may be rejected or accepted as such.

A newspaper's news column, however, belongs to that newspaper's readers. No publisher and no editor possesses the right to pollute or prostitute a newspaper's news columns. A conscientious publisher, a conscientious editor, regards his paper's news column as a public trust. In the fulfilment of that trust, he must print facts, he must give information, upon which the public can depend. He must print the various sides of all major controversial matters, the pros and the cons. His trust is that of publishing the information upon which an intelligent electorate can reach

the major conclusions upon which they make fateful decisions as a part of our democratic process.

Most newspapers seek to influence those decisions by what they say on their editorial pages—and that, I believe we will all agree, is their right. But no publisher and no editor has the right to carry his own point of view on such matters over into the paper's news columns. For, as I have said, those columns, the news columns, are a public trust, and publishers and editors must respect that trust. So long as they do, all points of view will continue to find expression.

Beautiful theory, you say. But how is the performance?

The integrity of the news column is, in my opinion, the vital factor, the criterion, with which a community, no less than a publisher or an editor, should concern itself.

So long as the news columns possess integrity, so long as any responsible person or agency or group can make, through one honorable device or another, its views known, there need be no concern over newspaper consolidations resulting in the elimination of points of view.

It has been my observation that most so-called monopoly newspapers make an even more determined effort than many competitive newspapers to assure a forum for conflicting and diverse viewpoints. In fact, such procedure is only good business for the monopoly newspaper. Failure to present conflicting and diverse viewpoints tends to invite competition.

While the *Sun-Times-Daily News* combination is by no means a monopoly, and I hope that neither it nor the *Tribune-American* combination becomes one, I can assure you that it is Mr. Field's determination that no conflicting or diverse viewpoints held by any responsible person, agency, or group shall ever be denied expression in the newspapers he owns. And I have seen increasing evidence that the ownership of the *Tribune-American* combination holds similar views.

As one who spent some 35 years in the newspaper business, as one who cherishes the traditions and ethics of journalism, I say the recent combination effected between the four Chicago newspapers will but serve to perpetuate them as separate entities. The extent to which that will be good for Chicago will depend in the future, as in the past, on the integrity and ability of the publishers and editors in charge.

The inexorable workings of economic laws brought about the combinations.

The dedication, or lack of it, of the various publishers and editors to the public welfare will determine whether good or bad results from it.

I, as one long involved in this type of endeavor in Chicago, am optimistic as to the future. For I believe that financially stronger and editorially better newspapers will result from these combinations.

## The Science Writer and the Doctor

By Frank Carey

Doctors and medical researchers as a group transmit a great deal of information through the press to the public. But there are still too many individual doctors who say there's no value in giving the public a lot of medical information through the press—too many, indeed, who say the public really has no right to know. There are still too many individual doctors who believe that the only information the public should get beyond that involved in a treatment is that which is spoon-fed to them in small doses in a doctor's office, often in vague generalities or in terms too technical for people to understand.

There are still too many who believe that the press can not get anything in the medical or other science field straight, and that the press is dedicated to nothing but sensationalism and stepping up the sale of newspapers and the sale of radio or television time.

Happily, the number of these diehards is small in all instances. Happily, too, their number is growing smaller all the time as increased understanding and cooperation is achieved between medicine and the press.

There is a steadily growing effort on the part of medicine to meet the press half-way and to share in what, after all, is a mutual responsibility, with obligations on both sides. And I might say right here that the press realizes that it has been to blame for a share of the rhubarbs and donnybrooks that have occurred, and still do at times, between medicine and the press.

It's not so long ago that the appearance of a newspaper reporter on the program of a scientific meeting would have been as improbable as the appearance of a strip-tease act.

Some people can recall the time when most scientists, especially those in the medical field, would almost rather face a firing squad than talk to a reporter, let alone listen to one make a public speech. And reporters, and their newspapers, some 20 to 25 years ago were, for the most part, just as bad.

Just as scientists and medical doctors looked upon newsmen as rather shady, inaccurate characters who couldn't be trusted as far as you could toss an X-ray machine, so too did reporters and their newspapers have some bizarre ideas about scientists. They looked upon them as queer birds, caricatured them as absentminded professors who

---

This is from a talk to the 65th annual convention of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States held in Washington, D. C., in November 1958. Frank Carey, AP science writer in Washington, was a Nieman Fellow in 1947.

lived in ivory towers, stroking long grey beards. And, many of the stories about science and medicine were of the screwball variety—kidding the language of science and the methods of science, rather than making a sincere effort to understand and interpret them.

But the scientists had themselves to blame for a lot of this unhappy situation—unhappy because it was depriving the general public of something that was intensely interesting, educational, and even exciting, to say nothing of being potentially beneficial from a public health standpoint. Many scientists did maintain an ivory tower existence, having no patience even with the occasional newsmen who had a legitimate interest in the doings of science and who asked sincere, even though somewhat faltering, questions.

But newspapers gradually learned that science could be handled on a day-by-day basis and treated as straight news, just like any other activity, from politics to religion. And more and more scientists began to realize that more and more reporters could write science news accurately. The rise of an organization known as the National Association of Science Writers has been a key factor in this change. The NASW is dedicated to promoting the accurate reporting of science and medical news.

Incidentally, the growth of the NASW—from some 25 pioneering members in 1934 to well over 150 active newspaper and magazine science writers at present—is an indication of the interest taken by laymen's publications in developing specialists in this field. In addition, the NASW includes in its membership, as associate members, science-writing specialists associated with hospitals, universities and industrial concerns, including pharmaceutical houses.

Yes, much progress has been made during the past 25 years or so, but science, including medicine, and the press still are not exactly lovey-dovey, nor do they constitute a mutual admiration society. There are numerous exceptions, of course. Some doctors and some reporters see completely eye-to-eye on how medical news should be handled, but others don't and there are enough squabbles and misunderstandings to indicate that there's room for improvement on both sides.

But, what are the specific criticisms that some doctors still make of the press?

We often hear the charge that the press is guilty of publicizing premature announcements and overoptimistic claims in the medical field and that the press does not exhibit enough judgment and discrimination in handling such stories.

This should be remembered: The press, in reporting

any such story, is quoting a doctor. And, if he gives his views at a legitimate medical meeting, in a legitimate scientific publication—or, in the case of a doctor being interviewed, if he is at least reasonably well known—we can only assume that his views are proper for publication, regardless of whether one happens to agree with them.

Science reporters do not work in laboratories or operating rooms themselves; therefore we are in no position to censor a doctor's statements as to their validity except in instances where they might run contrary to something we know to have been previously published. In that event, we can—and do—present the contrary viewpoint or evidence.

When the subject matter appears open to challenge, a reporter has an obligation to see whether a responsible authority in the particular field cares to make a comment so that both views can be aired in the same story. And a reporter will do just that.

But, sometimes, we do not get to first base by seeking such comment. We may question a source who takes a dim view of what a given scientist has reported, but he is unwilling to be quoted to that effect. He has a hunch that the first man is off key, but has no evidence to the contrary other than the fact that such and such a development hasn't been reported before. He may even grant that there's always a chance that the first man may be right—so, where does that leave the press.

It doesn't do any good to stew and fret about such things at private medical meetings or in informal conversations with newsmen. If a doctor thinks a researcher is cock-eyed and has made some announcement prematurely, let him call the same newspaper that has published the story. I'm sure he'll find the editor happy to consider running a statement under his name.

Obvious charlatans and quacks are quite another thing. Newspapers are not so dumb. They are pretty experienced in recognizing phonies or the obvious publicity-seeker, whether he is in the medical or any other field.

I agree that carelessness as to facts in a news story can be serious indeed where patients are concerned. And, if a wire service or newspaper incorrectly quotes a source—and therefore gives the wrong impression, such as an unjustified hope—the wire service or newspaper is then the guilty party, and doctors have every right to jump on them.

Certainly, we make mistakes, but so does a doctor sometimes in his work. The difference is, our errors are open for all to see and condemn, just like the left fielder who muffs the long ball with the bases loaded, whereas the human errors of a doctor in diagnosis, and worse, are not always brought out into the open.

Some doctors appear to demand far more accuracy from newsmen than they do from their own colleagues. They'll

dismiss a muffed diagnosis as "the best clinical judgment," but if a science reporter makes a blooper, they're quick to blast him.

The charge is still made today by some doctors that newspapers by and large are interested only in the "sensational." True, there are some instances where a story is juiced up in rather lurid fashion, but nowadays they are pretty isolated. The very large majority of newspapers realize that a medical story need not promise a cure a week from Tuesday in order to be interesting to the public. I could count on the fingers of my hands the stories I have written in the past 15 years reporting or promising "cures" for anything.

Some doctors feel that a newspaper is no place to discuss medical things, that a doctor can tell his patients all they need to know. Newspapers aren't in the business of trying to practice medicine, thus interfering with the field of the doctors. But they know that medicine is news, that people are interested in their health and their ailments and like to read and talk about them. Various surveys have shown that medical news ranks high among the preferences of readers as they read their newspapers or magazines.

And, newspapers contend that in a democracy people have a right to all the information they can get on every possible subject, be it politics or pellagra, labor strife or leukemia, tornadoes or tonsillitis.

Some doctors contend that a physician has enough to do tending his patients without feeling any obligation to help generate or encourage the publication of medical news. But such doctors should remember this: Advances in medical research are depending more and more on public support, either through direct contributions or tax-supported grants-in-aid programs. The day of big support by wealthy philanthropists is pretty well a thing of the past.

Thus, to be a better and better doctor, one needs the advantages of new and better research efforts, and support for these must come largely from the public. And a public that is well-informed about medicine and its possibilities is much more apt to loosen its purse strings in support of research.

While it is true that a doctor may be able to tell his patients all they need to know while they are under his direct care, there are periods when people are not under such direct care, and when the principles of preventive medicine are important. A newspaper or magazine, quoting responsible authorities, can alert people to the danger signals of such ailments as cancer and diabetes, perhaps bring such people to a doctor sooner than otherwise.

Some doctors, even including some of those who are

otherwise co-operative with reporters, are gun-shy about the use of their names in stories, mostly for fear of being branded by their colleagues as publicity seekers, courting advertisement.

But newspapers need to use names in fairness to the reader who wants to know whether what he is reading comes from a reliable and authentic source or whether it is something someone may have just dreamed up. Intelligent doctors would be among the first to howl if newspaper stories on some controversial political issue failed to name the people who were sounding off, yet some of them still think that medical stories can and should be presented anonymously.

Another "beef" by some doctors about newspaper medical stories is that they tend to play up the dramatic phases and sometimes place the emphasis on some point that may have been given only minor consideration by the doctor in making his technical report.

Well, why not? The job of the reporter is to make his story as interesting and readable as he can, and, if there are dramatic or even bizarre angles to the subject matter, he is certainly going to use them. As long as he gets his facts straight—and that is the responsibility he must always keep in mind—he intends to use every trick in his bag to keep the reader interested, to stay nothing of the editor who decides whether his story gets into the paper.

Science reporters are writing for the general public, NOT for scientists, so doctors should appreciate that the news story can not employ the same technique of presentation as the article in a technical journal. And, by the way, articles in technical journals might profit by using attention-holding tricks at the beginning of the article. Science is getting so specialized these days that it must be

tough, for example, for the biologist to know what the physicist is talking about, and vice versa.

In connection with an obligation to get facts straight, newspapers have, it seems to me, an obligation to train more men in the specialized field of science and medicine in these days when science has become so much a part of our daily lives. Some papers have been doing just that, but more remains to be done.

And they don't necessarily have to have Ph.D's on their staff to do so. A good science writer must first of all be a good all around reporter who got his early training chasing fire engines, buttonholing ward bosses at city hall, and covering luncheon meetings of the Kiwanis club. Most of the top science writers in the country today began that way, and it has helped them keep down to earth in their writing.

But the guy who is suddenly drafted from the police beat to cover the penicillin front is going to need help, no matter how keen his news sense may be, and no matter how skilled a journalistic craftsman he is. He will need to get help from his paper by getting the time to bone up on his new field—perhaps even take some courses—and time to develop contacts.

Doctors can also help out by being patient and tolerant with the neophyte, and try to put their scientific jargon into everyday English.

The problem of providing plentiful and accurate medical information for the public is a two-way thing, with obligations falling upon both the doctor and the newsman.

We in the newspaper field have our rascals and irresponsibles, just as you have them in the medical field, and just as they exist in every line of human endeavor. But my strong belief is that they don't last long after they are found out, in the same way that responsible medical organizations seek to weed out their wrong-doers.

# Is The Press Necessary?

By Evans Clinchy

There is an uneasy fear abroad in the journalistic land. Newspapers everywhere are claiming financial anemia. Each day brings fresh reports of some newspaper expiring or being cannibalized before the anxious eyes of the profession. Our audience and the advertising dollar are deserting us to consort with the painted ladies of television and the magazines. There seems all too little doubt that the American newspaper is entering a period of decline in solvency and influence.

It has been persuasively argued that our decline is due mainly to shifts in the economy and to our antiquated technology. Perhaps. Yet the newsmagazines and the *New York Times* face the same economic circumstances. They use the same paleolithic methods of production, and they flourish.

No, the cause lies elsewhere. It may well lie, in fact, in ourselves, in the simple proposition that *as we presently operate, the American press is becoming increasingly expendable*. It may be that what makes us cry crisis is the sure if secret knowledge that we are no longer as necessary to our readers as we imagine ourselves to be.

Surely it would be difficult to argue that American society would suffer an irreparable loss if most of the newspapers in Boston or Los Angeles or countless other papers throughout the country should suddenly disappear from the face of this earth. The population of the suddenly newspaperless areas might for a while be fretful, like an addict suddenly bereft of heroin. Business might suffer. Everyone would miss the ads. But there would be no sense of general outrage because of another simple proposition: that *as we presently operate, the American newspaper is becoming increasingly irrelevant*.

It may well be that we in the newspaper profession, we who should be supremely sensitive to the whims and needs of the broad public, are not fully aware of what is going on in the world we so minutely report. Most of us do seem to be aware that this country during the past 50 years has been experiencing a vast and radical transformation in every conceivable realm of life. Indeed, the transformation is really just beginning. We almost inadvertently write stories and sometimes even editorials about the changes every day—normally editorials noting that things sure were different, and better, in grandma's day. But too few of us seem to have any clear perception of the total

process of change, or at least no perception that leads us to assure our solvency by adjusting ourselves to it.

Let us remind ourselves, in a handful of wholly inadequate sentences, of some of the things that are happening in the world out there. As numberless social scientists and psychologists tell us, we are rapidly ceasing to live in a society that cherishes hard work, thrift, the ambitions of Horatio Alger, militant individualism, economic freedom, social reform, the accumulation of vast and conspicuous personal wealth or enormous power over others.

Today we are becoming instead a nation devoted to consumption rather than production, to the good and supremely comfortable life replete with dishwasher and Volkswagen. We now seek leisure, security, the ever-higher standard of living. We no longer see as much virtue as we once did in beating the other fellow over the head and stealing a nickel from him. We would now prefer that he like us—in fact we are desperate that he like us. We are generally more interested these days in pleasant living, in pleasure itself, rather than in aggressive doing. We are turning from the arena of worldly achievement to the world of the personal, to home, to family, to other people, to the concerns and cultivation of our own psyches.

Nor is it difficult to see why many of these changes in the contemporary scene have come about. Those Americans who are now assuming the dominant position in our society, those among us who are to some degree aware of the world and its troubles, have been battered and conditioned throughout their lives by the revolutionary turbulence of the past 50 years, by two bloody and irrational wars, by the appalling, the magnificent and the incomprehensible achievements of science, by the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews and the 100,000 inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, by the enormous political and economic success of a totalitarian regime in Soviet Russia. We have learned, too, from the explorations of the psychologists and social scientists that we are not by nature either the masters of our outer fates or the captain of our inner souls.

Those among us, perhaps the majority, who have received this same battering by osmosis on a less conscious level are still responding in much the same way—by a withdrawal from the harsh competitive struggles of Victorian scarcity, by a turning to the comforts, the affluences, the bewilderments of the new, revolutionary world. These people, too, have new hopes, new desires, new fears.

The many subtle but powerful forces that have changed all of us have also frightened us both consciously and un-

---

Evans Clinchy of the Hartford *Times* has just completed a Nieman Fellowship.

consciously. They have shaken our easy beliefs in the goodness of man and his world, made us far less eager to take up the ideological cudgels and struggle for the quick liberation of mankind from all evil. Few among us are really sure of anything anymore. We are, almost all of us, lost and disturbed. Those of us who are aware of the values of human life and the facts of nuclear death are gnawed by vague, unquenchable anxieties. The rest of us have drawn our cocoons of apathy even more tightly about us, understandably impervious to the remote, ill-thought, ill-written, impersonal hash of vital news served up by the daily press.

These transformations in all of us, of course, are in no small measure responsible for the obsequious blandness of the American newspaper. We of the press, too, have decided that we want to be liked by everyone. We desire to disturb no man's sleep or bank account, to step on no man's civic or economic toes. We, too, are frightened. And thus we have become little but the dimmest reflection of mediocrity—cautious, timid, and conservative industrialists and department store owners. To borrow a phrase from J. K. Galbraith, it is a case of "the bland leading the bland."

Yet despite the fact that we of the press are so consummately up-to-date in our psychological responses to our times, too many of us are curiously prehistoric in our perception of many other equally important currents in the great social transformation.

We have, all of us, been exposed in the past 50 years not only to war, totalitarianism and the recovery of the unconscious but to many other things, including five decades of deeply introspective psychoanalytical selfknowledge. Perhaps most important of all, more people than ever before in the world's history have been exposed to some kind of organized educational process, much of it genuinely progressive, all of it unprecedentedly broadening. Through this education and through means of communication barely imagined 50 years ago, we have become aware of so many new and old things that we can never begin to comprehend them all.

Our new knowledge has revolutionized the way we bring up our children, the way we look at our government, our society, ourselves and at other peoples throughout the world. We have learned—all of us to greater or lesser degrees—that the United States inhabits only a small portion of the earth and that Western civilization is but one of many legitimate approaches to the business of living in social groups. We have been forced to realize that life includes within its orbit a great deal more than the latest decision on parking meters, who most recently murdered whom, the latest batting averages, the tribal rites of

young ladies allegedly ceasing to be virgins, and the latest ordering of sexual musical chairs in Hollywood.

In short, we have been frightened and immobilized by our times, but many of us have also become a great deal more sophisticated, more knowing, more cynical, if you will, certainly less cocksure and more thoughtful. We accept the machined answers, the glib political solutions less easily, even if our lips are rubbery from the service we pay the American pieties. We have been forced to grow up a little. We are far from being all saints or learned men. Certainly we are not wise. But more and more of us are fast developing a probing curiosity, an almost desperate need to know, to understand what is happening to us in this world we certainly never made and only God knows who did.

Yet 90 per cent of the newspace of the average American newspaper is composed of great, tossed-together heaps of trivia about the new sewers, the stove fire down the street, the arrest of the town's most beloved madame, the DAR meeting and a host of raw, undigested and frantic bulletins on the latest mystifying maneuverings in Washington or Iraq or Moscow.

What we of the American press display when we offer up this often irrelevant, almost always unreadable, daily dish is not the stupidity or worthlessness of the public we claim to serve. We display nothing less than our own disorderly, insecure and often ignorant minds and our professional incompetence. We bore our readers and then complain that they seek passive diversion in television or turn to the attractively packaged and wide-ranging opinions expressed as news in the news magazines.

Our profession has a dual mission before it. If we are to have any press or any public to worry about, we have a mission to intrude the facts about the life and death of the planet into the public mind in the clearest, most concise, most vivid, most penetrating, most interpretive form possible. We must present the news from every corner of the country and the world, telling our readers what the people in Little Rock and Afghanistan are thinking and feeling, why non-American people distrust or like us, what they hope and fear and dream. And we cannot do this by scattering bits and pieces of unintelligible wire copy among the brassiere ads. We must somehow bring it all together, sum it up, explain it boldly and on Page One.

We have a mission, too, to keep ourselves in business by catching up with our public—perhaps even, heaven help us, leading our public—in the myriad new fields to which the public interest is increasingly turning and which we presently tend to ignore.

And all of these myriad new fields, what are they? The most obviously undiscovered countries are education, science, the arts, business and society itself.

Our schools and colleges are rapidly becoming one of the nation's major, billion dollar industries, justly consuming an ever increasing share of the national income. As more and more leisure is placed in the reluctant hands of the American public, more and more people will be demanding more and more knowledge. The need for education, in fact, progresses geometrically. A master's degree is now well nigh worthless in many fields, and four years of college counts for little more than grammar school training in the past century. Quite ordinary people violently debate the relative merits of fairly abstruse educational philosophies and worry continually about what their children are being taught—or not taught. Yet few newspapers are educated enough to maintain full time education reporters. We do not provide our public with even the basic knowledge about what is going on in the schools.

What, for instance, is the heated debate between the progressivist and the traditionalist really all about? What are the schools in the local community actually teaching? What should they teach and in what order of priority? And how should these subjects be taught? (Discussions, please, not editorials.)

What is the political set-up, the power structure, of the local and state educational scenes? Who actually decides what is going to happen in the schools? How does one get to be a teacher? What is it like to be a teacher? Is it a hard job or an easy one?

What standards does the local system use for academic achievement? How are students graded? What does the system hope to accomplish for its students outside of academic studies? What is daily life in the classroom like? How does it feel to be a student in a large—or a small—high school?

Similarly, we live in an age when our entire material civilization and many of our written and unwritten rules of life are based upon science or its unruly handmaiden, technology. An ever-growing portion of our population is either scientifically or technologically trained in everything from astro-physics to high fidelity. Yet too many newspapers limit their scientific coverage to advice for the local hypochondriac or the unblushing news that we are "ahead" of the Russians because the 8,500 pounds in orbit of the Atlas satellite exceeded the 9,600 pounds in orbit of Sputnik III.

Too few newspapers are telling the public, for instance, that the entire complexion of medicine is changing, that the future battles against disease will be increasingly fought on a molecular level in the bio-chemical laboratories. Or the effects that this will have on local medicine.

Or just when atomic power will or will not begin to affect local industries and the local consumer of electricity. Or what effects automation and computer systems are having and will have on local business and industry—just

how many companies now are or will soon be using machines to do the work of people. And what the people and the labor unions are going to do.

Or what the coming changes will be in transportation—how soon, for instance, automobiles on super-highways will be electronically controlled. Or what is being done locally about water pollution, the dropping water table, conservation in general, the use and abuse of antibiotics, smog, the dirty, sooty cities, new methods of preparing food or the inadequacies and inadequacies of the local hospitals.

Again, Americans now spend more money on concert-going than on baseball, surely a hint that some kind of revolution in America's cultural life is occurring. Classical recording and high fidelity are now major industries. The theater is finally escaping the death grip of Broadway economics by skipping off-Broadway, also by reviving itself in the colleges and little theaters. Movies are now fewer in number but infinitely better than ever before. The art museums are beginning to realize that they can be more than sepulchral shrines. The class paperbacks have enormously increased the availability of stimulating literature—*The Organization Man* and *The Lonely Crowd* have sold more than 300,000 copies each in their Anchor editions. Magazines such as *American Heritage* and *Horizon* have found audiences welcoming their middling highbrow fare. We simply are no longer the raw-knuckled, raw-brained bumpkin that the world—perhaps because the world reads American newspapers—still sees us to be.

Why should not the average American newspaper take the arts seriously and seriously inform the public about what is going on in schools, colleges, concert halls, theaters and bookstalls all over the country? And why not tell the audience out there what the actual rather than the professed attitude of the local community towards the arts is? How much money, for instance, the community actually devotes toward supporting the arts. Or interviews with leading businessmen and industrialists giving them an opportunity to state clearly and fairly what they conceive the place of the arts—if any—in the community to be. Or discussions about advisability of tax support for the arts. A question always worth asking a businessman is this: if it came to having a local symphony with some measure of tax support or not having a symphony at all, which side would you be on?

And why should not the average newspaper print reasonably intelligent, unfettered criticism of local artistic endeavors and also of the films that turn up at the local bijous. We rarely have anything to fear but our fear itself. Even advertisers of the Hollywood ilk become surprisingly meek if you threaten to throw their ads out of the paper.

It is more than possible, too, that the American public is eager for some honest reporting about business. Not

just the brocaded publicity on who has been promoted, not just platitudes about the wisdom of the city fathers in pushing urban renewal. But perhaps stories about what the battle for the presidency of the bank was all about and what Mr. Megabucks' assumption of the post is likely to mean for the little fellow seeking a loan. Or what urban renewal might do to help the stark economic facts of downtown business life.

Or stories about the exact status of industry and business—the healthy concerns, the marginal ones, the shifts in types of industry in the city, the needs for labor and the availability of the proper kind of labor. Or stories about the discount houses and their effects on the more normal retail outlets. Or about sharp business practices and how the consumer can avoid being done in. Or the ins and outs of installment buying and how much the easy installments add up to. Or what it is like to be an American business man in the local community—what kind of personality is best suited for the kind of life he must lead, how many hours he works, how one rises to the top o' the heap. Or what local companies are doing about expense accounts and high executive income taxes.

The American public might well also be ready for some penetrating studies about how our various individual communities are set up and how they operate, just whose royal seal must be placed upon a civic project for it to become feasible, or just what forces and personages in the community determine social status, country club memberships, political popularity or the availability of Negro housing.

Perhaps we are also ready for a picture of what the local community means when it calls a man successful—what does his position have to be, how much must he earn, what are the signs of success, how big the house, what make of car, what club membership (and does his club admit non-Anglo Saxons and non-Christians to its ranks)?

Trendex ratings might well plummet if we could see on the woman's pages not just recipes and descriptions of what the manufacturers think women should be and do but stories about actual women living at various social and economic levels of the community—how they spend their time and money, where and what they would like to buy, whether they feel wanted or useless in this society of ours.

Yet it is probable that if these few sure-fire ways to make the American press necessary were presented as serious suggestions to the average newspaper editor, the suggestion would be greeted with hoots of outrage and suspicion. And why? Because many of these pitifully exploratory thoughts run counter to the attitude that is perhaps the least noticed yet the greatest failure of the American press as a whole—our attitude towards the discussion and criticism of this country's most cherished values.

As Mr. Bruce Grant of Australia's *Melbourne Age* has pointed out in a recent issue of *Nieman Reports*, there is less difference between the press in Western society and that in the Soviet Union on this score than we would like to imagine.

After describing the amount of routine "technical or mechanical" criticism that appears in both presses, Mr. Grant asks the fundamental question: "Just how different is the role of the newspaper in Western society?"

His answer is given in terms of the Australian press, but it applies equally to the newspapers of the United States. "I submit," he says, "that newspapers here do just the same (as newspapers in the Soviet Union): They criticize performance, practice, but they do not question the basic premises of their society."

In this country we not only refuse to question, we rarely even speculate. We merely record and play back the commonly held prejudices of what we imagine to be the public at large. We, like the Soviet press, are more intent on being on the right side than on being right or true to the facts. And we thus achieve little more than a further re-inforcement of the public mediocrity that we privately and hypocritically deplore.

We stand staunchly, for instance, by the side of free enterprise capitalism, but most of us would not dare to question big industry, the welfare corporations, social security, welfare grants, fair trade laws, the regulatory commissions, the anti-trust laws, government subsidy of the airlines and the shipping industry, federal labor laws, federal aid to farmers or the host of other facts of American life that long ago marked the obsolescence of the free economy here.

Except in the South, which has its private reasons, there is little discussion, either pro or con, of the true merits of representative democracy—even though the shortcomings of the system daily fill our news columns. We simply accept with little question the general faiths, giving them coverage in our cramped news space and support on our Victorian editorial pages.

How many newspapers regularly speculate on the true value and function of the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club, or the Community Chest? Or on the various churches and, indeed, on the place or lack of place of religion in contemporary America. Or on the present and future situations of the American family—is it still necessary or should it be radically altered? Or on the facts about the sexual mores of the country rather than always stressing the conventional hopes of the pious?

Who is there to examine the economic and civic policies of the inner group that yields the dominant influence in almost every American city? Most publishers and too many editors are not interested in this sort of questioning be-

cause they have been deliberately courted and won by these powers interested in remaining powerful. Newspapers have become an indispensable cog in the power structure of "things as they are."

As newspapermen, we too often delude ourselves with the myths we concoct and the myths we perpetuate. We too often do not allow ourselves to say what we know to be true. We are frightened of ideas, distrustful of thought. It is small wonder that few people buy newspapers anymore for the expression of candid views or to discover what the bold and original minds of the land are thinking.

The ultimate question that faces the American press, then, is this: is it possible in these days of stress and anxiety

for the American newspaper to draw back just a little, to re-examine itself and its audience, to find a new sense of excitement in reporting and commenting on the exploding world and public that is being born around us? Might we even, perhaps, begin to realize that our job is not just to give the public what it wants but to print what the public may well want if it is given the opportunity to taste it, smell it, experience it in its daily newspapers?

Let us hope—let us at least hope—that we can discover a more relevant job for the newspaper to perform. This is our best, and perhaps our only, chance for surviving the century as a useful, a necessary and therefore a solvent institution.

### Nieman Fellows

(Continued from page 2)

John R. Murphy, 25, Atlanta correspondent of the Macon *Telegraph*.

Native of Georgia and graduate of Mercer University, he began newspaper work with the Macon *Telegraph* in 1952 and has been their State capital correspondent since 1955.

He will study state government and regional problems.

Ralph M. Otwell, 32, assistant city editor, Chicago *Sun-Times*.

Native of Arkansas, he is a graduate of Northwestern University. After earlier newspaper work in Arkansas, he served in the Korean War and was news editor of the *Pacific Stars and Stripes*. He has been with the *Sun-Times* since 1953, assistant city editor since 1956.

He will study economics and urban problems.

Robert K. Plumb, 37, science reporter, New York *Times*.

Born in Kansas, he was graduated at the University of Kansas. He has been for 12 years on the science reporting staff of the *Times*.

He will study in the sciences.

Edmund J. Rooney, Jr., 34, Chicago *Daily News* reporter.

Born in Chicago, he studied at DePaul and Loyola Universities. He began as a copy boy on the Chicago *Sun* at 18. Later he worked on a Chicago neighborhood newspaper and the City News bureau before joining the *Daily News* in 1951 where his work has ranged from police news to major investigations including a part in the investigation of State Auditor Orville Hodge that won the paper the Pulitzer award for public service in 1957.

He will study state and local government.

John G. Samson, 37, Associated Press reporter in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Born in Providence, he joined the Air Force in 1942, had four years of combat service in China under Gen. Chennault, then entered the University of New Mexico, to

graduate in 1949. He returned to Asia in civil aviation for several years, and worked for the United Press in Korea before joining the AP.

He will study the Far East to prepare for correspondent service there.

The associates are:

Howard J. Sochurek, 34, *Time-Life* photographer, Moscow bureau, *Life Magazine*.

For nine years he has been on global assignments, doing photographic essays in Algeria, the Middle East, Africa, Indo-China, and for more than a year in Russia. Native of Milwaukee, Sochurek was a staff photographer for the Milwaukee *Journal* for three years after army service interrupted college studies at Princeton. Sochurek is appointed a research associate without stipend for Russian studies.

V. V. Eswaran, 38, parliamentary correspondent, *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, India.

He started newspaper work 17 years ago with the *Statesman* of New Delhi. In 1945 he joined the *Hindustan Times* and since 1950 has covered national politics, and reported developments in other Southeast Asian countries.

He will study government and economics.

Satoshi Otani, 29, foreign affairs reporter, *Sankei Shimbun*, Tokyo, Japan.

A graduate of Tokyo College of Foreign Languages, he joined the staff of *Sankei Shimbun* in 1954 as a reporter, is now chief editor of their foreign news section.

He will concentrate on Russian studies.

Shan Shen, 34, city editor, *China News*, Taipei, Taiwan.

Born in China, he was graduated at St. John's University in Shanghai. He began working for the United Press in Shanghai in 1947, while still a student. He reported the civil war that drove the Nationalists from China to Taiwan and in 1950 joined the new *China News* in Taipei to become its city editor.

## NIEMAN NOTES

1939

Twenty years after completing their own Nieman Fellowships, Edwin A. Lahey and Louis M. Lyons served together as members of the selecting committee for Nieman Fellowships this May. Interviews were scheduled a week earlier than usual to avoid conflicting with the wedding of Lahey's younger daughter, Judith, May 22nd.

Lahey then went to Cuba for the Knight papers to see how Castro was doing. Lyons went to Providence to speak at the commencement of the Rhode Island College of Education and receive their honorary degree of doctor of education.

Linda Shaw Clark, daughter of the late John McLane Clark and Rhoda Clark, was married January 28 to Thomas Wight Davis at Syracuse University.

1941

Vance Johnson became director of public relations for the Chicago *Daily News* on May 28. He was vice-president of Crowell-Collier Publishing Company until it liquidated its magazines two years ago. He was in public relations then with the Chrysler Corporation. Johnson started newspaper work with the Amarillo (Tex.) *News*, became its managing editor, then moved to Washington as correspondent of the Chicago *Sun* and later started a Washington bureau, with Carroll Kilpatrick, for the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

1942

Kenneth N. Stewart is taking a sabbatical leave as professor of journalism at University of Michigan to spend next year at Stanford as research associate at their Institute for Communications Research.

Prof. Stewart acted as consultant for a special radio series "News in 20th Century America" produced this spring by the University of Michigan station, WUOM-fm, for distribution to some 50 stations through the network of the National Educational Television and Radio Center.

1946

Frank K. Kelly reports that the Kellys will soon be starting off in a covered

wagon for the West, where the Fund for the Republic, of which he is vice-president, is to take up new quarters in Santa Barbara, California.

1949

David B. Dreiman has entered the children's book field, as president of the New York publishing firm of The Platt & Munk Co. Inc. He had been for several years a consultant to the Ford Foundation and completed a study for them of the history of educational television.

1950

Murrey Marder, European correspondent of the Washington *Post* covered the Geneva Conference, after accompanying Prime Minister MacMillan to Moscow.

Afred A. Knopf announces for October publication a book by Clark Mollenhoff, *Tentacles of Terror*. Its subtitle is "The Teamsters Defy the Government." Sen. John J. McClellan has written the introduction. Knopf says of the book:

"This book is as important for our day as *The Shame of the Cities* was for Lincoln Steffens' day. Like Steffens, Mollenhoff is a great investigating reporter and the winner of many awards."

1953

William Gordon, returned from a year in Africa on a Reid Fellowship, began a season of lecturing with two talks to Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

Calvin Mayne of the Rochester *Times-Union* editorial page, is spending a month in Rennes, France, this summer, working on the French paper as part of an editorial exchange. He's writing in French and spent his evenings this spring boning up on it. The Maynes had a third daughter, Susan, born April 15.

Mayne received the Leroy E. Snyder Memorial Award from the Chamber of Commerce in Rochester in May, "in recognition of outstanding community service."

Watson S. Sims, New Delhi correspondent of the Associated Press, covered the escape of the Tibetan Dalai Lama to India and the ensuing controversy between China and India over it.

1954

Charles L. Eberhardt became director of the University of Chicago Foundations Office, April 1. He had been chief Washington correspondent of the Voice of America.

1955

William Woestendiek, editorial director of *Newsday*, was elected a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at its April meeting.

Arch Parsons is taking a leave of absence from the New York *Herald Tribune* to go to Nigeria for a period of six to nine months to prepare a handbook for the use of administrative personnel as Nigeria sets up its independent government.

1957

Robert F. Campbell was appointed editorial page editor of the Winston-Salem *Journal* and *Sentinel* in May when the retirement of W. K. Hoyt as publisher caused a realignment of executives. Campbell had been writing editorials. He has a staff of five to put out morning, evening and Sunday editorial pages.

The National Editorial Association awarded the top prize for newspaper editorials to John Obert, editor of the *Park Region Echo*, Alexandria, Minnesota.

William Worthy lost his case against the State Department for refusing him a passport. The United States Court of Appeals June 9 upheld the State Department's right to restrict travel to areas they consider trouble spots. Bill went to China without State Department permission and he wouldn't promise not to do it again. It was this refusal that licked him on his appeal.

Later the same week as the court decision, Worthy was awarded a Ford Foundation grant to pursue studies of Africa at Boston University for nine months.

1958

In May Stanley Karnow was shifted from the North African bureau of *Time-Life* at Rabat to their Hongkong bureau. His final activity in Africa was to marry Annette Andrew who was USIS press officer in Algiers. Their address: 607 Great China House, 8/a Queen's Road Central, Hong Kong.

A son, Thomas Grey Wicker, Jr., was born to the Tom Wickers in Winston-Salem on Easter Sunday, their second child.

1959

Perry Morgan became editor of the editorial page of the Norfolk *Ledger-Dispatch* in May. He had been associate editor of the Charlotte *News*, which was sold to the Knight papers while he was on his Nieman Fellowship.

Phil Johnson joined the staff of the Miami *Herald* in May. He had been on the New Orleans *Item*, which was merged with the *Times-Picayune* and *States* while he was on a Nieman Fellowship.

*London Times*, May 18

## A Newspaper That Can "Talk"

From our Tokyo correspondent

The Japanese reader of the future may not even bother to scan his newspaper or magazine. Merely by tearing off a page and feeding it into a machine he will be able to listen to the exchange of vituperation in a Diet debate or the explosion and the roar of the first Japanese rocket ship on its inaugural journey to the moon. Such a machine was put on sale commercially at the beginning of the month. For the time being at least, the only thing preventing the Japanese from becoming a nation of illiterates is its prohibitive price.

The Synchroreader, as this latest development in electronics is called, is the result of four years' research by Professor Yasushi Yoshino, of Tokyo Industrial College. He got the idea when watching a newsreel. The sound track failed, and as the pictures went on flashing across the screen his eyes dropped to the newspaper on his knees for a key to their meaning. How convenient, he thought, if the photographs in a newspaper could be given "voice." The outcome of this inspiration was the first "talking" newspaper, which was exhibited at the Brussels Fair last year. Now it is being produced at the rate of 3,000 a month by the Canon Camera Company, and patents have been taken out in several European countries. Some 10,000 orders were received even before it was advertised for sale.

### Conference

From Williamsburg, Va., comes a June "Greeting from a three-Nieman reunion" signed by Dorothy and Irving Dilliard (1939); Georgia and Clark Mollenhoff (1950) and Mary and Don Gonzales (1950). The occasion was Colonial Williamsburg's International Assembly, a conference on American life for foreign students completing studies in this country. Dilliard of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* and Mollenhoff of the Cowles papers led conference discussions. Gonzales is director of public relations at Colonial Williamsburg. The annual conference is directed by Thomas Schlesinger.

### Magnetized Paper

The Synchoreader differs from the conventional tape recorder in that sound waves are registered on a magnetized sheet of paper. The basic material is, however, the same. The Syncrosheet is coated with a film of black powdered gravure ink containing iron dust by a process similar to photogravure. To record a text or sound, the sheet is placed under a transparent plate which holds it in position, on the top of a box-shaped machine about 12 in. by 18 in., and slightly bulkier than an office typewriter.

The sheet to be recorded remains stationary, and the head of the recording arm, comparable with the turntable of a gramophone, moves in a circular motion under the sheet. The instrument carries a selector, so that, for instance, if a newspaper or a page from a magazine which has been recorded on the back carries a set of photographs each bearing a number, the "reader" can select the commentary accompanying that number merely by pressing the appropriate button.

The machine is still very expensive—it now sells for 135,000 yen, the price of two television sets. But mass production will reduce the price substantially. The Syncrosheet, on the other hand, is extremely cheap, and costs about 10 yen. Magnetic tape for an hour's recording costs about 1,000 yen; the Syncrosheets for the same period cost only 60 yen.

Copies can be readily taken from the master sheet with an accessory which looks just like a mangle. The master sheet is covered with the copy sheet, and the recording is transferred in the time it takes to run through the rollers. As many as 10,000 copies can be made by this device from one original, and each sheet can be played about 2,000 times. This is one of the great advantages of the Synchoreader over a conventional tape recorder. Another is that recordings, being in sheet form, can be filed and handled far more easily. The business man of the future needs only to dictate a letter to a client through the machine on to specially treated air mail paper and post it in the ordinary way.

### Royal Wedding Recorded

To publicize the invention, the *Asahi Science Monthly* printed 10,000 copies of its May number which carries a page with three numbered photographs—Niagara Falls, Big Ben, and the Houses of Parliament, with commentary on the reverse. It invited readers to come to any of its five main offices to hear the explanations of the commentator.

The *Asahi Shimbun* also printed experimentally, on the back of a newspaper photograph of the wedding of the Crown Prince, the commentary on the ceremony and the music played by the Imperial Court orchestra.

The quality of the sound is not yet as good as a tape recorder; but improvements will soon make faithful reproduction possible. A "talking" newspaper is not, therefore, a dream of the future, but, economically, a practical proposition. It is cheap to produce and the sound coating can be printed on an ordinary rotary press.

Because of the high cost, the Synchoreader initially will only be within the reach of public institutions, hospitals, schools, and business firms, although Professor Yoshino had in mind that university students and scholars would find it invaluable to record educational broadcasts. The machine offers a substitute for Braille, and can be used by doctors in forwarding an oral diagnosis with X-ray pictures to consultants abroad. A large model has already been constructed for the display of an entire newspaper in restaurants, station lobbies, or public halls.

## A. H. Raskin, Reporter

By His City Editor

Contrary to general belief, Abe Raskin was not born with a telephone receiver at his ear. But there is abundant evidence that this tall, winsome, smiling man has had one there most of the time since. The weightiest stories he has dug up in the quarter-century since he joined the *Times* staff on March 19, 1934.

Abraham Henry Raskin was born in Edmonton, Alberta, on April 26, 1911. His father was a pioneer fur trader in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. When Abe was 2, his family moved to Seattle where they lived for nine years. At the age of 11 he spent a year in Berlin while his father was in Russia negotiating fur contracts. Since his return he has lived in New York.

At City College Abe was a Big Wheel: editor of the college newspaper, the yearbook, the literary magazine; secretary of the Student-Faculty Discipline Committee; president of the senior class. But even big wheels found it hard to get jobs in 1931, the year of his graduation. Abe was delighted to stay on as a postgraduate student for two years, subsisting on the \$12 a week he got as *Times* college correspondent and the \$3 additional he made covering Sunday sermons.

A story he wrote about Dr. Frederick B. Robinson, president of City College, wrathfully descending with his furled umbrella on a group of students demonstrating against military training did not endear him to the president or faculty, but it did to the *Times*, which liked honest, fearless reporting then as it does now. When the introduction of the five-day week opened a job on the city staff, Abe got it. He began as a general assignment man, filled in two days a week on the Board of Education beat; started covering relief when mass unemployment brought a rash of new agencies into being, and from that gradually moved into labor as the jobless went back to work.

Perhaps the first inkling to the staff that a top-notch man had joined it came when Abe, after a week or more of hard digging, broke a story about the difficulties

that foreign countries were having with New York unions in building and operating their pavilions at the New York World's Fair. The story attracted international attention and helped to ameliorate a situation that was threatening the success of the fair.

In 1940, Abe was covering the convention of the American Federation of Labor in New Orleans when he came into the news himself. He was sitting in the bar of the Hotel Roosevelt, having a friendly drink with Dave Dubinsky and his daughter, Jean, when Joe Fay—later to serve time in Sing Sing but then a power in the building trades—attacked Dubinsky with his fists for having sponsored an antiracketeering resolution at the convention.

Abe chivalrously shielded the lady from the knuckles of Fay's henchman. As soon as he could he extricated her and himself from the melee and dashed for Western Union. His exclusive Page 1 story about the clash got nation-wide play and won him the lasting enmity of the most unsavory elements of organized labor. They have tried threats and bribes on Abe without avail. Only a few years ago he scornfully rejected an offer of \$1,000 a month to be "consultant" to a labor leader, later unmasked by the McClellan committee as having underworld ties.

Abe's devotion to the news before all else resulted in delaying the reuniting of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. for thirteen years. Abe, himself an ardent believer in labor unity, found out not long after Pearl Harbor that John L. Lewis and Big Bill Hutcheson were secretly negotiating a pact to reunite the two rival groups. Abe printed the story and the reactions were so violent that Bill Green and Phil Murray, titular heads of the two, backed hastily away from the projected settlement.

In September, 1942, Abe entered the Army. He served as an adviser to Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, on labor problems affecting war production and was instrumental in promoting better understanding between organized labor and the armed forces. Abe was pilloried by Westbrook Pegler as the master mind behind the forcible ousting of Sewell Avery from his Montgomery Ward office when the army took over the plant, but actually his connection with it was remote.

Discharged in 1945 with the rank of lieutenant colonel, Abe received the Distinguished Service Medal. He has been called back into public service several times since—as consultant to the President's Committee on Universal Training in 1947; as consultant to the Scientific and Research Board of the National Military Establishment in 1950; as Acting Director of Industrial Relations for the Defense Department in 1951.

Soon after his return to the *Times* from war service, Abe went to City Hall on a story. There he met two other *Times* reporters recently returned from military service, Marshall Newton and Kenneth Campbell. Billy Donoghue, press secretary to Mayor O'Dwyer, recalled the old newspaper gag about the Beacon Hill butler who announced to his master: "Three reporters and a gentleman from the *Transcript*." With a grin, Bill ushered in to the Mayor: "A bunch of reporters and three colonels from the *Times*."

Abe is a prodigious worker. He bears one of the hallmarks of a true pro—he gives the same care and attention to a D head that he does to a Page 1 exclusive, of which he produces a goodly number. In fact, I would be willing to guess that in the last ten years Abe has produced more good stories than any other member of the local staff. He does it by working twenty-four hours a day. His connections are so good that he has been awakened out of a sound sleep to relay to the office an outstanding beat.

Most of his social life is spent with persons who share his interests in the fields of labor, economics and government. On the rare occasions when he can be inveigled into a bridge game he plays surprisingly well; he once, years ago, covered a national championship bridge tournament in Asbury Park for the *Times*.

In the highly competitive newspaper business it is rare indeed to find a man who dominates a whole area to the extent that Abe does. But Abe's luminous intelligence, unchallenged integrity and fierce drive for news have won him the ungrudging admiration of colleagues and competitors. Perhaps the finest tribute to his quality, however, comes from the men on the copy desk. "Reading Abe's copy," they say, "is like eating ice cream." —Frank S. Adams, *Times Talk*, April.

## On the Reporter's Privilege

Following the contempt conviction of Marie Torre for refusing, as a witness in a civil case, to disclose the source of certain information she had published in her newspaper column, a number of bills intended to establish the "reporter's privilege" have been introduced into both the Congress and the New York Legislature. These would afford newspaper and other reporters a statutory right to decline to identify in court, grand jury or legislative investigatory proceedings the source from whom they had obtained published information.

The American Civil Liberties Union is opposed to any attempt to deal with this issue, at least at the present time, by legislation; specifically it is opposed to all the bills of this character which it has examined. The ACLU believes that important civil liberties questions are raised by cases like that of Marie Torre, but it believes that they involve a conflict of principle which cannot be resolved by any form of legislation so far proposed. On one hand there is the vital public right, implied by the First Amendment, to the freest and fullest flow of public information—and it is well known that much of this information becomes available only because the sources are confident that their identities will not be disclosed. On the other hand, there is the vital public and private right to the unhampered administration of justice, including—under one of the most firmly established of legal principles—the right of a litigant or defendant to compel the production of relevant testimony.

To compel a reporter to disclose the identity of sources to whom he has promised anonymity would weaken the effectiveness of one of the principal tools which he employs in his task of keeping the public informed. To grant him an absolute privilege, in all cases, to withhold the identity of his sources will lead to instances (fortunately, in practice instances of the kind have been very rare, indeed) in which the reporter, if for no other reason than his own convenience, can defeat a public or private right of access to due process.

This is the basic issue of principle in-

volved. None of the bills under consideration resolves it. Like the similar statutes already adopted in thirteen states, all purport to establish an absolute privilege. (Some include exceptions which will be noted below.) This is tantamount to saying that the public interest, under the First Amendment in a free flow of information shall be paramount to the public interest in due process in all cases where the two come in conflict. The ACLU, as an organization devoted to civil liberties, which of course include both freedom of speech and access to due process, cannot subscribe to this, and will oppose all legislation purporting to establish an absolute privilege. Neither can it subscribe to the proposition that the public interest in a reporter's ability to protect his sources must in all cases be subordinated to a litigant's, or a prosecutor's or an investigator's desire to compel testimony. It believes, in short, in the value of both principles, but it does not believe that it is possible to combine them into a common formula by legislative action.

Attempts have been made to do this. There have been efforts to draft legislation which would establish only a qualified privilege, operable only in certain types of cases or when the identity of a source of only certain types of information was in question, or only under specified conditions. We believe none of these attempts has been successful, because all leave the basic issue of principle still open. A case in point may be found in the Keating bill, introduced into the United States Senate, and the Dorn bill, introduced into the House. While they would generally establish an absolute privilege, they would qualify it by excepting instances in which "disclosure is necessary in the interests of national security." There is in principle no more reason for excepting cases in the interests of national security than of excepting (as is now the situation) those involving the interests of the administration of justice. Perhaps there is even less; for it is precisely in cases where the "interests of national security" can be claimed by investigators or prosecutors that the public's right to know—and right to information obtainable only by the reporter's pledge of

anonymity to his source—is most urgent.

A final difficulty with legislative action in this field is that of accurate drafting. Even if the issue of principle could be satisfactorily resolved, there would remain large troubles of definition—who is a "reporter," a "source" or a publisher," what constitutes "in the interests of national security," "publication," and so on. Most of the proposed or enacted statutes seem dangerously loose in this respect; none of the statutes has yet been tested for constitutionality, and the survival of such a test may be doubtful. It may be noted that few if any cases which have under them in those states which have such enactments; and it is impossible to discover that they have had any measurable effect on either the free flow of information or the administration of justice. This confirms the ACLU's belief that the legislative approach in this field is neither necessary nor at the present time desirable.

Statement of American Civil Liberties Union, March 2.

## Other Freedoms, Too

We stand second to none in defending freedom of the press, but there are other freedoms, as the Supreme Court acknowledged the other day, that are equally as important. In fact, press freedom is usually called the guardian of all the rest.

So while we sympathize with Miss Marie Torre of the *New York Herald Tribune*, we do think the hue and cry of some of our colleagues about press freedoms is misplaced.

The TV-radio columnist wrote a story about Miss Judy Garland in which she quoted an unidentified "network executive" at the Columbia Broadcasting System as saying Miss Garland possessed "an inferiority complex," wouldn't make up her mind about anything and that she was "terribly fat." Miss Garland promptly sued C.B.S. for more than \$1 million, charging not only breach of contract but libel by the unnamed "network executive."

In pre-trial examinations, Miss Garland's lawyer asked C.B.S. officials who had said that about Miss Garland and C.B.S. replied that so far as they could learn no one had. Miss Torre was asked to name the person who had made the

remarks, and she refused to say, pleading that a compulsory disclosure of a confidential source would affect freedom of the press.

That, plainly, is nonsense. Freedom of the press guarantees only a right to print matter; it is no guarantee that one may not have to answer for what is printed.

And where it concerns justice in the courts, it seems to us that there neither is

—nor ought to be—any press freedom involved at all. What is involved is the right of a citizen to require other citizens to testify in his behalf in court.

People who work for newspapers are as answerable to that requirement as any other person. And newspapers will not suffer because of it. But justice could suffer greatly without it.—*Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 16, 1958.

## We Print 1,000 Times As Many Items Of ‘Good’ News About Young People As We Do In Reporting Delinquency.

In our Public Opinion column the other day, a reader took us to task for “headlining” news about juvenile delinquency, and urged us to feature news about more constructive activities of our young people.

Such a suggestion is made from time to time, in private and in public, and it is about time for all readers of the *Herald Statesman* to give a good close look to this subject, and to come to a sensible decision for themselves.

We would say that—in an average issue of the *Herald Statesman*—the “good” and “constructive” news about Yonkers young people, the reports of their activities which make them and all of us proud, exceeds that of the “bad apples”—the juvenile delinquents—by about one thousand to one. In other words, hundreds upon hundreds upon hundreds of “constructive” news items about our youth are published regularly, while only inches are devoted to those who get into trouble.

It is important for each reader to set himself straight about this—and to arrive at the truth by undertaking a “do-it-yourself” project.

All it requires is a copy of any *Herald Statesman* and a ruler. You measure the so-called “bad” news, and compare the totals, either by inches or headlines, or number of items.

Of course, there are the “bad apples”—the young hoodlums who beat up children after a school dance, and who make news by the manner and method by which they virtually escape punishment in the courts.

There are the lame-brains who throw stones at trains or who steal cars or who get into trouble some other way, by burglary or traffic violation or perverted fun that turns into felony.

But these are the fairly limited number, the one or two per cent of whom our society is ashamed. It is vital we know what they are doing. Without the full story we would be ignorant of the truth, of the full facts.

Of what is the so-called “good” news composed?

It includes the many columns we print regularly about our public, parochial and private schools—from preschool and kindergarten through the colleges.

It would include the columns on Boy Scouts, the news of their activities, their plans and hopes, their achievements, their honors and good deeds. Similar items are printed of scores of other youth organizations.

We regularly provide the news of Yonkers young people in schools, churches and their organizations; of youth in recreation and in sports. Hundreds of columns a year are devoted to what our boys and girls are doing in sports and kindred activities.

Within the last few days we carried a leading editorial commenting about our young people and their important participation in two community fund drives.

The day before that we were commenting editorially about the Police Athletic League, one of our foremost young people projects.

We tell the developing stories of many groups—the youth musical organizations, for example, and the drama units. We print about the bands and orchestras, the soloists and the dancers.

And we report frequently and fully what such big and active groups as the Junior Red Cross are doing.

We have special and very elaborate news about the schools—from the Board of Education, from each of the schools, from the Parent-Teacher Associations and from various other groups in and with the education system.

Surely we do not have to point out our picture-story serial about how Yonkers boys and girls are taught, a series that ran daily for six weeks and that totaled at least 360 columns of news space within that period.

And then there is the news of the Science Fairs—both the Yonkers Science Fair in March and the Westchester Science Fair in April.

To each of these we devoted dozens upon dozens of columns of news and picture space. All of these told of the “good news” about our boys and girls—just about the best kind there is.

What are we inclined to wonder about is this: Do the people who complain that the *Herald Statesman* never reports or headlines “good” news about Yonkers young people—do they read only the “bad” news, and do they skip the “good”?

Or is it that only the trifling amount of “bad” news makes such an impression upon them that they forget quickly the mountainous amount of “good” and “constructive” news about Yonkers young people?

There's one thing about a newspaper—each reader finds in it just about what he wants, as little or as much of news, as little or as much of pictures as he desires, as little or as much of sheer entertainment.

This is as it should be. But for the person who takes his fill of what he wants, there is an additional obligation—at least before he says we didn't print it—to glance over what he has skipped and make sure that the complaint is valid and will hold water.

In the case of the *Herald Statesman's* “good” news about young people, we believe any reader is in a position to settle the matter for himself—on any day, or in any week, or for any year.

We have said the ratio is about 1,000 inches of “good” news to one inch of so-called “bad.” That is a very conservative estimate. The ratio is really larger than that.

*Yonkers Herald Statesman*, May 11.

## High Tension

By Louis M. Lyons

HIGH TENSION. By Hugh Baillie. Harper & Bros. N. Y. 300 pp. \$4.50.

"High Tension" describes this book and its author's life with the news. It is an intimate companion to *Deadline Every Minute*, the 50-year history of the United Press, brought out in 1957. For 40 of those 50 years Hugh Baillie was a spark plug of the United Press and half that time its driving rod, as general manager. The picture on the back cover of Hugh Baillie with jutting jaw and close cropped hair, in open-necked shirt, with the tough appraising eye of a head football coach, might well be the aggressive personality of the news service with which his life was wrapped up.

Now at 68, Baillie rejoices in the excitement of his early days as police reporter in Los Angeles and all the excitement he has enjoyed since then. Dynamic is the word for Baillie. His life has been a straight line since the raw days in Los Angeles in 1910, when he found it expedient to carry a gun while he dealt with the characters who turned up in the news.

He has lost none of his touch as a dramatic reporter. This is a vivid story. It contains many a chapter worth retelling, starting with the trial of Clarence Darrow in 1912, charged with jury-fixing in the case of the McNamara brothers for bombing the Los Angeles *Times*. (Darrow was acquitted.) Baillie covered this trial and its sensational background, whose violence colored the period of his first reporting.

Another graphic account is of Woodrow Wilson's crusading tour for the League of Nations and his collapse. He recounts also a vivid inside story of the abdication of King Edward VIII over Mrs. Simpson.

Baillie's reporting hits the highlights of two world wars and Korea, and includes almost photographic closeups of General MacArthur ruling Japan and interviews with the figures on the world stage from Mussolini to Chiang and Adenauer. Most of this period he was the general manager of the United Press. He became its gen-

eral news manager at 30, its sales manager at 34, business manager and vice-president at 37, president at 45, in succession to Roy Howard and Karl Bickel.

But his executive desk must have seen him mighty little. He was in the field like a farmer spurring on the hands and stacking up the biggest haystacks himself. He carried excitement with him, exploring the world for headline exploits.

His intense enterprise was a combination drive for news and business. He was expanding the UP clientele throughout the world. Every scoop extended the service. He was prodding his field staff both to get the news and to sell the service. UP correspondents combined reporting and salesmanship. Baillie was both star reporter and super salesman.

The first half of his career he and the United Press had the world as their oyster, outside the United States. For the Associated Press until 1934 was prevented by its contracts with the great news monopolies of Europe, headed by Reuters, from any direct contact with foreign newspapers. This had broken down earlier, as to South America. But even there the unfettered United Press was first in the field, to exploit the appetite of the Latin American press for full coverage of the first World War. For the continent was the domain of Havas, the French news agency, which refused to transmit the German communiques. The Associated Press was denied any exemption from its contract with Havas to meet the news famine in Buenos Aires, and the United Press had a free field until the war was over. Only the 1918 did the Associated Press achieve, in South America, its first breach in the world news monopoly. It was 1934 before it won the right to deal directly with the Japanese newspapers, and soon after with the rest of the world.

Until the emancipation of the Associated Press, the United Press had no competition in providing news with an American accent from the world scene. Baillie gives scant attention, in a few pungent paragraphs at the end of his personal narrative, to this fundamental factor in the development of the United Press as a world-gathering news organization. But what he says of it is characteristically graphic:

"As an upstart the UP had to be a

**Kent Cooper and Hugh Baillie, former chiefs of the Associated Press and the United Press, published their autobiographies this Spring.**

fighter for freedom of information. But the fact that we weren't in a cartel—and couldn't just pick up the news stories dug up by all the newspapers we served—helped us more than it hurt us. We had to be quicker on our feet and we had to present the news in a livelier manner. We could give the men who worked for us a chance to put personality into their copy... The members of the cartel had divided up the earth among themselves and posted "No Trespassing" signs in their own countries. The AP could not sell its service in Britain because its arrangements with Reuters gave the British agency exclusive rights to the United Kingdom (and elsewhere too). But these "No Trespassing" signs meant nothing to the UP. We "didn't belong". We were free to solicit sales for our service in all the nations of the world. Our foreign bureaus could become not merely sources of news but also sources of revenue.

The contribution of the United Press in that period was in opening access to news and in presenting it in livelier fashion than the then deadpan style of the Associated Press. Baillie was the flashing exemplar of putting personality into the news.

If this was to lead to overdramatizing the news, to the pursuit of excitement for its own sake, to headline hopping from crisis, without much attention to what Barbara Ward calls the sustained story of developments that would explain the crises—that is outside Hugh Baillie's personal story. He does not reflect on these things or much else in his crowded career. He exults in its high tension. That appears to be his definition of journalism. His life-long experience of excitement and his success in exploiting it have contributed to the tempo of our lives.

## Kent Cooper's Career

KENT COOPER AND THE ASSOCIATED PRESS. Random House, N.Y. 334 pp. \$6.

This is a very personal memoir of such a success story as Horatio Alger might have envied or invented. In his 80th year, Kent Cooper recalls the milestones of a career that brought him to the head of the Associated Press, which he developed to a world news service. He retired in 1948 as general manager of the AP. He has had time to assemble for the record his exploits and recognition, with the satisfactions of success. His recall is almost complete of the days when he was a \$12 a week reporter in Indianapolis at 20, and the day when he persuaded Melville Stone of the AP that he could save that organization \$100,000 a year. He did, at 30, and Stone raised his pay from \$65 to \$75. But Cooper was already indispensable to the AP and from that time on was its driving force. By energy, enterprise and innovation, he moved steadily ahead. His capacity for administration was the same that served other ambitious young men of his generation to build chain store systems and industrial empires.

But this ample volume of an old man's proud recollections does not do justice to Kent Cooper's career.

His professional autobiography was published 17 years ago—*Barriers Down*. That is the chronicle of his achievement in breaking through the World-wide news monopoly headed by Reuters. Cooper found the AP bound by its contract to this cartel and he made it his life work to emancipate it. That is enough for one man. This later book is of interest and importance chiefly for the further inside revelations of that struggle. It is worthwhile to be reminded of how recent is the freedom of the press to report world news, of how restricted and controlled were the channels of international news only a short generation ago. Final freedom to the Associated Press came only in 1934.

For 20 years Cooper had struggled to break the AP free from its fetters to Reuters and the European monopoly Reuters headed. Perhaps the most incredible part of the story is the constant brake

that was put upon his effort within his own AP. Melville Stone had been a banker before he was persuaded to manage the AP. He had secured the first contract with Reuters in 1893, and 40 years later he still believed the AP in all its strength was dependent on it. He would not countenance any move that would risk the contract, even though he knew that Reuters delivered them world news in biased form and slanted the American news it delivered abroad.

The conservative publishers who were the AP directors supported Stone in his view. They were local men and business men, and this was the era of American isolation. Of them all, Adolph Ochs, with his appetite for world news and his principle of uncolored news, gave the steadiest support to Cooper's zeal to free the AP from the cartel of the imperial powers.

Cooper's first realization of the humiliating restrictions the cartel put upon the AP came the first month of the first World War. It came by chance. He happened on an unanswered cable from *La Nation* of Buenos Aires, asking if the AP could furnish it the German war communiques. When he asked his chief why the cable had not been answered, Stone gave him two answers. One was his theory that a query that would not be answered favorably was better ignored. The other was that the AP could not send war news to South America, because under the contract with Reuters, South America was the exclusive province of Havas, the French agency. Havas management, under its government's subsidy, refused to send any but French official war news to its South American clients. And there was nothing AP, under its contract, could do about it.

The war was over before Cooper had prevailed on Havas to let the AP into South America. It was 20 years before it was allowed to serve Japan, and the initiative came from Japan, as it had already from Australia. The showdown came in 1934. When Reuters refused to let the AP serve Japan, the AP at last renounced their Reuters contract. Reuters quickly came to heel. The AP, as Cooper had held for years, was more important to Reuters than Reuters to the AP.

Kent Cooper sums it up in this passage:

The sway the European news agency cartel had held for forty-one years over the destiny of the Associated Press as a world news service came to an end, and the Associated Press got its freedom from the cartel's repression of its activities on February 12, 1934.

Tragically for our country until then, the restraint that the Associated Press so willingly accepted had placed the United States, as a nation, in an inferior position abroad, and the cartel knew it. Each member of it except the Associated Press was more or less responsible to and motivated by the government of its own country.

England had its empire. Reuters was the instrument that, through its news reports, undertook to weld Britain's dependencies exclusively to the mother country. With the same restraint, it kept all other members of the cartel from sending news to the heavily populated areas of the western Pacific, including China and Japan. England's dominance in trade and influence of all of these vast territories was supported by the pro-British news delivered to them by Reuters. Reuters had done more for England in that respect than either England's great navy, which ruled the seas, or its shipping, which then led in carrying on the commerce of the world.

France had built a smaller empire. Its Havas News Agency played the same role as did Reuters for the British.

Germany, after the accession of Wilhelm II, sought its empire and girded for war to obtain it. Its Wolff News Agency served as well as it could in fulfilling that ambition.

Not only did these three news agencies prevent the Associated Press from sending its news abroad, but correspondents of Reuters, Havas and Wolff, stationed in the Associated Press office in New York, could and did pervert AP news into dispatches that misrepresented and disparaged America before the rest of the world. This was the worst feature of the Associated Press contract with the cartel.

The fifteen years I had spent before Melville Stone's death in 1929 stressing the urgency of breaking the fetters by which the cartel bound the Associated

Press had availed nothing but the right to take South American newspapers into Associated Press membership. After Mr. Stone's death, President Noyes held as firmly as did Mr. Stone against a break with Reuters.

With the second World War and the decline of the European empires, the cartel was no longer to maintain its imperious control of world news channels. Reuters itself was taken over by the British newspapers, in a form to parallel the non-profit cooperative service that the AP had been for half a century.

The principle of freedom against monopoly that illuminated Cooper's fight against Reuters is strongly absent from his aggrieved comment on the other significant action that widened the service of the AP. He fought the Supreme Court case that in 1940 ended the right of one publisher to deny the AP service to another in his area. Cooper concedes that

it did no harm to the AP; that the only result was to add three members who had been shut out by their older competitors. He still resents the zeal of Thurman Arnold against the AP franchise and blames the partisanship of President Roosevelt for Marshall Field's *Chicago Sun*, against Colonel McCormick's *Tribune*. He quotes Colonel McCormick to show that it could all have been taken care of privately.

"I would have been glad to have waived [the franchise] had Field asked me. He never did," McCormick told Cooper.

Publishers who as AP directors at the time fought the case have long since agreed it was one of the best things that could have happened to the AP. But to the man who fought to break a foreign news monopoly there was nothing incongruous about letting a publisher decide for himself whether to keep a monopoly on AP news.

clerical titles, he ticks off the roster of ministers, pastors, priests, rectors, etc., ending, of course, with "Amen."

A "footnote on characterization" comments that "the press agencies recognize only three types of women: beautiful, pretty and attractive. This classification is similar to the grading of olives, under which colossal means fair size, mammoth means medium and large means pretty damn small."

Pleading for constant explanation and background in news stories that might be hard to understand, he exhorts reporters to "keep the school kids in mind constantly. You'll need them to pay your salary by and by."

Commenting on "monologophobia and synonymomania," he notes that "some writers would rather kick their grandmothers than be caught repeating a word."

Here are some juicy samples of "syntax sinners":

"Although definitely extinct, Professor Daevey said it had not been too long ago that the moa was floundering around in his deathtrap swamps."

"As reconstructed by the police, Pfeffer at first denied any knowledge of the Byrd murder."

"A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Dartmouth, Pat Weaver's head is said to burst with ideas." (Bernstein's comment, "What did Dartmouth do with the rest of him?")

A section titled "Sleepy-Time Editor" lists these among errors that slip through the rim:

"A college friendship that began a year ago ended in matrimony today. . . ."

"Sheriff Tidwell said a leopard had been spotted . . ."

Some howlers from the "Head-Hunting" section:

"Crooks Reelected by Stock Exchange."

"Fly to Attend Venice Art Show."

"Developers Scan Virgin Far North."

"Lawmakers Hope to Pass Water, Other Bills in Trenton Tomorrow."

Samples of bright heads:

"Auto Men Told to Get Out and Push."

"5% Rail Increase; Is It Fare Enough?"

"Bees Follow 'Line,' or So Say Russians."

## The Quality of Words

By Paul A. Perry

**WATCH YOUR LANGUAGE.** By Theodore M. Bernstein. Channel Press, New York. \$3.95.

This volume of wry and erudite commentary on the foibles of wordsmiths should be both a help and a source of comfort to anyone who has ever sweated for a daily deadline.

The help comes from the bright, expository way in which the book is written, with criticism frequently lower-cased and specific examples that hit the nail on the head nearly every time.

The comfort derives from the fact that Mr. Bernstein, assistant managing editor of the *New York Times*, has culled virtually all his examples of sloppy syntax and weird wordings from the *Times* itself.

The book is an outgrowth of "Winners and Sinners," which Mr. Bernstein edits under the subtitle, "a bulletin of second-guessing issued occasionally from the southeast corner of the *Times* News Room."

His approach is similar in both cases.

He points out both good and bad examples of word usage, news writing, syntax, copy editing and headline writing. Mercifully (and wisely), he leaves the sinners to anonymous repentance, while crediting the winners by name.

Especially helpful are his chapters on "Words That Need Watching" and "Syntax Sinners." Both include brief, concise lists and examples, backed up by rules and reasons.

Not to slight the pencil-pushers, he also has chapters on "Helpful Hints for Hatchet Men" and "Head-Hunting."

His corrections are deftly salted with humor and modesty that takes much of the sting out of them and make the corrected one remember the point. An example:

"Telephone switchboards through the district were lit up like . . . Complete the foregoing sentence in exactly two words. Mail your answer with two box tops to 'Dead Letter Office. Care of Postmaster, N. Y.'"

Passing the word on correct usage of

## Good Reporting

By Dery Bennett

**THE PULITZER PRIZE STORY.** Edited, with commentaries, by John Hohenberg. Columbia University Press. 327 pp., appendices and index. \$6.50.

**REPORTING THE NEWS.** By Phillip H. Ault and Edwin Emery. Dodd, Mead and Company. 314 pp., appendix and index. \$5.00.

Here are two books on the art of reporting news—one on how to do it and the other on how it has been done in the past in prize-winning fashion.

Taking them in the order that a young man would, *Reporting the News* is a thorough textbook, in non-textbook style, of the mechanics of journalism. Although it neglects to say that a newspaperman should always carry paper and pencil, it does get at the rudiments of the profession with sections of the basic story form, story construction, and includes brief notes on style and proof reading.

The heart of the book, however, comes under the section titled "The Techniques of Reporting." Here is a quick look in the city room, an idea of what the editor looks for and should expect and some journeys with hypothetical reporters on the beat, in the police station, the courthouse, the state house and Washington.

The book is less satisfactory when it leaves hard news and dwells on special writing but this is probably because no one can sit down and say just how columns, editorials or features should be written anyway. There is also a short discussion on "Becoming a Foreign Correspondent," which should discourage the cub who wants to get overseas immediately.

The section on sports writing is particularly candid with some telling remarks about the atrocities committed on those pages each day, which, in spite of themselves, are said to draw heavy readership.

Both authors are UP veterans and bring their variety of experiences to bear on a variety of reporting questions in clear and logical fashion. The book, says the jacket, is designed for one- or two-semester beginning college reporting courses or the young newspapermen who want addition-

al professional background. But it reads quickly and almost any newsman who leafs through it will see himself in an awkward position at least once.

On the other hand, in *The Pulitzer Prize Story*, one sees newsmen at their best.

John Hohenberg, who is Secretary of the Advisory Board on the Pulitzer Prizes and a Professor at the Columbia School of Journalism, has culled a representative group of prize-winning stories, editorials, cartoons and photographs from a 40-year-long file and set them down according to subject with short introduction, footnotes, and sometimes followups.

One can follow the reporting of two wars or the reporting of crime and get a good idea of why the stories belong on the Pulitzer list.

Many of the stories included have come to light all too infrequently since they were written. Others crop up whenever an anthology on newspaper writing is published.

Leading example of the latter is Meyer

Berger's story of the Unruh mass murder in East Camden, N. J., which won for Berger and the *New York Times* the Pulitzer award in 1950 while across the Delaware River a mile away, the Philadelphia *Bulletin*, the largest evening paper in the country, lacked such a craftsman to immortalize a backyard tragedy.

In Berger's story can be found nearly all the principle outlined on *Reporting the News* though it is certain that he did not consciously follow too many of them as he moved the whole mass of detail in one day.

Mr. Hohenberg's collection seems to indicate that following the rules is not a necessary requisite for vivid journalism. But the feeling prevails that most of the newsmen cited wouldn't be in the collection without a firm background in the fundamentals.

There is an arresting footnote to the Berger story—while probably more amateur and professional newsmen have studied or read this story than any other, Berger said that he never re-read it himself.

## Life Among the Commuters

By William Stiles

**SUBURBIA: ITS PEOPLE AND THEIR POLITICS.** By Robert C. Wood. Houghton, Mifflin Co. 340 pp. \$4.

This very readable book is not only a valuable essay on the political and cultural woes of our no man's land between the city and the farm, but an urbane critique of grass-roots, small community democracy. The "crisis in suburbia," it seems, exists because its inhabitants, with a nostalgia for the old town meeting democracy, try to manage a 20th century giant with 18th century, small-time government.

Forty-seven million of us live in suburbia, an area nestled closely around the mother city and composed chiefly of housing developments and older towns swallowed up when the compact city burst its seams. It's here that the political ideology of the small community is out of place.

In their efforts to be dull, most political economists leave no phrase well-turned. Professor Wood, a political scientist at M.I.T. and a frequent consultant on gov-

ernment affairs, has a breezy but incisive style which carries his analysis along smoothly.

The natural history of homo suburbien-sis, supposedly the type specimen of the modern, "other-directed" American, has been detailed by others, and Professor Wood summarizes their findings. He is the organization man and the 7:52 commuted. His house, not too different from his neighbors', is lost in a development laid out like grid lines on a map.

Life's goal is material security, and the way there is by group cooperation, fellowship, and conformity. Each member of the society seems "attuned to the others but never to himself," Wood says.

There are important exceptions to this view of suburbia as a "looking glass" in which the values of middle class America are imaged. One of the strangest hold-outs in this age of the big organization, Wood finds, is the suburban government which manages the community as though it were a village in the wilderness.

And this is the major fringe benefit for

which so many of us move to the city's outskirts—to escape from the complexity, corruption, and anonymity of the big city to the intimate simplicity of the small community dedicated to government in the miniature.

Unfortunately, Wood argues, the politics of the small community is unable to cope effectively with the complex problems of modern American society. Instead of being run efficiently as an administrative unit, suburbia is a hodge podge of small communities and ancient jurisdictions—towns, counties, school, sanitary, and water districts—getting in one another's way. By 1954 the New York region, for example, had 1071 separate jurisdictions. The result is political and fiscal havoc, duplication, confusion, and overlapping.

*Since the birth of the technological revolution and the welfare state,* Americans have grown to expect more public services—clinics, better schools, employment bureaus, more parking lots, and pollution control—problems which the old township never had to face, and problems for which the suburban community has neither the financial nor material resources. The tax system, based on property, is antiquated and unrepresentative of the real wealth at the disposal of the community. And in the disorganized state of suburbia, the materials of civilization—water, metal, bricks, and lumber—and other resources in the metropolitan area are ineffectively tapped.

Wood asks us to take an unsentimental look at small-town, grass roots democracy. The trouble all started when Plato and Aristotle agreed that the small community is the center of the good life. Since then, the same sentiment has kept turning up: "To be well-governed, the state must be small."

It is not surprising that the descriptions of "democracy at work," town meeting style, become invariably anecdotal: instance after instance of informality, good will, the triumph of personality over procedure, the potency of the wisecrack at the proper time, the decision tailored to the person involved, the horseback judgment overriding the expert opinion. In the rosy glow of the fellowship which propin-

quity and equality produce, the pattern dissolves into a series of character sketches, each actor classified and typed, each reading his lines in the comfortable assurance that the script has been agreed upon by all.

Wood finds in such a setting not so much democracy as "fraternity," a sort of political Elks Club whose members—sharing a common background and beliefs, interdependent and intimate, good fellows who, after all, have to live together—form a tight little unit. Privacy and strong dissent yield to group aims; diversity is lost.

Not only that; the set-up is too small. For democracy to be worthwhile, all the fruits of civilization should be accessible to its citizens. "The political body should be large enough to encompass the richness and variety of human experience," Wood feels. Instead the small community offers only the routine of "the work-week, the Saturday night revelry, the school days, the church service, and the hours spent on the bench on the court house square." Democracy was never meant to be provincial.

Wood proposes that we scrap the ideology of the small community and think big. A single metropolitan government can more effectively run our urban-suburban settlements. In the new regime, the joys of the "fraternity will have a harmless confinement to neighborhoods, while the metropolis as a whole will be better off under a single administration.

This is pretty close to present-day big city government, whose virtues and blessings Wood counts off. Good city government is "less the exception and more the rule," he finds. To be sure, democracy in the city is less personal and more institutionalized. But after all, politics here more closely approximates "the conception of government by a series of minorities functioning through reasonably well-identified organizations and interest groups—the modern norm of acceptable democratic practice."

The diversity of the city is better not only for democracy, but for the individual. Liberated from the fraternity of the small community, the citizen can pick what he wants—politically, economically, and culturally—from the "bundle of constant,

never ending choices." This is the only place where he can live his life at the top of his potential. Here all the amenities of civilization are at his disposal: "the Boston Symphony instead of the First Baptist choir, the legitimate stage in place of the little theater, the museums in contrast to the culture section of *Life* magazine." Here, indeed, is the proper milieu of the good life.

Wood's thorough but entertaining study adds perspective to what we've read here and there in newspapers and magazines about the "crisis in suburbia," and for those who want details and reference to original sources, notes and a valuable bibliography are appended.

Wood's book explores, in a contemporary problem, a major theme in the American story: the conflict between personal freedom and social order, between the body and its separate parts. Whether the small suburban community can, or should, retain its identity within the metropolis is still unsettled. Wood is for "federalism," but he doesn't see any hope for his plan in the near future. Whatever settlement may be reached, one can't envision a civil war taking place in suburbia—for people who live in picture window houses never throw stones.

### Our Reviewers:

William Stiles and Dery Bennett, Harvard News Office; T. V. Parasuram, Press Trust of India, a Nieman Fellow this past year; Paul A. Perry, Worcester Telegram; and Louis M. Lyons, Nieman Foundation.

## Understanding the Arabs

By T. V. Parasuram

NASSER OF EGYPT, the Search for Dignity. By Wilton Wynn. Arlington Books, Inc. \$3.95.

The most difficult problem of East-West relationship is the psychological one of adjustment between powers that were once dominant and still talk the language of the past and the newly independent countries of the East—weak but conscious of their importance and dignity, powerless but quick to react and take offense. Theoretically a country like the United States, with its revolutionary heritage and anti-colonial traditions, should be able to get along with the ex-colonial people better than their former masters. It is the Soviet Union, however, and not the United States that has succeeded all too frequently in emerging as a champion of the oppressed and suppressed races.

How does one get over the psychological barrier? Books like Wynn's are a help in that direction. At a time when responsible organs of public opinion in the United States still refer testily to President Nasser's "seizure" of the Suez Canal, Wynn proves that the word "nationalization" need not stick in all good American throats. It is possible to understand the Arabs and the Asians if one makes the effort, as Wynn has done.

Wynn, a scholar and journalist—he represents the AP in the Middle East—does not gloss over the weaknesses of the Nasser leadership. He quotes Nasser himself as admitting, "I don't act, I react." In a leader this is a serious defect. But Wynn also points out that Nasser symbolizes today the yearning of the Arabs towards dignity and independence and gives some instances of Western bad faith, bullying and ineptitude that turned him and the "free Arabs" against the West. Why did Nasser enter into the arms deal with the Soviet bloc? Nasser had to buy arms where he could because the Americans were not willing to supply them. "What was even worse," says Wynn, "America still treated Egypt like only a semi-independent territory, not like a sovereign state and a partner on equal

terms. Nasser complained that there still was no direct line from Washington to Cairo. The American government still had a tendency to do business with Egypt through London or Paris. Whatever aid was offered, it was hedged about with a thousand conditions. Nasser got the impression that the American government did not trust him with money or arms."

What was his experience with London? It is not realized by many students of international affairs—and Wynn does well to bring this out—that the attempt to bring Jordan into the Baghdad Pact went contrary to a deal that the British had worked out with Nasser:

In the fall of 1955, shortly after the Czech arms deal, the Eden Government made a strong bid to restore good relations with Nasser. The move very nearly succeeded. . . . As for the Baghdad Pact, the British frankly told Nasser they had no intention of dismantling it, or of withdrawing from it, or of encouraging Iraq to leave it. Nasser then made a suggestion for a truce on that question—a "freeze" of the Pact at its present limits. Britain was to promise not to press any other Arab state to join the Pact. In exchange for these British concessions, Nasser was to tone down his anti-British propaganda, especially those broadcasts to British territories outside the Arab world. . . . Anglo-Egyptian relations were rapidly improving till almost the end of December 1955. Then British General Templar arrived in Amman, Jordan, on an important mission. Nasser flew into an uncontrollable rage when he learned the naked, almost incredible truth about the Templar Mission. Templar had gone to Amman to negotiate Jordan's entry into the Baghdad Pact.

It is common knowledge that President Nasser's decision to nationalize the Suez canal—with full compensation—followed the U.S. withdrawal of its offer to provide funds for the Aswan Dam. National-

ization of the canal was Nasser's answer to the Dulles slap.

Wynn emphasizes that what is called Nasserism existed in the Middle East long before Nasser came on the stage. In 1882, before Nasser was born, the British had to send a military force to Egypt to crush the Arab rebellion, a thorough-going "Nasserist" movement. When Nasser was still a child, the British had to crush violent revolutions in Egypt and in Iraq, both motivated by the force now called Nasserism. At about the same time France and Spain had to throw huge forces into North Africa to quell the Berber revolt led by the old Riff leader, Amir Abdel Karim al-Khattabi, who was driven by the same impulse as Nasser. In 1941, more than a decade before Nasser emerged, President Rashid Ali Gailani tried to create Arab independence and status by courting Germany. A British expeditionary force overthrew Rashid Ali and kept him from playing the role which Nasser later assumed.

Nasserism is not the creation of a single man but is the expression of the aspirations of forty million Arabs in the Middle East. The only sensible thing the West can do about Nasserism, according to Wynn, is to come to terms with it. This means in practical terms: recognition that Nasser and his friends represent the aspirations of a majority of the Arab people; withdrawal of support to unpopular leaders; recognition of the right of the Arabs to be neutral in the cold war if they so desire; and reliance on Arab nationalism as the only practical bulwark against communism or other subversive ideologies in the Middle East. In the economic field, says Wynn, it may ultimately mean that the West will see its oil companies nationalized. "This will not happen immediately, but certainly Arabs in the Nasserist tradition will not accept Western domination of their number one economic asset indefinitely."

Wynn concedes that this may look like a bleak future for Western interests in the Middle East but argues that this is the only way to close the doors to the Russians. "If the West recognizes Nasserism and proves that it had no predatory designs on the Arab world, we may well see the Arabs again opening doors to the West to counter Soviet influence."

## Behind the Washington Dateline

By Louis M. Lyons

**THE FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT.** By Douglass Cater. 194 pp. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$3.50.

Since 1950 Douglass Cater has been Washington correspondent of a fortnightly, *The Reporter*. This has given him a chance to observe the work of his colleagues who struggle against daily deadlines. The result is a considered examination of the strategic role of the Washington correspondents, so vital, Cater finds, as to be in reality the fourth branch of government. Reciprocally, government manages as best it can to shape the image that the press communicates to the country.

Cater is impressed by the undefined but inescapable involvement of each in the field of the other. Nowhere else does the reporter play so large a part; and on no other stage are the players he describes so conscious of his importance to them, so concerned to impress him, if possible to use him. The interaction is what Cater calls government by publicity.

"Much of the tension between [government and the free press] is part of the healthy unrest of democracy. Yet both need to be examined to discover how much or how little they contribute to a continuing disorder in democracy which results in weakness rather than strength."

Seeking to describe our system of communication, he finds it confused and disorderly, from the haste and haphazard of competitive news searches on the one side and competition for attention on the other, the whole channeled by the conventions of what is news and the mechanics of press production. The successful politician contrives ways to use this system or evade it as his interests dictate, to exploit its impact or to manipulate its weaknesses. Unconsciously, accidentally, it has built up demagogues, distorted issues, destroyed reputations, created myths. But when political leadership gauges its wave length, it can be the greatest educational instrument in the land.

Exploring the vehicles and processes of communication in the capital, Cater shows the variety of operations of the 1,200-man Washington press corps. In the reporters' individual bureaus and vast wire services he follows them at work on their news sources. These he develops in detail: the press conference, the publicity processes of government departments and Congressional hearings. This makes a valuable reference, though it lacks an index.

The power and provocative character of the book are made up of what Walter Lippman describes on the cover as "the shrewd reflections of an insider." Here is a penetrating critique of the dynamics of American publicity at its most sensitive nerve center.

A fascinating chapter dissects the President's press conference. Cater is impressed by the unmatched opportunity the conference provides for the head of the Government to communicate to the public and to be questioned on the whole range of his policy and program. But he is distressed by the casual preparation on both sides, by the accidental shape the press conference takes from the sheer chance of what reporter is recognized and by the frequent confusions resulting. He is convinced that it cannot be displaced and that only a President can re-form it to bring out its potential value. Cater agrees with Justice Frankfurter that "the Presidency is the most important educational system in the country."

Cater examines the often discussed parallel of the parliamentary question period in the British House of Commons but finds little similarity between its ritual procedure and that of the Presidential press conference. Only one thing would he adopt from the British—the right to one "supplementary question" to bring the point home. This is a privilege the Washington correspondent does not normally enjoy.

Though the Executive has its highly developed public relations, in Cater's view "Congress is uniquely creator and creature

of publicity." The dramatic vehicle is the committee hearing with its publicity paraphernalia to contrive action and reaction by timing and spacing of witnesses, to hold the headlines as long as desired and even in some hands to maneuver the opposition out of any chance at the final editions. It was here that McCarthyism reached its frightening peak, by a process Cater describes with the skill of a dramatist and the insight of an expert.

The current struggle of secrecy versus disclosure in government is presented in all its elaboration of classification, of calculated leaks and planned "background" information. Along with the *Times'* James Reston, Cater is less disturbed by withholding of news than by an increasing tendency of officials to try to manage and manipulate the news to their own ends. Cater recoils at "the colossus of public relations in the Pentagon" and at the propensity of Presidential press secretary James Hagerty "to make of publicity an end of itself."

He finds the core of the reporter's problem in the increasing complexity of what he must report. The reporter "has watched politics . . . explode like the now familiar mushroom cloud, engulfing economics, military strategy and at last the worlds of nuclear and space science. . . . The reporter finds himself caught in an insufferable bind between the scientist and the politician and his readers. Is he up to the enormous challenge that confronts him?"

With high appreciation of the vitality of American reporting and the quality of its best, Cater concludes: "There is growing awareness of the perilous state of our communications. Yet, hopefully, there is also a new awareness that our very survival as a free nation may depend on the capacity of reporters to relate the essential truth and 'make a picture of reality on which men can act.'"

Cater's book will heighten this awareness both among his colleagues and their readers.

N. Y. Times, June 7.

## Postscript from England

Donald J. Sterling, assistant city editor of the *Oregon Journal*, in Portland, has spent four months in the British Isles on a traveling fellowship, the first awarded by the Portland branch of the English Speaking Union. He has spent his time visiting British newspapers and writing on public affairs.

As this issue was going to press, a book and an article arrived from Sterling, who is the 1956 Council member of the Society of Nieman Fellows, with this letter:

This is a book which I encountered on my recent junket to England, and which I think is one of the most in-

teresting works on journalism I have ever read. I thought, therefore, that the Nieman library should have a copy.

It is a history of British journalism, but the author has a lot to say which applies over here, and he says it very well. I was so impressed with it that I have also written the enclosed review. I realize the fact that it was published a couple of years ago may prevent you from using it in *Nieman Reports*, but anyway here you are, for what it's worth.

Yours,  
DON STERLING

This is Mr. Sterling's review:

## Journalism in England

By Donald J. Sterling, Jr.

**DANGEROUS ESTATE: THE ANATOMY OF NEWSPAPERS.** By Francis Williams. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., London, 24s.; and in paperback, Arrow Books Ltd., London, 3s. 6d. (Available in the United States through the Macmillan Co.).

Any Chicagoan in Britain is likely to be startled to discover that over there the slogan "The World's Greatest Newspaper" belongs not where he always had been told it did, but to the *News of the World*.

The 16 pages of the *News of the World* are read every Sunday by approximately half of all the people of Great Britain over the age of 14. Its circulation of somewhat more than 7,000,000 is the largest one-day sale of any newspaper on earth.

And what are its contents? A seasoning of sport and a solid meal of sex, transcribed with painstaking accuracy from the proceedings of divorce and criminal courts and illustrated with stock publicity shots of the tightest sweaters in Hollywood.

Meanwhile the *Times* of London, with correspondents in the most unlikely corners of the globe and editorial writers who may take a week or more to polish each expert leader, enjoys a relatively tiny circulation of some 255,000. And the

Manchester *Guardian*, nearly as authoritative as the *Times* and more interestingly written, is barely approaching the 200,000 mark.

The gulf between "popular" and "serious" newspapers, as represented by the extremes of the *News of the World* and the *Times*, is far wider than in the United States, where most newspapers try to appeal to all sorts of readers in one package.

In *Dangerous Estate*, Francis Williams has written a history of the British press, showing how the gradual enfranchisement and education of the stratified British society, class by class, has been reflected in the newspapers that they read.

He writes from a sympathetic point of view, having been an editor of the Labour party's official, mass-circulation *Daily Herald*, and later press officer of 10 Downing Street during Clement Attlee's tenancy as prime minister.

He acknowledges the vital need for "judicial" newspapers like the *Times*. But he warns that to sustain such an absolutely impartial role "calls for qualities not easily come by even in the highest minded. There may be such men. But it seems to be straining credulity beyond reasonable bounds to expect to find them in the office of every popular newspaper."

Instead, he says, the popular press

should provide a voice for "the ordinary man and woman" which "even the largest administrative monster (of modern society) will hear above the grinding of its own machinery."

"Its role in society is not that of a judge but that of a minefield through which authority, great and small and at every level of policy and administration, must step warily, conscious always that a false step may blow it up. . . .

"It need not worry if it is thought vulgar, noisy and disreputable. All these are in its nature. What it cannot afford to do is open the gates to its enemies by itself providing them with evidence that it is biased, malevolent and ill-informed and ought not to be taken seriously."

Williams examines the financial facts of life in British newspapering and concludes that both the best serious and the best popular papers are in good economic health.

But there is a third group of British papers (the *Daily Herald* among them) which try to present serious news in a popular way. They are much closer to the pattern of American dailies. And Williams finds that in Britain, these papers are "in serious difficulty," caught between the millstones of competition from the two extremes of the press. (The recent troubles of the New York *Herald Tribune* suggest themselves as an American parallel.)

This book shows that the histories of the British and American press are not the same. In many ways journalism has been a more robust plant in the United States. But much can be learned from the British experience, including the reminder that a great many people have gone to jail or suffered financial ruin to establish the rights and privileges of a free press.

With so much of the work of the United States Congress still being done in secret, behind locked doors, who can find uninteresting the three-quarters of a century of struggle which finally won access for British reporters to Parliament in 1771?

This is not an entirely new book. It was first published in 1957, and brought out in a paperback edition this year. But it has a great deal of interest to say to anyone in the newspaper trade.

## U.N. Debates Its "News"

By Louis B. Fleming

With a bow, but not a very deep one, toward Madison Avenue, the United Nations is refining its public information program.

Refinements—it would be premature to say improvements—will be based on a controversial report calling for a shift of emphasis in disseminating information from the mass media to the techniques of public relations.

Many recommendations of the report have received general support, but the proposed change of emphasis and philosophy has been opposed by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, the U. N. Correspondents Association and the American Mission to the U. N.

In the face of this hostility, the 81 members of the world organization side-stepped a blanket endorsement of the report and passed it along to Mr. Hammarskjold for implementation as he sees fit.

Unenthusiastic as he is about many parts of the report, he is nevertheless under strong pressure to put into practice some of the recommendations which run counter to his personal stand for "information activities in the true sense of the word, not a selling operation in any kind of disguise."

The United Nations Office of Public Information is a delicate operation with the unenviable task of appearing objective from 81 points of view.

More than 700 correspondents are accredited to the world organization, representing newspapers, wire services, radio, television and newsreel services. Among other things, the staff produces more than 3,000 press releases a year, a monthly magazine in three languages, daily and weekly radio broadcasts, film materials, pamphlets. OPI operates 27 information centers around the world and also is responsible for the 875,000 visitors who tour headquarters in New York each year.

The biggest pressure on OPI has been economic. The concern of members has appeared directly proportional to the budget, which reached \$5,179,000 in 1958. That may sound like peanuts alongside the annual budget of the U. S. Information Agency, which exceeded \$100 million last year, but it is equal to almost 9 per cent of the U. N. budget.

Political pressure also has been building up, particularly among the Iron Curtain countries. The Soviet Union has been outraged by the use of the Voice of America facilities for some U. N. programs and by direct U. N. broadcasts

to Central Europe telling the story of U.N. debate on the Hungary uprising of 1956.

With an eye focused for the most part on the budget, the General Assembly voted in 1957 to set up a six-member Expert Committee on U.N. information to report on the operation and to come up with a solution to the politician's favorite equation: Maximum of effectiveness at lowest possible cost.

There are those who disagree as to how "expert" the committee turned out to be, but it spent a busy five months surveying the OPI. Its report touched off eight days of debate, an amazing spectacle of the subtleties of Madison Avenue being dissected in the unlikely arena of the United Nations.

The special committee's three basic conclusions were:

1. There should be a "shift of emphasis in the method of dissemination of information from 'mass approach through media of mass communication' to the selective approach of public relations . . . "

2. In so doing, the OPI should emphasize "working through existing organizations, governmental and non-governmental, and through individuals who are disseminators of information and exercise influence or occupy positions involving exercise of influence in the formation of public opinion."

3. There should be an expansion of the overseas information program which, tied to an overall budget reduction to a ceiling of \$4,500,000, implies a reduction of services at headquarters in New York.

The report runs 105 pages, plus annexes. It touches on every aspect of OPI and winds up with a dozen general recommendations and scores of specific items.

The report was scarcely in the hopper when the blasts began, which led the American member of the Expert Committee to charge premature and misleading leaks.

Directors of the United Nations Correspondents Association, at a meeting attended by 13 of the 15 board members, voted unanimously "to express its strong dissent from the the report. . . ."

They added: "Specifically, the United Nations Correspondents Association deplores those recommendations which imply (1) impairment of service for the working press at its headquarters, and (2) down-grading of the importance of media of mass communication as channels for disseminating information on the United Nations."

Dr. Charles H. Malik of Lebanon, president of the General Assembly, told the Women's National Press Club in Washington:

"When the report concludes that 'the best way . . . for reaching the peoples of the world at this time is that of working through governments of member states and through a select group of individuals and organs,' and when it recommends 'a shift of emphasis from mass approach through media of mass communication to the selective approach of public relations,' there is real danger that complete freedom of information throughout the world about what is really going on at the United Nations will be curtailed."

Secretary General Hammarskjold had his say, too, in a special report commenting on the study of the Expert Committee and in two personal appearances before the Assembly's Fifth Committee:

"The United Nations should not indulge in propaganda for itself or for any of the positions taken within the organization. Thus, the public information activities are information activities in the true sense of the word, not a selling operation in any kind of disguise. One sometimes hears it said that there is nothing wrong in making propaganda for something that is good; the argument is a dangerous one, as everyone resorting to propaganda certainly feels that he is serving a good purpose whatever his aim may be."

As the debate opened, a curious combination of the Soviet Union, United Kingdom, India and France took leading roles in calling for endorsement of the report and implementation of its 12 general recommendations. Even though unified in support, they were not unified in argument or interpretation.

The Soviet Union, for example, used its support for the report as the springboard for a bitter, personal attack on the Secretary General. Under Mr. Hammarskjold, they charged, the OPI had become an "echo" of American foreign policy. The Ukrainian delegate said: "The remarks of the Secretary General follow the line of the American press. In fact, it is hard for us to determine who follows whom in interpreting the Report of the Expert Committee."

Soviet interpretations of the report in the debate lent credence to the stand of the American delegation that the recommendations were not clear enough to avoid confusion as to meaning.

The United Kingdom delegation finally switched from outright endorsement of the report to the American position, placing the problem in the lap of the Secretary General. When it reached the floor of the General Assembly on the last day of the 13th session, it was approved in this form by 68 votes, with none in opposition,

3 absent and 10 abstaining—including the nine Iron Curtain countries.

In this final action, the Assembly was critical of OPT and condescending to Madison Avenue only to the extent that it urged greater emphasis on the overseas information centers and on "enlisting the cooperation of member governments, privately-owned media of information, private institutions, non-governmental organizations and educators in the program of informing the peoples of the world of the United Nations and its activities."

The resolution instructs Mr. Hammarskjold "to give effect in 1959 to the extent practicable" to the report recommendations which he deems in line with established U. N. policy.

Eliminated is any reference to two of the most controversial parts of the report: A budget ceiling of \$4.5 million, and discontinuance of U. N. broadcasts not relayed by members governments.

The Expert Committee is pacified with a reference to its "many excellent recommendations."

The only professional newsman on the Expert Committee, and thus, in the words of some observers, the only "expert," was Louis P. Lochner, choice of the United States. He is former Berlin bureau chief for the Associated Press, winner of a Pulitzer prize in 1939 for foreign correspondence.

Serving with Mr. Lochner were:

R. A. Bevan, British advertising executive, war-time division chief in the Ministry of Information and a post-war British information officer in Washington.

Ahmed M. El Messiri, Egyptian Lawyer, active in U. N. affairs since the founding conference in San Francisco.

P. N. Haksar of India, chief information officer of the external services of his government.

Prof. Enrique Rodriguez-Fabregat, Uruguay's permanent representative to the U. N., and a part-time radio commentator.

And, A. F. Sokirkin, Soviet economist and civil servant.

Mr. Lochner has been busy since the controversy started trying to clarify the report of the committee, for he feels that the criticism is unjust and the result of misunderstandings.

"They made up their minds before they read the whole report," Mr. Lochner said regarding the position of the U. N. Correspondents Association.

But a more basic difference of viewpoint was apparent as Mr. Lochner reviewed the attitude of the committee. He made clear his disagreement with the position of the Secretary General. And he emphasized the committee's support for a program of promotion, not just information.

"By 'public relations,' we meant it in the good sense,"

Mr. Lochner explained. "You just can't sit back and wait for somebody to come by and pick up the press releases. You have to get out and push the U. N. information output, or, as the basic principles of the OPI put it, you must 'promote understanding' of the U. N."

He added: "I feel that the Secretary General must change his attitude about propaganda. I've looked it up in the dictionary. Let's be frank. Promotion is propaganda. Selling is propaganda. He can never implement the ideas of our report until he changes his attitude on that. I want the wonderful work done by the U. N. to be known everywhere. How can you do it without making propaganda for this world institution?"

Some of the misunderstandings about the report, Mr. Lochner indicated, may have resulted from efforts of the committee to mend what the committee considered were specific faults of the OPI.

He said that the committee found evidence of inefficient or ineffective practice in its global examination of OPI. Members of the committee came home critical of misunderstood posters, misplaced press releases, misinterpreted films, unused pamphlets, of some key staff people unable to speak the language of the nation where they were assigned, and of weak leadership in some areas.

Some of the recommendations of the report were designed to mend these things. But, since the specific faults were not always reviewed in the report, the reason for the remedy was not always clear.

At any rate, the debate is stilled for a year. And, regardless of the interpretations of the report, the Secretary General is faced with some reorganization because of the death December 5 of Ahmed Shah Bokhari of Pakistan, under secretary in charge of OPI.

It is not surprising that the General Assembly action has had as many interpretations as the report itself.

Quoth an unhappy Soviet delegate: "We hope the Secretary General will draw the proper conclusion and will take into account not only the letter of the resolution but the spirit of the resolution as expressed by many delegates."

Quoth the happy president of the U. N. Correspondents, Bruce Munn, chief correspondent for United Press International: "The resolution goes far toward reassuring correspondents that facilities at U. N. Headquarters, the news center of the organization, will not be impaired and that mass media, the best means of informing freely and fully the greater number of the world's people, will not be downgraded."

Quoth Committeeman Lochner, denying both joy and grief: "I doubt if they do much of anything."

## Press Principles and Expediency

By Richard B. Eide

To its casual reader, the press of America has every reason to be a contented institution. In most cities it is a well established business enjoying the advantage of being the only newspaper in its community. It is a respected institution which apparently enjoys complete freedom of expression and the right to publish whatever it may choose from an ever abundant supply of news and entertainment material.

To the more discerning of its critics, however, the American press has become a business institution that is often more concerned with profits than it is with the principles of its profession. To such critics, the press is the product of two kinds of editors: conformists and practical idealists. Conformists are well aware of the conflict that exists between the principles of their profession and expediency, yet are rarely concerned about it. In contrast, practical idealists continually chafe under economic imperatives which conflict with such editing principles as truth, independence, decency and fair play.

Conformists rarely question a newspaper's publishing formula. They struggle to raise and to maintain circulation figures, the barometer of their success. As representatives of a significant community institution, they soon gain recognition as public spirited citizens and leaders of their social and civic groups. Rarely, if ever, are they reminded of their editing omission, timidities or improprieties.

Practical idealists, though ever conscious of the goals to which they are committed as journalists, can, themselves, do little more than express distaste for those journalistic practices which enlarge profits by cheapening reading matter, or by reflecting only dominant regional political philosophies and prejudices, or by avoiding discussion of vital, but touchy, regional and national issues of our time.

And while they oppose the use of crime news and entertainment materials which cheapen and debauch the reader, such practical idealists are compelled by economic imperatives to rationalize that such questionable materials are necessary for a complete picture of life, that such news should go on page one only when it meets the requirements of front page news, that it is not what is printed but how it is printed and not whether facts are pretty but whether facts are facts that really counts.

If permitted to function as dedicated journalists, however, they would be the last to tolerate arbitrary rules for writing and editing or censorship in any form. They would release

---

**Richard B. Eide** is professor of journalism, Florida State University, at Tallahassee.

dedicated journalists from all limitations and free them to search for truth and to give their own impressions of the events of their day.

Aware that many American newspapers have strayed from their original, socially-valid function of providing the complete information and independent opinion so vital to an enlightened public opinion in our country, dedicated journalists, at every opportunity, envision a new era in American journalism. In this era, the best of our editors would produce newspapers that were both distinctive and representative. They would alter the conformity and standardization that has resulted from an indiscriminate use of wire copy and syndicate matter. They would present unbiased, social and political news of their community completely, and in such a manner that it would appeal to readers at all levels.

Such editors think of integrity as the chief asset of a newspaper. They realize that the conflict of principles

and expediency, often most evident on editorial pages, can easily destroy this great asset. They are not pleased, therefore, to see editors surrender their influence to column writers. They lament the passing of the militant initiative that once characterized the great editorial pages in America. They feel deeply that present day editors are too timid, that they need to demonstrate by their courageous stand on touchy issues that the greatest obligation of all free men is the obligation to think and to speak boldly. They are convinced that courageous editors, and such editors only, can encourage the critical intelligence so necessary in our democracy.

It is the best of our editors, then, the dedicated journalists, that wish to be freed from the limitations imposed by economic imperatives. For only then, and at last, would they be free to work towards the goals to which they are committed—the strengthening of our American ideals and purposes.

## Headline

**Palm Springs Business Man Slain:  
Friend Hunted (See Sports Section)  
—Riverside Enterprise, Calif. June 16**

# The biggest magazine bargain in America!

NIEMAN REPORTS AT \$3 A YEAR.

*The best present for a newspaperman.*

## THE MAGAZINE ABOUT NEWSPAPERING.

*Everything in it is For and By and About Newspapermen!*

Four Times a Year — Four Issues for \$3.00

250,000 words for \$3.00 and all of it good reading. No ads except this one

No policy line except whatever interests newspapermen to write  
and to read about newspapers.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, representing the 250 newspapermen who have held Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of matters common to their work.

*Start a subscription for a newspaper friend with this issue.*

Send subscription to:

NIEMAN REPORTS, 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass.

1 Yr. \$3.00
2 Yr. \$5.50
3 Yr. \$7.50

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE .....