

NiemanReports

September 1963

The Publishers and the Teamsters

Murray Seeger

Free Press Vs. Fair Trial

Hubert Will

Asia Faces a Newspaper Revolution

A. G. T. Vittachi

Musings of an Ex-Education Editor

Ford W. Cleere

Our Class-Conscious Women's Magazines

Robert E. Doherty

Why Newspapering is not Attracting More Young People

O. W. Riegel

Fears for the Press of Africa, Tom Hopkinson; *Postscript to PM*, Ralph McA. Ingersoll; *Mexico: Neutralist Neighbor*, John C. Merrill; "No Effective Forum," Fred Zimmerman; *Asia's Free Daily Newspapers*, Albert Ravenholt; Nieman Fellows, 1963-64.

Reviews — Scrapbook — Letters

NiemanReports

VOL. XVII, NO. 3

SEPTEMBER, 1963

Published quarterly from 77 Dunster St., Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council. Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Washington, D.C.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; John O. Emmerich, Jr., Baltimore; Saul Friedman, Houston; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, University Park, Pa.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; William G. Lambert, Los Angeles; Francis P. Locke, Riverside, Calif.; Joseph Loftus, Washington D. C.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Philadelphia; Charlotte F. Robling, Evanston, Ill.; Dwight E. Sargent, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, Berkeley, Calif.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, New York City; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

"No Effective Forum"

By Fred Zimmerman

There was nothing extraordinary about most of the stories that came across the desks of America's newspaper editors last January. Most of the month's newsworthy events were of the sort that newspapermen are accustomed to handling with proficiency.

On January 21, for example, Chicago papers reported that an 80-year-old cold record was tied at 7:05 a.m. when the temperature hit 15.2 degrees below zero. The Philadelphia papers that day had pictures and stories about a rear-end collision of two commuter trains that sent 279 passengers to hospitals. On January 15, the Boston *Herald* printed a picture of the new president of the City Council holding a gavel. And ten days later the San Francisco *Chronicle's* "Question Man" reported the outcome of his survey at Second and Market Streets on the question, "Should Sybil divorce Burton?" (Four of the seven persons interviewed said yes.)

It was a fairly routine month for covering the news—with one exception. For last January, at a time of record national prosperity, the President made the unprecedented proposal that the federal government cut taxes and deliberately set out to incur an \$11.9 billion deficit in the next fiscal year. Such a proposal, which violates most of the conventional economic wisdom made sacred by a long

line of American statesmen, placed an extraordinary responsibility on the nation's newspapers. The press had to provide an intelligent explanation of what the President, a presumably sane man, had on his mind.

How well did the nation's press cover this complicated and crucial story? In an effort to find out, I read more than 250 issues of some 25 metropolitan dailies for the month of January, concentrating on news coverage, not editorials. My conclusion is that the performance of most of these papers ranged from miserable to barely adequate.

There were some bright spots in the coverage of the economic story, which ran throughout the month as Kennedy gave his State of the Union message, budget message, economic report, and tax message. But most of the coverage, while it might be acceptable if judged purely on journalistic terms, would raise serious questions in the mind of one who believes the press has a major role in intelligent public discussion of policy questions.

There is good reason to look closely at the way newspapers covered this story. For, as Walter Lippmann noted: "This, the second Kennedy budget, differs from all preceding budgets in that it expresses openly modern economic theory as developed in this generation."

Kennedy seemed to be trying to narrow the gap between what economists think should be done and what the government actually does. His proposals represented a new departure for public policy. Much of the responsibility to educate the electorate is the President's. But a major obligation still falls upon the press; this is especially true if the President shirks his part of the educational job, as Kennedy may be doing.

Fundamental to the President's economic program is the premise that the government—through its taxation and expenditure policies—should exert a stronger compensatory force in the economy. To offset the insufficient demand for goods and services that has slowed the economy since 1957 and has led to a sluggishness of investment and economic growth, Kennedy proposed a \$10 billion tax cut. This would give consumers more money to spend, and business firms more money to invest. If the theory is correct, the program would at least alleviate the twin problems of unemployment and unused productive capacity.

Along with the tax cut, Kennedy wanted the government to spend \$98.8 billion in the next fiscal year, an increase of \$4.5 billion over this year's estimated expenditures. His plan was that the high levels of government and consumer spending would stimulate the economy sufficiently so that by 1966 or 1967 tax revenues from a wealthier citizenry will bring the budget into balance at a point of "full employment and a higher rate of growth with price stability."

Some of the newspapers I read did an excellent job of

(Continued on page 10)

The Publishers and the Teamsters

By Murray Seeger

When the Cleveland newspaper strike staggered to its close exactly 18 weeks after it started, many of those directly involved could not recall how it all began.

A publisher's representative compared it to the row-of-dominos phenomenon—when one union went out the other 10 inevitably followed.

No union member felt it was that simple but few stopped to analyze the causes. Management and union spokesmen issued pious statements which expressed the hope that such a thing would not happen again.

With the newspaper workers concerned with getting their personal lives re-established on a sound basis and the managements striving to make up lost revenue and circulation, the strangest aspect of the cruel shutdown was left like an unanswered question.

This issue has developed gradually but steadily in newspaper management, at least in Cleveland, over the past few years. It is the unusual relationship between the publishers and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Jimmy Hoffa's union which represents the delivery truck drivers.

My first direct experience with this problem came during last fall's political campaign in Ohio. I was covering the major state contests including the race between Michael V. DiSalle, the Democratic incumbent, and James A. Rhodes, the Republican state auditor and now governor.

From several sources in Cleveland I learned that the Teamsters had committed themselves to help Rhodes through membership activity and financial contributions. The information was reliable and fits into a traditional Ohio political pattern.

The 1956 gubernatorial and senatorial campaigns were highlighted by disclosures that the Teamsters had bought radio and television time to be used by the two GOP ticket leaders, C. William O'Neill who was elected governor, and George H. Bender, who was defeated in his attempt to gain a full term in the Senate after serving a short term following the death of former U.S. Sen. Robert Taft.

In 1958, the Teamsters had to back away from their traditional support of the Republican ticket along with the building trade unions. They were willing to support U.S. Sen. John W. Bricker for re-election along with O'Neill but the governor had embraced the so-called "right-to-work" issue.

Murray Seeger was State political reporter on the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* during the long newspaper strike. He is now a television commentator on KYW in Cleveland. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1962.

Industry groups had managed to get on the Ohio ballot a proposed constitutional amendment to bar union shop contracts. Sensing that the tide was running against him, O'Neill endorsed "right-to-work" to assure continued financial support from big business and to mobilize a conservative vote.

State GOP Chairman Ray C. Bliss and Bricker were furious. The party leadership had agreed to keep hands off "right to work" and to let "the people decide." O'Neill's statement forced Bricker to take a similar stand which undoubtedly led to his defeat.

The Teamsters did not like DiSalle, who had chased them out of the Toledo juke box business through court action, or Stephen M. Young, the veteran Cleveland Democrat, but they could not support the Republican ticket when it was identified with "right-to-work."

When I learned what the Teamsters were preparing to do for Rhodes, then, it meant a re-establishment of an old alliance and a major re-entry into state politics for the bete noir of the labor movement. It also gave substance to reports of Rhodes' close associations with the trucking industry.

The Teamsters of 1962 were much smarter than the Teamsters of 1956, however. They now had a political action committee headed by a quiet executive instead of using either William Presser, head of the Cleveland Joint Council, or his chief aide, Louis (Babe) Triscaro.

Through friends associated with the Teamsters I was given a list of the union's endorsements. Missing from the list was a candidate for governor. After pressing the issue I was told the Teamsters would support DiSalle "over Presser's dead body" and that it would be safe to say that Rhodes was being helped.

The Teamsters were being careful not to put anything on the record for Rhodes although the endorsement had been directed by Hoffa after a national conference to direct the union's political activity for the 1962 campaign.

All the details I could gather about the Teamsters' campaign plans were passed on to the editor of the *Plain Dealer*, Wright Bryan, who has since resigned. The paper carried one story about the endorsement of Rhodes, but it was played inside. The Cleveland *Press and News* followed with a story about the Teamsters' local activity and mentioned in the final paragraph that the union was understood to be supporting Rhodes, also.

At this time both newspapers were considering their endorsements for the election. The *Press and News* had

made it clear they were going to back Rhodes but the *Plain Dealer* was still on the fence. Within a short time both papers announced they were supporting Rhodes.

One of the veteran *Plain Dealer* editors objected to the weak handling of the Teamster story but could not move the news desk. "The managements are more afraid of antagonizing the Teamsters than anyone," he observed.

At the *Press and News* this attitude had become apparent a few months earlier. The Teamsters were involved with the International Association of Machinists in a representation election at an East Side plant. Triscaro was leading a campaign to oust the IAM from its jurisdiction and the fighting had been going on over a period of years.

In the exchange of charges and countercharges, the IAM had placed an advertisement with the *Press and News* which particularly upset the Teamsters. The *Press* drivers saw the ad and refused to move the papers. The head of the delivery local, Anthony DePalma, came to the office of Editor Louis B. Seltzer to present the union's objections.

Seltzer ordered the ad changed and the papers were delivered.

Election season was also negotiation season at the two Cleveland papers. The main interest was in the talks between the Guild and the management, since the Printers, the other union with a contract expiring early, normally takes several months to arrive at an agreement, and the Teamsters had traditionally talked tough and negotiated soft.

There was no real likelihood of a Guild strike after the union's contract expired October 31 and talks continued. The Teamsters, it was understood, had authorized a strike and one television station had broadcast the report.

The newspaper managements did not take this talk seriously. At the *Plain Dealer*, the former Teamster local president was now a member of management, the only official who parked his car daily in the company garage and had it washed daily. A former labor reporter who had good connections with the Teamsters had also joined the *P.D.* management since the last round of contract talks.

When one of the Guild's officers, a veteran union man who consulted regularly with the other craft unions, told the company's negotiator, "You're going to have trouble with the Teamsters," he was ignored.

"I've got the Teamsters right here," the company man answered, pointing to his open palm.

The Guild was attempting to win a union shop or some form of that type of union security for the three groups it represented, the *Plain Dealer* editorial staff, the *Press and News* editorial staff and the *Press and News* commercial departments.

At the *P.D.* Guild officers were told they could have a form of union security since more than 90 per cent of the members of the editorial staff were already in the Guild.

The *Press* editorial staff was in the same category, but the commercial department was about two-thirds Guild and one-third non-union.

The Cleveland Guild is Local No. 1 of the American Newspaper Guild, since the first contract covering editorial workers was won by *Press* staffers in the early depression. The commercial department was taken into the unit a short time later but the *Plain Dealer* did not get a contract until after World War II.

Guild people had been working almost a month without a new contract when the Teamsters struck the *Plain Dealer* on the night of November 29. The first edition was just coming off about 9 p.m.

By 10:30 p.m., management representatives had circulated through each department where a union held jurisdiction. Signs were posted notifying these workers that they were suspended effective at the end of their present shift. "There is no work for you to perform," they were told. "You will be notified."

The Teamsters posted pickets at the *Press and News* Building early the next morning. Some Guild people passed through the picket line, largely because they did not know what their personal situations were and because they did not want to honor a strike by "Hoffa's gang."

At noon on Friday, November 30, the *Press* Guild members agreed to two motions: to honor the Teamsters' picket line and to stay off their jobs until a new contract was negotiated. The vote of *Press* workers was very close but it had been a secret ballot. Many *Press* people later complained they did not know of the meeting and did not attend.

The *Plain Dealer* unit met next. The union officers said they were close to agreement with management and felt they could achieve a good contract. The same new moves were approved overwhelmingly by the *P.D.* workers.

A week later a "citizens' committee" made its strange appearance. Over radio and television the newspaper workers were told that Mayor Ralph S. Locher and three judges and three clergymen were urging a resumption of publication while talks continued.

Included on the committee was Federal Judge James C. Connell, who in private practice had been an active Republican Party official, represented the Teamsters, and had his name on a famous Christmas gift list of the union for a silver ice bucket. Also on the list was Rabbi Rudolph M. Rosenthal, who had performed the wedding service for the daughter of Bill Presser, the boss of all Ohio Teamsters outside of Toledo and Cincinnati.

Presser appeared personally at a meeting of the drivers' local to urge them to return to work under the aegis of the "citizens' committee." With television cameras recording his remarks, Presser said the Guild did not "have the guts to maintain a strike." He charged that the Guild had "thrown

the Teamsters out of the A.F. of L." and said Guild members were the culprits writing bad things about Jimmy Hoffa.

Although they were promised a secret vote, the drivers were asked to vote by standing up on the question of returning to work. They decided to go back to their jobs.

The Guild called a meeting for the next afternoon, a Sunday. Along with some of the other "younger" Guild members I first went to the *Plain Dealer* Building to augment the union's picket line.

None of us knew if we could close the plant or not. Supervisors were going into the plant, including six Guild members, and they were calling a shift of men to work. The Teamster members crossed the picket lines but no other union men did. A committee from the Printers' Union showed up to make sure none of its members crossed the line.

Over night other Guild members had done some checking on the "civic committee." They learned that the group had never had a meeting. The statement they agreed to had been written in the office of Baker, Hostetler & Patterson, Cleveland's second largest law firm and the attorneys for both the *Plain Dealer* and E.W. Scripps Co., publishers of the *Press and News*. Some of the committee members said they understood they were lending their names to a general statement of civic intention and did not know they were being used as an anti-strike force.

With this information and the backing of the other craft unions, the Guild members voted by greater majorities to uphold their leaders and maintain the strike.

The truck drivers continued to work with considerable embarrassment for two weeks. Privately, the Teamster rank and file apologized for crossing the Guild lines to turn in their reports. The drivers took their trucks out every day but the only work they performed was to deliver Christmas calendars and parts of a Sunday *Plain Dealer* which had been piled on the loading dock and to pick up old papers for return credit.

After a few days of this "busy work," the Teamster members forced their officers to call a meeting of the local. DePalma, the local president, held one session without allowing a vote on renewing the strike. A week later another session was held and DePalma called for a new strike vote because, he said, management had broken its agreement with him.

There was no explanation of this agreement but it was learned that the papers were going to cut down the drivers' pay. When the Teamsters went out the first time, DePalma said they would stay out "until hell freezes over." He was less expressive the second time. He manned the *Plain Dealer* picket line by himself all Christmas Day.

Presser tried once to get the other 10 newspaper unions to follow his lead back into the plants. But the members of

the Printcraft Unity Council responded by revoking the Teamsters' membership, making them the real pariahs of organized labor in Cleveland.

A few days later Presser went to a federal reformatory for the second time as the result of being an uncooperative witness before the McClellan Committee. He was convicted of destroying union records, including the Christmas gift list, which had been subpoenaed by the committee.

After their hopes had been raised on the union security issue, the Guild members faced a new, colder attitude. Louis Seltzer declared he would resign as editor of the *Press and News* before he would allow a union shop in his newsroom. The Guild quickly countered that it was willing to drop the issue of union security in the editorial departments and would negotiate the question for the business departments.

Seltzer then said he would not allow a union shop in the business department because it would inevitably lead to the same clause covering the editorial shop. He did not want any union boss telling his reporters what to write.

When the Guild pointed out that every other union had a union shop agreement, Seltzer said the Guild was different. "Once a printer always a printer," but a Guildsman can move to almost any level, he said.

This attitude meant there was no negotiation as long as the Guild held out for any form of union security. The editor's statements also served to stiffen the attitudes of the blue-collar unions.

While the *Press and News* negotiators glowered at each other and traded insults, the *Plain Dealer* group idled away the days. The *P.D.* management refused to negotiate separately or to exert pressure on the *Press and News*.

The Christmas advertising pressure passed with little notice and then the January clearance and February furniture promotions went by. With the New York strike stalemated over issues involving the Printers, the Cleveland Printers decided they would wait and see.

National attention was focused on New York and its classic economic struggle. Cleveland was that other newspaper strike.

The publishers now say they will try to work out union problems earlier to avoid future strikes such as those of Cleveland and New York. That would certainly be a gain for all concerned—the publishers, the newspaper workers and the general public and business community. The Cleveland Guild started meeting with management six weeks before its contract was to expire in 1962, but serious negotiations did not get underway until after the papers were closed down. Meeting after meeting was called off by management, including one postponement for a fishing trip.

There are other issues to be worked out before there will be peace in the newspaper industry, however. At least in

Cleveland, the unusual associations with the Teamsters should be examined. The Cleveland strike started, in my opinion, because a new Teamster boss wanted to show that he was now the man to deal with and any "insurance" policies negotiated with others were worthless.

Agreements between publishers which include non-economic issues such as the union shop should also be investigated. It is understandable why the New York publishers would join forces on an issue which would cost them millions. But how an issue which would cost management nothing and, perhaps, improve relations in the plant could bind publishers for four months is a mystery yet to be solved.

Union leaders are certainly not without blame in the Cleveland situation. But after management automatically suspended union members when the Teamsters walked out and continued to pay non-union employees, the union leaders had little difficulty in winning support for strike action.

Musings of an Ex-Education Writer

Ford W. Cleere

It's somewhat dampening to the morale of an ex-education writer to learn that college professors dourly assess as inadequate and superficial the performance of the press in covering the nation's schools.

Now a college teacher, this former education reporter can attest to the prevalence and intensity of the negative opinions encountered on campus. And here's a confession. While doggedly fighting a rear guard action, I must reluctantly agree that many of the criticisms appear valid.

Just how much do most education writers really *know* about their subject, they ask. What minimal degree of knowledge about the schools is demanded of them before they are assigned the job? How much of the philosophy and history of education do they know? What do they really know about teacher education? How many can explain pragmatism and the finer points of John Dewey's theories of learning?

The critics on the campus see education writers as falling into one of two general categories: either they adopt a shoot-from-the-hip irresponsibility or they become pale echoes of official policy and fall into an amorphous all-things-to-all-men liberalism. Either way, the public is shortchanged and the democratic process deftly sabotaged. Irresponsible attacks cause an ideologically trigger-happy segment of the public to bolt off in the wrong direction

Ford Cleere teaches journalism at Colorado State College at Greeley. He spent 13 years in newspapering, from weekly publisher to metropolitan rewrite. In 1957-58 he was a Haynes Fellow at U.C.L.A.

The Guild members, especially, felt they had shown their good faith by working for almost a month without a contract, only to be suspended without notice when the drivers walked out.

Reporters and editors sat in shocked disbelief as the management's notices went up in the *Plain Dealer* city room. There was no crash schedule of meetings organized to work out the differences between the Teamsters and the publishers and to get the papers back on the streets as quickly as possible.

After the Teamsters struck on a Thursday night, the publishers agreed to hold a negotiation session the following Monday, making sure first that no other union people would be paid in the meantime. Eventually, the *Plain Dealer* did pay the editorial workers for the fifth day of that first week, but by that time it was too late for a token effort at good will.

while the official handout bores people to death.

In the meantime, of course, the genuine weaknesses of the schools go unexplored and unchallenged. Valid criticism gets lost amid irresponsible attacks. A bewildered public, misled too often by writers crying wolf, lumps the valid with the invalid. This unfortunate situation appears to be particularly characteristic of ultra-conservative areas where right wing newspapers sometimes publish the most casual street corner criticism of education as if it had the validity of documented truth.

Over coffee one day, three professors cornered me on the question of preparation for education writers. Among them they quickly agreed on a dozen or so books about education they claimed constituted minimal preparation for a reporter writing regularly on the subject.

How many had I read, they wanted to know. They cited books on the history, philosophy of education, teacher training, economics and sociology of education and so forth.

Out of the dozen named I had read three. What I did not tell them, however, was that I had read the books *after* leaving newspaper work.

How many education writers in the United States have read even *one* of these books, the academicians wondered. Somewhat wearily I pointed out that just reading books doth not a good education writer make. It would be quite possible, I maintained, for some pedant to read the books and still fall far short of professorial expectations. That was assuming, I added, that most educators could agree on a book list.

Beyond this sort of quibbling, however, the legitimate

point remains that there is a body of knowledge about education which would be valuable ground for a man who reports on schools to know. To carry the idea a bit further, wouldn't it be helpful if such a writer served brief internships on different levels of teaching? Combining both the reading and teaching approaches, isn't there a specialized new task here for the teacher college?

Come to think of it, what other specialists on a newspaper are adequately prepared in the opinion of experts in the respective fields? Are we perhaps headed for a day when the aviation writer, the labor writer, the political writer, etcetera, must pass an objective examination before assuming responsibility in writing about their fields. Would that be a poor idea?

An often voiced gripe by the academic people is that education writers seem unable to assess education from any other perspective than a business framework. New programs, for example, are evaluated almost entirely on a dollars and cents basis, yet it might well be argued that education in America has become great to the degree that it has transcended the narrow business viewpoint.

Even the critics, however, will admit that economy-minded approaches on occasion result in heightened quality as well as diminished cost.

How much is character worth? What kind of graduate do we want?

A Greeley, Colo. school board member put it bluntly to some economy-minded critics recently. "All right," he told them, "we'll cut out kindergarten. And art and music, we can cut those out. There're all frills, you know." Taken aback for once by the unusual spectacle of a school board member on the offensive, the critics subsided.

The business view of education flows naturally from a press structured preponderantly upon business financial support existing within a profit-motivated society. It is unfair, I told the professors, to heap all of the responsibility for the dollars and cents parochialism upon the education writer's head when the policy factor is often so strong.

What sometimes happens, of course, is that the education writer starts out with high dedication and commitment to human values but the idealism succumbs to new personal burdens such as a tract house in the suburbs and two kids. By a perverted osmosis long familiar to tired but observant liberals in news rooms, the man of dedication becomes the man of accommodation. It's a process which might be euphemistically entitled the Taming of Talent.

Is there perhaps a fundamental value conflict between education and the press? The view presented is that the schools attempt to teach certain values which the press, and other mass media, not only fail to reinforce, but almost daily contravene. A *Fortune* writer 20 years ago [July 1943] issued an indictment most educators of my acquaintance would probably accept as valid today.

They (movies, press, radio and the advertisements) tend to present as desiderata the trappings of material success, of false comfort, of egotistic adventure; they appeal to personal avarice and personal vanity; they play up and down on the child's nerves, and furnish him mechanical emotional outlets at the same time that they apply to him that most insidious of regimentations, mass anesthesia. Against this deadly passivity, our schools are our only bulwark. If they are not strengthened and if they do not teach the student to discriminate and to evaluate, not they but commercial indoctrination, or still worse, political mobstering, will form the minds of our children, and in so doing, destroy whatever capacity is within them for democratic thinking.

This view, of course, implicitly assumes that the press need not be a mere reflector of an often sordid reality and of a society which pays entertainers like Elizabeth Taylor more than it pays university presidents. Educators, it seems to me, too often make the press a scapegoat for the shortcomings of the entire society. There is a tendency to be blind to the demands of the newspaper marketplace.

Educators, in some instances, definitely resent the dominance of business values in the public schools. Here's one such view:

Business influences the curriculum (subjects and materials useful to the business community represent a sound and worthy expenditure of tax money while those considered otherwise are frequently held to be wasteful, perhaps even subversive); business encourages the teaching of knowledge thought to be "functional" and or "practical" and, while giving lip service to the liberal studies, finds little place for them in practice; business, particularly manifesting itself in "patriotic" and "Service" clubs, seeks to have the schools teach the sanctity and the inviolable efficiency of free enterprise; business would run education from a bookkeeping point of view.¹

Conceivably, an education writer who is really doing his job may exercise a sort of reverse value thrust on the sort of newspaper overly laden with crime news and trivia. It's a David and Goliath contest, however, and requires a writer of stern character to weather such opposition.

A few years ago the late Los Angeles *Mirror*, hearing rumors of fear among teachers, sent out its own survey to social studies teachers. The rumor that social studies teachers were afraid to teach certain controversial subjects in the classroom was confirmed by the survey. Orthodox sources would probably have never confirmed such a story.

Ideally, it seems to me, the education reporter should mix socially with the teachers as well as with the brass.

¹ Lloyd P. Williams, "The Educational Consequences of Laissez Faire," *School and Society*, Feb. 2, 1957, p. 21.

He must *earn* their trust. Long ago, reporters in centers of government learned that there is much to be picked up at the social affair not available through official channels.

How is one to assess schools?

A useful set of guidelines was outlined a few years ago by the National Education Association. While the answers may not get to the heart of the problem, they may at least provide clues for deeper investigation.

The NEA suggested the following questions be raised in evaluating a school system.

Does your public school system provide for all ages from kindergarten through adulthood? For the average? the mentally ill? the highly talented? the handicapped? emotionally handicapped?

For the parent whose normal child has been attacked in the classroom by an emotionally disturbed youngster wielding scissors, some of these questions can be important.

What about double sessions? Is each child challenged to the maximum of his capacity? Is he placed in a situation where he can achieve a satisfactory measure of success?

Does the school attempt to develop in each learner a respect for work and excellence in performance, an appreciation of learning, and the ability to carry a task through to a completion?

Some of these questions are obviously shaded in deep subjectivity but parents, at least, can look for these qualities as clues.

Does he or she bubble with excitement about school? There is an old saying that he who would kindle another must himself glow. How does the child use his leisure hours? What sort of reactions does he exhibit toward things intellectual and towards new ideas in all fields? Does he persevere in the face of obstacles?

Other questions: What proportion of classes have no more than 25 pupils? What sort of testing program exists? To what extent is discipline a problem? Are teachers adequately paid? What is the rate of teacher turnover? Just what does the term "professional" mean in an operational sense? Do pupils attend school regularly and arrive on time?

Educators point out, however, there are far bigger questions awaiting the attack of the men of the press. There seems to be a national current of elitism running through education today. Frightened by Soviet advances since Sputnik, some quarters would seemingly settle for 100 first class graduates and 900 poorly educated if they can be produced *right now*. A longer view tending toward a rise of the mean level somehow lacks attractiveness to the impatient.

Educators of democratic bent are worried about this view which is buttressed by the insidious belief that not all children are educable. Aside from the implications to

the democratic process if this idea gains official acceptance, what will this mean in terms of political unrest? Will a small educated elite be running the show, gaining the rewards with a large, slave-like mass confined to menial tasks enjoying only the crumbs?

When is someone going to smash into the IQ test fixation? For years it's been known that there is no such thing as a culture-free IQ test; that, therefore, the culturally-privileged enjoy an inordinate advantage. Yet the lay public continues to display an unwarranted awe toward the IQ score in a day when professionals have come to look upon it with suspicion and use it only as one of many indices in rating an individual.

What should be taught? Dr. Perry E. Gresham, president of Bethany College, says American colleges and universities are unsure whether their primary purpose is teaching ideas, morals or know-how. In attempting all three, the higher institution has achieved excellence in none, he maintains.

It is time to denounce the tiresome myth about the superiority of the rural school with its pitiful undernourished financial support.

What about the curriculum? Some science educators are now pushing for a 25 per cent share of the general education curriculum in college and increased emphasis in the secondary and elementary schools. Every subject is fighting for its life against the powerful onslaught of the new god of science. The situation calls for a fine, humanistic eye to appraise.

It is true that our education system is unsure of its goals. Much needs to be written, to be clarified for the lay public. Clyde Kluckhohn, anthropologist, saw the dilemma thusly:

The existing educational system is hopelessly irresolute on many fronts. It vacillates between training girls to be housewives or career women. It is torn between conditioning children for the theoretically desirable cooperative objectives or to the existing competitive realities.²

Reporters oriented to the police beat and generally not alive to the changing social drama of our time sometimes refer to education news as dull. Like their lodge brothers, they lump the PTA, report cards, football games and fraternities in one big schmalzy package they call education.

Failing to see the protagonists, they fail to see the excitement of the struggle. The stakes are not minor. As H.G. Wells summed up in this widely-known phrase:

"Civilization is engaged in a race between education and catastrophe."

² Clyde Kluckhohn, *Mirror For Man*, Fawcett Publications, New York, 1960, p. 189.

Why Newspapering Is Not Attracting More Young People

By O. W. Riegel

A good deal has been said on this subject by a good many people, so that we have become familiar with certain negative reactions to newspapering. These most commonly stated are:

1. Not enough opportunity for self-fulfillment.
2. Boredom.
3. Not enough prestige.
4. Not enough pay.

Incidentally, the problem is just as much of holding good people after they have been newspapering a while as it is of gaining recruits.

My assignment is to give my impressions of the thinking of the young people with whom I am in contact at my university.

But the basic problem is what is happening to the intellectual worker for commercial enterprises in an affluent society which is straining to preserve the status quo in a world of revolutionary ferment and deadly danger. I think the situation is much more desperate than most people realize, and involves nearly everyone, and not just newspapers. That is too big a bite to chew here, however, and I will try to confine myself to more immediate things.

The first qualification I must make is that I am no mind-reader. Anyone who says he knows what the complex and confused new generation thinks in this complex and confused world has more self-assurance than I do. I can only give a few personal impressions.

Another qualification I must make is that Washington and Lee is a small, not cheap, so-called "liberal arts" institution. This means that most of our students come from what is roughly known as the "middle class," economically speaking, and that they have been indoctrinated, at least in recent years, with "liberal arts" concepts and aspirations. Few of them run hungry. Most of them aspire to the professions or to executive positions in business. Our students therefore may not be typical of young people generally, or even of most students in institutions of higher education.

We can eliminate from this discussion a certain number

of dedicated young men we have every year who have always wanted to be newspapermen, have never seriously thought of any other occupation, and will be newspapermen unless you fire them or starve them to death. The Virginia press is infiltrated with quite a number of them, like Walter Potter, Ed Berlin, Marshall and Bill Johnson, and others. These men were "hooked," if you will pardon the phrase, at an early age.

That leaves everybody else, and "everybody else" includes some who are dedicated to other occupations in the same way, but also a great number, probably a majority, who have no fixed occupational goal when they enter the university and who shop around for a career that promises to be the most pleasant and profitable possible, taking into consideration their interests and what they think are the limitations of their talents.

The better students, the ones in whom newspapers are, or should be, most interested, generally have a political orientation, a flare for self-expression, and a desire to make an impression on society and "be" somebody. Unfortunately, or so it seems to me, the general impression they have is that newspapers do not offer the kind of self-fulfillment they have in mind. There is excitement, challenge and glamour in the big national and international stories, in the "think" writers, and often in newspaper ownership, but their general image of the press is not exciting, and the young man sees little chance of attaining the exciting levels of journalism without what seems to him a long, boring, unproductive, and unrewarding apprenticeship; and even then, he thinks, his ideas will be beaten into conformity. The image of the press is not of an innovator or of a prime mover in political or cultural life, but of a mere transmission belt for the ideas, too often clichés, of others. It is my impression that most newspapers are considered dispiritedly conventional and most newspaper jobs concerned with routine reporting of routine subjects in routine ways without intellectual challenge to the writer, for the purpose of offering a routine product that fills the space around the advertising and makes money for the publisher. The chain of thought in the young man's mind, it seems to me, runs somewhat as follows: If I have to make a living, and if I have to do something that offers no special challenge or intellectual or spiritual reward, and which is essentially a routine occupation to provide a service to make money, I might as well work for someone who pays me a relatively large amount

O. W. Riegel is director of the Lee Memorial Journalism Foundation at Washington and Lee University. This is from a talk at a panel in a Virginia Press Association news writers seminar at Charlottesville, June 15.

of money for my talent rather than for someone who pays me relatively little.

Please note that I am not saying that this is a true picture of the newspaper press or that there are not many exceptions. I am trying to convey only what I take to be the state of mind of many students with whom I am in contact. My colleague at Columbia University, Dean Barrett, says that out of 200 major newspapers in the country, only 18 are first rate. I don't know about that, but I suspect that the 18 papers on his list have no special recruiting problem. It should also be said that certain types of people are fitted for routine jobs; they are happy with their work and give good service for what they are paid. But these are not usually the types that many employers think they would like to have, the exceptionally bright and ambitious young people who have spent four years in a university in a serious pursuit of knowledge, insight and values.

What to do about it? A higher salary scale is not the only answer or necessarily the best one. Basic attitudes toward newspapers must be changed, and this can be accomplished only slowly, by actions over a period of years of individuals in their daily performance. It can't be changed by massive promotion or the passing of resolutions. Every day newspapermen might ask themselves questions like the following: Has today's newspaper stimulated any new ideas or fresh thinking in the public or in the staff? Has it thrown light on unknown or little known aspects of community life? Does it report what people—including *all* social and economic groups—really think, say, and do, or merely repeat with indifference the conventional categories of meetings, crime, statements of politicians and public relations men, and social ritual? Have we given our writers a head, encouraged them by giving them time and opportunity to learn a subject thoroughly and develop it with some degree of expertness?

No Forum

(Continued from page 2)

covering the story and explaining what it all meant. (It is difficult to imagine how this could have been done better than it was by two papers in particular, the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *Wall Street Journal*.) Yet the coverage of many of the other papers was lacking in quality; and in some cases it was openly distorted.

There was a considerable amount of reportorial sniping at the President's program, usually the sign of a biased newspaperman at work. Here is an example from the Buffalo (N.Y.) *Evening News*:

The annual report of the Council of Economic Ad-

Do we then give them recognition for their accomplishment so that they may enjoy increased prestige and stature in the community? Does our editorial page open new horizons and excite an intellectual dialogue with the community, or merely repeat the tried and true, so familiar and rigid that everybody knows what the editorials will say without bothering to read them? Does our newspaper take advantage of the brains and social vision of gifted people who reside within its area? If our community is dull-witted, dispirited, and has a closed mind, are we content merely to mirror the characted of the majority? Do we abdicate the responsibility to be lively to a few "safe" syndicated columnists, starving our own writers with the crumbs of routine trivia?

We in the academic world have the same problems and must ask ourselves the same questions. Every day we must ask ourselves, have we stimulated the student to think and judge; have we added to his knowledge; have we given him fresh insights; have we contributed as much, or more to his intellectual growth as any other course he has had or will have; have we increased his enthusiasm to learn and grow; have we increased his respect for us? Journalism is either a profession with intellectual challenge, a body of subject matter, traditions, principles and ethics, having a political and social function and mission, equal in power, importance and substance to the other arts and professions, or it is a mechanical process of putting words and headlines together without taste, knowledge, imagination, courage, or insight.

I think that in newspapering or in teaching the problem boils down to a question of the practitioners, and especially of the leaders and administrators. Do they command respect? Do they really care, and for what? I think that lively, bold, intelligent, creative newspapers will attract lively, bold, intelligent, creative people. I think it is as simple as that.

visers buttresses the President's report in greater detail than has been customary in the past. The economic advisers discuss how the \$27 billion, three-year deficit should be financed, which is ordinarily a Treasury-Federal Reserve System problem. . . .

It is not made entirely clear in the council's annual report whether Chairman Walter W. Heller and Gardner Ackley, his associate, speak authoritatively or simply as advisers about the policies of constitutional and statutory agencies over which they have no direct control. . . .

While both the President and the council advance the 'feedback principle' to argue that the Administration is not intentionally moving into an indefinitely long period of budgetary deficits, neither has been willing to spell out in explicit detail how quickly this feedback principle can be expected to operate.

It could be argued that the reporter's grumbling over such petty matters does no significant damage. Even so, his long article—which appears, ironically, to be aimed at providing meaningful background information—certainly contributes nothing to public understanding of real issues (one of which, incidentally, is *not* whether Dr. Heller is operating outside his province.)

An article of similar tone was transmitted by the Chicago *Daily News* service and printed in the Memphis *Commercial Appeal*. It, too, seemed to be written under the guise of explaining the reasoning behind the proposals:

President Kennedy has made his plunge into John Maynard Keynes' wonderful world of color, where most of the ink is red.

Keynes is the late British economist who gave respectability to the theory it's OK to spend it before you get it. . . .

Until Keynes captured Washington, American politicians had been plodding along with Benjamin Franklin's old belief you don't spend money until you have it. . . .

The President's [State of the Union] message was historic for the frankness with which he accepted the deficit philosophy. This philosophy for most of Kennedy's conservative life has seemed unwholesome.

But he's long gone from his earlier dedication to the fiscal policies of spending only what you've got.

The reporter's breezy style and his capacity for simplifying the complex would probably cause many editors to consider him an asset in their Washington bureaus. And his ideas on modern economics, fairly explicit in the quoted paragraphs, would certainly please most publishers. But even if the report were completely objective, the practice of reducing a complex economic program to its lowest common denominator is highly questionable. Some things can be told *too* simply—even to newspaper readers, who, many journalists seem to assume, have the mentality of nine-year-olds.

Probably the most obviously slanted story I found was written by a Washington correspondent of the Kansas City *Star*. It was printed as a straight news story on page one of the *Star's* 380,000-circulation Sunday edition. It included the highly newsworthy intelligence that the President's budget message "almost brought the Capitol roof—including the 14,985-pound freedom statue atop the dome since 1863—tumbling down upon stunned lawmakers." The story reported that Congressmen "still are in shock from the dull thud with which President Kennedy's amazing budget message hit the legislative chambers." The story compared the federal government to a business enterprise in this way:

A group of White House advisers has suggested raises from \$25,000 to \$45,000 for members of the cabinet to

make the pay comparable with business executives. There's one flaw in the theory. A business executive who was proposing to lose \$11,900,000,000 a year would be fired. In fact there could be no business with the company 316 billion dollars in debt or even a smaller amount.

After calling the budget message a "near disaster," the correspondent ended his news story with this ominous statement from Rep. Clarence Cannon:

"Khrushchev is waiting."

It must be said that biased reporting was not the norm on the economic story. Most of the papers handled the story in their objective, traditional way. This itself, however, led to shortcomings in the coverage. With rare exceptions, the papers went through all the journalistic motions on the story without realizing, apparently, that Kennedy's proposals—because they are novel—cannot be treated like the fires, speeches, and traffic fatalities that make up much of a day's news. Consequently, there was a surprising dearth of thorough, factual news stories of an interpretive nature that actually sought to explain the economic problem, the President's proposed solution, and the arguments of *responsible* critics of the proposals.

Most of the coverage fell into a pattern that would probably be acceptable by conventional journalistic standards. Yet it seemed to lack shape or substance. Its total effect was chaotic, almost repelling. Most of the papers in this category did just what one might expect them to do. They printed a full page, sometimes more, of Kennedy's text each time he made one of the four addresses. They printed long wire service stories full of figures and quotes from the messages (with the opening paragraphs of the stories, and therefore the headlines, invariably based on the size of the expected deficit, or the size of the proposed budget). In spite of all this, these papers failed to inform their readers. The coverage was without depth or real meaning.

Following standard procedure, the wire services played up the most sensational aspects of the stories, with lead paragraphs such as this one by the Associated Press:

President Kennedy dispatched to Congress on Thursday the biggest budget in all history—a colossal \$98,802,000,000 financial plan he said would permit 'the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business.'

To finance what Mr. Kennedy called an essential 'investment in the future,' this gigantic spending program would run the Government \$11.9 billion deeper into the red. . . .

Except for the use of the words "colossal" and "gigantic," and the juxtaposition of Kennedy's statement about frugality with the "colossal" size of the budget, this is acceptable

wire service treatment. Yet it seems likely that if an economist, even one with a knowledge of newswriting techniques, were to have written the story he would not have chosen to emphasize such subordinate matters as the relative size of the proposed budget or deficit.

Compare it with this page one lead by Richard L. Strout of the *Christian Science Monitor*:

President Kennedy is going to find out soon whether Americans—who approve installment credit for individuals—can be persuaded that the idea isn't so bad for the government either.

Whereas the wire service reporter seems to be trying to do little more than stun his readers with the fact that this is "biggest budget in history," Strout is attempting to deal with reasoning behind the proposals, and this is what the electorate must understand. As for the wire service story, the republic would certainly be no better served if all its citizens were enabled to comprehend the simple magnitude of the budget. And only the economic primitive, the fellow who likes to compare government spending today with that of a century ago, would attach any great significance to the fact that the proposed budget is the biggest in history. The best response to that bit of information is probably, So what?

Of a similar nature is this AP report which was used as a front page "sidebar" story in some papers:

If you have any idea that you could spend nearly 99 billion dollars as President Kennedy proposes to do, abandon the illusion. . . .

A reporter who is a chain smoker conducted an experiment today . . . providing himself with 10 quarters. . . . he approached a cigarette machine. . . .

If a person worked a cigarette machine eight hours a day, seven days a week, it would take him 313,926 years to buy 99 billion dollars worth of cigarettes. This is 323.9 times the life span of Methuselah. . . .

For readers who might not be satisfied with the cigarette-machine approach, the reporter offered similar computations based on spending the \$99 billion buying \$20,000 homes. (Result: at the rate of one month to close each deal, 425.2 Methuselaha.)

This is a clever, well-executed idea based on a technique called "humanizing" the news. Unfortunately, it adds nothing to anyone's understanding of what is behind that \$99 billion budget and the rest of the economic program. In fact, by impressing people with the sheer size of the budget, the story may cause a few to make comparisons with "the good old days" when government budgets were infinitesimal. To the extent that it leads readers into this treacherous analogy, a news story such as this deters meaningful discussion of economic policy.

Certainly the editors who print the flamboyant wire service stories, the long excerpts from the messages, and the meaningless sidebars, are covering the story. It seems likely, though, that they are covering it too much, and in the wrong way. Their readers would be more enlightened if the editors used the available space to print material of genuine significance.

It is traditional reporting procedure to write "reaction" stories after the President has sent a message to Congress. The reporters interview some Congressional leaders (or collect prepared statements from them), and then write stories which purport to tell what members of Congress think of the address. In the case of the economic proposals, this practice probably contributed to a great deal of public confusion, for the reason that many Congressmen seem to compete for a place in the reaction stories by seeing how thoughtless and flashy their statements can be. The frequent result is a story such as this one from the Washington bureau of the Chicago *Tribune*:

'Radical. . .discouraging. . .incredible. . .cynical. . .too big. . .mockery. . .extraordinarily high. . .unrealistic' were among the denunciations that bombed President Kennedy's record high budget when it reached Congress today.

The spending document was an instant controversy. Praise for it was hard to come by in the halls and cloak-rooms on Capitol hill. . . .

One of the lonely voices backing the President was his House leader and fellow New Englander, Rep. John McCormack (D., Mass.)

Much of the story consisted of angry statements by Congressmen such as Clarence Cannon, Everett Dirksen, and Charles Halleck. In addition, this story and the reaction stories of several other papers ran under headlines such as "Both Parties Help Blister Big Request," or "Both Parties Blast \$98.8 Billion Spending, Huge Deficit." (The latter headline covered eight columns at the top of page one of the Boston *Herald*.) The problem here is that relatively few readers understand that even though *some* members of both parties criticized the budget, there is not necessarily an overwhelming bipartisan consensus against it. Yet this is what seems to be implied by the "both parties" treatment. The truth on this point, of course, is that nearly all Republicans and a few Democrats (the usual ones) are against the proposed budget.

I have no solution to the dilemma of the reaction story. I am convinced, however, that the sensational public statements of irresponsible Congressmen pose a journalistic problem that is similar to, though certainly not as serious as, the problem a few years ago of how to handle the reckless yet newsworthy charges of Senator McCarthy.

In the final analysis the significance of the shortcomings I have mentioned transcends what took place last January. The greater significance arises from the awesome and unique responsibility of the press in modern America. In this light, deficient coverage of a story as important as this one is alarming, for it is probable that most of the newspapermen who handled the economic proposals were convinced they acted with the highest public responsibility. But their responsibility, in fact, is broader than many of them seem to realize.

As James Reston wrote in January, with the President's economic proposals.

. . . We run into one of the most serious problems of our time: The great public issues are getting increasingly complicated. . . and we have no effective forum at the local level where the facts, the alternatives, and the consequences of action and inaction can be discussed in an orderly way."

This should be the function of the nation's newspapers. But regarding the proposed economic program, a large segment of the press has failed to provide that 'effective forum.'

Fred Zimmerman is a reporter on the *Wall Street Journal*.

Our Class-Conscious Women's Magazines

By Robert E. Doherty

If there is anything that social critics, sociologists, and other analyzers of American life today agree upon, it is that Americans have become homogenized. Mass media, mass production, the leveling of incomes, inter-marriage, the waning of ideological politics, and the ecumenical movement, these commentators claim, have put an end to both group solidarity and old-fashioned individualism. Cultural pluralism, that grand interpretation of the American genius so dear to the heart of aging historians, has been assigned to the theoretical dust bin along with the charismatic leader and the class struggle. Few people, it is argued, now invoke pride of race, religion, occupation, political party or income group to set themselves off from their fellows.

Well, I demur. I think that all these learned people have been looking in the wrong places and that this so-called massification is a fiction. I maintain group solidarity still exists and we are as healthy, vigorous, and heterogenous a society as we ever were. You have probably seen their evidence; here is mine.

For more than a year now leading women's magazines in the country have been running full-page ads almost daily on the back pages of the *New York Times*. These ads are very informative. The important feature to keep in mind is that they are not meant for the general reader, but for marketers, people who have something to sell.

Each magazine in making its appeal to advertising men or manufacturers says a great deal about its readership. Now a readership to a magazine is naturally a market to an advertiser. To me it is a social group. And it does not take many months of careful study to discover that no two of these groups are alike. Each magazine's Women Reader Consumer Group (hereafter referred to as WRCG) has

distinct, non-interchangeable characteristics. To learn more about the individual characteristics of each of these consumer groups we must turn to the magazine ads themselves.

The youngest WRCG, of course, is to be found among readers of *Seventeen*, "The one magazine that covers the youth market!" While their youth is the most important factor setting them apart from other WRCG's, the *Seventeen* people like to point out to manufacturers that these sub-debs are also at that "acquisitive age." "She wants everything she sees . . . sees everything she wants . . . in *Seventeen*," a recent ad. And lest prospective advertisers concede that the magazine's readers are sufficiently greedy but nonetheless penniless, *Seventeen* is careful to remind them that teen-age girls have about 5 billion dollars worth of discretionary income to play with annually. Thus we have our first group: young, affluent, rapacious.

The second groups consists largely of *Seventeen* alumnae, now clustered around *Glamour*, the "Magazine for the Twenties Market." The *Glamour* ads tell us that women in their twenties are "11,000,000 consumer strong now," that there will be 15,000,000 by 1970, that most of them are getting married and having babies, and that 1,050,000 of them read *Glamour*. This doesn't give us much to go on, but the tone of the ad is so ingratiating that one cannot help but get the impression that *Glamour* readers are a cut above the *Seventeen* crowd.

Not all women in their twenties are in the *Glamour* camp, however. *Redbook*, "The Magazine for Young Adults," with a circulation three and a half times that of *Glamour*, claims the prize as the most efficient merchandizer for the 18 to 34 age group. Straddling the twenties market, it presents women in this age bracket with the awesome dilemma

of having to choose between the two publications. It hasn't always been that way though. The *Redbook* people, with a keen eye for birth and death rate statistics and with enough business acumen to know what the difference between these two figures means in terms of shifts in consumer patterns, has dropped its middle-aged readers flat. ". . . our oldest friends and readers are deserting us," *Redbook* boasted in an ad last Spring. "We admit it. We encouraged it. We planned it—ten years ago." It now devotes "every page of every issue to the interests and concerns of young families." (There are undoubtedly magazines published especially for older readers who have particular problems and unique consumer habits—but, alas, they do not advertise in the *Times*.)

It may very well be that we have two distinct WRCG's in the *Glamour-Redbook* field. There is no question that *Seventeen* readers are a breed apart, separated not only by their age but by their gargantuan greediness as well. But whether *Glamour* and *Redbook* readers can be subdivided into two groups, or whether preference for either magazine is based solely on whim or feminine cussedness, we cannot determine from the data available.

From the next WRCG's we can deduce some far more interesting and unusual characteristics. There evidently exists in this Republic a sizable number of women afflicted with a kind of literary masochism, unable to resist reading things that make them hopping mad. These are the women who gravitate toward *Good Housekeeping*.

Good Housekeeping's "courageous editorials occasionally draw blood," an ad informed merchants not long ago. "That's because we tell the truth—and not everybody enjoys the truth. We tell women flatly there's no magic way to diet and some women wish there were." (*Good Housekeeping* would have us picture millions of women, faces flushed, lips drawn firm, avidly and painfully pouring over their latest editions.)

A part of the masochist syndrome, of course, is an exaggerated admiration for courage. And by all counts, *Good Housekeeping* must be the most courageous magazine in the business. Subjects that would make an anthropologist blush are their stock in trade: "We tackle ticklish questions other magazines avoid—water pollution, for example—the pro's and con's of contact lenses. . . . Once we brought the roof down with an article on beauty-parlor tipping."

Less blood-thirsty are the *Ladies Home Journal* and *McCall's*, recently returned home from the circulation wars, which *McCall's* seems to have won ("... the largest women's circulation in the world"). The *Journal* not only admits defeat but has the grace to advertise it: "We are reducing our circulation in those areas where the women we seek are few in number." Both magazines tell ad agencies, marketers, and, inadvertently, the rest of us something about their respective families. Although *McCall's* is the

most massive of the mass circulation magazines, it would be a mistake to think of the magazine's readers as an indiscriminate lot. Actually, the *McCall's* reader is more aloof than other magazine readers. She doesn't want to waste her time on trivia: "I have a private world. You're welcome, if you have something to say." She's intellectually curious: "I have an adult mind. I want to be kept informed." And she's not a bit prudish. "I like plain talk," the collective personification of *McCall's* readers said not long ago. "But," she immediately adds, betraying a frame of mind that puts her in step with all other wholesome American mothers, "it must be the kind of talk I'm not embarrassed to have my young daughter read."

Journal readers, on the other hand, don't quite come up to the standards of poise, sophistication, and motherly concern set by readers of its sister publication. But, even with these shortcomings, they do have other charms which endear them to the hearts of business men. A *Journal* ad in the *Times* made this quite clear: "The *Journal* gets them where they live. Where they live—if they're *Ladies Home Journal* readers—is in the better neighborhoods. (This figures: *Journal* readers have more money.) And in the bigger homes. (*Journal* readers have bigger families too.) In fact, a cross-section of all *Journal* homes reveals that our readers not only have more income and more children than the readers of any other major women's magazine—but they have more youth and more education as well."

Well, maybe they do at that. But to the casual observer it looks as though the *Journal*, in its zeal to become everything to every ad man, has laid claim to other WRCG jurisdictions. The *Woman's Day* group, for example, would probably challenge the *Journal* readers' assertion that they outdo all others in fecundity. It is our readers, a *Woman's Day* ad recently boasted, that have "proportionately the largest number of children in the high consuming age group of 6-17 in the women's service field." And do *Journal* readers really "have more youth?" What about *Redbook* and *Glamour*? And "more education?" Doesn't the discriminating taste and the ever-present gentility of the *McCall's* reader make her really better educated? (Has not the *Journal* already breached social etiquette by making a head count of holders of high school diplomas and B.A.'s among its following?)

But what does set the *Journal* group apart is that they have the most money and live in the biggest houses in the best neighborhoods. And that is enough. A woman who can say she belongs to a group like that has something to be proud of.

At the other end of the spectrum is our last, and least privileged, group in the survey. This is the 18,610,000 readership of Macfadden's Women's Group, i.e., *True Story*, *Photoplay*, *TV and Radio Mirror*, *True Experience*, *True Love* and *True Romance*, undoubtedly the largest

women's organization in the country. That 18,610,000 figure, by the way, does not reflect the Macfadden circulation; they admit to only a miniscule 5,000,000. An ad in the *Times* last spring explained it in this manner: the 5,000,000 copies are read by 9,200,000 women; 73 per cent or 6,930,000 of these are passed on ("Primary Pass-on") to other readers who in turn pass on 68 per cent or 2,480,000 copies to a third group ("Secondary Pass-on"). The Macfadden people make no further claims, thinking, I suppose, that another step would take them beyond the point of diminishing returns, or that the magazines would have worn out by that time.

Not only is the Macfadden WRCG the largest, it is also the one about which we have the most complete sociological data. (Our thanks go out to the Macfadden publications for their willingness to share with us the results of their costly surveys.) The publishers have taken great pains to delineate their readership to the business community, because, as they see it, of the growing crisis in the marketing of brand name products. House brands of such items as coffee, bread, and canned goods, usually cheaper than the brand names and probably of equal quality, have cut seriously into the brand name market. The people at Macfadden would like to see the manufacturers of brand name products recoup their losses.

And how can Macfadden's Women's Group help out? By convincing manufacturers to advertise in *True Story*, *True Romance*, *True Love*, etc. And why should manufacturers advertise there? Because of Macfadden's Women's Group reader? What's so wonderful about her? "She's the last new frontier for the national brand marketer."

Well, any national brand marketer worth his salt should start to get curious now and want to find out more about this group of women. All he has to do is read any one of four full-page ads that have appeared in the *Times* over the past year and he will know as much about them as can be known about any group.

First and foremost, he will discover that the readership is composed of WORKING CLASS WIVES. ("White-collar people may not read these magazines—nor may we on Madison Avenue—but millions of working class wives do.") Now the marketer, like myself, may find this allusion to the working class quite strange at first. I had learned in school and have been teaching my own students over the years that there is no such thing as a working class, that such distinctions were made only by disgruntled, car-buncle-plagued philosophers, or by other people equally incapable of seeing the world as it really was. But the Macfadden arguments to the contrary are most convincing. I learned, sneaking a look over the national brand marketer's shoulder, that a working class does indeed exist, that they have wives, and these wives are a breed apart.

Consider consumer habits as one distinguishing feature.

Unlike the bargain conscious middle-class or white-collar wife who buys house brand products without the bat of an eye ("Sure she does. She's self assured: has few qualms about herself as a shopper. . ."), "the working class wife has an extraordinary emotional dependence on national brands—her symbol of status and security (because she is basically unsure of the world outside her door)." What a comfort the national brand must be to "the working class wife who is looking for a name she can lean on." The working class wife also spends considerably more on food than her white collar counterpart. ("The working class family spends an average of 12 per cent more on food than the national average.") There is no reason to believe, of course, that any part of this 12 per cent can be traced to her failure to take advantage of house brand bargains, or that there might be more mouths to feed.

Another way of differentiating the working class wife (or Macfadden's Women's Group reader—for all practical purposes they are the same thing, the ads assure us) is by her reading habits. While it is possible that a large number of, say, the *McCall's* WRCG wander over to the *Good Housekeeping* camp on occasion, the Macfadden readers can be depended on to stick very close to home ground. A recent Macfadden ad gives us the statistics revealing how cohesive the Macfadden readers are regarding literary matters: 88 per cent of this group never see the *Ladies Home Journal*, 90.4 per cent are not "reached" by *Good Housekeeping*, 90.6 per cent leave *McCall's* alone, and a whopping 96.6 per cent are oblivious to the charms of *Woman's Day*. No other women's group I know of would care to claim such solidarity.

These figures not only illustrate the insularity of the Macfadden women, they also go a long way toward dispelling the notion that there is a powerful leveling agent abroad in the land. As the Macfadden sociologists see it, "the working class wife does not share her interests, needs or desires with the white-collar group . . . less than five per cent of the working class families in America are psychologically oriented to move into the middle class."

Such is the way our great women's magazines go about fulfilling their public obligations. Marketers are assisted, housewives are instructed in the arts of mass consumption, and bystanders are given an invaluable insight into the true nature of social organization. Women Reader Consumer Groups are American society writ small. And who can say that this is not a good society, filled with variety and diversity? It may not possess the type of dynamic pluralism Jefferson had in mind, but neither is it becoming the dull, other directed, massified society so many people are complaining about. Homogenization indeed! !

Robert E. Doherty is assistant professor, School of Industrial & Labor Relations at Cornell University.

Free Press vs. Fair Trial

Hubert L. Will

Much of the serious comment and reflections on the shortcomings of the American press is nurtured by a noble vision of the role of a free press in our society. It is a vision which I and many others share. Indeed, it is hard to enunciate thoughtful words critical of this free institution which do not at the same time commend it to all humanity and cherish it as indispensable to democracy. This is as it should be. And yet, as doubtless with other critical analyses, the impetus for this article is the all-too-frequent failure of the press, either through lack of concern or lack of understanding or both, to subscribe to standards and perform in a fashion which fortify and replenish the democratic system, not degrade it or pander to its basest aspects.

"Freedom of the press" is a slogan in our national life, and like many such phrases which have embedded themselves in the historical consciousness of the country, its purpose and meaning are too often and too easily obscured by its mere invocation. This is no less true of it when used or applied in a legal context. As Mr. Justice Holmes once aptly observed, "It is one of the misfortunes of the law that ideas become encysted in phrases and thereafter for a long time cease to provoke further analysis."

Of all the ideas which have suffered this analytical paralysis, none suffers more than "freedom of the press." And nowhere, as will develop, is its contagion more injurious than in the courtroom. Both within and without the legal profession, the easy acceptance of this phrase as a kind of necessary nostrum for every ill of democracy, regardless of whether or not it proves an appropriate and effective administration, has created a situation which makes the press' treatment of criminal trials and certain of their antecedents a significant threat to the fair administration of criminal justice by the courts.

In most areas which are subjected to news coverage, the charge generally lodged against the press is that it has abused its right to inform the public, either by misinforming or not fully informing the reader, viewer or listener, slanting a report in a particular direction, misquoting, unfairly interpreting a certain situation or the like. These are prob-

lems of thoroughness and accuracy, of professional competence and integrity, and while they also inhere in the coverage of criminal trials and almost invariably result in an inaccurate and incomplete picture of what is actually happening in the courtroom, they are not, as such, the principal sources of injury to the judicial system. If they were, the judiciary's complaint against the press, while substantial, would not vary markedly from that of other individuals or groups whose activities are relatively open to press scrutiny.

The distinctive and overriding concern of those responsible for the administration of criminal justice, however, is that the press, even when it reports crimes and criminal trials with reasonable thoroughness and accuracy—which is seldom—too often in the very process encroaches upon and subverts the constitutional right to a fair trial by an impartial jury. The manner and extent of this will be recited below. It is enough to state here that press interference with the proper administration of criminal justice is no mine-run interference with a relatively inconsequential activity in society which must compete in the marketplace, as it were, for attention, influence and effectiveness; it is an interference with a constitutionally protected guarantee, one to which the Bill of Rights accords at least as full dignity as "freedom of the press." This analysis, it seems to me, properly dislodges the press from the superior footing which it enjoys in constitutionally unprotected areas, and requires that it justify itself in a no-more-than-equal setting.

The First Amendment's free press guarantee, like all other constitutional guarantees, is not absolute. Just as not every form of speech or writing is within the contemplation of the free speech protection, so not every form of press inquiry is within the free press protection. Nor, as a matter of logic, can any constitutional guarantee be absolute, for there is an inevitable overlapping of and competition between protected rights, out of which some accommodation in reason and policy must be reached in order that one not be largely sacrificed for the sake of preserving another.

Accordingly, when "freedom of the press" competes with other constitutionally protected guarantees, particularly when it encroaches on their domain—which is the way in which the conflict usually arises—it should be held to a high degree of accountability and prove itself of significant social value in order to warrant the intrusion. When the press moves in these other protected areas, it cannot be permitted to turn its attention willy-nilly on every event or item which fulfills its often elusive and sometimes jaded concept of news, in disregard of rights which are as fully and equally enshrined in the Constitution.

Confidential government documents, for example, however newsworthy, are not the legitimate subject of complete press inquiry. Disclosure to the press of information not

Hubert L. Will is judge of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. This article is reprinted by courtesy of the *DePaul Law Review* where it appeared in the Spring-Summer, 1963 issue. Its footnotes and case references, here omitted for space, can be found in the original.

open to the public generally could seriously undermine the various branches of the Government in the discharge of duties and responsibilities entrusted to them by the Constitution. This restraint on the press has sound reasons to support it, reasons to which much of the press itself subscribes. It should be added, of course, that control of allegedly classified information may be subject to abuses by the Government, but in this realm of constitutional conflict, the overall balance decidedly favors the Government's interest over that of "freedom of the press."

In much the same sense, the press must come forward with sound reasons to justify its present treatment of crime and the criminal trial as that treatment affects the fair administration of justice. And these reasons must have deeper roots than the press' own subjective standard of newsworthiness, since that standard often accords the administration of criminal justice little more significance and stature than that accorded the death of a movie actress, a catastrophe or a sporting event. In this constitutionally protected area, some basis other than the lurid or curious appeal which the entire transaction may have for the paying customer must be demonstrated.

ASSUMPTIONS EXAMINED

Perhaps the most obvious but unanalyzed assumption on which press coverage of criminal trials rests is that the constitutional guarantee of "freedom of the press" confers on the public and the press a so-called "right to know," a doctrine which is much used but ill-defined. If there were any such right, it should logically permit representatives of the press to be present in the judge's chambers during pretrial conferences regarding such matters as legal questions which may arise at the trial, the conduct of the *voir dire* examination, etc.; similar conferences during trial dealing with the court's instructions to the jury and other matters; and, of course, during the deliberations of the jury itself. There has been no serious suggestion, however, that any of these areas are properly within the surveillance of the press. Indeed, as to jury deliberations, Congress has made it a criminal offense for any person knowingly and willfully to record, listen to or observe a grand or petit jury "while such jury is deliberating or voting." It would seem that proponents of the so-called "right to know" should leap to challenge the constitutionality of this enactment. The fact that no such right is to be found in the Constitution, and further, as is apparent from the foregoing discussions of trials and the non-disclosure of confidential government documents, there are a whole host of matters which would appeal to the variegated interest of the public but to which no one supposes the press should be privy.

In all the talk about the "right to know" as it relates to criminal proceedings, the point which generally and con-

veniently escapes the attention of the press is the reason for the public nature of criminal trials. The Sixth Amendment provides, in part: "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, . . ." Nowhere else in the Constitution is there mention of any other beneficiary of the right to a public trial than the accused—neither the press, the public, the judge nor the jurors. The presence of the press is merely an avenue by which the accused may obtain a fuller expression of this right. Yet it is a right which, to say the least, has become of dubious value. Indeed, it is the harshest irony that the exercise of a right secured to the accused is all too often the vehicle of his destruction.

The main benefit which the accused is meant to derive from a public trial is protection against the arbitrary use of judicial power. While there is always a danger of such an abuse, it is highly questionable whether press coverage of criminal trials affords any appreciable source of restraint. In fact, the erroneous and distorted picture which the press often conveys of criminal proceedings is much more likely to create the illusion of malfeasance or, conversely, the illusion of competence where one or the other does not exist.

The real safeguards to the accused in curbing judicial excesses are not only his right to a public trial, but, of equal or greater importance, the quality of judges, the rigorous employment of the adversary system by competent counsel, the provisions for appellate review, and the various guardians, not directly connected with the courts but within the legal profession and academic community, who provide scholarly analysis of the judicial system, its shortcomings and its developments. This is not to say that the press, as a conduit in aid of the right to a public trial, has no role to play in guarding and preserving the integrity of the courts. Regrettably, though, it has too often wielded its considerable power as an instrument of subversion, not improvement or enlightenment.

Notwithstanding the abstract benefit which the press may afford the courts and litigants, it must be remembered that its access to the courtroom is not based on any inherent right which it enjoys, but stems from the right of the accused to a fair trial and the assumption that the press will further this end. It is a right which, like most rights, can and at times has been waived. And on such occasions the public and the press may be excluded. This, however, is at best only a partial solution, since an equally significant threat to the administration of criminal justice is caused by pretrial publicity, which frequently brings to the attention of prospective jurors and the public-at-large information which, for reasons deemed essential to a fair trial, is excluded from the evidence presented to the jury.

Furthermore, there is no assurance that the accused would be willing to waive his right to a public trial in a situation where there has been substantial pretrial publicity and where the possibility of heavy trial publicity impends. Since one basis for appeal from a conviction is prejudicial press publicity, few defendants move for press exclusion, in the hope that the appellate court will ultimately reverse the conviction and order a new trial. Here the interest of the sovereign and the people come into play and the dubious efficacy of reversals on grounds of prejudicial publicity can be seen. The vagaries of retrying cases are many, particularly where the possibility of more prejudicial publicity may again be a significant factor. Moreover, depending on the lapse of time involved, the practical opportunity for a retrial may have evaporated with the death of key witnesses or the loss of valuable evidence. Thus, it can be either the public or the accused who suffers as a result of the publicity, to say nothing of the ill effects on the fair and efficient administration of criminal justice. All this, I believe, is an extraordinary price to pay for our laissez-faire notion of "freedom of the press" and our relatively unexamined adherence to its supposed all-embracing desirability.

There are other arguments which have been put forward to justify the public airing of criminal trials by the press. One of these is the educational value which the public is said to derive from an actual report of the workings of its courts, an argument closely associated with the public's so-called "right to know." While this argument deserves some weight as an abstract proposition—an informed citizenry being fundamental to the effective operation of a democratic society—it is hardly sufficient to counterbalance the adverse effects of publicity on the administration of criminal justice. Realistically speaking, though, press reports of criminal trials do not enlighten the public, for there is little, if any, educational value in reports filled with half-truths and distortions.

If it is really the purpose of the press to inform the public about the workings of its courts, that purpose would be much better served by delaying the publication of the day-to-day proceedings of a criminal trial until the trial has terminated. As it is, there is no assurance that the press will report each day's proceedings in a particular trial, let alone report them fully and accurately, and, accordingly, the likelihood that a witness' direct examination, for example, will receive broad press attention while his cross-examination receives little or no attention is great. From an educational standpoint, the most balanced picture which the press could convey of judicial proceedings, short of a verbatim report, would come from a comprehensive summary after trial, not from the bits and pieces from which the public now must endeavor to glean anything at all of value.

Another justification, and one deserving of more con-

sideration, is the legitimate interest which the public has in being apprised of the occurrence of crime and the apprehension of a suspect. Certainly the citizenry is entitled to be informed of the efficiency and effectiveness of its police force and the relative safety of the community. Equally, it is entitled to have any fear allayed, particularly in cases of heinous crimes, by the knowledge that a bona fide suspect, without naming the person, has been taken into custody. Few people would argue against making this information available, assuming its accuracy under the circumstances; indeed, this is an area in which the press performs one of the kinds of services which its constitutional guarantee contemplates. No one is proposing to eliminate this service. What is proposed is that a long, hard look be taken at the accommodation which has been reached between the equally cherished guarantees of free press and fair trial in order to determine whether a serious readjustment is not required. It is my belief that, while the press has a legitimate role to play at the very early stages of the criminal process, the nearer the case moves to trial and to an actual determination of guilt or innocence, the less the role and interest of the press can be supported on any basis of reason, law or social policy and the more the interests of justice merit protection.

THE BURDEN OF PROVING INJURY

Much of the foregoing has been predicated on the assumption that, in fact, the press does adversely and significantly affect the fair administration of criminal justice. The press demands proof, contending that there is no scientific evidence that prejudice does result from the publication of information which the law will not permit the jury to consider in determining guilt or innocence.

It seems appropriate here, however, to raise the question of who, in fact, should bear the burden of proof and persuasion on this issue—the courts or the press. The apparent assumption of the press in this, as in most areas, is that the other side has the burden of demonstrating that the press is out-of-bounds, never that the press has the burden of demonstrating that it is within bounds. As previously indicated, the former may be a fair assumption in unprotected areas, but not in areas where the press clashes with another constitutional guarantee. It therefore seems at least equally justifiable for the judiciary to demand proof by the press that its treatment of criminal trials and certain of their antecedents does not impinge on the fair administration of criminal justice. It is the press which invades the sanctuary of the courtroom, not the courtroom that of the press.

Accordingly, the press should demonstrate that the publication of a person's prior criminal record or of his purported confession before trial or before its admission into evidence during trial is neither adverse to the accused

nor to the administration of justice. The presumption against the publication of such information, which Anglo-American law permits to enter into the determination of guilt or innocence only under the most carefully defined circumstances, is great. Yet this information is uniformly and with impunity broadcast, frequently with provocative headlines, by the great majority of the press long before that determination has been made.

It is argued, however, that not every juror or prospective juror may have been contaminated by this information, that those who have can be weeded out, and that, in any event, whatever adverse effects the information may produce can be substantially erased from the minds of the jurors. Trial judges who have faced the task of selecting an impartial panel of jurors in a case which has been subjected to widespread pretrial publicity know the lingering doubts which exist even after all available protective techniques have been utilized. Why, furthermore, should we have to tolerate the mere possibility of a contaminated panel of jurors when there is so little demonstrable benefit which flows from the disclosure of such information and so much potential harm which may be inflicted on the defendant, the public and the administration of justice? And, it should be pointed out, the only scientific data available, though fragmentary, supports the conclusion that emotionally charged news reporting is prejudicial.

The law, in excluding from the knowledge of jurors certain information such as coerced confessions, prior criminal records, hearsay evidence, refusal to submit to a lie-detector test, etc., itself necessarily deals only in possibilities, not certainties. Yet this exclusion is consistently maintained or the admission into evidence carefully controlled in spite of the countervailing benefits which might accrue by freely permitting jurors to learn the substance of any of the above, benefits which could be considerably greater than those derived from the publication of this information to all the world, prospective jurors and the public alike. A coerced confession, for example, may be a true confession and its exclusion from a jury's consideration may materially harm the prosecution's case, but the possibility that a confession secured under such conditions is unreliable and, more importantly, the abhorrence with which a decent democratic society views such a procedure combine to militate against its admission into evidence.

But where are the countervailing benefits in the publication of a confession by the press before the evidentiary value of such a document or statement can be tested in court? Will the public be any safer in the knowledge that a suspect has confessed, when that confession may have been induced by means which cast such doubt on its validity that a jury will not be permitted to consider it? Will its confidence in the effectiveness of the police be intelligently enhanced by publication in such circumstances?

In the almost total absence of reasonable and appreciable benefits which inure to the public from the disclosure of information which courts strive so mightily to keep from the knowledge of the fact-finders until a proper basis has been laid for its admission, it is to be wondered why, save for unquestioning attachment to the analytically neglected slogan of "freedom of the press," this practice has been allowed to continue. The policy of the law has always been to weigh competing interests in order to arrive at a fair accommodation when there is at least some discernible merit in pursuing either course. In the area of free press versus fair trial, the propriety and importance of invoking this policy in favor of a readjustment should be apparent in light of the imbalance of benefit and detriment which the present accommodation, if such it be, permits, and in face of the indisputably great and ever-growing audience which the press is able to reach and influence.

PRESENT SOLUTIONS

The present means by which the law purports to deal with the excesses of the press are almost all in the nature of afterthoughts or aftereffects. While the Supreme Court has held that in a strong enough case prejudice resulting from pretrial publicity will be found as a matter of law, thereby obviating the necessity of proving actual prejudice of individual jurors (often a quixotic effort), the best that such a determination can produce is a reversed conviction. Although some of the vagaries of reversal and retrial have already been discussed, it is important to mention one other consideration which adds to the illusory nature of reversals as a remedy in these cases.

When criminal convictions are reversed for reasons other than prejudicial publicity, such as for the admission into evidence of a coerced confession or of illegally seized evidence, the effect of the reversal is not only to afford the accused a new trial at which the coerced confession or illegally seized evidence will be excluded, but to demonstrate to those responsible for it that there is nothing to be gained by coercion or illegal seizure. Consequently, reversal in these situations has the very important by-product of supervising the administration of justice at the law enforcement level. And, in another context, when a reversal is the result of some error committed by a judge during the course of a trial, the ancillary effect of the reversal is to admonish him that a repetition of the error may result in further reversal. Yet, when a conviction is reversed for reasons of publicity, it has no effect whatsoever as sanction against the press, and there is consequently nothing in the reversal which prevents prejudicial press treatment of the case before or during any retrial or similar treatment of future trials of other defendants.

The only concretely available sanction against the press in the foregoing circumstances is the power of the court

to punish for contempt, but this is a circumscribed power which has been more recently narrowed than broadened. Until 1941 the substantive rule regarding contempt was, in effect, that the publication of matter which had a tendency to, or was calculated to, obstruct justice was punishable by the court. This rule, the so-called "tendency rule," was discarded in favor of the stricter test enunciated in *Bridges v. California*, the nub of which is that the right of free comment is limited only to situations where there is a "clear and present danger" to the administration of justice. The Supreme Court reaffirmed the "clear and present danger" test in *Pennekamp v. Florida*, *Craig v. Harney* and, most recently, in *Wood v. Georgia*.

The *Bridges*, *Pennekamp* and *Craig* cases each involved press comments and reports on matters tried to a judge without a jury and resulted in reversals of contempt convictions. The cases which have reached the Supreme Court concerning alleged petit jury prejudice through publication have turned on fair trial-due process questions rather than free press considerations. And, notwithstanding Mr. Justice Frankfurter's recent assertion with respect to prejudicial press disclosures that "the Court has not yet decided that, while convictions must be reversed and miscarriages of justice result because the minds of jurors or potential jurors were poisoned, the poisoner is constitutionally protected in plying his trade," there seems to be no inclination to deal by contempt citations with the excesses of the press as they affect jurors. It therefore appears that, while the Supreme Court may ultimately revise its attitude in light of changing circumstances, it is necessary to explore alternative solutions.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The purpose of this article thus far has been not only to demonstrate that existing remedies are less than adequate to cope with the growing problem of prejudicial publicity; its purpose has equally been to indicate the manner and extent to which press treatment of crime and criminal trials poses a significant threat to the fair administration of justice. It is apparent that one possible solution to the problem of prejudicial publicity would be for the press—with the aid and advice of the legal community, if necessary—voluntarily to impose effective standards and restraints upon itself.

This, of course, is not a new proposal, nor is it one which, for various reasons, has found much general acceptance. Indeed, H. L. Mencken once wrote of such efforts:

Journalistic codes of ethics are all moonshine. Essentially, they are as absurd as would be codes of street-car conductors, barbers or public job-holders. If American journalism is to be purged of its present swinishness and brought up to a decent level of repute—and God

knows that such an improvement is needed—it must be accomplished by the devices of morals, not by those of honor. That is to say, it must be accomplished by external forces, and through the medium of penalties exteriorly inflicted.

Nevertheless, while it may ultimately be concluded that external restraints are the only practical means of solution, an analysis of possible voluntary action should not be foreclosed.

It is probably as generally unknown to the newspaper profession as it is to the public that in 1923 the American Society of Newspaper Editors adopted a set of ethical canons of journalism. For present purposes, it is worthwhile to quote the canon entitled "Decency":

7. Decency—A newspaper cannot escape conviction of insincerity if, while professing high moral purpose, it supplies incentives to base conduct, such as are to be found in details of crime and vice, publication of which is not demonstrably for the general good. Lacking authority to enforce its canons, the journalism here represented can but express the hope that deliberate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter effective public disapproval or yield to the influence of a preponderant professional condemnation.

This canon, by its very words, expresses the essence of the problem. On the one hand, much of this article has been directed towards showing how press "incentives" to the kind of "base conduct" which the profession itself condemns have an adverse effect on the fair administration of criminal justice. Yet, on the other hand, the admitted lack of authority within the profession to enforce its own code of conduct has obviously permitted the behavior which is condemned to continue.

In the legal, medical and other professions, means have been established by which members may be disciplined for infractions of particular canons of ethics, and while these means may not reach every such departure, they are continually invoked against violators and consequently provide a significant deterrent to "incentives to base conduct." But no disciplinary machinery exists within the newspaper profession, nor, apparently, is there a desire to establish any. Whatever economic or social rationalizations are put forward to justify the absence of such machinery, the fact is that there is no compelling reason why the newspaper profession, if it made the effort, could not discipline itself just as other learned groups, subject to many of the same economic and social pressures, have seen fit to do.

Voluntary action by the press may not be easy to instigate, but it should not be written off as a possible solution to the problem of prejudicial publicity. If representatives of the newspaper profession were able to meet and agree on a code of conduct, they should be able to meet and agree

on the machinery for its enforcement. And surely the help and advice of the legal community in making provision for the machinery and in drafting additional canons to protect the legitimate interests of both the press and the administration of justice would be readily available if a genuine desire were evidenced by the newspaper profession. I am frank to say, however, that, while the difficulties facing the press in providing for means of self-discipline are not appreciably greater than those of other professions which have already faced this task, I am not optimistic about the possibility of voluntary action, though it seems to me this is the course which any self-respecting profession should follow.

In the absence of such action, the necessary alternative is the imposition of external restraints on the press. I would therefore join others who advocate the adoption of legislation which would cover the problems in this area. Such legislation should provide for criminal penalties against any person responsible for the publication of prejudicial information under conditions hereinafter described before its admission into evidence at the trial. It would thus not only reach newspapermen and their counterparts in other areas of news dissemination, but also the sources of the published information such as defense attorneys, prosecutors or policemen. It would, further, only apply to criminal cases tried to a jury. Upon its violation, the offending party would be proceeded against by information or indictment, would have the right of trial by jury and the right of appeal.

Following closely the outline suggested by Justice Meyer of the Supreme Court of New York, the statute would be divided into two sections. The first section, supported by a legislative finding, would list specific disclosures which *per se* constitute a clear and present danger of substantial prejudice to the fair administration of criminal justice. The items therein would include (1) disclosure of the existence and substance of an alleged confession, (2) the prior criminal record of an accused, (3) the fact that an accused refused to submit to a lie-detector test, and (4) the existence and description of tangible evidence seized from an accused during a search or arrest. The disclosure of each would be prohibited until its admission into evidence at the trial, or,

if not admitted, until the jury renders its verdict. Also prohibited should be expressions of opinion, whether through man in the street polls, columnists, comments or editorials, concerning the effect of evidence introduced, the credibility of witnesses or the guilt of the accused, all of which may usurp the function of the jury. Publication of any of these items would, without more, amount to a violation of this section of the statute.

As to items in the second section, publication would not constitute an offense unless the jury found that in the circumstances of the case concerning which publication was made the material published created a serious and imminent danger of substantial prejudice to the fair administration of criminal justice. In this second category would fall material, such as interviews with the family of the victim of a crime, statements as to the identity and possible testimony of prospective witnesses, publication of the names and addresses of the jurors sitting in the case, matter which appeals to racial, political, economic or other bias, or other information concerning the facts or the parties, which may pose a serious threat, depending on the circumstances of the case, to the securing to either the prosecution or the defense of a fair trial. This section would not prohibit the publication of these items outright, but would force the press to run the risk of their publication, just as it does in the area of libel.

While this proposed outline by no means exhausts the statutory possibilities or fully examines all the inherent problems, it is intended to encourage and point the way to appropriate legislative action. Furthermore, it is meant to demonstrate to the press that those responsible for the fair administration of criminal justice are wholly disenchanted with the fatalistic notion that "trial by newspaper" or by other news media is "an unavoidable curse of metropolitan living . . ." In the absence of voluntary action by the press, the constitutional right to a fair trial will have to be secured by means which the press may find repugnant but which will have been brought on by its own disregard of this fundamental right. One way or the other, the right to a fair trial, a cornerstone of justice, must be protected.

Postscript to *PM*

By Ralph McA. Ingersoll

In a commencement address at a junior college in New Jersey, Ralph Ingersoll recalled his adventure in publishing PM, the adless newspaper that struggled to be different through the 1940's.

What I have to say about the newspapers—the institution of the press—as your source material on the world you live in, is that you cannot expect it to keep you accurately and objectively informed.

First: Because the 20th Century American newspaper is, first of all, an organ of the conformist. It long ago learned that it had its living to make—and that the safest way to insure its living was to conform—with the preconceptions that were fashionable, with the prejudices that were in vogue.

Second: Because the facts of the 20th Century have proved too complicated to be gathered and reported and edited by an institution which evolved in the late 19th Century to serve an infinitely less complicated world. The intellectual discipline—the basic skills—required to master 20th Century national and international news, and to make it intelligible, is simply beyond the ability of the rough and ready journalistic machinery that was invented for the horse and buggy days. There is neither a body of adequately trained reporters nor a leadership of adequately educated editors—nor a class of dedicated publishers. The institution itself is inadequate to the problem.

These are the basic limitations of institutions on which you are about to rely for the facts with which to continue your education about the world you enter—the world that is about to be you.

Once upon a time, I was so impressed by the limitations of the press that I started a newspaper of my own to correct all the abuses which I found so easy to inventory. I took a brave motto for it—from something Darwin once wrote. I said that we would steadily endeavor to keep our minds free so as to give up any hypothesis, however much beloved, once facts were shown to be opposed to it.

We all tried very hard to live up to those bold words—but the newspaper we produced ended up by being even more opinionated than the newspapers we had dedicated ourselves to setting straight.

I am not saying that some of the opinions we expressed in *PM*—that was what my paper was called—were not sound. Our crusade against racial discrimination was sound, all right, but we were 20 years ahead of our times. We were breathlessly on time—it was in the year 1940—when we preached that war against the Nazi dictatorship was as

right as it was inevitable. Since the Russians were then allied to the same dictatorship, this brought the communists down on our neck. At the same time we were being denounced as communists ourselves mainly because we believed in the legitimacy of collective bargaining in industry. In those days *that* was considered radical. Also the English were against the Nazis, too—and the Irish didn't like the English. There being a local shortage of Englishmen to throw brickbats at, the Irish threw them at us.

So *PM* came to be regarded as a highly controversial publication—and its staff as being so highly opinionated as to be insufferable—and all because we had set out simply to tell the truth as we saw it, and to keep our minds open the way Darwin had taught us!

Let that be your first lesson about newspapers: the newspaper that fights only what you approve of anyway will be popular; should it take issue with the status quo, it will irritate you. You will consider it controversial. If its opinions differ from yours, you will think of its editors as hopelessly biased.

This is not meant to be cynical. I am not a cynic, and I believe that noisy little *PM* served its countrymen well—at least as well as it was able. But what I say *is* meant to be realistic. *PM* died soon after World War II because out of the 9 or 10 million people in and around New York only some 160,000 of them cared enough about its uncomfortable outspokenness to buy it every day. It needed 200,000 readers to stay alive.

It seems to me a basic truth that you must face in this world you are going out into: that if you believe in the truth you must prepare to pay for the privilege of serving it—for its service will make you no more popular than Old Diogenes made himself in his search for an honest man. So do not expect your newspapers to make too much of “the other side” of any issue. Remember, they have their livings to make—and learned long ago that they would only get cancelled subscriptions for their pains if they really got under your skin with news you didn't like to read.

The second lesson we learned at long-forgotten *PM* was at least anticipated. Another quotation from its prospectus simply said: We acknowledge that the truth is difficult to arrive at. What a magnificent understatement that was! The assumption, in the context in which we spoke these pious words, was that other newspapers were burdened by handicaps of which we would be free. Neither publisher's policies, nor partisan politics, nor pressure from advertisers, nor the ignorance of editors nor the illiteracy of reporters were going to push us around.

The thing we forgot was that we, too, were human beings! For every chain we broke, we forged another for ourselves. For other publishers' prejudices, we too often substituted our own; when we allowed ourselves the privilege of being morally indignant, we assumed partisanship like a mantle.

And their enlistment under our brave new banner did not, by miracle of liberation, make our editors and reporters into the supermen we promised ourselves they would become.

In short, we soon found out that we were the same newspapermen we were after our rededication that we were before—as full of prejudices and personal limitations as we'd always been. And the truth was just as illusive, and difficult to find, as it had always been.

This is the second lesson: that the truth can only be served with discipline—in journalism as in science and the arts.

If you believe, now that you have your diplomas in hand, that you are through with the disciplines of learning, you have a sad awakening before you. Your need for discipline in learning has just begun.

The world into which you go forth is clearly in confusion. If it is the newspapers on which you are to rely as your text books—from which to learn what is important for you to know—I assure you that they are no more realistic today than they were when I set out to reform them twenty-three skiddo years ago!

They often do try to tell you the truth—but within limitations that are truly appalling. First there is the lesson I have just gone over: since you must support them, they would not dream of telling you—if they could help it—anything that would too seriously disturb you.

Could you imagine a free-thinking newspaper challenging sectarian religion—as an ancestor of mine named Robert Ingersoll did on public platforms in the 1890's? Yet are the hostilities of sectarian religion really a healthy social phenomenon? Even the late Pope of the Holy Roman Catholic Church had his problems with such a radical doctrine as unity amongst churchmen.

There is still a good case which could be made for trying to handle the Cuban “problem” with understanding—of the too real problems of the starving and illiterate Cuban peon—instead of with force. But who dares advance it today? I can see the picket lines forming around the plant of the poor publisher who tried—with any journalistic weapon more lethal than a scholarly editorial.

Who dares seriously challenge our present basic ideology: that our survival as a free people depends primarily on our ability to win an arms race with the Russians? It can be challenged—on the relatively simple ground that having already achieved the force necessary to wipe the Soviet Union off the map, we are beyond the necessity of racing with them—or anybody else. But who would care to try?—and be denounced as unpatriotic? The more you are for overkill, the better American you are these days.

No, your newspapers will not seriously undertake to correct a preconception, if the correction might cost them readers. (And advertisers have loyalty only to the statistics of readership.)

And probably their publishers and editors would not even contemplate such suicidal adventures because they share your preconceptions and the prejudices you have, for better or worse, built upon them.

If the people must rely on the press in order to know how to govern themselves, yet the press must keep itself popular with the people in order to reach them, then the people are relying on nothing more than the echo of their own voices. And that, I believe, *is* what is happening—and will go on happening until some brave new generation like yours catches on to illusion and is thereby shocked into opening its mind to truths that may not be pleasant to take.

This is the application of my Lesson No. One.

And Lesson No. Two applies, too. To get more truth to print, newspapers must have more and better disciplined truth seekers than they have now. But well trained, well disciplined bodies of men do not come out of wishing wells. They come only in response to recognized need. The highly trained, highly disciplined men whose labors solved the problems that had to be solved before Gordon Cooper could orbit this planet 22 times did not just happen. They were recruited and paid for by the need all of us felt—to keep up with our unfriendly neighbors.

Some millennium we will wake up to the fact that we need understanding of the people who make up the world even more than we need understanding of the behavior of its atoms. I grant that nature can trouble us, but most of the trouble that's troubled my life has been made by man himself—my life span having already included two world wars and a punishing and unnecessary world depression.

That brief history—less than half a century's— a fraction in time—should be enough to make skeptics of us all!

I would like to see at least one-tenth of the money and energy and brain effort that we Americans have happily thrown into the space race set aside, some day, for a comparable attack on our ignorance about ourselves and our motivations—which are, of course, the source material of the horrifying news that has characterized the last 50 years.

I speak to you of newspapers in terms of history because your newspaper is your contact with contemporary history. It reports, day by day, history as it is being made. It is your first contact with the material of history, which man must master to guide him in making a better history of the next 50 years. And its record to date has been a sorry one—at least if judged by results. Clearly there has been something basically the matter with our source material that, using it, we have come up with so many, and so consistently, wrong answers.

I promised that I would be speaking to you about a subject I knew *something* about—but I'm afraid I have let you down. I know a little about producing a newspaper but when I face the ultimate issue of what to print in one, I

find I stand humbly in ignorance. There is so much to be learned and mastered about man himself before one can even begin to compose a serious answer to the question of how to keep him "well-informed."

So I have only a challenge to pose. The challenge is to you to make your newspapers what they should be to serve you better—for the lesson to end my lessons is that newspapers are what their readers, not their writers, make them. And not until you want—really want, and are ready to pay—to make them better—not until that great day—will they be better.

Fears for the Press in Africa

By Tom Hopkinson

Such press as existed in the now independent States of Africa was until a year or two ago almost entirely expatriate owned, controlled and edited. With the coming of independence there emerged simultaneously a need and a danger.

The need was for competent, trained and reliable African journalists—men who if they could not fill the top posts on newspapers and magazines immediately could fill the next-to-the-top posts.

By 1960 few African journalists in East and Central Africa had risen above the level of the junior reporter. Even in West Africa where there have been African editors for more than a decade, these same editors still complain bitterly of their difficulty in finding reliable assistants. This then was the need.

The danger was and is that if capable and reliable African journalists are not made available quickly a deadly split will open between politicians and the press. African politicians will not accept that under independence press power shall continue to be held exclusively, or even mainly, by expatriates.

Equally they are quick to resent criticism by African journalists unless this criticism is moderate, closely reasoned, and carefully expressed. There has been a growing tendency among African politicians to regard press freedom as a nuisance; to say that the expatriate-run press is inevitably hostile and the African press still undeveloped, and that in these circumstances the only answer is for the government to own or take over the leading newspapers and either close or hamstring the remainder.

Examples where this has happened already spring to mind. In territories where it has not yet happened the idea is openly canvassed. Over a large part of Africa the defender of press freedom supports an unpopular cause.

Tom Hopkinson is director of the Africa seminar program of the International Press Institute. This is a statement he made at their Stockholm assembly, June 5.

Nieman Fellows 1963-64

Harvard University has appointed ten Nieman Fellows for the academic year opening in September. One will hold the Arthur D. Little Fellowship for science writing. Two Associate Fellows have been appointed, from Canada and South Africa and three Asian Associates selected by the Asia Foundation. All the foreign associates are supported by other foundations.

The U.S. Nieman Fellows include two foreign correspondents, two Washington correspondents, one magazine journalist, two state political correspondents and three staff reporters.

This is the 26th group of news men appointed to the Nieman Fellowships established under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman, widow of Lucius Nieman, the founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*. The Fellows, on leave from their papers, pursue studies of their own choice to strengthen their background for journalism.

The 1963-64 Nieman Fellows are:

Clarence H. Jones, Jr., 29, State House reporter, Jacksonville *Journal*. Native of Jacksonville, a graduate of the University of Florida, he was on the staff of the *Florida Times-Union* five years and since 1959 has been with the Jacksonville *Journal*. His reporting won two public service awards last year.

He will study local and state government.

Wayne P. Kelley, 30, Atlanta bureau chief, Southeastern Newspapers. Born in Rochester, N. Y., he was graduated from Vanderbilt University, and began newspaper work on the Atlanta *Journal*. In 1959 he joined the Augusta *Chronicle*, became its city editor, and in 1960 started their Atlanta bureau which serves also the affiliated Savannah *Evening Press*.

He will study psychology and social relations for application to the race issue.

Robert J. Korengold, 33, UPI correspondent in Moscow. Native of Minneapolis and graduate of Northwestern University, he served four years in the Navy, then for two years was roving correspondent in Europe for the *Army Times*. He has been with the UPI since 1957, serving in Paris, London, Geneva and since 1959 in the Moscow bureau. He was in charge of the bureau last year while Henry Shapiro was on leave.

He plans to concentrate on Soviet studies.

James H. McCartney, 37, Washington correspondent, Chicago *Daily News*. Native of St. Paul, he is a graduate of Michigan State University with a master's degree from Northwestern. He has been 11 years with the Chicago *Daily News*. He worked on major stories in Chicago, including the expose of the state auditor for which the *News* received a Pulitzer Prize. He served also as assistant city

editor and night editor before assignment to the *News'* Washington bureau in 1959.

He will study problems of the federal government.

David M. Mazie, 30, Minneapolis *Tribune* staff reporter. He was born in Sioux City, Iowa, and is a graduate of Northwestern University. He was editor of an army post paper (Fort Carson, Colo.), during his military service, then joined the AP Indianapolis bureau for a year and since 1959 has been with the Minneapolis *Tribune* on general assignment, which included the 1962 political campaign, city hall coverage and serving as assistant city editor.

He will specialize in Latin American studies.

Morton A. Mintz, 41, Washington *Post* reporter. He was born in Ann Arbor, Mich., and is a graduate of the University of Michigan, where he was editor of the college daily. He served three years in the Navy in the Second World War, then worked on St. Louis papers, for four years on the *Star-Times* and after its demise seven years on the *Globe-Democrat*. He has been since 1958 with the Washington *Post* covering major assignments, notably the *Post's* successful campaign for the 23rd amendment, giving Washington residents the vote. His exclusive Thalidomide story last year won him the Broun and Polk Awards and was instrumental in reform of the food and drug regulations.

His studies will be chiefly in U.S. history.

Roy E. Reed, 33, *Arkansas Gazette*, staff reporter. Native of Hot Springs, Ark., he is a graduate of the University of Missouri and has a master's degree from that university. He began newspaper work on the Joplin (Mo.) *Globe*, then spent two years in the Air Force, and joined the *Arkansas Gazette* in 1956. He has covered the Little Rock school integration problems, local politics and, since 1958, the state legislature.

He will study government and economics in relation to the race and industrial problems of his state.

Thomas B. Ross, 33, Washington correspondent, Chicago *Sun-Times*, was appointed to the Arthur D. Little Fellowship for science writing, supported by the ADL Foundation. Born in New York City, he is a graduate of Yale University. He served four years in the Navy before starting newspaper work with the International News Service, which he served in Atlanta, Hartford and Washington. In 1958 he joined the *Sun-Times* bureau in Washington, where since 1961 he has specialized on the Pentagon.

He will study government science and defense policies.

Jerrold L. Schecter, 30, correspondent, *Time-Life* Southeast Asia bureau, Hong Kong. Born in New York City, he is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin. He served two years in the Navy in Japan and Korea, and a year and a half with the *Wall Street Journal*, before joining *Time, Inc.*, in 1958. In 1960 he was assigned to Hong Kong and has covered developments in Laos, Vietnam and Malaysia.

He will study the Soviet Union and the Far East.

Dan Wakefield, 31, magazine journalist. Born in Indianapolis, he is a graduate of Columbia College. He has been a free-lance magazine writer since 1956, specializing in social issues. In 1960 his "Report from the South" occupied an entire issue of *The Nation* and he has since been a staff contributor but contributes also to various magazines. His articles on the Puerto Ricans in New York, and on the South, developed into books, *Island in the City* and *Revolt in the South*.

He will study political science and history.

The Associate Fellows are:

Guy Lamarche, 28, political editor of *La Presse*, Montreal, is a graduate of the University of Montreal. He was a National Newspaper Award winner in 1961.

He will specialize on American political institutions.

Robert C. Steyn, 35, political correspondent, *Cape Argus*, Cape Town, South Africa. Educated in law, he turned to journalism, joining the *Argus* in 1953. He is treasurer of the Parliamentary Press Gallery Association and vice chairman of the Cape Town branch of the South African Society of Journalists.

He plans to study American government and international relations.

P. N. Krishnaswami, 38, city editor, *Economic Times*, Bombay, India. Graduate of the University of Bombay, with an M. A. in economics, he has been nine years on the *Times*. He plans to study the American economy.

Miss Chirabha Onruang, 39, education editor, *Siam Sirkorn Daily*, Bangkok, Thailand. A graduate of Thammasat, in Bangkok, she is also a member of the UNESCO Commission of Thailand. She plans to study American education.

Woon-Yiu Pang, 39, reporter, *Overseas Chinese News*, Hong Kong. A graduate of Lingnan University, he has been 14 years with the *News*. He plans to study modern history and political science.

New Address

***Nieman Reports* has moved to 77 Dunster St., Cambridge 38, new home of the Nieman Foundation.**

A Nieman Reunion

is being planned for June 3-4-5, 1964.

Asia Faces A Newspaper Revolution

By Tarzie Vittachi

The Asian press finds itself between the devil and the deep blue sea. Look in any direction and it becomes painfully evident that the frontiers of press freedom are shrinking fast. Many Asian governments are beginning to take a hostile attitude toward the press and tend to reject the concept of the freedom of the press as an outmoded product of 19th century Western liberalism which has no validity in the modern world, least of all in the Asia (or Africa) of the 1960's.

Only in Japan and the Philippines is the freedom of newspapers to publish what they please limited only by the normal canons of defamation and obscenity but, apart from this, news and comment are free from government control and direction. Until October 1962 when the Chinese incursions flared into a hot war on the northern frontiers, the Indian press enjoyed a similar range of freedom. Since then the Defense of India Rules (taken on almost totally from the powers used by the Imperial Government during World War II) threaten severe penalties covering a frightening range of new offenses. The government of India claims that these stringent measures are necessary for "total" security in the face of "total" threat from China. It also claims—with considerable force—that these new powers are not being invoked in practice and that even where newspapers have committed offenses under the DOIR they have not been punished accordingly. The assurance by the government of India that the severity of the emergency laws would be mitigated by liberal interpretation and judicious application would be good enough for most Indian editors but for the ugly possibility that the emergency will continue for five—or even ten—years. In that time India could lose her liberal leadership and, after all, no government is so altruistic as to surrender a weapon forged by a previous regime to meet a special situation as long as the weapon is powerful and handy. And, in any case, politicians and bureaucrats soon get into the habit of power.

The picture is even grimmer elsewhere in Asia. There is, by definition, no question of a free press in Red China. Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, Taiwan, Korea and Thailand have dictators at the head of their governments and it is axiomatic that where there is autocracy, press freedom—or any other human freedom—is only permissive if it exists

A. G. T. Vittachi is director of the Asian program of the International Press Institute. Till recently, he was editor of the *Ceylon Observer*. He is author of "Emergency '58" and "The Brown Sahib."

at all. The Ceylon government has apparently discovered that the Sword of Damocles can be used very effectively in place of the censor's scissors. In three years seven different bills to nationalize or otherwise control the "dissemination of all news and views" have been passed by the cabinet whenever the press became critical of the cost of living or of the growing corruption in public life. These measures were never actually enacted—apparently on the rather canny reasoning that if the press can be threatened into conformity, why undertake the financial burden of running nationalized newspapers which, like most other state undertakings in Ceylon, is likely to be a business failure?

In Indonesia President Sukarno has gone even further. Several critical newspapers have been suppressed by the device of confiscating a newspaper's assets but not its liabilities; their owners therefore are in the position of having to continue to meet their business debts without collateral or the means which secured these obligations. Many editors, like Mochtar Lubis, who has been under arrest—five years house arrest and two in jail without even a semblance of a trial because he dared to be critical—or refused to sign a 19 point agreement imposed by the President, lost not only their newspapers and their jobs, but also their right to a profession. They are proscribed as writers.

Read one Indonesian newspaper and you have read them all—except for innocuous features about the culture of Indonesia and a few other "unsensitive" items.

President Sukarno's most recent and solemn pronouncement on the press was to ban officially the concept of objectivity in reporting the news. All news going out and coming in through the official news agency goes through a process of political fumigation before it is passed for human consumption. The Malayan press does not suffer from government censorship but is subject to a licensing law also inherited from the British who enacted it to squash the possibility of internal unrest. In Thailand and Pakistan and Burma the press suffers from the inevitable restraints of dictatorship. Burmese journalists, however, have succeeded in salvaging a small measure of freedom from the debris of democracy—through strongly led united action and by voluntary self-regulation. Newspapers in French-speaking Asia are also victims of politics largely in the sense that their strength and freedom fluctuate with the stormy political changes that this region has experienced since the war.

Those are the dimensions of the devil stalking the Asian

press: in front, the deep blue sea is frightening too in its vastness but it also offers a prospect of hope and great achievement.

A massive revolution in readership awaits the Asian press. Newspaper circulations in Asia fall far below their potential. A recent report of UNESCO shows this chasm between possibility and achievement very sharply:

Asia, excluding Communist China has a population of nearly 1,000,000,000 people; the total circulation of daily newspapers in this region is about 46,000,000.

Of these, Japanese newspapers account for 36,000,000.

This means that in the rest of Asia—including India with 450,000,000 people, Pakistan with 96,000,000, Indonesia with 98,000,000, Burma with 26,000,000 and the Philippines with 27,000,000—less than 10,000,000 take a daily newspaper.

India with a population of 450,000,000 has a daily newspaper circulation of less than 5,000,000.

Thus, Japan prints 40 copies for every 100 people; India prints less than one copy for every 100 people, Indonesia and Pakistan also show similar ratios.

The ready explanation that springs to mind is that Japan has a much higher level of literacy and economic well-being than India, Pakistan or Indonesia. But this is by no means the complete explanation.

Surveys conducted by the Indian Institute of Public Opinion have shown that, accounting for illiteracy and poverty, the number of Indians who can read and afford to buy a newspaper are around 40-45 million—although less than five million daily newspapers are sold today.

Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru pointed up the problem very clearly and memorably when he asked Indian editors: "Why can I not reach the masses of India through your newspapers?"

More and more Indian editors are discovering that no facile excuses will provide a satisfactory alibi and that they must face up to the unpleasant fact that their newspapers may not be attractive enough to meet the needs and tastes of the new readers. These "new-literates" are growing in number every year with the extensive program of compulsory education started since the war by the newly independent countries of Asia. Education is rapidly spreading but, inevitably, the content of education is becoming thinner because the number of schools and teachers cannot adequately catch up with the "explosion" of the school-going population. The new class of readers, therefore, are different from newspaper readers of the past two generations. Also, the potential readership is largely for the vernacular press because the movement toward the use of national languages is very fast.

Asian editors are finding that the primary change needed is for a more simplified style of writing and simpler methods of presentation.

Mr. Nehru told a gathering of Indian editors recently: "I am convinced that the fault lies with the people who run these papers and who write in them. They do not use a language which is easily comprehensible to the average Hindi-speaking person. They tend to write for special academics and want to show that they are very learned people . . . Whatever the language of the newspaper it is necessary to use simple language agreeable to the growing number of new literates."

The following extract picked at random from a newspaper published in Bengal typifies the kind of approach which, as Mr. Nehru says, repels the new reader. "A Special Representative" of an English language newspaper trying to explain to his readers the work the government was doing at Hatia to improve the lot of the people writes:

"Howsoever little I could comprehend all about the totality of tempo and effect of the massive activity now permeating the wide work sites here I could feel that Hatia has evidently sparked our growth plan. It was a comforting evaluation of the splendid Government Community participation to broadbase the foundation of heavy industries."

Here is another example from a Madras newspaper. "The maximum payment of Rs. 1000 in case of each saving Bank depositor as a preferential claim from out of the assets of a Banking Company under liquidation is sought to be raised to Rs. 2500 under the Banking Companies (Second Amendment) Bill introduced in the Lok Sabha today."

Surely these paragraphs, loaded with Latinisms and complicated constructions, are heavy-going for the most sophisticated reader, let alone the new-literates.

But simple language is only one of the ways of attracting the new Asian reader. The reluctance to use pictorial journalism has also been a deadening factor. In recent times more editors are beginning to see that photographs, illustrations, and cartoons are necessary and very effective means of communication and that, in countries where populations are fragmented by linguistic barriers, a picture is a picture in any language.

Another grave drawback to increasing circulations is the excessive urbanization of the Asian press. Newspapers, even national newspapers, published from the capitals of states, tend to ignore the problems, views and fields of interest of the rural readers and it is in the agro-urban and rural areas that the present and future potential for readership lies. The result is, as newspapers in Ceylon and India found at their last general elections, the rural population—to the enormous surprise of the editors—do not seem to have been even touched by the political views and preferences of the national newspapers.

A Malayan language newspaper in Kerala, South India, which got wise in 1962 to this widening gulf between itself

and its readers, found it possible to increase its circulation from 81,000 to 114,000 in four months by the simple device of giving more space and attention to local and state views and problems and proportionately less to national and international news.

The strength of the press as a community service—as a powerful means of safeguarding the public interests in banishing graft and corruption in public affairs—is also being gradually realized.

Asian newspapers—particularly in India and Pakistan—are badly handicapped in their attempts to reach their potential readership by extraneous factors over which they have no control: lack of foreign exchange for newsprint and machinery is the foremost among these. Lack of adequate transport facilities for economical distribution is another.

The internal defects over which newspapers have some control are, however, the principal reasons for the failure of the press to reach the people. The most urgent and vital requirement seems to be the training of journalists, newspaper production specialists and managers with a real sense of professionalism. Asian newspapers are beginning to realize that no newspaper can even exist, let alone achieve its true potential, without a persistent, skilled and conscious sense of direction in the newsrooms, printing rooms and in the advertising and circulation departments.

In 1960 Asian editors invited the International Press Institute to conduct a series of seminars, training workshops and visits to newspapers by editorial and management consultants. The gospel of the value of professionalism and the need for trained skills spread rapidly. Many Indian editors have stopped looking for excuses and are boldly facing the challenge in front of them: the possibility of the

circulations growing from five million a day to 10 or even 20 million in the next decade.

Indian newspapers established the Press Institute of India this year on the lines of the very effective American Press Institute at Columbia to serve as a forcing house of ideas and training skills to improve the Indian press. The gospel of professional training has caught on in Pakistan, the Philippines, Japan, Malaya and Burma. The Philippines are preparing to set up a training institute which is also to be a scaled down model of the American Press Institute.

Another valuable development is the growing awareness of the commensurate responsibility that goes with the freedom of the press. The Burmese press has its own Press Council with quite an effective Ethics Committee designed for self-regulation is a subject of active discussion in India just now and before the year's end there may be a national Press Council and a number of state-wide councils for the same purpose.

Possibilities for mature growth are enormous. The real issue is, will the press be able to build itself to its real strength, rooted in the confidence of the people it seeks to serve, before it falls a victim to the demagogues?

Even democratic minded politicians in Asia are in a hurry to show results, and demand to know whether the press has a right to be critical of governments elected by a majority of the people. They claim, with apparent logic, that they hold a mandate from the people whereas the press does not. A soundly run newspaper, however, should be able to retort with perfect justification that whereas a government gets its mandate every four or five years, the press receives a fresh mandate every day.

Asia's Free Daily Newspapers

By Albert Ravenholt

Rarely have assembled newspapermen occupied themselves with such a thorough-going appraisal of their own profession as did those who met during the International Press Institute Seminar at Manila in March, 1962. Some 25 Asian editors devoted long sessions every day for a week to examining both their own performances and the challenges they face. The net result was a revealing estimate of the quality of the press today in those Asian countries where it is allowed to function with relative freedom. More important, the discussions yielded glimpses of the enormous opportunities for expanding newspaper readership in much of Asia. They also brought to focus the fact that unless

the press serves the needs of these "new literates," newspapers themselves may be among the first casualties of authoritarian political rule. For in successive new Asian nations where newspapers have failed to reach out and become identified with the daily life needs of ordinary citizens, the free press has lacked the popular support demanded for survival. As the "revolution in readership" now under way in much of Asia gathers momentum, only a major effort to upgrade professional journalistic performance promises to enable the press to fulfill its vital functions in building freer societies.

The comparatively limited circulation of the daily press

throughout most of Asia today is indicated by a few statistics. Pakistan, with a population of some 96 million, prints a total of roughly a quarter of a million newspapers for the eastern and western sections of this new country. In the Philippines where their distribution is limited by the fragmented geography of the Archipelago, all the daily newspapers have a combined circulation of some 300,000 among 29 million Filipinos. Indian newspapers have a circulation of 4.5 million in a population of 440 million. In Ceylon 330,000 newspapers are produced for a population of about 9 million. Malaya does relatively better with a newspaper circulation of 300,000 for a population of about 6 million. By contrast the 100 leading daily newspapers of Japan have a total circulation of over 37 million, or one newspaper for every 2.6 citizens in a country with 94.5 million inhabitants. Japan is a land of huge newspaper empires with two dailies publishing more than 3 million each, one daily with a circulation above two million, and two others whose distribution is in excess of one million each.

The newspaper revolution that in an earlier day transformed the Japanese press along the pattern of mass circulation dailies that had so vitally affected the way of life in Great Britain and the United States, now is reaching into South and Southeast Asia. It reflects fundamental changes under way in these societies, particularly the development of mass education usually in the vernacular languages. Urbanization, industrial progress, and a new concern with wider horizons of interest and employment aspiration all are part of this process.

Experience of several newspapers indicates that this process is already under way. The *Hindu* of Madras, the *Malayala Manorama* of Kerala, and the *Jugantar* of Calcutta have approximately doubled their circulation during the past five years. Yet, a survey conducted by a professional group in Delhi found there may be another 30 to 40 million Indians ready to buy newspapers, provided there were papers that met their needs and interests. In the Philippines daily newspaper circulation has been increasing on an average by more than 10 per cent annually. This expansion in readership throughout much of Asia is being experienced by newspapers usually published in the traditional manner and often in English, which has been the language of education, government, and commerce in many of these emerging countries. More marked is the growth in circulation of the vernacular press. In Rangoon today newspapers published in Burmese are gaining readers more rapidly than the older English-language press. In Ceylon the Sinhalese-language press has far outstripped the English newspapers. And in Indonesia, where Bahasa Indonesia is becoming the common tongue among a people who formerly spoke many dialects, it is also the principal language of the press.

Where a newspaper, or even a single reporter, has discovered how to reach these "new literates," the growth in circulation frequently has been far more spectacular. Amitabha Chowdhury, the conscientious, quiet Indian journalist who won a Ramon Magsaysay Award last year for his investigative reporting, told of a classic example. Within three months after he began revealing the abuses and misdeeds of a top management officer of the Damodar Valley Corporation, circulation of the Bengali-language daily, *Jugantar*, where he works, jumped from 60,000 to 95,000. An East Pakistani editor in Dacca learned of this technique during an earlier IPI seminar in Lahore. He went home and by careful investigative reporting brought to light the system of kidnaping small boys from his area for disfiguring and sale as beggar props to be used in Calcutta and elsewhere. Within eight months, as ordinary Pakistanis learned to trust his newspaper, circulation grew from 12,000 to nearly 24,000. These were new readers; circulation generally was not taken away from other newspapers. A vernacular daily in Ceylon raised circulation from 71,000 to 93,000 in six weeks by abandoning the former practice of simply translating the English press and, instead, sending out its own reporters to gather news that interested Sinhalese readers.

The present content of many among the older and more respected newspapers explains part of this virgin opportunity for a new, more readable, and meaningful type of journalism. A single issue was selected at random among the established newspapers published in New Delhi. This 12-page issue contained 93 news stories. Of these, 47 dealt with speeches of President Rajendra Prasad, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, cabinet ministers and members of parliament and government press releases. Twenty-seven stories were gleaned from cabled foreign news accounts, again dealing primarily with governmental activity. Reports from the law courts provided 13 stories. Four stories concerned struggles for control of the ruling Congress Party. One story about Sir Edmund Hillary's search for the Yete and another about an orchid show were of more general interest. There were three pictures in the newspaper, two of Prime Minister Nehru and one of President Prasad. Similar practices applied in Kerala before the IPI influence was felt in the tempestuous South Indian state that has one of the highest literacy rates in Asia. A check among the 42 daily newspapers that have a combined circulation of roughly one-half million among a population of about 15 million found that 80 to 85 per cent of the news printed was national and international. Few papers had local reporters and there was scant examination in the press of those daily events that most intimately affected the life of the citizens in this state. With help from the IPI, editors in Kerala now have been encouraged to devote up to 80 per cent of space

to competitive local news gathered by their own reporters, and circulation has expanded steadily.

The fact that much of South and Southeast Asia's press clings to these ancient models of European journalism affects far more than the size and prosperity of the newspapers. It has meant that generally newspapers failed to become intimately involved with the daily affairs of ordinary citizens in these new nations; they have not become vehicles for voicing popular frustrations, problems, and hopes. Nor have they offered culturally useful entertainment. The appeal to this burgeoning mass of new readers has been left largely to publishers of comic books, movie magazines, pornographic literature, and to some communist-and other totalitarian-oriented propagandists. Instead, the established press has been largely content to cater to a privileged minority of professionals, officials, merchants, and educators whose greater purchasing power appealed more readily to advertisers.

Ceylon offers a warning of the price paid by a country for such shallow journalism. On this lush island the press largely endorsed the United National Party during the 1960 elections. After her election, the new Prime Minister, Madam Sirimavo Bandaranaike, who had won with the help of a left-wing coalition, retaliated against the newspapers for having opposed her. In the "speech from the throne" her government threatened to nationalize the press. Since then communal disturbances between Sinhalese and Tamils and successive financial crises have delayed such action. Also, there was some disagreement evident among political leaders in office as to who actually would run the press. But under present emergency laws all newspapers are censored. And the press has been intimidated to a point where it plays along with the government in return for being permitted to survive in form. The mass of Ceylonese who had never come to trust or appreciate the press failed to respond to such government action with any significant demands for retaining free newspapers that could be champions of their needs.

Curtailed press freedom is becoming an even more common feature of contemporary life in Asia. Pakistan, Indonesia, South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia all have a press that is substantially influenced by the authorities. In Singapore and Malaya emergency regulations instituted by the British require annual registration of newspapers as a condition for publishing. Thailand's press still is inhibited by uneasy legal and administrative requirements, although it is freer than it was five years ago. Burma's press has been officially advised to be carefully responsible. Only in Japan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and India are newspapers fully their own masters. Yet, most of the new countries of Asia embarked upon independence during the past 15 years with freedom of speech and press expressed as a byword for the type of

society they wanted to build. The inhibitions that now curb the press throughout much of non-communist Asia reflect a near equal limiting of freedom in other areas of life.

It is among the purposes of the International Press Institute to foster freedom of the press and responsible journalism. The Institute was formally established nearly a decade ago with headquarters in Zurich, Switzerland. Originally, it was an idea in the minds of a few leading editors, including several distinguished Americans. Now its membership includes 1,500 journalists in 48 countries and it is becoming an instrument that enables them to act together with growing sureness. Their concern is first with getting to know each other; like members of other professions, newspapermen usually take joy and courage from comradesly association. Secondly, the IPI has acted organizationally to counter official encroachment upon press freedom in a number of countries on several continents. The Institute has come to the defense of imprisoned newspapermen and sought through representation and publicity to induce governments to lift curbs. Such moral support from leading editors in America and Europe is particularly valued by Asian newspapermen struggling against great odds. A third concern of the Institute is with elevating professional standards to make newspapers both more successful and worthy of respect. One of America's ablest newspapermen, Jack Harris, of Hutchinson, Kansas, voluntarily went to India and shared valued practical advice with editors in Kerala and elsewhere. With IPI encouragement a national Indian Institute now is being organized to transmit such know-how in depth. In Burma and several other countries the IPI is encouraging creation of press councils designed to foster greater responsibility by newspapers through charting of a mutually accepted press code.

The IPI seminar held in Manila from March 11 to 17 was the fourth of its kind in Asia; earlier seminars, also financed with some help from the Rockefeller Foundation, were conducted in New Delhi, Lahore, and Kuala Lumpur. Participants in this seminar came from Burma, Thailand, India, Malaya, Hong Kong, Australia, Japan, and the Philippines. Originally, some Filipinos had wondered why they needed to hold a seminar here. They long have prided themselves upon possessing the freest press in Asia. But following the missionary work done some two months ago by Tarzie Viltachi, the IPI representative for Asia, the publishers and editors here joined enthusiastically in the enterprise. Leading editors of metropolitan and provincial newspapers took time out from other responsibilities and really worked, presenting papers and joining in seminar discussions that included mutual criticism of their papers. As they became more deeply involved in this process of examining their own professional performance, they also were candid in recognizing their own shortcomings.

The seminar covered almost the entire gambit of pro-

blems facing an editor. Readability in newspapers was examined meticulously. Vittachi took the Philippine newspapers to task in a nice way for their unimaginative use of pictures, showing how they can be employed to heighten attractiveness and understanding. Each participant received a copy of a special IPI Manual on news editing published for Asian newspapers. Investigative, economics, interpretive, and science reporting all were dealt with in detail and the editors encouraged to see how improvement of professional standards in these fields can make their newspapers more successful and useful to the community. Similar attention was devoted to column writing, political and election reporting, and the opportunities for public welfare work by newspapers. There was intensive discussion of the new layers of readership becoming available and the problems confronting the press in dealing with government. One major finding of those who joined in the seminar was the opportunity all their newspapers have available for humanizing coverage by becoming responsive to the universal desire of readers to learn about those events that most intimately affect them and their neighbors.

As these otherwise often competitive editors discovered such unused opportunities for building their own publications, they became more avid for gleaning techniques that later could be applied in their own newsrooms. Spurred by their inherent desire to be successful, they found that the avenue to such achievement can be professional excellence. And the realization grew that such performance by them was inextricably linked to the jealous safeguarding of larger areas of freedom at home. Those who have come to take for granted the legal protection for the individual and his property so developed in Europe and North America may have difficulty appreciating the revolutionary implications of such a realization in most of Asia. Yet, it is in this area that the IPI seminar here possibly made its greatest contribution. Newspapermen, like other busy professional folk, tend to be preoccupied with their immediate responsibilities. As the seminar discussions compelled them to sit down and jointly sort through their mutual problems they rediscovered the dependence of their jobs and way of life upon the maintenance and development of such fundamentals as effective rule by law. The tasks confronting newspapermen in Asia in the face of the developing "revolution in readership" are on a scale without precedent elsewhere; odds hardly favor the press fully meeting these needs. But such efforts as the IPI seminars and the national institutes it seeks to found can substantially enhance the standards of professional excellence that become the yardstick for newspaper performance.

Albert Ravenholt is on the American University Field Staff, serving in the Far East. This report is from a pamphlet in their Southeast Asia Series.

Mexico: "Neutralist" Neighbor

By John C. Merrill

Mexico, right in our own backyard, is looked upon as the leader of the neutralist bloc in the Western hemisphere; it makes much of being a "third force"—against both Soviet communism and American capitalism.

Having sampled Mexican opinion since 1960, when I began work on a Ph.D. thesis at Iowa, and having continued this sampling through questionnaires, letters and interviews well into 1962 after having obtained the doctorate, I am convinced that the Mexican neutralism is a myth—simply a semantic gimmick to obtain whatever aid is forthcoming from any direction without any commitments made.

Of course, there are those who will say that I obtained opinion only from one group—journalists (on 15 leading dailies in all parts of Mexico); this is true, but there is good reason to believe that journalistic opinion in Mexico is extremely sensitive both to government attitudes and to public opinion.

Although generally the Mexico government gingerly walks the fuzzy "no-man's land" between the East and West, it is not too unusual for its basic anti-Americanism to show through. Several times its governmental voice broke through in angry growls at the U.S. in 1960; and everyone remembers how Mexico voted at the Punta del Este conference in respect to sanctions against Cuba in January, 1962.

And even as recently as June 6, 1962, on the eve of President Kennedy's visit to Mexico, the Mexican ambassador to the OAS hurled the charge at the U.S. that Americans are guided by a "Western movie mentality" in which everything good is done by "blonde types."

The month before this blast by Sánchez Gavito I had received some 30 "opinion" essays about the U.S. from Mexican editors—all but two of them unfavorable. Here is one from a staff member of *El Universal* of Mexico City, typical of the group:

I feel that the United States is trying now harder than in many years to show good intentions in its foreign policy toward Mexico and Latin America generally. President Kennedy in his Alliance for Progress has tried to make a start in helping Latin American economies improve. But his program has met much opposition for many reasons both in your country and in Latin America. For some reason there is still deep-rooted suspicions and antagonisms among us which builds a strong wall against inter-American cooperation. My belief is that people in your country generally still do not really care

about us in Latin America—in our economic well-being or in our social and political well-being. Your president has tried, but his aspirations will pass away in the face of basic prejudices and isolationist attitudes which I think are held by a great majority of North Americans.

Another journalist (*El Norte*, Monterrey), who works on one of the leading pro-U.S. dailies, reiterated in May, 1962, the familiar theme which had been sounded repeatedly in my ears since 1960—that “basically North Americans are noisy, crude, devoid of the elements of refinement and courtesy, and are condescending toward us in Mexico.”

It might be interesting to look briefly at a few other opinions about the U.S. given by Mexican journalists from 1960-62. In all, slightly more than 100 essays were written at my request by journalists representing some 15 dailies of Mexico; of these 97 per cent can easily be classified as negative or unfavorable to the U.S. Following are a few excerpts from a number of these. Those presented below are believed to best typify the various commentaries coming from all through the country. Names of the journalists are withheld in accordance with promises made the journalists.

North American women fascinate me, intrigue me, infuriate me. Most generally they infuriate me. I have little respect for them for I observe them as domineering, spoiled, lazy, egotistical, selfrighteous, and observe that their children are exactly like them. I would say that women are ruining your country in spite of all its wealth and power. (*El Imparcial*, Hermosillo)

Materialistically the typical North American is one far advanced. But culturally he is just beginning to advance. This, in my personal opinion, is why in general he is considered all over the world as a crude person who lacks the refinement of manner that marks one who comes from an environment of knowing and thoughtful and considerate people. (*El Fronterizo*, Ciudad Juarez)

The U.S. is beginning to take the peoples of Latin America seriously. This is understandable now that Castro has perched like a red vulture on the tip of Florida. However, the U.S. still thinks of itself as the rightful determiner of the future of all the Americas, and fails to realize that the Monroe Doctrine concept is not taken with much respect in Latin America. (*El Porvenir*, Monterrey)

Your country is a thirsty giant—gigantic in economic proportions and thirsty for land possessions as well as for human possessions. Also it is an ingenious giant; its foreign policy is fundamentally characterized in the application of ‘directed publicity’ which fixes in the minds of those of the democratic counties the liberty of the U.S., while at the same time the policy of the State Department is calculated to subjugate economically the

underdeveloped parts of the world. (*Sol del Norte*, Saltillo)

It is very strange—this psychosis brought about by communism in the United States. So grave is it that any deed, regardless of the extremes it may take, can be brought about as long as it is against communism or something that appears close to communism. This obsession with communism, I think, is causing the U.S. to lose many former friends and is disrupting harmony and cooperation within the U.S. itself. (*Excelsior*, Mexico City)

Most North Americans try too hard to be friendly—I have the feeling that this is usually an act, not a true attitude. There is also a basic egotism in your people; there are exceptions, of course, but I am forced to say that I have not seen very many. (*Novedades*, Mexico City)

One thing that is incomprehensible to us Mexicans about your country is that everybody who does not think as a North American is categorized as a “communist” by those in leadership in the U.S. You don’t seem to realize that there are other political and social roads open to a people and a country other than those of North American imperialism and Russian communism. We in Mexico are trying to avoid overtures made to us from both directions. (*El Occidental*, Guadalajara)

You will hear kind words about the U.S. in Mexico, I am sure. But these words come from the surface of the mind of my fellow citizens and not from the deep chambers of the heart. Basically the Mexican is anti-United States for the same reason that a poor but proud man, who because of circumstances is forced to beg, is against the giver of the charity. I hope you will sincerely try to understand our country; we are much more than guitars, serapes, and Acapulco. (*Diario de Yucatán*, Mérida)

So much for the personal opinions of Mexican journalists. These presented above are typical of those given and reflect the underlying antagonism for the United States. Now, what about the “image” of the U.S. and its people reflected in the newspapers themselves? This image, at least in the opinion portions—editorials, columns, and letters-to-the-editor—is little different from the personal opinion of the journalists; and it reflects the same unfavorable attitudes.

For example, I isolated twelve dominant “themes” in opinion pieces appearing in a selected sample (one month) of ten dailies in 1960 (these dailies represented nine cities in the main regions of Mexico). Ten of the 12 themes were unfavorable. They follow in order of the emphasis in the ten dailies:

1. The U.S. is plagued with family problems, juvenile delinquency, and sex-crime problems.
2. The U.S. needs to improve its total foreign policy toward Latin America (or needs to get one).

3. The U.S. should try harder to reach an agreement with the USSR to end atomic testing and to maintain world peace.

4. The U.S. is unfair to Mexico in placing blame for border drug smuggling activities on her Southern neighbor.

5. In the U.S. the people are overly-concerned with money, possessions, and are hurried people who show great emotional tension.

6. The U.S. should not try to interfere in the internal affairs of Latin America.

7. The Castro revolution, which led to a break with the U.S., has generally proved to be a bad thing for Cubans and for the Western World.

8. The U.S. is overly-concerned with the danger of communism in the Americas.

9. Remarkable progress is being made in U.S. science, especially in medicine.

10. U.S. tourists in Mexico create unfavorable impressions.

11. The U.S. needs to be consistent in dealing with anti-democratic governments, e.g., if it is against Castro,

it should be against such "dictators" as Franco and the Somozas.

12. The U.S. needs to return to a Democratic "New Deal" Era as under F.D.R.

One can easily detect a rather extreme "liberalism" in the above 12 themes; also this is true in the sample opinion essays quoted earlier. This leftist liberalism (*izquierdismo*) seems to pervade all journalistic talk and writing. At every turn Mexican journalists hasten to identify with Castro's revolution and express a deep-rooted sympathy for self-determinism. They are quick to talk of the friendliness and cooperation of Soviet information specialists, while deprecating the work of the USIA. Reluctant to criticize adversely the USSR, they are quick to criticize Americans for being "overly-concerned" with the communist threat.

If Mexico is truly "neutral" as is claimed, it is extremely difficult to tell it from talking to her journalists or analyzing her daily press. Perhaps the best term for Mexico would be "an anti-U.S. neutralist nation."

John C. Merrill is associate professor of journalism at Texas A. & M.

Letter

Competition in San Francisco

To the Editor:

In the June *Nieman Reports*, Kenneth Wilson, an assistant news editor of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, wrote an article about the New York *Times* Western Edition. Since he works in San Francisco, he concentrated on San Francisco's three papers—the *Chronicle* and the *Examiner*, both morning, and the *News Call Bulletin*, evening.

He wrote: "Competition between the *Chronicle* and *Examiner* is fierce. . . . Both papers are combat sharp, very much a part of and attuned to the community. Both are lively and, in most respects, good newspapers."

"The *News Call* figures in our examination only slightly. It is in the evening field, holds a poor third place in circulation and generally is not noted for its news coverage."

I agree that we can't compete with the *Chronicle's* type of news coverage. Here are some of the stories on which we were

1. A reporter was sent to Nevada to cover an expedition to open a whorehouse in a ghost town. He wrote several stories.
2. A page one bannered series on wife-swapping.
3. A page one bannered series on the necessity of placing clothes on nude animals for morality's sake. (This was a gag dreamed up by a New York writer, and the *Chronicle* fell for it.)
4. Count Marco, the *Chronicle's* boudoir activities columnist, went to Russia to report on its women. The day President Kennedy, from Berlin, pledged "We'll Risk Our Cities," as we said in our banner on June 25, Count Marco was bannered on page one. And on June 26, with a banner (One-Man Task Force—Count Marco's Moscow Hunt—Marco Behind Curtain) and story on page one, plus almost a full, page inside the story ended: "And now—

overnight—let me leave you with an interesting question. Do you think that falsies are selling well in Moscow's department stores?"

5. A page one bannered series on the allegation that coffee served in San Francisco is horrible. It was notable for the complete absence of facts.
6. A page one bannered "I live with the Negroes" series, which the old *Police Gazette* would have eschewed, and proving nothing constructively or sociologically. All the four-letter words were spelled out to give the story authentic color.

While the *News Call Bulletin* doesn't specialize in stories on whore-houses and wife-swapping, we do specialize in public service. For this, we've won a Pulitzer prize; an Ernie Pyle award; an Inter-american Press Association's Tom Wallace award; plus 7 firsts, 10 seconds and 5 thirds in the 15 years of the McQuade Award, North California's top newspaper public service contest.

I think it's only fair that your readers, most of whom are far from San Francisco, see both sides of the story.

HARRY PRESS
City Editor
News Call Bulletin.

Great Biography

FRANCIS BACON, *The Temper of a Man*. By Catherine Drinker Bowen. Atlantic-Little Brown. Boston. \$6.

This is the very essence of great biography. In this last of her brilliant series of biographies, starting with Holmes and exploring the roots of his philosophy of the law back through John Adams to Coke, Mrs. Bowen has distilled the distinction of the craft she has acquired through more than twenty years. She encountered Francis Bacon in her studies of Coke, the great House of Commons man, the supreme advocate. Bacon was his lifelong opponent in the political struggle of the Elizabethan time. But this was only one side of Francis Bacon, who had as many sides as that richly creative period. Bacon was not in the direct line of her historical series. His discovery was an accident of a biographer's studies. But of all the characters she had met in her travels back through three and a half centuries, Bacon most attracted her, from the depth and complexity of his nature, the immense range of his talents and interests, the unmatched quality of his mind, revealed in the wisdom and rare distinction of his writing. The book on Bacon was the frosting on her cake, the final reward of laborious years. In the life of Bacon she found all the elements of the human drama raised to greatness by the stature of the man, his preeminence in a great period, the contradictions in his character, the elements of his achievement, the tragedy of his public disgrace at the peak of his lofty career, as Lord Chancellor, confidant of a sovereign who could not save him from his enemies; and the grandeur of the philosophy with which he met his overthrow and, in the years that followed, wrote his great books.

In dealing with her most impressive subject, Mrs. Bowen has created a form for her book to reflect the subject. The grace of its style excels all her other writing. The economy of the writing follows Bacon's own intense condensation of thought to epigrammatic sentences. The immensity of detail she had to master for her task she has refined to the essentials for the finished structure. It is as

though she presented a series of portraits of her subject against a background of the turbulence of his time. Only a master of her materials and her craft could so illuminate her subject. Her sculptured prose discards all that would clutter the picture. In a single page she shows the political struggle between King and Commons. In an incisive paragraph she develops the character of a key figure in her drama. Yet she has left out nothing essential to understanding the man in relation to his times, in which he had so commanding a part.

In her *Bacon*, Mrs. Bowen has shown that biography can be a great creative art, as in her remarkable biographical series she has shown how to study history, to trace the origin and development of our institutions and ideas through the lives that most greatly represented them.

—L.M.L.

The Arms Arguers

ARMS DEBATE. By Robert A. Levine. Harvard University Press. 345 pp. \$6.50.

To the multitude puzzled and frustrated by the welter of arguments, claims and propaganda about arms control and defense policy, this book offers more help than most. It sorts out the various debating positions and seeks to identify them with the outlook and appraisal of the situation held by their advocates. It seeks to compare government policy on military defense with policy toward "disarmament" in its various forms, and points out the inescapable inconsistencies.

It approaches a systematic study of the national psychology as evoked by a vital issue which is both terribly dangerous and infinitely complex. It indicates the relation between the "value judgments" of various sectors, from the anti-communists to the pacifists, with the positions they take. Ideology is obviously a larger factor than the technical evidence they select, in the arguments of the polemicists of this issue. Mr. Levine finds five schools of arms policy. He analyzes these various positions, undertakes to define "the logical structure of a policy position" and

leads on to "implications and conclusions" about it all.

One chapter deals specifically with "the systematists"—the anti-war systematists and the anti-communist systematists. The attempt to rationalize national policy as between defense and disarmament is a strategic struggle. Unlike most writers in this field, Mr. Levine holds back his "personal conclusions" to his last chapter. His personal view is somewhat near the middle, rejecting the systematists of both extremes, which would seem to be an indispensable qualification for writing such a book at all, although till now the lack of it has been no deterrent. But his chief contribution is the attempt to deal rationally with a basically irrational problem. This proves chiefly that Robert Levine has an orderly intelligence, but it may help others to put theirs in a little better order.

The author is an economist at the Rand Corporation working on arms control problems. That so reasonable, even philosophical, a book could come from this source will modify some judgments about the source, based on other publications from there. But it needs to be added that Mr. Levine wrote it while he was a research associate of the Harvard Center for International affairs. L.M.L.

THE ORDEAL OF COEXISTENCE. By Willy Brandt. Harvard University Press. 112 pp. \$3.

This is a little book which resulted from the series of Gustav Pollak lectures delivered at Harvard in the fall of 1962 by the well known Mayor of West Berlin.

In the first and more important of his three lectures, Brandt defines his "two meanings of coexistence." First is the Soviet idea of coexistence which has usually created a negative reaction from free people to coexistence as a Soviet propaganda concept. The other view of coexistence Brandt considers is "the only alternative to atomic war and universal suicide." This "genuine coexistence" he said must be accepted by the Free World and ultimately would help free men to "see beyond temporary conflict, and grasp the transcendent vision of the essential unity of man and of nations."—Nguyen Thai.

"Neutralism" in Burma

By Nguyen Thai

BURMA'S FOREIGN POLICY. A Study in Neutralism. By William C. Johnstone. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 339 pp. \$7.50.

What is neutralism? Why did a small country like Burma adopt neutralism? What else could it have done? What are the prospects for neutralism as a foreign policy for small nations? These are some questions which are answered by this interesting book. The author, a professor of Asian Studies at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, spent five years (two in Burma) to research for this study of Burma's "neutralist" foreign policy since its independence in 1948.

In the first part of the book, the author made a magistral analysis of the "roots of Burma's neutralism" by retracing the historical context conditioning Burmese adoption of "positive neutralism" as a foreign policy. In his interpretation, three main factors in the historical setting were instrumental in orientating Burma toward neutralism: 1) the influence of Buddhism and its "otherworldliness"; 2) the postwar policies of the Soviet Union toward Burma and its leaders (labelled by Radio Moscow as "the running dogs of the imperialists"); and 3) the Burmese leaders' fear of involvement in the Cold War regarded as the exclusive business of the Americans and the Russians.

After analyzing Burma's relations with Communist China and its record in the U. N., Professor Johnstone tried to see what alternative choices in foreign policy were open to Burma beside neutralism. He saw two chances for Burma to become closely aligned with the West. First in 1952-53 when Burma faced a grave economic (low rice exports) and political crisis (difficult removal of several thousand and refugee Nationalist Chinese troops in Northeast Burma). Later in the period 1956-59 when Burma had a military caretaker government which showed anti-communist and pro-western dispositions.

The communists on the other hand had also two chances to draw Burma into

their orbit: first around 1948-49 when most Burmese leaders, influenced by Marxism-Leninism, were predisposed to a Soviet rapprochement; later around 1953-55 when the Soviet Union and Red China tried to court Burma with their unsuccessful economic aid.

Is neutralism a viable policy or a fatal trap? Neutralism, said Professor Johnstone, "has not been a viable policy for Burma under the conditions of 1962, but instead has led Burma close to being trapped into a status of dependency on Communist China." He added, however, that "it cannot be inferred that because neutralism may have turned out to be inviable for one country it is equally so for other small nations elsewhere whose situation may be quite different."

What is the alternative? Professor Johnstone proposed that "in the long run, dropping all the terminology of neutralism and standing on the principle of the sovereign right of independence might contribute as much to development of a world of law and order as anything else."

It is difficult to disagree with the above general conclusion. Yet it can be argued that precisely because the small underdeveloped countries like Burma felt that Cold War politics threatened their "sovereign right of independence," they had to resort to the expedient of neutralism. It may seem inconsistent and irrational to the West, but it provides a way out of involvement in Cold War politics. Furthermore, how consistent and rational can the policy of small underdeveloped countries be when they have no control over the impact of world politics shaped exclusively by big powers?

As Professor Johnstone rightly pointed out, the underdeveloped countries are primarily interested in coping with the internal problems of underdevelopment—"the dangers from within" as he called them. Given this concern, any policy adopted by the new nations—be it neutralism or something else—must be evaluated on the basis of the solutions it provides for the problems of economic development, national integration, human

resource utilization and political stability. The question is then twofold for a small nation like Burma: 1) Does neutralism as a policy help increase the margin of *real* political and economic independence for small nations in the context of Cold War politics? and 2) Would anti-communism with a total commitment to the West (and usually heavy economic dependence on it) be a better alternative for countries like Burma which, geopolitically and historically, find it hard to maintain their independence and sovereignty?

These questions of crucial importance to the underdeveloped countries emerging into *legal* independence after World War II need an urgent answer based on facts. A deeper understanding of neutralism, in all its forms and situations, is essential to a successful long-range Western policy of peaceful competition with communists. For it would be a tragic mistake for the West to equate neutralism with pro-communism and to consider all neutralist states as "lost to communism."

Fighting Guerrillas

COUNTER-GUERRILLA OPERATIONS. By Col. N. Valeriano and Lt. Col. C. Bohannan. Praeger, N. Y. 275 pp. \$5.95.

This is a timely book about the successful anti-guerrilla operation against the communist Huks in the Philippines. The authors were formerly military assistants to the late President Ramon Magsaysay, who was the chief architect of the victorious campaign by the Filipino government forces against the Huk guerrilla.

The conclusion reached by the two military experts in their detailed study of counter insurgency tactics is heavily political in emphasis. "The lesson," they said, "is that a government—whether it be one imposed by force from outside or a freely elected indigenous one—which succeeds in convincing the governed that it is acting effectively in their interests can be successful in eliminating a guerrilla movement. . . . The nation is the target of the guerrilla; it must be the target of the counter-guerrilla as well."—Nguyen Thai.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING. By Andrew Hacker. The Brookings Institution. 132 pp. \$3.50.

This describes specifically with many examples the inequalities of congressional representation through failure of many state legislatures to reapportion their states to adjust to population shifts. It is a very practical book that gets down to cases, state by state, and describes the prospects and possibilities of adequate redistricting. It deals with the Supreme Court decision and interprets its meaning and consequences.

A useful and timely book.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NEWS PRESS. Marquette University Press. 88 pp. \$2.

There's more of interest and understanding for the layman of the role of the newspaper in this little book than often turns up. Five professionals gave lectures in the new Nieman Chair of Journalism at Marquette University School of Journalism last year. These are their lectures.

Alan Barth of the *Washington Post* editorial board, on the press as censor of government; John Oakes, editor, *New York Times*, on the editorial: what it is and what it aims for; Mark Ethridge, just

retired as publisher of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, on the meaning of the news; Marya Mannes on the responsibility of the newspress to the arts; and Jay W. W. Jensen, head of the University of Illinois Department of Journalism, on freedom of the press.

These are among the ablest and most articulate of practitioners and critics of journalism and what they have to say is very effectively said and of high interest and concern to any newspaper reader.

COMMUNITY POWER AND POLITICAL THEORY. By Nelson W. Polsby. Yale Univ. Press. 141 pp.

This is a first-rate and provocative case study of the forces that are effective in governing communities. It reappraises such theories of the power structure as the Lynds' and concludes they do not fit current realities. It deals in detail with the politics and social structure of a number of cities—Atlanta, Philadelphia, Baton Rouge, New Haven among them. It dissects sociological studies developing pattern theories in all of them, and pretty well demolishes them.

It finds quite other elements than the legendary power structure determining policy in these places. Notably in New Haven, which the author knows best, the

personal force, political talent and energy of Mayor Richard Lee has changed the city. Lee was no part of any power structure. He emerged through his own personal qualities and carried the community with him, regardless of its earlier "stratification." Other case studies bring comparable examples.

THE DILEMMA OF MEXICO'S DEVELOPMENT. By Raymond Vernon. Harvard University Press. 226 pp. \$4.95.

This is an economist's study of Mexico's economic development and prospects. He deals particularly with the roles of public and private enterprise, and presents the political problem the government faces, whether to go further into public development or to ease the regulations on private enterprise to secure its maximum development. There's enough Mexican history to provide the setting for the present problem, and practical exploration of the interaction of politics and economic development.

It is one of a series of such studies by the research director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard Business School. He directed the recent series of studies (books) on the economic problems of Metropolitan New York.

Taps for Medgar Evans

By Charles W. Bailey

Scrapbook

Arlington, Va.—The humid haze of early summer lay hot and heavy on Washington, D. C., but here across the river, under the oak trees, the air was fresh and cool.

The little girl sat on a folding chair, her mother on one side and her older brother on the other. The child's face was blank and bemused, almost dazed. Around her stood a thousand others. Closer in, a score of men with cameras crept and scuttled and snapped their shutters at her.

In the center of the crowd, just in front of the girl and her brother and her mother, stood six soldiers. They held an American flag stiffly over the casket in which

the little girl's father was to be buried.

All around stood the small white headstones. Closest to the new grave, they marked men from New Mexico, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Minnesota, North Carolina.

"In the midst of life," the preacher said, "we are in death . . . he cometh up and is cut down like a flower." A big airliner, just airborne from the nearby field, drowned out the rest of the prayer, and the little girl twisted her feet and looked up, trying to see the plane.

Something touched the girl's hand and she looked down. It was her mother's hand, seeking hers and enfolding it.

The words went on, but the little girl

seemed not to be listening. She sat still in her wide-skirted white dress, its color seeming brighter in contrast to the black clothes of all around her.

A man's voice snapped out a muted command, higher up the hill, and there was a rattle of rifle bolts, a warning in the quiet. But neither the child nor her mother seemed to have heard this, for the crash of the three volleys shattered their composure.

Then, from above, came the long sad sweet notes of taps, just 24 notes in all. The bugler stood over the crest of the hill, out of sight of graveside, and it was probably just as well. Surely no man could play those notes every day, as this

one must, if he had also to look at those who have to listen.

The little girl wept for the first time now, as did her mother. The boy gave his sister a clean handkerchief. She twisted it in her hands as other men spoke at the graveside.

There were two men from the American Veterans Committee, which had long known the girl's father as a worker and a companion, and which only a fortnight ago had elected him to its national board. Their words seemed not to touch the girl or her family, despite the sorrow in them and in the speakers.

Then another man, the director of the organization for which her father worked, began to speak, and the little girl began to listen.

This man did not pray or read from scriptures, as others had earlier. Instead, he spoke the words of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

He said that the man being buried "believed in those principles" and that when the time came, he had put on his uniform and gone "far from Decatur, Miss. . . to help a strange people who, like those he left behind, were threatened by racism."

He told how the little girl's father came home to Mississippi—to "the land he refused to disown"—and how he turned down opportunities to move elsewhere.

The speaker referred again to the Declaration of Independence, this time to its closing sentence. "Every time he left his family," he said, "he too was offering his life, his fortune, his sacred honor. That offering was finally accepted. He believed in his country. It now remains to be seen whether his country believes in him."

When the speaker finished, another man stepped forward and led the crowd in a hymn—the only one sung. It was a

song the little girl's father had often led at home:

"We shall all be free;

"We shall all be free;

"We shall all be free;

Oh, deep in my heart

I do believe

I do believe

We shall all be free—some day."

Now the little girl wept again, and then, looking at her mother and seeing her weeping too, sobbed aloud and clung to her uncle's arm. He lifted her into his lap.

The six soldiers at the grave, moving for the first time in a half-hour, silently and in intricate pattern folded the flag. Silently they passed it to a chaplain; silently he took it to the window. She hugged it to her, seeing nothing as the chaplain saluted her and turned away.

Then the little girl and her brother and her mother were taken away, leaving their father and husband under the oak trees with the others who, like him, earned in war their right to lie there.

In a few weeks, he too will have a little headstone, with an inscription like all the thousands of others on the hills and in the hollows under the trees. His will say:

Medgar Evers

Mississippi

—*Minneapolis Tribune*, June 20.

Letters

Yours for MACEJ

To the EDITOR:

The very least that can be said for Dean Norval Neil Luxon's renewal of his plea for consideration of his "pruning" approach to the numbers problem as he sees it in journalism education is that he gives voice to it. Too many of us in journalism education spend too much time crying into our whiskey-and-branch-water while condemning with faintest praise the various deficiencies in our academic endeavor.

But I do think that in his otherwise candid polemic in the June issue Norval Neil begs an obvious question: If there are too many units in journalism edu-

cation, why doesn't the American Council on Education for Journalism do something about it? Without opting for or against the validity of Dean Luxon's complaint, I would suggest that the proper place to begin a realistic appraisal of the problem is with the national body constituted to ensure that professional education for journalism is just that—professional.

Unfortunately, ACEJ as it exists is a deplorably clumsy, anachronistic machinery either for such an appraisal or to conduct meaningful evaluation of journalism education. ACEJ's constituent membership is dominated by three newspaper publishers' groups—two regional, one national—plus the broadcasting industry's national organization and the American Society of Newspaper Editors. At least two vitally important national journalism groups—representing working professionals—are not ACEJ constituent members. One of these is the Radio-Television News Directors Association (*cf.* ASNE) which, despite disclaimers to the contrary from journalism education's Establishment, is relegated to second-class citizenship on ACEJ because of its inability to meet the annual fee requirement for first-class membership. And there are other inequities and inconsistencies in the architectonics of ACEJ, one of which certainly is the archaic system for election of educator-members . . . a system shockingly out of sync with contemporary practice and trends in mass communications.

ACEJ has long been a sacred cow, within and without the ranks of journalism educators. The times demand an honest if agonizing reappraisal of its viability, especially in regard to its utility in helping to solve the kind of question raised by Dean Luxon. I'm in favor of having senior journalism educators close their letters with "Yours for MACEJ"—Modernizing the American Council on Education for Journalism. One hopes that we'll not have to wait until the 21st Century until, kicking and screaming, the troglodytes in journalism effect this urgently necessary modernization of what is supposed to be the very group to keep professional journalism education squared away.

ROBERT LINDSAY

Instructor of Journalism
University of Minnesota

Touche, Francois

To the Editor:

I was very flattered by Francois Sully's review of my book, *Southeast Asia*, in the June issue. To be complimented by someone who knows the area as well as Mr. Sully is praise indeed.

However, I feel that I must take issue with Mr. Sully's description of me as a ruthless, slave-driving oriental potentate who spends his time working and forces his staffers to do the same. It may be that Mr. Sully observed me under the kind of pressure that occasionally builds up in the trade of gathering news. For his information I have also found time while in Asia to father a child, gain pounds in Chinese restaurants, learn to smoke opium and, among other things, to reduce my golf handicap appreciably. And I have written the book reviewed by Mr. Sully.

STANLEY KARNOW

Hong Kong

News Management

To the Editor:

I am puzzled and dismayed by what appears to be an editorial comment by NIEMAN REPORTS attached to a letter from Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, concerning an earlier article in your publication by Donald Zylstra about news management in the Pentagon.

Following Mr. Sylvester's letter there appears under the heading, "The Transcript," an abbreviated and opinionated version of what is supposed to have gone on at a Pentagon press conference on Jan. 8, 1963. This version, while not clearly labeled as such, appears to have been written by somebody on your staff, and represents an attempt to counter Mr. Zylstra's contention that Mr. Sylvester intervened unduly at a briefing held by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Rather than detail my objections to the accuracy and tone of this essay, I prefer merely to point out that this version is not, as labeled, "The Transcript." As a matter of fact, there are only six complete sentences cited from the

actual transcript which was 27 pages long in its entirety.

As one of the Pentagon reporters who covered that press conference, I, like Mr. Zylstra, am under the impression that Mr. Zuckert, the Secretary of the Air Force, was constrained in his answers to reporters' questions as the result of Mr. Sylvester's presence and comments. This, however, is certainly not the impression one receives from a reading of your "transcript."

At any rate, I believe you have been grossly unfair to Mr. Zylstra, honoring as you do by implication, Mr. Syl-

vester's charge that Mr. Zylstra's account in "highly imaginative."

I have personally followed Mr. Zylstra's reporting for nearly five years in and out of the Pentagon, and can testify that he is one of the most able and accurate newsmen in the business.

WILLIAM L. MACDOUGALL

Washington Bureau
Los Angeles Times

(Mr. Sylvester's letter and the appended "transcript" were published exactly as received. This is one of a number of letters from Washington correspondents protesting the publication.—Ed.)

Reporting the Race Issue

To the Editor:

I regret that my garage-full of clippings and tearsheets refutes the statement of Red Holland of the *Birmingham News*, in a recent issue of *Nieman Reports*, that "the wire services have done a competent job" of reporting racial issue developments.

On the contrary, in all too many instances, the wire services and 90 per cent of Southern dailies have not only NOT done a competent job, they haven't done an honest one.

This is not surprising in view of the fact that the wire services and most daily papers, as well as news magazines, slant "news" and buy editorial columnists to please large wealthy special interests.

These special interests, more of them headquartered in the "North," "East," and "Midwest" than in the "South," have—sometimes covertly and more rarely, openly—encouraged the maintenance of segregation, and other forms of cultivated racial ill-will in order to maintain political and economic control over, and their venal use of, the peoples' government to provide special privileges to a wealthy few.

They in their Wall Street board rooms and their lackeys in Southern units of national chains do not really care what color their customers are; their vital concern is to hold down the salary scale of the little white girl clerk and servile assistant managers behind the counters.

It is all expressed in the confidential

aside I've heard a thousand times: "Why pay a white man (or woman, or girl) a dollar an hour when you can get a nigger for 50 cents?"

Both white and colored, who have to work, and work hard, to feed, clothe, house, and safeguard the health of their often large families, know the logic of that threat.

Many of the whites, frustrated by the hopelessness of their own situation in dealing with "the big man," simply have to have someone toward whom they can feel "superior."

So, as short-sighted as the "business leaders" are—and don't underestimate how shortsighted they can be—the whites, with limited educational opportunities, are easily aroused to help "keep the nigger in his place."

Short-sighted as they are, the people at the top of the economic power structure nevertheless sense the threat to their special privilege and exorbitant profits if whites and Negroes, given genuinely equal educational opportunities, ever discover how they've been "played off" against each other and ruthlessly exploited. Their votes, together, the political power that the Constitution says is theirs, would topple many a corrupt business complex now dependent on purchaseable political privilege. Then more citizens, white and colored, and our nation, would know a greater measure of prosperity than ever before, under a true free enterprise system.

If anyone is inclined to doubt the role that "big business" has played and is playing in protective condoning, if not outright encouragement, of segregation and discrimination among citizens, let him look at instance after instance recently when "token desegregation" has been achieved, when the business interests of city after city passed down the word—to governors, legislators, mayors, police, and people—that "we just aren't going to have any violence." And there is none.

Let him look at the conference of "big business men," "chain store executives,"

et al, called by President Kennedy to help solve racial turbulence.

If they can stop it—and they can, then they could keep it going—and they did.

We can be earnestly thankful for all endeavors toward good will among all human beings—however tardy. But at least 90 per cent of the press, tragically, as yet can't qualify to share in the appreciation.

Thank you for publishing this.

JAMES ETHERIDGE, JR.
903 Washington Street
Tallahassee, Florida

they want. It is almost safe to say that developing countries want first of all a jet-powered international airline followed closely by a steel mill.

"In addition to this kind of research we are also doing basic research into the types of buildings, in all categories, best suited to regional needs. One of our projects at the moment is figuring out the best possible type of teaching hospital for wet-dry and hot dry tropics. We don't have a hospital contract at all but we feel we should be aware of and ahead of the need."

1947

Francis P. Locke has left the editorial page of the Dayton *Daily News*, after 16 years there, to join the editorial staff of the Riverside (Calif.) *Press-Enterprise*, where Norman Cherniss (1959) is editor. Before leaving Ohio, the Lockes joined in the third consecutive summer reunion of the Midwest members of the 1947 Nieman group: this one in Lexington, Ky., with the Hornsby's, Stewarts and Evanses. Henry Hornsby is executive editor, Lexington *Leader*. Paul Evans is information director, TVA, and Pete Stewart assistant director there.

1948

The August 10 issue of *Life*, featuring the signing of the test ban treaty in Moscow, has a full page picture of Averell Harriman in an interview with Henry Shapiro, UPI chief in Moscow.

1949

Angus Thuermer, and Alice, are on home leave from Accra, Ghana, where he returns this Fall to his embassy post as political officer.

1951

Dana Adams Schmidt, Middle East correspondent for the *New York Times*, won the Overseas Press Club's George Polk Memorial Award for "courage and enterprise in foreign reporting," for his series on the Kurdish rebels in northern Iraq.

1952

John Strohmeier, editor of the Bethle-

NIEMAN NOTES

1939

After several years service as American consul general at Melbourne, Frank S. Hopkins returned to Washington this summer for reassignment.

Princeton University appointed Irving Dilliard to be Ferris Professor of Journalism and Public Affairs for the 1963-64 academic year. Former editorial page editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, Dilliard is a trustee of the University of Illinois. He has held visiting lectureships in other universities. Among his books are the collected decisions of Learned Hand (*Spirit of Liberty*) and of Justice Black (*One Man's Stand for Freedom*).

1940

Hodding Carter, editor and publisher of the *Delta Democrat-Times*, Greenville, Miss., is the 1963 recipient of the Bowdoin Prize, the most distinctive non-academic honor conferred by Bowdoin College. It will be presented during a special convocation this fall.

1941

Alexander Kendrick, CBS, received the Overseas Press Club Award for the best radio interpretation of foreign affairs. Kendrick has been based chiefly in London.

1942

Don Burke, formerly Mid-East correspondent of *Life-International*, has joined an international architectural firm, Robert S. McMillan & Associates, with offices in Rome, Switzerland and Nigeria.

"Our latest contract was the design for the new University of Lagos and we even have some projects afoot in Washington, D.C. which, I'd say, makes us truly international. We can even top that with the fact that we have designed a mosque for the Aga Khan which he is giving to the new university now abuilding in Dar es Salaam in Tanganyika.

"We have a young and lively group of architects. I am, in fact, the grandfather by far. At a quick estimate I judge their average age to be a shade over thirty. This new set-up gives us the freedom and control we needed. Being in Rome, our main base, we are at a splendid airlines crossroads. We can get to West Africa in hours, for example.

"I think we can now exploit the plan that brought me here. That is, we will continue to keep a close eye on all developments in Africa, the Middle East, etc. By having this basic research at hand we will, or should, know beforehand what the situation is in the various countries.

"We should also know what these countries need which is not always what

hem *Globe-Times*, was a discussion leader in a seminar in Hamburg, Germany, on "Responsible Crime Reporting," conducted by the International Press Institute in March.

The official IPI Bulletin reported on his talk:

He fascinated his non-American audience with stories of how a dedicated and incessantly probing crime reporter can topple from office some of the most securely entrenched officers of a municipality, a state, or even of the federal government in Washington. He told how a city council which had set its face against long overdue reforms was forced into action by the exposure of a councilman's conduct in a brothel.

The Strohmeier story showed the immense difference between American investigations, politics and judicial proceedings and those on the Continent.

Strohmeier himself reported:

"This was an area of enterprise which seemed foreign to our counterparts on the continent. I couldn't help notice the ocean between us. They were eager to know more but I had the feeling the liberties of an American investigative reporter are simply unfathomable to newsmen in Europe and Asia where contempt of court restrictions are so rigid."

1953

Robert W. Brown has left his managing editorship on the St. Petersburg (Fla.) *Times* to return to Hodding Carter's *Delta Democrat-Times* in Greenville, Miss., where he was city editor 26 years ago.

1955

Piers Anderton of NBC received the Overseas Press Club Award for the best reporting from abroad. He has covered chiefly Germany and Berlin.

The *Washington Post* ran in *Editor & Publisher*, July 20, a full page ad, headed Selig Harrison and Friends.

It shows Sig with Nehru, signing the guest book at the opening of the *Post's* Children's Book Fair in New Delhi.

Arch Parsons has joined the staff of the *Washington Post*, and is back covering the United Nations, which was his beat for the New York *Herald Tribune* before he left it to go to Nigeria for the Ford Foundation in 1961.

1958

Stanley Karnow has joined the staff of the *Saturday Evening Post* as Far East correspondent. He remains in Hong Kong where he has been correspondent for *Time-Life* after serving them earlier in Algeria and Paris.

Juan Saez, formerly on the Manila *Times*, is press counsellor to the Philippine Embassy in London. He has enrolled in a foreign service course in the London School of Economics.

195

Grady Clay, real estate editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, was elected an honorary member of the American Society of Landscape Architects this summer. He is also a member of the American Institute of Architects, editor of the quarterly, *Landscape Architecture*, author and consultant in architecture and planning.

1960

In July **Ralph M. Otwell**, news editor of the Chicago *Sun-Times*, was promoted to assistant managing editor, on the retirement of Paul W. Ferris.

1961

In August, **John A. Hamilton** joined the Norfolk *Ledger-Star* as associate editor, leaving a similar post on the Lynchburg (Va.) *News* where his editorials won the top award of the Virginia Press Association the last two consecutive years.

Howard Sochurek shared with a *Life* colleague, Wren R. Young, the Sherman Fairchild Prize for writing on air safety, this for their article in *Life* on "Search for Safety in the Skies."

1962

John Emmerich is moving from McComb, Miss., where he has been managing editor of the *Enterprise-Journal*, to the Baltimore *Evening Sun* as news editor, this fall.

Martin Goodman, representing the Toronto *Star* in Washington, toured the segregation front this summer to cover the race revolt.

1963

On his return to the Atlanta *Constitution*, **Bruce Galphin** joined the editorial page staff. As a reporter he had specialized for several years on the race issue.

At the end of his Nieman year, the AP moved **Shelby Scates** from Oklahoma City into New York, on the foreign desk.