

Nieman Reports

VOL. 3 NO. 1

Published by the Society of Nieman Fellows

JANUARY, 1949

The Full Dimensions of the News JAMES S. POPE

Newspaperman Meets Television

Lowell M. Limpus

Dartmouth Studies the Newspapers

Louis M. Lyons

Free Speech in the United Nations

Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

The ABC of News Coverage

Paul Miller

Historians or Jitterbugs

Jenkin Lloyd Jones

The Country Weekly

Houstoun Waring

Ted Link--Reporter

Arthur Hepner

"A Newspaper Court" — The Press and the Election — "An Editor at College"
by Rebecca F. Gross — "Segregation Doesn't Work" by Fletcher Martin —
"Pointing Up the Editorial" by Wm. W. Vosburgh, Jr. — Nieman Notes —
Nieman Scrapbook — Reviews — Letters

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

A Newspaper "Court"

ARTHUR H. SULZBERGER, publisher of the New York Times, Proposed a Journalists' Council to Enforce Professional Conduct, in an Address to the New York State Publishers Association, August 30, 1948.

We know that private ownership is the greatest strength of a free press but many of our citizens ask how any industry vested with so much public interest can proceed with fairness to the community without some form of government control. Of course the answer is that the government control would destroy freedom and the question these people ask is, therefore, a self-defeating one—you cannot have **outside control** of a press and have it a **free press. Control must come from within.** Which means that on the structure of press **freedom** there must be imposed the **responsibility** of the press. The community has the right—and indeed the duty—to insist upon such responsibility. It has the right to demand certain standards from the newspaper it patronizes. Of course I speak only of news columns—our editorial position can be argued with but not questioned. But what appears in the news columns of a newspaper, at least in my judgment, is a matter of legitimate public concern. The news lies, in a sense, in the public domain and we are the trustees of a great national interest.

Obviously, a man's judgment cannot be better than the information on which he has based it. Give him the truth and he may still go wrong when he has the chance to be right, but give him no news or present him only with distorted and incomplete data, with ignorant, sloppy or biased reporting, with propaganda and deliberate falsehoods, and you destroy his whole reasoning processes, and make him something less than a man. Then he will not have a chance to think straight.

If no news or too little news threatens to strangle a nation then surely false news or sloppy news or biased news is even more to be scorned and feared. I am concerned with how we are to achieve ethical standards in journalism—standards that will be reflected and practiced in every department of a newspaper office or a press association. As a wise man from the East recently pointed out to a gathering of the United Nations: We are the one profession, if we are a profession, that does not insist on preliminary training or qualification for a person to adopt that profession or to be entitled to practice it. What is more important is the fact that there is little internal discipline, among the members of the profession. The medical group, in many countries, has organized itself and has set up a disciplinary body from its own members, who control and regulate the professional conduct and etiquette of the medical practitioner. The legal profession has similarly set up, in many advanced countries, Bar Councils, which maintain discipline in professional matters among the legal practitioners. Has not the time come, when there should be more discipline, when there should be set up some Council of Members from among the journalists, who will be in charge of detecting unprofessional conduct and taking appropriate action?

Personally, I think it has, and I know that the A.S.N.E. and others have given thought as to how to do it. We are groping in the right direction but thus far our fingers have fastened on nothing tangible.

See editorial comment on page 26.

NIEMAN REPORTS

Editorial Council

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

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH, N.Y.C.
WELDON JAMES, Louisville, Ky.
ROBERT LASCH, Chicago, Ill.

WILLIAM J. MILLER, New York City
PAUL L. EVANS, Mitchell, S. D.
LEON SVIRSKY, New York City

LOUIS M. LYONS, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman

JUSTIN G. MCCARTHY, Washington, D. C.

The Full Dimensions of the News

by James S. Pope,
Managing Editor, Louisville Courier-Journal

Now when an editor has decided to print as much news as his readers can digest, he has only begun the complex job of designing his newspaper. How much is enough? How much space can be used for current news? How far must he go in printing non-news material in order to attract and hold circulation?

A few years ago a survey was made of the Louisville Courier-Journal. It showed the preferences of men and the preferences of women.

Out of every 100, 94 looked at the pictures on the picture-page (we no longer have enough newsprint to carry an entire page of pictures, but many American newspapers still do this); 69 of each 100 men read "Blondie," our most popular comic; 71 read the weather forecast; 60 looked at the editorial-page cartoon; 44 at the radio schedules; 72 read a cartoon called "Private Lives," showing how easy it is to stimulate curiosity with a title; 36 read a sports column. Most of the other comics ranked close to "Blondie"—over half of our subscribers read them.

The front page banner-headline of that day (April 12, 1940) reported that 18 German ships had been sunk. Mr. Churchill was quoted as saying "We're on the Road to Victory." He did not say how long that road was to be. With such news, the front page was well read. Seventy-eight (78) of the same 100 men read the leading story. But after the front page was passed, readership of news dropped off sharply.

If you were designing a newspaper from that survey, and knew nothing else about your job, you would carry a front page of news and fill the remainder of your paper with comic strips, cartoons, and sporting features.

Such a product ought to be perfect. But it would not be. It would be like a huge market which displayed meat and bread in the windows, but offered for sale over the counters inside nothing but chocolate candy. Your customers would soon

get the stomach-ache. They would look elsewhere for meat and bread.

We have never made news one-half as appealing as it should be. News is the most interesting item we could offer. It is life. It has no other limitations. Its limits are merely those of human activity—mental, physical, spiritual. News is our very selves, multiplied and magnified to a world-wide stature.

News is the basic stuff from which is copied the little ersatz images, the comic drawing and the photographs. We have let the image-makers surpass us, though we have the blood-and-bone original to offer. For this I think every American newspaperman should feel shame.

News is endless in variety, but the comics and pictures are monotony itself. Comic characters go through familiar adventures day by day. They meet the same obstacles, triumph in the same old way. There is little novelty or surprise in them, and almost no real imagination.

And what of the pictures? Americans have looked at so many of them so many times, it now takes a touch of magic from the photographer to get a photograph worth printing. For every dramatic news picture there are dozens that are simply tiresome—Congressmen staring at a stack of papers on a table, or waving an arm in oratory; film actresses exposing last year's toothy smile; football players in a futile mass; piled wreckage of locomotives or airplanes; shots of fires with nothing visible except smoke. Every editor knows he could go to his picture files and find almost the same material he gets day by day over costly wires.

Of course people look at pictures. It is a basic human instinct. But how many of them hold a fresh interest? The reader-polls have not found a practical way to measure quality. That is our job, as editors.

Are we to admit that a cartoonist's stale bag of tricks and an album of shop-worn pictures can interest more readers than living news of living people, freshly gathered and told with humor, with drama and with penetration?

We must always remember that these surveys have been made of newspapers as they are, not of newspapers as they should be. We have not begun to exploit

the rich store of material that is ours. We have not trained reporters who can make a diplomatic conference—which may settle our fate for 100 years—as vital as the capture of a comic-strip crook by a witless detective.

What we need is a survey of our minds, of our imaginations, of our timidities and failures as editors. We need a survey to tell us why we have to push our priceless product with so many free confections.

When we begin to learn to reflect the true color that is a part of the news, we must be very careful not to pour false color into it.

I am sorry to say there is disagreement in this country about what we call objectivity in news reporting. That simply means that the reporter tries to keep himself out of his report. He gives the reader full information, avoiding words that throw a favorable or an unfavorable light on the event. The reader thus can form his own opinion; the reporter's opinion is not pressed upon him.

Many newspaper and magazine editors openly question whether it is possible to be objective, and even whether it is desirable to be. There is a belief that what is objective is dull. But this is a part of the foolish myth that news is so pale it must have rouge smeared on its face with blatant adjectives and adverbs. This is not true. It is seldom the news which is dull, but the manner in which it is told. Truth is not only stranger than fiction, it is much more exciting.

There is a great danger in writing "color," which usually means bias, into straight news. Every good newspaper has an editorial page. On this page the editor may express his opinion of the news. If he introduces those opinions into the columns where his readers expect to find only factual information, he is being dishonest, and in time his readers will find him out.

In color photography and printing we have learned that the greatest aim is to reproduce natural color. Adding artificial color with a brush to get stronger effects will never equal the colors the camera found—even, harmonious, convincing.

The picture must be natural in color and tone. It must be complete. News is not unlike a colored jigsaw puzzle. It

In this paper, James S. Pope carries further his discussion of the responsibilities and performance of the newspapers. Readers of *Nieman Reports* will recall his critical appraisal "On Understanding the Press" in our last April issue. The present paper is from a longer talk to the German editors attending seminars at the American Press Institute last Fall.

must be put together day by day, and all the relevant pieces must be there, with no distortion of tint or size. Many papers, like your own, do not have the newsprint to make this job as big as life. But you can reduce the size without falsifying the proportions, just as a great mural can be printed on a post card.

It is my argument, then, that news can be more interesting than any other material we choose to print, little news as well as big news; that it must not be accepted and printed in the form given to it by those with a selfish interest; that it must be offered to the reader in its rich, natural color.

There is still another thing to consider in the proper handling of news. It must reflect vision and understanding on the part of the editor if it is to bring vision and understanding to the reader. No intelligent citizen of this world believes any longer that what happens in his own town, or his own county or in his own nation is all that matters to him, and all that he needs or wants to know.

What has happened in Germany in the past 50 years has had more influence in our lives in many ways than what hap-

pened here at home; and what happens in America and in Russia in the next ten years may easily determine the future of your children and grandchildren. Therefore, the editor who does not attempt to give his readers a clear account of foreign affairs is putting a blindfold over their eyes. They will be helpless pawns in the international game of chess.

On the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times we have the world-wide news reports of the United Press and the Associated Press, and also the superb accounts of the foreign staff of the New York Times. In addition to this we buy the articles of the North American Newspaper Alliance, the Chicago Daily News Service, the Overseas News Agency, and the work of many independent writers. In recent months we have printed on some days as much as 15 or 20 columns of foreign news, out of the 45 or 50 columns of spot news in the paper. But we have not been content with that. We want the people who handle and comment upon the news to know something of the lands and the people whence it comes.

Within the past few years our editor, Barry Bingham, has been to Germany

twice, studying the problems of reconstruction there and throughout Central Europe. Mark Ethridge, our publisher, has twice been to the Balkans. We have been repaid for his total absence of some eight months on Government missions by his unique grasp of the problems we face along the borders of the Soviet Union.

When it became clear to us in 1945 that India would not live in colonial bonds after the war ended, I flew to New Delhi and traveled over the country. I tried to learn something of the political and religious and economic background of India's struggle for independence.

These are merely examples. Other editors on other American newspapers have done likewise, and the frontiers of our understanding are steadily being pushed outward.

The world has a basic hunger for news. It is as deep, I believe, as the hunger for food in many regions. This craving for information is just being felt among millions who never had it before. And if we will satisfy it, we can remake our world into a vastly better place, a community in which peace can live without fight daily for its life.

"The Country Weekly Dream Is Real"

by **Houstoun Waring**

The weekly newspaper in the small town is seldom found outside the English-speaking world. It has played a role in the democracy of these countries which seems to have been ignored by Fitzhugh Turner when he exploded "The Country Weekly Dream" in the last Nieman Reports.

First of all, let us look at some of Mr. Turner's statements.

"Ideal newspapers, city or country," he says, "have a way of losing money, and roltop desks don't of themselves pay dividends."

We have tried to operate an "ideal" newspaper. We have butchered all the sacred cows. We have published items in the forty categories of news generally omitted from the metropolitan press. We have had sixteen competitors come into our town and start newspapers. We have trod on shoes and on beliefs not usually touched. We have never tied up with a political party as a party organ. Yet

many's the year we have declared divi-make much more than we do on their invested capital. (This is not as much as it sounds, as hundreds of going weeklies were bought up in the 1930's for as little as \$2,500.)

Weeklies, one old rule of thumb advises, should sell for five times the net earnings. This means 20% dividends, a high yield for money these days. Wall Street should be interested. Yet fortunately for society, weeklies don't easily admit of absentee or chain ownership. There are a few small chains, but most of the 10,000 country papers in America are owned by the men who operate them, and their voice is the voice of the community.

Mr. Turner writes that small papers are mainly published by men with printing and business knowledge. "Business men, on the whole, make poor editors," he declares. I agree. On the other hand, his big city writers and successful reporters, magazine writers, and managing editors want to be country editors without any demonstrated business acumen. This is the dilemma. We have high hopes when

writers start a publication like '48 and then, when the venture fails, we are jerked back to the realization that publishing is a business.

For twenty years I have tried to get journalism graduates with a liberal arts training to enter the small-town field. Most such graduates either lack the small capital needed or are not interested in anything except the daily press. I know a few who are good editors and businessmen, and they are serving their communities well. They are also bringing their families in more than the \$300 or \$400 a month Mr. Turner scorns.

That brings us to the question of what gives satisfaction to a man. If he needs two Buicks and wants to send his sons off to private schools, he should work for an advertising agency or be a public relations counselor for a business establishment. On the other hand, if he is content with a Ford and a six-room house, with the public high school and the state university, he may choose the ministry, education, or the country weekly. He may work more than forty hours a week, but if it is work that counts in other people's

Houstoun Waring is editor of the Littleton (Colo.) Independent. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1944-5.

lives he will be happy. As Granville Hicks has said in his book, *Small Town*, people have an inborn desire to control their environment. The country editors, like all folks in the rural areas of America, have this feeling of shaping their destiny.

Mr. Turner contends that weeklies, having the same aggregate circulation as dailies, should play as important a role in forming public opinion. Reading this statement after the Truman victory brings a chuckle, as only 10% of the daily circulation backed the president. Actually, it is hard to gauge the effect of newspapers, but it is not hard to learn their circulations. Dailies, as a matter of fact, have a circulation three times as great as the weeklies, and that circulation has its impact on the reader six or seven times a week instead of once. But page

for page, advertising readership studies indicate that the weekly has three times the effectiveness. Whether its influence is of a better or poorer quality, we cannot judge. Certainly, there is plenty of room for improved editorial direction in both the fields. That is why we must try to teach old dogs new tricks by means of American Press Institutes, Nieman Foundations, and Hutchins Commissions.

There is nothing wrong with the country weekly that good men can't cure. The state press publications, with their field managers, have placed country editors on their feet financially in the last quarter century. With this independence, more and more weeklies have been weaned from the political parties that once controlled them. The same forces that might control the daily press cannot control the

weeklies, and vice versa. This is all to the good and it is a further safeguard to our democracy.

The small-town editor knows what the masses of unorganized Americans are thinking, and he puts these thoughts into words. His editorials may not have the style of the metropolitan daily, but they carry weight in Washington when the congressman opens his mail. And they are not bad. In a ten-year period, when I offered a trophy for the best editorials, the weeklies nearly always won over the dailies. This judgment was reached each year by an entirely different set of intelligent men and women from various walks of life.

The country weekly dream is real. I wish more capable young men were dreaming it. It is no job to retire into.

Historians Or Jitterbugs?

by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, Tulsa Tribune

From an Address before the Iowa Daily Press Association, September 19, 1948

I wonder if we have not reached the point where we must consider the possible effects of panic in our nation. In the past 18 months the press and the radio of America have been keeping up an incessant war of nerves upon the American people. The traditional calmness of our people is beginning to be shaken. A lot of us are starting to paw the ground and roll our eyes like frightened horses at the smell of smoke from the haymow. This talk of a preventive war and how we ought to atomize Moscow and Leningrad in a sneak attack is not in the American tradition. It is not good old American aggressiveness. It is a symptom of unreasoning fear.

And it would be a miracle if this fear were not spread in the land. Listen to the hysterical portents of doom delivered every Sunday evening between slugs for Jergens Lotion. Listen to the horrible forecasts of the modest gentleman who keeps shouting, "I predict—" and predicts all over the place on the sound theory that nobody takes notes and most people have short memories.

The Weekly Kiplinger letter is an invitation to suicide. Our columnists, too often, are purchased by editors on the basis of their ability to deliver sensations. How these sensations stand up in the march of history is often a secondary consideration.

Our telegraph desks and our editorial writers compound the felony. The wire services, generally speaking, write and

edit their news in a manner approved by their large city clients. And the large city newspaper is in competition with its rivals for street sales. The emphasis is on the spot development, the new lead, the lead-all bulletin—anything that will make a banner headline to help sell a copy to the man hurrying by on the sidewalk.

This type of wire reporting is admirable for its speed. It is punchy, terse, and interesting. As far as it goes it is usually accurate. But it often gives a fragmentary and unconnected account of the story behind the spot development. It lends itself to the scare headline. The reader has difficulty in reaching a fair appraisal of its true importance.

Let me give you an example: In the past two weeks shots have been exchanged between Russian soldiers riding through the American zone of Berlin and American MP's. Every paper I have seen, including our own, has given these stories a big page 1 display. Citizens glancing nervously at the news stands must have concluded war is pretty near when soldiers fire on soldiers. Yet, when I was in Europe last year that sort of thing was going on all the time. A few nights before I reached Salzburg some American border guards had killed some Russians who were trying to steal a jeep. These stories are only now beginning to come out, but they are old stuff. Such incidents will not precipitate a war until and unless

the Reds decide they want war.

The same day one of these Berlin incidents was heavily played the fourth French government of 1948 fell after only two days of existence. Most papers gave it a modest play. Some ran it inside. The average news editor will argue with righteous heat that French governments are always falling and public interest in such collapses is nil.

Yet the news from Paris was far more ominous to the welfare of the United States than the shooting story from Berlin. France is the keystone of our European recovery program. Its continued political and economic instability could wreck the entire Marshall Plan. I'll bet you that not one American in 100 has learned this through his newspaper.

The American people are thirsty for the news behind the news. They are hungry for an intelligent understanding of the real meaning behind the fast-breaking and puzzling developments on the world front. They want to know not only what happened but why it happened and what it will mean. And that, I think, accounts for the immense popularity of the news magazines, for there an attempt is made to gather up the loose ends of the spot news and weave it into an understandable pattern.

This is not a plea for editorialized news stories. But I think we have yet to explore the extent to which news stories may be honestly interpretive without becoming loaded or biased. You recall that

during the war all the wire services and many syndicates supplied "experts" who sought to interpret and assess the significance of the daily war bulletins. Some of them made some pretty sour guesses, but they were avidly read.

I could use a good daily column of that sort on the cold war. I could use a calm appraisal by a sound student of history concerning this constant barrage of jitters being laid down upon us by the masters of Moscow. Instead of shaking our readers with all these thunderbolts indiscriminately (which is just what the Kremlin wants), it would be helpful to consider which aggressive moves have real significance and which are feints and phonies for the purpose of masking the real Russian plan.

There is danger, of course, that any such expert might guess wrong. He might guess wrong quite often. But it is significant that during the height of the Berlin scare two weeks ago not a single eastern European newspaper under Russian domination gave any emphasis to the news of this rioting. That fact did not get on our news wires but I think it is immensely significant, for it shows that as far as the Reds were concerned the scare was for export only. And we, the good, dumb, honest press of America fell right into the trap.

Our editorial writers are too prone to view with alarm and shoot from the hip. On smaller dailies the man assigned to handling editorials is generally too busy for exhaustive research. There is the temptation to draw dire editorial conclusions from five-line bulletins. Too many editorial writers direct their shots at distant targets because they fear the kick-back engendered by strong editorials on subjects close to home. Yet the distant editorials are often produced hurriedly and based upon insufficient information.

The result is that a number of our editorial pages are filled with dismal jeremiads written by editors who are not exactly sure what they are writing about but who feel in their bones that things are in a hell of a mess. This feeling, unfortunately, is very correct, but editorials that merely whine, gripe, despair and view-with-alarm are neither an inspiration nor a guide to constructive action. I do not wonder that many people have ceased reading them altogether.

The immense popularity of the Christian Science Monitor among non-Christian Scientists, including many godless newspapermen, springs from the fact that that

publication is both factual and hopeful. There was a time, I believe, when that newspaper considered unhappy news something of an illusion. But this is not the case today. The Monitor knows the score about as well as any American newspaper. It recognizes and describes the weak spots in the dike and the pitfalls in the path. It is capable both of alarm and righteous indignation.

But it never gives up the ship. It never discounts its ultimate faith in the triumph of decency. And even if such a faith is an illusion those who hold it will not spend their last years doubled up with stomach ulcers. If the world does disappear some day in a runaway atomic explosion the pessimists will be incinerated just as quickly as the optimists.

Again, may I emphasize, I am not suggesting that newspapers should fill their columns with insubstantial trillings of the bluebirds. Good news of minor importance should never be given top billing over bad news of major significance. It is desperately important, for example, that our people be completely disabused of the roseate halo with which our White House and State Department propagandists shrouded the Russian bear during the last war. It is important that we realize that in the Comintern we face a menace just as immoral and vastly more powerful than we ever faced in Hitler. There may be war. We'd better get ready. All this it is the duty of the press to tell.

But it is further the duty of the press to give a reasoned, not an hysterical, picture of the world. It is its duty, so far as it can, to separate that which is accidental or frivolous from that which is meaningful and indicates a trend. Sensationalism is a poor yardstick for genuine news value, for it rarely distinguishes between one and the other.

It is also the duty of a newspaper, both to its readers and its owners, to be as bright, as palatable and as constructive as possible. The newspaper with inspirational qualities has a loyal readership.

To these ends may I make the following suggestions:

1. Check your newspapers to see whether you are putting scare heads on stories that are not likely to have as dire consequences as your headlines would indicate.

2. Look for the story that gives the complete picture, that tells not only what happened today, but what happened last week or last year in the same condition. Ask yourself if your wire news contains enough background information to help

your readers reach an intelligent opinion on these matters. If not, why don't you squawk about this at the next state AP or UP meeting?

3. Do your editorials merely complain, or do they suggest a course of action? In a Navy pamphlet on survival after shipwreck the officer who finds himself in charge of an isolated lifeboat or liferaft is urged to set a course. "It may not be the best course possible," says the Navy, "but your men will be heartened in the knowledge that they are going somewhere. Whatever you do, don't just drift."

That's good advice for editors, too. Whether you are complaining about the county roads, an act of Congress, or the Palestine situation, always suggest a course of action for a cure. An editorial that has no such suggestion is neither informative nor constructive. It is a belly-ache, and people have enough troubles without listening to the pointless griping of an editor.

4. —and finally, it doesn't do any harm to accentuate the positive, both in your news columns and on the editorial page. This means more than reporting the doings of the Girl Scouts or printing a favorable crop report. It means that your reporting staffs must be trained to look for the feature story on the admirable citizen. They must be taught, as they are not always taught in journalism school, that top reporting is not exclusively concerned with death, defalcations and disasters, but that there are good things worth digging up and spreading on page one, too.

One of our reporters a week ago discovered that some neighbors in a small community near Tulsa had pitched in and completely rebuilt the burned farm home of a widowed mother. I'm sure that his piece had more readers, and happier ones, than the brilliant editorial I ran the same day excoriating the city commission. There must be a lot of things that you can honestly point to with pride and view with satisfaction.

Living on top of the news as we do we are, as a class, deafened by the sound of alarm bells and the wail of sirens. We pass our fears along, but in such a way that our readers are sometimes rendered skittish, hopeless, and incapable of intelligent action. That's what our enemies want.

We are not true historians. We are jitterbugs. It is in the direction of becoming true historians, through the development of a balanced and intelligent report on the state of the world, that our great challenge lies in these, the nervous years.

Dartmouth Studies the Newspapers As Texts On the Great Issues

Objection by the Chicago Tribune

When John Sloan Dickey came to the presidency of Dartmouth College from the State Department he immediately organized a course for all seniors, to make them aware of the great issues of their time. The "Great Issues" course is now in its second year. It brings to Dartmouth each week some distinguished American to present one of the great issues and discuss it in a forum with the senior class who have prepared for it by reading and later write reports on it.

The Great Issues course by its nature depends largely on newspapers as texts and a most useful byproduct of the course is the training of the students as discriminating newspaper readers. All students are expected to follow the essential news daily in either the New York Times or Herald Tribune. Every student is assigned a project for one week to do intensive newspaper reading on some current issue. In that week he is expected to follow closely the news and comment on that issue in the following list of papers: 1, New York Times or Herald Tribune; 2, Chicago Tribune; 3, New York Daily Worker; 4, Christian Science Monitor or Washington Post; 5, New York Journal American or New York Star; 6, Time; 7, Newsweek. He may substitute for (4) or (5) another paper from a larger list available in the college library. A Laboratory of Public Affairs, set up for this course, provides a large reading room, takes multiple copies of the prescribed newspapers, posts daily directions on "must" reading, and organizes timely exhibits on current issues as they are treated in the newspapers and news magazines.

Each week there is a briefing session on Thursday with reading assignments. The following Monday evening is the weekly talk by the guest speaker. On Tuesday morning he holds an open discussion with the class on the topic of his talk the night before.

This Fall the opening sessions of the course were devoted to newspapers as texts and tools for the course. Joseph Barnes, editor of the New York Star, discussed "The context of our times." John McL. Clark, editor of the neighboring Claremont Daily Eagle, spoke on the use of newspapers. The second week Archibald MacLeish discussed the key question,

"What is a great issue?" Profiles of Barnes and MacLeish were put up on the laboratory wall and half a dozen books or articles by each were displayed for these two weeks. A shelf of books on newspapers, placed on the reading table for the opening weeks, suggested background reading. All were asked to read the first half of the book "Your Newspaper" by Nine Nieman Fellows, at the start.

A wall exhibit at the opening of the term offered this suggested framework for following the news:

"The Context of Our Time"

"The relative importance of individual news items can be judged only against the framework of facts, opinions and ideas with which you can equip your mind. Joseph Barnes suggests that you should be particularly alert nowadays for news about:

The problem of sustenance for enlarged world populations.

The decay of old colonial systems.

The effects of modern transport.

"He cited three ideas which particularly motivate the behavior of great numbers of men:

1. Nationalism.
2. Political Democracy.
3. Economic Democracy.

"Some such framework—a sense of the topics and forces of particular current importance to you—will help you choose what is worth reading in the many pages of newsprint with which you are confronted."

The newspaper study project in the Great Issues course is outlined on mimeographed instruction sheets which describe it as follows:

It is the aim of this project:

1. to develop your ability to distinguish between statements of facts and statements of opinion in the news;
2. to help you to recognize distorted or deficient handling of the news, and to be aware of the kind of influence, intended or unintended, which such handling may have on the casual reader;
3. to enable you to arrive at intelligent conclusions of your own about the relative merits of the particular pub-

lications which you choose for regular reading;

4. by an elementary comparative exposure to a range of newspaper types to give you an understanding of what very different diets of information and opinion large blocks of your fellow Americans live on—which is one important clue to why they think and act as they do.

The project requires you to read analytically a certain number of issues of each of seven newspapers and news-magazines, and to prepare a paper on them.

Choice of a News Story

Select one of the current news topics posted on the PAL bulletin board for your due-date group in accordance with your interest in its substance, and look up the background of it. In obtaining the background, you may rely on your previously developed techniques of library research, or ask the advice of the instructor. Your paper should include a summary of this background in less than 500 words.

(The topics posted for the week of October 11 were:

- US-Russian relations.
- the Berlin crisis.
- the Civil Rights issue.
- the Thomas Committee.
- United Nations.
- Palestine.
- Labor Management disputes.)

Following the News Story

For the full week indicated in the schedule read the treatment of your chosen news story in each issue of your five newspapers. Read for the same limited purpose the two most recent issues of each of the two news-magazines. Make notes somewhat as follows:

1. **Coverage.** Does this publication bring you all the important facts? Is the selection and elimination done in the best interests of an informed citizenry, or guided by a policy of deliberate propaganda, or subordinated to sensationalism for news-stand sales, or is the choice made at random, perhaps for the convenience of the composing room?

2. **Emphasis.** Is the story played up in front-page prominence, over-emphasized, or buried back of the obituaries? Is it buttressed by editorials, special articles, cartoons? Does its treatment indicate that the people on the staff of the newspaper had a grasp of the scope and significance of the story? Could the net result be improved in the public interest?

3. **Distortion.** Make a record of examples, if any, of (a) headlines which give false, exaggerated or colored ideas about the content of news stories; (b) tricks of selection, location or word choice that tend to influence the opinion of the reader; (c) admixture of opinionated statements in the text of news stories.

Writing the Paper.

The paper should include (1) a succinct statement of the background of your selected news story, (2) comments on the handling of that story during the indicated time limits in your seven publications, (3) general comments on the nature and relative merits of these publications, (4) bibliography. To describe everything you have discovered is impossible within the set limits, and inadequate in any case. The important thing is to study the evidence and submit reasonably documented conclusions.

Considerable condensation and selection of material will be necessary in the writing of your paper, for its length must not exceed 4000 words. Organize your bibliography according to the pattern indicated on the bulletin board in the Senior Reading Room.

Written work done for the Great Issues Course should reflect the fact that this course builds upon and extends your previous work in all three divisions of the College. An adequate paper will show the scientist's respect for the processes by which facts are sought and verified, the social scientist's concern for their significance in organized society, and the humanist's understanding of the spiritual and moral issues to which these facts are related.

An orderly arrangement of material and a concise, direct style will be expected of you. Slovenly grammar will not be tolerated. Sources must be cited for key facts, and quotations credited to their authors. You should avoid wordiness, repetition, long quotes and unnecessary digressions. Make your meaning clear.

Clippings on a current news event, the

Textron case, made material for this exhibit to illustrate a basic issue:

A BATTLE OF OUR TIMES PROPERTY RIGHTS vs HUMAN RIGHTS THE TEXTRON CASE

"The central issue running like a thread through these stories is the struggle between human rights and property rights. Note how these articles emphasize either side depending on the slant of the publication."

An exhibit of "The News Magazines" offered this warning on colored news:

"Intermixed with the facts of events are ideas. You should know by what methods these ideas are interjected so that you are conscious of the separation of what the publication thinks and what the facts are.

"Some of the methods of interjecting ideas into a story:

- 1 use of colored adjectives
- 2 omission or strained selections of facts
- 3 use of unidentified source
- 4 use of unflattering photographs
- 5 colored headlines
- 6 bandwagon phrases
- 7 selection of the story for the idea
- 8 wise-guy attitude."

All these methods were illustrated by underscoring occasions of their use in *Time* and *Newsweek*.

A major exhibit covering the panels on one wall of the college library this fall was on:

"QUALITY IN NEWSPAPERS"

Raised these questions:

"Does Your Newspaper Carry Enough News?

Does it carry a judicious selection of news?

Does it consistently play up or play down certain types of news?

Does it distort your impression of the news by deliberately loading the headlines?

Does it distort news stories by a prejudicial choice of words or by including frank or subtle statements of opinion?

Does it have a party line that permeates all its departments?

Does it run thoughtful editorials and columns?

What policy is suggested by its use of cartoons and pictures?"

This was in large part an exhibit in distortion of news. The extreme slants and booby traps of the Chicago Tribune and the Daily Worker showed graphically in contrast to the treatment of the same news in the New York Times and Herald Tribune.

The Chicago Tribune performance was summed up as follows:

"The Chicago Tribune plays up:
FDR (anathema)
Marshall Plan (any details capable of discrediting it)
British socialism ("failure of")
Government projects ("folly of")
United Nations ("silliness" and "danger of")
"The Chicago Tribune plays down
News favorable to the ERP"

This exhibit brought the Chicago Tribune to town to produce possibly the most ludicrous complaint ever made in print: that the smear master of Chicago was being smeared by the college at Hanover.

"In the Public Affairs Laboratory," the Tribune reported, "is brewed the real poison of America Last propaganda." Eugene Griffin, the same Tribune reporter who smeared Harvard and Princeton last Winter did a series on Dartmouth that ran under the headlines:

"New Dealism Forced on Dartmouth,"
"Seniors Forced to Listen to Propaganda,"
"Most of Profs at Dartmouth New Dealish,"
"Carnegie Pays for Dartmouth Smear Course," "Dickey a Drum Beater for Utopia."

The Tribune's opening piece informed that "under the leadership of Pres. John Sloan Dickey, who came here last year directly from a State Department propaganda job, Dartmouth has become the eastern seaboard's newest seat of higher indoctrination in the New Deal cult of America-Last internationalism." "The Great Issues course at Dartmouth," the report continued, "has received rave notices in the pro-British section of the New York press and other schools have sent scouts to Dartmouth to copy it." The "pro-British" New York papers, to one uninitiated in Chicago Tribune vocabulary, are the Times and Herald Tribune. "America Lasters" are all who are not, like the Tribune, America Firsters.

Pres. Dickey got a \$75,000 Carnegie Corporation grant for his new course. The Tribune reports of this: "Alger Hiss, former State Department official, who has been accused of being a Communist, is president of a sister trust, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace." It also reveals that "Dickey studied at Harvard Law School while Felix Frankfurter was there."

Dartmouth could not have asked for a more graphic demonstration for the class than the Tribune's smear pieces. No student would be so dumb as to miss this illustration of what the Public Affairs Laboratory had described as "justifying some-

thing by defaming somebody who opposes it." Elsewhere in this issue Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, proposes that decent standards of newspaper conduct be enforced by a board set up within the newspaper business, after the manner of bar and medical associa-

tions. This is a problem with which many of the most responsible minds in journalism have long wrestled and it is likely to remain a problem for some time. Until Mr. Sulzberger's goal of self-enforced standards can be realized by the press, the only answer to the public problem of per-

verted news is a readership educated to detect journalistic quackery. When enough schools and colleges prepare their students, as Dartmouth is, to recognize honest sources of news, then such irresponsibles as the Chicago Tribune will have fewer people to fool.—Louis M. Lyons

Pointing Up the Editorial

by William W. Vosburgh, Jr.

At the first annual meeting of the National Conference of Editorial writers, held in October, 1947, in Washington, D. C., editorial pages were the subjects of somewhat gloomy dissection. The editorial pages contributed to by those attending the conference were parcelled out to several members of the conference for analysis, which was as searching and searing as amenities permitted. Finally that old hand at the moulding of public opinion, Henry L. Mencken, took the floor and kidded editorials and editorial writers in characteristically outrageous fashion. The Parthian shot of his discourse was directed at attempts to lure more readers on to the editorial page by introducing extraneous features there, when he remarked acidly that editorials are only read by the more intelligent of newspaper readers in their more intelligent moments, and then with a sense of acute disappointment.

The following Spring, at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, this clinical study of editorial pages was resumed. This time it was the policy-makers instead of the hired editorial page hands who assessed the current state of public opinion moulding and they too found much to be desired in the modern editorial page. Lloyd M. Felmly, editor of the Newark News, was one of the leaders of this discussion. And with regard to editorials themselves, he remarked, "They are long, recitative and repetitious. There is a deadly similarity about them."

Pinned down on the proper length of an editorial, in the discussion that followed, Mr. Felmly declared, "I don't think

there is any rule about that. I think if you have a complex and difficult subject you will have to let it run. I don't think you can get it down to four or five inches. I think that leads to arbitrary documents, doctrinaire pieces, and so on. I find that when you are considering a controversial subject, if you state both positions in the editorial, no matter which way you go, people don't get so mad at you. Sometimes you have to let them run out. Editorials discussing the President's message practically all ran from 15 to 20 inches, and I don't think they were too long.

This opinion of Mr. Felmly's is one with which most newspaper editors will agree. If an editorial is fairly and adequately to state an opinion on some of the complicated issues of today, length is unavoidable. Editorials don't need to be recitative and repetitious, to recall his other criticism, but a certain length, even in the wide measure type usual to editorial pages, can't be avoided in many cases. And the classic form of editorial writing which is all but universally adhered to allows the reader of editorials no short-cut to the nub of what's on the editorial writer's mind such as the conventional pattern of news stories affords.

For your conventional editorial doesn't blurt its message like a news story. It falls rather into the accepted form of the argumentative essay, with an introduction, a lengthy exposition and a conclusion. If it were written for the convenience of the average, which is to say the hurried, reader, the conclusion would come first. For what said reader is trying to discover is what the newspaper thinks about this or that situation. Does the editor regard the mayor's appointment as good or bad—the senator's argument true or false? Does he view with alarm, or point with pride to the latest action of legislature, synod, or C. I. O. convention? And since editorial headings are too often simply topical, and editorials themselves are necessarily the slow, methodical development of conclusions, instead of a terse statement of

convictions, what chance has the editorial page to capture any but, to paraphrase Mr. Mencken, the more intelligent reader with a particular amount of time on his hands, in his more intelligent and leisure moments? And wouldn't that sense of acute disappointment that Mr. Mencken mentioned be lessened if editorials were constructed so that the reader could tell at a glance whether a particular editorial corresponded to his interests and where it was heading?

Such considerations as these recently prompted the Waterbury (Conn.) **Republican** to make the experiment of putting its editorial conclusions in italics ahead of its editorial arguments. This may seem at first like putting the cart ahead of the horse, but it's done every day in the news columns when instead of beginning a news story with time, place and other scene-setting details concerning a crime, we shout "murder" in the first sentence of a story and as close to the first word of it as we can coherently manage.

The way it is being done on the **Republican** is to follow the topical heading of the editorial with a brief, punchy paragraph that states the editorial writer's conviction. This is printed in italics. And then under it follows the editorial in conventional style.

For instance, if the **Republican** had adopted this new pattern back of the time when President Truman delivered the message to Congress which provoked the 15 to 20 inch editorials which Mr. Felmly found in most newspapers, its comment would have gone something like this:

First, the title—"The President's Message."

Then, second, something like this in italics:

"Mr. Truman believes that we must not only finance European reconstruction but that the challenge of these times requires an army strengthened by peacetime conscription and compulsory training of our young men. He's right on all three counts."

And, third, would follow more or less the

William W. Vosburgh, Jr., editor of the Waterbury (Conn.) **Republican**, is the kind of fellow who goes to meetings and takes something home with him. The germ of his editorial page experiment came from the first meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers. By the time of their second meeting in November Bill Vosburgh had made the innovation he describes here.

very editorial that would have been written before these italicized first paragraphs were instituted, sketching the background for these momentous recommendations of the President, weighing the case for them pro and con, and stating why the editor finds them good.

We suppose that in miniature this form of editorial introduction could be likened to a trial lawyer's ringing, confident opening statement of what he intends to prove, before he produces his evidence and calls his witnesses. If that's a forceful form of argument in the one instance, why not in the other?

In the *Republican*, which is the morning paper of our combination, we've been experimenting with this editorial form and initial reactions have been good. We haven't attempted to educate the readers to our purpose but early comments show they are quick to catch on and that they value the new style. We began the experiment wondering whether putting the conclusion ahead of the full editorial argument would lend itself to all types of editorials. But we've found that in the case of the novelty editorial with a surprise punch at the end and the humorous editorial the italicized paragraph can be given a teaser twist and that the com-

memorative or complimentary editorial can start off effectively with an italicized quotation or bit of philosophy and so conform to style. For example, the Selkirk Grace makes a perfect lead-in to a Thanksgiving editorial.

And you can rather forcefully state an editorial position on a serious, straight subject in a couple of flat sentences. As an instance, Connecticut's new Democratic governor is sworn to preference of a state income tax instead of the present sales tax, and there's talk of the Republican legislature going along with him on the proposition just because they think it will put him in a hole.

Our editorial on that rumored strategy was headed, "Play It Straight," and the italicized paragraph read:

"It is hinted that Republican leaders may try to outsmart Chester Bowles by supporting a state income tax. They'll outsmart nobody but themselves if they do."

Under the self explanatory title of "Another Labor Law," our editorial writer concocted this effective boil-down:

"The Wagner Act was written for labor. The Taft-Hartley Law was a concession to management. This time we ought to write a labor law for the people."

And we've found unexpected dividends

in the subjective effect of this approach to editorial writing. Under deadline pressure your average editorial writer tends to plunge into his subject before he has fully thought it out and organized the data at his elbow. That's why he tends to be "recitative and repetitious." But if he charts his course first in the form of a carefully and forcefully written conclusion, it tends to keep his argument within bounds. And it discourages the "Yes-and-no" type of inconclusive editorial which the apologetic author justifies as "informative," though such an editorial is usually informative of nothing so much as poverty of conviction and poverty of reason for writing, except to fill space. In other words, this form of editorial writing is excellent discipline, after you've discouraged the editorial writer from writing the body of his editorial first and then pasting the italicized conclusion on top.

Finally, the digest of an editorial into a short and emphatic statement of conviction is a very convenient thing to bring into an editorial conference as a basis for policy discussion.

In summary, we on the *Republican* think we've hit upon a device that is helpful to both editorial readers and editorial writers.

Ted Link --- A Reporter in the Bovard Tradition

by Arthur Hepner

There had been a rumor nagging at the *Post-Dispatch* editors for a long time. The sheriff of St. Louis, the tip said, had uncommonly good connections with the Capone manufacturing and servicing industry of Chicago. Many of the sheriff's deputies had records longer than Cyrano's nose. But despite some very able reporting by various staff members, the rumor remained rumor.

Then Ted Link obtained enough points to be discharged from the Marines. In only a matter of days after he returned to his civilian job, his stories began to appear and the rumors were suddenly incontrovertible fact.

Such reportorial exploits come to mind now that Ted Link has been indicted on trumped-up charges along with a group of hoodlums by a county grand jury in Illinois. The phony indictment grew out of his interviewing a petty racketeer in his hotel room in Peoria where Link was in-

vestigating the relation of gambling and murder to state officials. The purpose of the politically-directed grand jury was obviously to discredit Link's disclosures.

In a series of articles which appeared under his own name, Link told last August of the machinations of gambling in vice-ridden Peoria. Most of the stories were copyrighted. They told how a representative of a state's attorney had solicited a \$25,000-bribe from Bernie Shelton, gang leader, a month before Shelton was assassinated; how Shelton had been paying state officers to protect his gambling casino across the river from Peoria; how the local Studebaker distributor was Shelton's silent partner; that a collector of the slot machine graft "for the state" was on the payroll of the Illinois Attorney General; that city, county and state officeholders were cutting in heavily on the substantial revenue from all forms of gambling; that gamblers in six Illinois counties, including Peoria, had been shaken down for contributions to Gov. Green's 1944 campaign and were feeling the pinch again.

Out of the disclosures grew the recall of the May term grand jury which indicted three state officials for malfeasance, bribery and perjury. But then came the September term jury which quashed the original indictments and substituted those for Link and three Shelton gangsters.

The citizens of Peoria were shocked. Peoria's *Journal* denounced the jury and special prosecutor James A. Howe, henchman of the Attorney General, in a rousing editorial titled, "The Expected Happens." Said the *Journal*:

"The grand jury whitewash delivered here and the similar whitewash in Sangamon county earlier this week are vicious attempts to pull the wool over the eyes of unsuspecting voters and to conceal any connection between organized gambling and high officials of the State of Illinois."

For the *Post-Dispatch* it was yet another round of ammunition in its fight against Gov. Green's re-election. It had already been hot in pursuit of him for corruption in the Centralia mine disaster of March, 1947.

Arthur Hepner, a former reporter on the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, is now with *The Nation's Business*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1945-6.

All this commotion in Peoria and St. Louis last summer and autumn would never have happened had it not been for Link. Theodore C. Link Jr. is a handsome hardy young man in his early forties. He is quick with his fists when necessary, quiet, unassuming, assiduous, suspicious, methodical. Some have likened his appearance to a Hollywood prototype of the screen detective. Except that wisecracking a la Humphrey Bogart's writers is not part of Link's equipment.

The C. in his name stands for Cabanne, one of the oldest and most proper families in St. Louis. An avenue, a neighborhood and a telephone exchange, not to mention laundries, food shops, florists and jewelers have been named for it. But the family name is where Link ends his ties with the Society page. He likes to pick a winner in the fifth, frequent working men's saloons and hobnob among the people instead of the snobs, even though the former in his case may include petty racketeers, sharpers, confidence men, pimps, bookies, strong-arm men and even murderers. They're his business and he attends to it well.

By protecting his sources and refusing to double-cross anyone who offers scraps of information, Link has gained a name for integrity among men who believe in honor among thieves. Any crook in the midwest trusts him.

He knows how to converse with crooks in their own idiom. And they discuss their intimate problems with him. Crooks are essentially weak, inadequate human beings who need to inflate their personalities by bragging of their prowess and their villainies to a responsive ear. Coupled with this quality Link has an uncanny ability to smell what questions need to be asked.

Even around the office there is something mysterious, almost glamorous about Ted Link. He works silently like a cat; sits at his desk chewing foul smelling cigars, and reading innumerable newspapers, his eye alert for the movement of some hoodlum. His phone calls invariably come in on the private-private line of the city editor, even when they arrive from some distant city or town. He says little ex-

cept when unburdening a long account to a rewrite man.

Link really isn't around the city room much. But when in the city between investigatory treks out of town, he makes a token appearance each morning, busies himself inconspicuously at his desk, awaits a telephone message and departs for points or rendezvous unknown. He keeps the city editor apprised of his general movements by a nod of the head or a brief memo.

When ready to unfurl a story, Link opens up like the locks of a dam. Chewing a half-smoked cigar or dragging at a cigarette, he sits down and talks over his reservoir of information with the city editor in an almost conspiratorial manner. Then a rewrite man is summoned to the conference.

With Link in tow, he retires to spend the morning shaping the page-one story. The facts roll off Link's tongue like water rushing to a lower level. The profusion of detail is fantastic; interlocking loose ends in Kansas City and Detroit, tracing the metamorphosis of his prey, through their many aliases, from reform school days. Implausible names—"Sleep Out Louie" "Ashcan Willie"—fall naturally into the account. The problem of the rewrite is how to condense it all. For every morsel bears pertinently on the story. Each segment fits into the complete picture so strategically there are hardly ever any leftovers. Many a Post-Dispatch rewrite man has marvelled at the precision and scope of his accounts. Once they have been hammered into shape the stories are models of the probing art.

Local legend has it that the St. Louis police department would give a collective left eye with a riot squad thrown in to get Link on its detective force. Link prefers to remain a reporter, even if he often carries about him that unmistakable aura of a cop.

I left the Post-Dispatch a year before the Peoria stories began appearing. At the time of my leaving, though, he was evidently working on it as part of a broad campaign to lay bare the masters of gambling throughout the midwest. I'm confident the method followed Link's habitual pattern: persistent, patient digging, careful checking and double-check-

ing, follow-through on every tip until it led to bonafide information or up a dead end.

Quite likely the Peoria stories under Link's signature were submitted to the major surgery of rewrite men. But the long narrations nailing the corrupt politicians to the cross with accumulation of fact piled on fact bore the indelible imprint of Ted Link's gift for investigation.

Link's Peoria investigation is the sort of thing at which the Post-Dispatch excels. From it have come many of the newspaper's Pulitzer prizes. Essentially, it's a team operation. Many members of the staff participate; in the Peoria case several other reporters were assigned to assist in the investigation once Link had traced out the paths to follow. But there's always one particular man who starts the investigation from scratch. He's usually the lone wolf operator until such time as the profusion of trails becomes too much for him to traverse alone.

Years ago, the self-starter was the late Paul Y. Anderson. Again it was the late John Rodgers.

But the moving spirit behind this kind of investigation was the fabulous O. K. Bovard who for years was the managing editor of the Post-Dispatch. Bovard, notwithstanding the tales of aloofness and coldheartedness, had a great warmth and admiration for the investigator-reporter who knew his way around the mires of rumor to find the hard spots of truth. He also had an uncanny ability for giving such men direction for he was always two steps ahead of them.

The Post-Dispatch has been a leader in unearthing any unsavory act in its midwest vicinity. Much of its work has implemented the creed of Joseph Pulitzer the elder, who in formulating the Post-Dispatch platform said the newspaper would "always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption . . . always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy for the poor, always remain devoted to public welfare." When its Ted Links risk personal safety to make a reality out of these lofty aspirations, the Post-Dispatch becomes one of the country's great newspapers.

THE NEWSPAPERMAN MEETS TELEVISION

by Lowell M. Limpus

"I never expected to see an old hand in the newspaper business cavorting in front of a bunch of cameras with his face covered by make-up."

Thus Danton Walker the Broadway columnist paid his laughing respects to a group of veteran political reporters clustered about the WPIX News Desk during the telecasting of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia. The shaft struck home because a number of us were engaged in a performance, the like of which we had never anticipated in our cub days.

It continued to fester—in my own case at least—during the ensuing months. I found myself becoming more and more deeply entangled with the problems of television as applied to the newspaper business. Since most of you are apt to become involved in the same predicament in the future, it may be that you would be interested in a recital of the problems faced and some of the tentative conclusions drawn by one of us pioneers.

I do not however, pretend to know all the answers—or any appreciable proportion of them.

Television is a new medium and most of us seem to be feeling our way in the dark, but it definitely concerns the working newspaperman, since more and more of us are being drawn into its clutches as various newspapers invade the new field.

My own paper—the New York Daily News—established station WPIX early last summer and immediately drew upon the Editorial Staff for personnel. Most of the original ones came from the Radio Broadcast Department which had been feeding hourly news bulletins to FNEW for several years. The head of this department, the veteran Carl Warren, became Director of News and Special Events for WPIX and recruited the backbone of his staff from the News' Editorial Department.

Men like Warren, who definitely transfer into the field of the new medium, are forced to learn an entirely new set of technical arrangements. They remain newspapermen but rapidly become specialists in the expanding television as well. They, however, have sufficient time and leisure to devote to the project to master it.

The rest of us are drawn in gradually at first, devoting only a small part of our time to the new medium—but, as time goes on, we find it occupying more and more of our attention. I presume my own case is typical.

I had never seen a television camera when I was borrowed by WPIX as a political advisor to make recommendations regarding the problems attendant upon covering the conventions. When I reported—chock full of advice—I was requested to prepare a tentative script and the first thing I knew I was reading it under the watchful eye of a young director-engineer, who had just joined the staff from the General Electric Laboratories at Schenectady. He decided that I might be one of the performers he was seeking and, the next thing I knew, I was selected to become one of the television commentators at the convention.

The selection resulted, in my own case, in a problem with which I presume few of you would be faced. It involved my whiskers.

My Nieman classmates will perhaps recall that I sported a goatee while I was at Harvard. I had shaved it off during the war, in an effort to make myself appear younger when applying for active duty as a reserve officer. My chin had remained nude ever since.

I discovered later that I was merely one of several political writers on the News Staff who had been considered for the convention assignment and the director had sent down to the morgue for pictures of all of them. A careless librarian had submitted an old photograph of me—one which still showed me wearing the Van Dyke. When I reported the director threw up his hands in horror.

His first question explained his reaction. "Where are the whiskers?" he asked. "Oh, I haven't worn a Van Dyke for seven years," I replied.

"Hell," declared the director. "That was one reason we picked you. We may want to put you on the air and I thought the beard might go well on television."

"Is it essential to the job?" I asked.

"It is, if you want it," he replied. "How long would it take you to grow it again?"

I explained that I thought I could do it in three weeks—and he insisted that I had better make the attempt if I wanted to earn the extra fee, which the station proposed to pay for the service.

I wanted the fee and so I complied. I presume that makes me one of a very few people who are paid real money for wearing whiskers—and since the goatee has become familiar to television audiences, directors of other programs insist that it be retained. It begins to look as though I am stuck with it. Especially since I became involved with additional programs soon after.

My experience at Philadelphia resulted in an offer to become the moderator of a new political forum which the station had just launched the preceding week.

I took over that weekly program and before long they asked me to participate in another one, built around the joint interview of national celebrities by Mrs. L. W. (Chip) Robert, the well-known Washington hostess and columnist for the Washington Times-Herald, and myself.

Shortly thereafter I was detailed—as a part of my regular newspaper work—to write the stories reporting the results of the Daily News' State Wide Straw Poll and almost immediately WPIX decided that it wanted to broadcast those results. Since I was beginning to be regarded as a veteran around our young studio, I more or less naturally inherited that program as well. Thus, within the space of three months I became established in three programs a week.

There is not a great deal of money in it—at least in these early days. You get paid something for each performance (which in my case at least was a welcome addition to the family budget) and you get so interested in the work that you willingly accept more of it.

My experience so far has been limited to three kinds of programs—the forum, the interview and the straight news commentary. Each type presents its own particular problem. But most of them are problems with which newspapermen already are familiar. The solutions therefore are not too difficult.

In handling the television forum—especially if it is an audience participation show, as ours is,—the moderator has to be continually on his toes, watching for libel and slander. You must follow the discussion with hawk-like accuracy because you have no chance to eliminate the libelous matter on a galley proof, if it once takes form. You cannot even replate it

Lowell M. Limpus, veteran correspondent and political writer of the New York Daily News, relates his initial adventures in television. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

out and thereby hope to reduce your damages. You must be ready to gavel down the offender—and if necessary to shout him down—before he can get you into trouble.

In our political discussions we found that the charge of Communism was the most dangerous possibility to be watched. If a member of the audience attempted to brand an opponent a Red, we learned to expect immediate repercussions from the target. One such charge did get on the air, despite my pounding gavel, and the next day we had a request for a complete transcript of the show from the eminent officeholder whom a questioner had implied to be possibly a Soviet sympathizer (and who, incidentally, happened to be a Republican). Fortunately it wasn't too specific and our explanation was acceptable. It would seem advisable, however, if the charge is once aired, to permit a defense against it to follow.

Needless to say, the moderator must be strictly impartial and avoid any appearance of favoring either side of an issue. He cannot even make a wisecrack which could be twisted into an implication that he is airing his own personal views. The temptation to make such jocular remarks simply must be resisted.

The television interview proves exceedingly difficult because the subject almost invariably refuses to go on record with anything of a controversial nature. The sight of the camera seems to slow him up exceedingly. During a radio interview he sometimes gets interested in the discussion and forgets about the microphone but he never loses sight of the twin red eyes of the camera glowing just outside

the audiences' field of vision. It seems virtually impossible to get him sufficiently worked up to forget that he is speaking to the great general public.

Furthermore, because of the cameras, he usually is unable to refer to notes or a prepared statement; at least he does not like to, since he prefers to seem to be speaking off the cuff and that means that you just can not get him to commit himself to anything that has not been rehearsed in advance. The only solution seems to be to go over the entire interview before going on the air and to permit him to answer prearranged questions in order.

It appears to work very well. One of my most successful interviews was with General Jonathan Wainwright and was conducted largely by signals. The grim old hero of Corregidor suffers from defective hearing as a result of his prison camp experience, but refuses to use a hearing aid. He could not follow the conversation in a crowded studio but he memorized in advance the order in which my questions would be asked. When I would lean forward and accidentally touch his knee, the General would begin replying to the next query. It worked out very well too.

On the other hand, at least during these early days, most celebrities when making their first few appearances on television, are much more easily handled in front of the cameras than elsewhere. They seem to be awed by the sight of the equipment and the realization that their performance is being broadcast in moving picture form.

The most dignified and eminent statesman appears to lose a considerable portion of his self control when he enters the studio and finds himself stumbling across

trailing cables and dodging between cameras and microphones. He "steps lively" when ordered to do so by the members of the sound and camera crews and ducks in pure horror if even a dead camera swings in his direction in an unguarded moment. Occasionally he freezes up with a bad case of camera fright and then the interviewer must be prepared to wade in and keep talking until the celebrity recovers the use of his tongue.

The commentator simply finds himself talking an editorial to the cameras and his success depends upon his ability either to memorize this talk or to continue with occasional glances at fragmentary notes on the table before him. It is fatal to try to read a prepared script unless the commentary is being illustrated by a series of charts, graphs or other material—including news films. In that case it simplifies matters to pick up the script and read it, although it must be carefully marked to indicate when the live camera will return to the speaker. The trick is to drop the script and be looking at the audience, as the the camera comes back and you continue your conversation.

Such are a few of the problems which must be faced and solved by the newspaperman who finds himself operating with the new medium. I repeat that I do not know all the answers, and I know nobody else who does. We are experimenting every day in an effort to discover new and better ones.

But you had better begin thinking about them yourself.

You never know when they will become your problems, too.

Barry Bingham Gets Out of Radio

Full Energy to Louisville Papers

The Louisville Courier-Journal sold its radio station, WHAS, to the Crosley Broadcasting Corporation September 28 for \$1,950,000. The purchaser took a ten-year lease on the radio studios that occupy two floors of the new Courier-Journal building.

The sale leaves Barry Bingham in the newspaper business, which is what he wants.

In a statement he said that television influenced the decision to sell the radio station: "Television," he continued, "is a new and exciting, but a very expensive medium. It will perhaps change the nature of radio in the United States, but it will probably be some time before it becomes profitable for the operators.

"Besides, to install television requires a very large outlay of capital. Our primary enterprise at the Courier-Journal and Times is not and has not been radio; it has been printing two newspapers and operating the Standard Gravure Corporation, which prints, among other things, more than a dozen locally edited magazines and the nationally edited Parade. That business has trebled since the war and we expect it to become much bigger. In addition, with the easing of the newsprint situation, we will be able to do a great many things with the newspapers in the way of editorial improvement and circulation expansion which we have been wanting to do since 1941.

"The easing of newsprint will permit our executives and staff to devote themselves to our primary job of editing, producing, and selling the best newspapers we are able to get out.

"While television is a great invention, by its very nature it is more divergent from newspaper publishing than the operation of a standard broadcast station. Its programming requires the staging and techniques of the theater, in which all of us here are certainly amateurs. We would rather invest our money and devote our energies to those enterprises which are more closely allied with newspaper publishing and printing."

FREE SPEECH IN THE UNITED NATIONS

by Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

The most important fact about the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information and about all other international efforts toward liberty of news and ideas is the common heritage of European civilization. Since 1492 this civilization has spread to all of America and to the portions of the British Empire which were settled by Europeans. China and India too, although they have their own civilizations, possess a great many of the ideas which are fundamental in this common European heritage. At the Conference the Chinese and Indian delegates seemed much closer to us than the Russian delegates. It was easier to talk to them.

Out of this common heritage grew the great ideal of freedom of information. The Sub-Commission and the Conference put it into these words:

"Every one shall have the right to freedom of thought and expression: this right shall include freedom to hold opinions without interference; and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas by any means and regardless of frontiers."

We in the United States are, I venture to think, somewhat forgetful that we are not the only country on earth which cherishes liberty of thought and speech. Roger Williams and the Pilgrims appear on the Reformation Monument in Geneva alongside thinkers from many other nations. The First Amendment to our Constitution ought to be viewed against its European background. When, soon after V-J Day, a large number of prominent American newspapermen sought to bring about UN action in the field of liberty of information, they were a bit inclined to assume that such action would lead all other countries to take bodily our ideas of freedom of the press. When the United Nations did act at Lake Success and Geneva, other countries were anxious for us to take over some of their ideas. This came as an unpleasant surprise to several of our leading editors. They started in denouncing as totalitarianism whatever UN decisions

about the press they happened to dislike, entirely ignoring the fact that these decisions were made in the face of bitter totalitarianism opposition. The decisions came from men within that common heritage—British Labor officials, editors of great newspapers in Scotland and Canada, the chief columnist in France, leaders in the struggle of India for independence, men who conducted underground newspapers in Norway and Holland at the risk of their lives. Yet the absurd idea has spread in American newspapers that every government except our own is trying to throttle the press.

It is stupid to behave as if the world consisted of just Russia and the United States. At the moment they happen to be the only two UN nations with great military strength and a stable economy, but that is pretty much beside the point when you are dealing with the free flow of news and opinions. At Geneva delegates from many other nations which share the common heritage knew that their contributions to that heritage are as significant as our own. England and France are determined to continue their strong cultural influences of the past. And smaller nations count. Where freedom is at stake, the weight of Holland or Switzerland is far beyond its size. Hence the Geneva Conference was a very different place from the Security Council where size and brute power are decisive factors. In the long run the problems of the world cannot be solved by either bombs or money. Ideas will be the weapons.

Therefore, we should constantly build upon this common heritage. Within the countries which derive from it, disagreements about details should, so far as possible, be subordinated to the unity of principles. Many important matters concerning the press will come before the UN within the next three years, for example the International Covenant on Human Rights. These are hard tasks. There are bound to be honest differences of opinion both inside the United Nations and outside it among American newspapermen and lawyers. When such disagreements do occur, they should not be discussed with imputations of sinister motives, but with a constant sympathetic understanding of the difficulties involved. It is good to know right from wrong—it

is also essential to distinguish between the great and the small. Disputes about methods ought not to be treated as if they were disputes about fundamental principles. The perpetuation and strengthening of the common heritage is the surest way to the kind of world we want.

The Soviet Union lies outside the common heritage. It derives from Byzantium and the Tartars.

The Russians are different and difficult. So far as my own experience goes, I see no prospect of common ground for several years ahead.

The big problem as I see it is to bring the Union of Soviet Republics into the common heritage of western thought. To expect the abandonment of all Russian traditions would be foolish, but the Russian peoples might eventually come to get along with us as easily as do the Chinese and the Indians and yet, like them, preserve ways of their own. My guess is that the process will not be a one-way street running solely in our direction. They will learn from us, but we shall also learn from them.

Is it possible meanwhile, to establish good will and fruitful relations between peoples so far apart in their ways of life?

While we were working at Lake Success last January, a friend asked me whether the stream which now separates us from Russians could be crossed. "Yes, lower down or higher up; but not where we stand now." Lower down, if it becomes possible to go below the leaders to the ordinary men of both countries, who get on together so much better than the leaders do—remember how the common soldiers of the two armies met in Germany. Higher up, if the debate can be lifted above the level of short-run considerations. But at the point on the stream where both countries are at present, the most we can hope is to be able to talk to each other across the torrent.

And that is made easy by periodic UN meetings. Whatever our present troubles, we do not have the added difficulty of arranging special conferences. Whenever our representatives go to Lake Success or Geneva the Russians are there too. The physical opportunity for adjustment exists whenever the will to adjust happily makes its appearance.

More than any other one person, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., has served the interests of freedom of speech through the United Nations. He has been the United States delegate in the Commission on Freedom of Information. He is Langdell professor of law at Harvard, author of many books on freedom of speech and press.

The repeated Soviet attacks on the free press made the rest of us close up our ranks. Our differences of opinion seemed less important when compared with the gulf between our view of the purposes of the press and the Soviet view. And so, many desirable measures were ironed into shape which would otherwise have come to nothing. The fresh realization given by the Slavs of what it would mean to lose liberty of the press helped the Conference to make this fundamental freedom stronger in the rest of the world.

In particular, the very process of rebutting the Soviet urgency for legal obligations made us more aware of the existence of moral obligations. The principle that freedom is inseparable from responsibility could not be ignored, although it is not mentioned in the First Amendment. We began asking ourselves new questions. Just what are the responsibilities of the Press? Do they extend beyond seeking the facts and publishing "all the news that's fit to print?" The Conference answered "Yes" in its notable Resolution No. 1. The Resolution calls for the "effective enforcement" of five duties as essential to freedom of the press. Though keeping this enforcement outside law as much as ever, the Conference brushed aside the old plea of newspaper owners, broadcasters, and movie producers that you must leave everything to their consciences. This final paragraph ought to make some of these gentlemen stir uneasily in their chairs:

"... observance of the obligations of the press . . . can also be effectively advanced by the people served by the press . . . provided that news and opinion reach them through a diversity of sources and that the people have adequate means of obtaining and promoting a better performance from the press . . ."

This is hardly what the Slavs wanted, but some of the credit for it must go to their presence, nonetheless.

There is, however, one subtle danger from the participation of the totalitarians. Because they are so vociferously antagonistic to our conceptions of freedom, a verbal battle soon develops during which the difficult and delicate problems of the relationship between press and public are forgotten. What started as an exploring party splits into the two sides of a Kentucky feud. The Soviet formulations of the principle of freedom of the press are so outrageous to western thinking that we are tempted to demolish them and

stop. The Conference ought to be considering disturbing situations in the press of freedom-loving countries like newspaper chains and lurid accounts of sex crimes, but we do not pursue such unpleasant matters. To dwell on weaknesses in our own press would be like furnishing ammunition to the enemy. The Slavs present their press as perfect. So we make out our press to be much nearer perfection than it is. Each side keeps repeating its own positions—what the Geneva newspapers called playing over worn phonograph records. The cold war becomes the scold war. The Russians spend an hour each day denouncing the sensationalism and inaccuracies of our press and its "censorship" by millionaire owners. We retort at length about the monotone uniformity of ideas in the Soviet Press and its censorship by government officials. Often at Lake Success and Geneva I was reminded of the story of the Oxford dons who were composing a letter inviting Queen Victoria to visit their college. The draft began: "Conscious as we are of our shortcomings—" One sarcastic professor suggested that it would be much more accurate to say: "Conscious as we are of one another's shortcomings—"

Such an attitude may be natural, but it is unproductive. Here were many distinguished experts on the press from various parts of the world. It was an opportunity to learn more about problems, even if the time had not yet come to solve them. It would have been a first step toward results if representatives from each side had given the gathering honest first-hand information about some significant operation of the article in the Soviet Constitution which purports to give every writer access to a printing-press and paper without charge. Suppose the Americans described the difficulties of reaching a satisfactory solution of the problem of the ownership of radio stations by newspapers. This sort of thing almost never happened at Lake Success or Gen-

eva. A bushel of argument to a grain of fact about the speaker's own country. Plenty of facts about the other fellow's country—all damaging. But denunciations do not open the way to the fruitful exchange of ideas.

The old problems of how far the government should keep its hands off the press are never fully answered, as the present controversy over the Mundt-Nixon Bill shows. Yet recently the focus of interest in the West has shifted from the scope of freedom of the press to the use of that freedom. What do the citizens of a free society need to receive from their press? Are they getting it now? If not, what methods can wisely be employed to make the press better? We have begun worrying about the way some press lords are using their freedom to publish reckless inaccuracies, about trends toward monopoly within cities and regions, about the low level of our radio programs, about the desire of powerful enterprises with American movies and magazines and press services, about gigantic headlines thrown like sparks toward the international powder-barrel. Or take the \$64 question: How are you going to change the judgment of the readers who now create such enormous circulations for newspapers so far below the standards of their best competitors? Even if the journals read by five or ten millions are really giving the public what it wants, nevertheless it is not what the public needs in order to make wise political decisions which deeply affect its own welfare. How then can the public come to want what it needs?

Such questions as these were in the minds of men at Lake Success and Geneva, but they rarely got aired in the conference chambers. I hope that we shall do better when the Sub-Commission reconvenes in January. For the future of the common heritage depends on bringing these new problems closer to solution.

Needed More Working Press At Geneva Conference by Howard K. Smith

The difficulty lay in the composition of the American delegation. It was overwhelmingly executive in function and conservative in principles. In all of our rather large group, there were but two working reporters, Harry Martin of the Newspaper Guild and I. I regret to say that this executive majority had very little

sympathy with the proposals of a working correspondent, and seemed mainly concerned to prevent new 'bureaucracies' and 'State intervention' from arising. Next time I think we should make efforts to have more working reporters represented on American delegations to such conferences.

And most important the conference tended to become one more peripheral battle in the cold war. That circumstance makes it almost impossible to judge issues and ideas on their inherent merits any more. A Court of Honor to condemn distorted reporting would be a wonderful thing in my estimation, but our delegation feared that such a court could easily be turned into a forum for Soviet satellites to make propaganda against the American press.

On its own merits, a special reporters' passport would be a good idea, but as a part of the cold war it could presumably

be used by reporters from the Iron Curtain to have free access which they might abuse in our western countries.

Personally I believe—and I thus argued—that our delegation's fears under this third category were exaggerated. I argued that we could easily find more distortions in the eastern press than they could find in ours, and further that we could prove there were such correctives in such a free and varied press as ours, while there are none in the eastern press. With regard to the argument that the special passport might be used as a means of access into our countries by reporters who were really

spies, I argued that spies already have free access into our countries; if they fail to get in one way they can find many others, for example attachment to an embassy or legation.

In summary, may I make these suggestions. That on future occasions we set committees to work out proposals in convincing detail, and that we strive to get working journalists better represented than they were in the Geneva Conference.

Despite our failure, I feel that this conference provided us with the raw materials for a better campaign in the future.

The Press and the Election

by Louis M. Lyons

The most conscientious American newspapermen realize that the position of the press with the public must have fallen far with their complete misreading of the election. It will take a chastened and informed effort to restore it. In very few spots is there any evidence of such an effort or even a recognition of its need.

The newspapers were further wrong than most want to admit. "We were wrong," as James B. Reston of the New York Times wrote in a letter to his own paper, "not only in the election but on the whole political direction of our times!" That's it. For sixteen years most of the big city papers had voted (editorially) on the opposite side from most of their readers. Now in 1948 the gap had widened until they were completely out of touch with the minds of the readers. Walter Lippman once told a Nieman seminar that it was the task of a political columnist to write of events in such a way that his readers would not be too surprised by the development of the news. But the columnists led their readers into utter surprise in November.

"A little careful reporting and a little less guessing," as Carroll Kilpatrick said in the San Francisco Chronicle, "might have resulted in a more honest picture." The newspapers tend to shrug it off as a muff by the pollsters. But it was far more than that. Anyway the polls had become practically a property of the newspapers. They built them up and ran them as their own features. Nobody ever asked the newspapers to go into the business of prediction. Their business is reporting. In overreaching themselves to see the future they failed in their primary function of reporting. They were discounting the election and discussing what was to come after. A Presidential election is too

momentous an event ever to be discounted or anticipated. It stretched the journalistic curse of pre-dating, of anticipating events, to the breaking point. And a good thing it broke down with such a crash as to discredit it. The reporters have a right to be indignant. For it was their function their papers forfeited to the crystal gazers.

The political reporters, many of them, as Mr. Reston indicates, had many reasons to doubt the certainty of the polls. But they failed to express their doubts, partly, as he explains, by their intoxication with the accepted certainty; but, partly, one may suspect, because they doubted that their papers would welcome a dissenting report.

The polls, as newspapermen well know, were never entitled to the legend of invincibility the newspapers had built up for them. Their errors in earlier elections were wide enough to have defeated their prediction in a close election. But their errors of detail were washed out in the Roosevelt sweeps.

Their huge error this time may prove to be largely in their bad guess as to the size of the vote. But why do they predict the size of the vote and "weight" their predictions by their guesses as to which party will be most effective in getting its voters out? That is a political, not a statistical problem, and political reporters are much better fixed to estimate it than the pollsters. Indeed if the pollsters had presented in their polls just what their samples showed without "weighting" them by their guesses about the capacity of the machines to get voters to the polls, then the political reporters might have used the polls as raw material to make much better guesses than were made.

If there is to be any future of Presidential polls, that would seem to be its limit:

to present the actual state of opinion as they measure it, and leave the rest to the parties and the political writers. In the average performance of the polls, the New York Times reported, the estimate of the Truman vote was off by 18%, of the Dewey vote by over 10%, of the Wallace vote by nearly 40%, the Dixiecrat vote by 33%. Dixiecrats were expected to sweep so widely as to threaten Truman in Virginia, Tennessee and Texas. Actually they had no effect outside the states where the electoral slate was shanghaied before the nominations. Massachusetts was unanimously put in the Republican column and it went Democratic by 390,000 votes (for governor), a 240,000 margin for Truman. Here the polls evidently ignored utterly the increased registration in the Democratic cities and the widely published reports that Church and Labor were working overtime to get out their maximum vote (for certain local referenda) that was bound to be overwhelmingly Democratic. Yet the very Boston papers that were keenly aware of this heavy factor were publishing their own local polls that predicted Massachusetts to go Republican.

The New York Times the Sunday before election presented forecasts for every state and gave Dewey 345 electoral votes. The Sunday after election the Times analyzed its failure under the head "Our Forecast: What Was Wrong?" This was an honest job. It finds "One fact emerges more clearly than any other. It is that the polls colored the thinking of the 'experts' all down the line." The Times had been printing the polls. When it asked its far-flung correspondents for their views, they gave back just what they had read in the Times. As one correspondent confessed "they simply let Gallup do their thinking for them."

And in one way or another the correspondents confess they failed to get in touch with the people.

To quote the Times:

A correspondent says: "Some predictions went wrong because the predictors did not get the opinions of the plain people."

Another says: "The poll takers did not get to the man in the mines and factories."

Still another says: "Looks like the forecasters failed to get far enough away from the country clubs and uptown clubs."

Another reports: "Guess I just stayed too close to my home county."

One correspondent says: "The fact is newspaper political experts spend too much time interviewing one another."

The Conclusions:

Two major questions are raised by the dispatches of The Times correspondents: First, is there any really accurate method of measuring public opinion? Second, even if there is one, is it in the national interest to use it?

With regard to Question No. 1, last Tuesday proved that the answer is: No, thus far—at least in so far as election forecasts are concerned. It may be argued that the press forecasters made inadequate use of one of the methods of gauging public opinion—direct contact with the voters. The answer may be that the polls purport to apply this method scientifically and they had no better luck."

With regards to Question No. 2—one Times correspondent puts it this way:

"Might it not be that the greatest mistake was in proposing the forecasts in the first place? The advance election prediction has become a sort of anticipation. There has been a haste to get a beat on the news of the event. A danger lurks here. A newspaper or association makes a forecast and then has a vested interest in having the prediction or forecast become accurate and correct. * * * This writer has heard many suggestions that all sorts of forecasts be prohibited as dangerous to the perpetuity of free institutions and a threat to the propriety of persuasive methods legitimately used."

Let Richard Strout of the Christian Science Monitor's Washington bureau sum up the case:

"The fact is that American journalism

is due for some pretty serious soul-searching if it faces the facts conscientiously and honestly. Having been just as wrong as everyone else, I get no particular joy out of the matter, but it seems to me that the subject requires scrupulous inquiry

"The stunning Truman verdict and New Deal resurgence show that the press from top to bottom did not know what was in the voters' mind. This was

no longer a question of giving advice and having it disregarded, but of having enough insight into the voters' thinking to be able to give a reasonable approximation of what was going on. In past New Deal elections, there was at least always divided judgment over the result. This time we missed the boat altogether. It is not a healthy sign in a democracy for such a gap to exist between the press and the masses."

The Failure of the Press

New York Times Writer Appraises it the Day After Election in a Letter to His Own Paper

To the Editor of the New York Times:

Before we in the newspaper business spend all our time and energy analyzing Governor Dewey's failure in the election, maybe we ought to try to analyze our own failure. For that failure is almost as spectacular as the President's victory, and the quicker we admit it the better off we'll be.

There were certain factors in this election that were known (and discounted) by almost every political reporter. We knew about the tradition that a defeated candidate had never been nominated and elected after his defeat. We knew that the national income was running at a rate of \$210 billions a year, that over 61,000,000 persons were employed at unprecedentedly high wages, and that the people had seldom if ever turned against the Administration in power at such a time.

We knew also that this prosperity applied not only to the people in the industrial areas but to the people on the farms as well; we knew that the small towns of the country had, during the war, become more industrialized and therefore more sensitive to the influences of organized labor.

We were, moreover, conscious of the fact that a whole generation had grown up under the strong influences of the Roosevelt era; that there were (and are) more poor people in this country than rich people; that personality is a force in American politics equally as strong as principle; and that the American people have always loved a fighter.

Yet while reporters on the Truman and Dewey campaign trains discussed all these points, each in his own way (including this reporter) was carried away by facts he did not verify, by theories he did not fully examine, and by assumptions he did not or could not check.

In a way our failure was not unlike Mr. Dewey's: we overestimated the tangibles and underestimated the intangibles; we relied too much on techniques of reporting which are no longer foolproof; just as he was too isolated with other politicians, so we were too isolated with other reporters; and we, too, were far too impressed by the tidy statistics of the polls.

What happens when a reporter goes out to "cover" an election? Usually he does one of two things: he goes on the campaign train or he goes out on his own to the various state capitals. If he goes on the train, he is usually so busy reporting what the great man says that he has no time for anything else. If he goes to the state capital, he usually spends his time interviewing the political managers and the political reporters, all of whom usually get their information from somebody else and place enormous confidence on the so-called scientific polls.

In short, neither on the train nor in the capitals do we spend much time wandering around talking to the people. We tend to assume that somebody else is doing the original reporting in that area, and if the assumptions of the political managers, or the other reporters, or the polls are wrong (as they were in this campaign), then our reports are wrong.

The great intangible of this election was the political influence of the Roosevelt era on the thinking of the nation. It was less dramatic than the antics of Messrs. Wallace and Thurmond, but in the long run it was more important and we didn't give enough weight to it. Consequently we were wrong, not only on the election, but, what's worse, on the whole political direction of our time.

James Reston.

New York, Nov. 3, 1948.

Prices and Presidential Predictions

Of all election predictions, the most definite and the one most completely ignored by the press was that of two Cornell economists, F. A. Pearson and W. I. Myers. They published an article in *Farm Economics* for September which showed that the popular vote in Presidential elections throughout our whole history could have been predicted by the price level. They went on to predict the election of Truman if the price level held, provided the splinter parties remained small splinters. And they thought they would. Perhaps more important than their own prediction was their suggestion to pollsters that they take account of the prevailing high price level and watch whether it continued right up to November. Of course it did. Nobody paid any attention. It is authoritatively reported that their article was offered to various publications and everywhere turned down. Yet it is plain, easy reading and a very interesting proposition about prices and politics, even if it had not coincided with a Presidential campaign.

It is too long for us now that the shooting is over. But certain key sentences in it show the method and the history:

"Perhaps greater success would attend political forecasts if more attention were paid to the lessons of history. In spite of difficulties, it does seem possible to form a theory that explains satisfactorily many of the observed results of our presidential campaigns.

"The theory is this: The public tends to vote for the continuance of administrations that have been in power during prosperous times.

"For political forecasts the general price level seems to be the best index. According to the theory, what can be said about the price level and next November's election? . . . No theory can make us independent of good judgment. In this case the good judgment must be exercised in predicting the level of prices.

"If one looks back over the shoulder of Time at those presidential elections decided by popular vote, he will find the voters have reacted according to the theory that has been suggested. If the *Literary Digests*, the *Gallups*, and *Fortunes* and other pollsters of the day had consulted the price level instead of the people, they would have been right in 27 of the past 31 presidential elections. If the prognosticators had predicted a change in the national administration when prices were declining or were stable at a low level, they would have been right 11 out of 13 times. If they

had predicted the reelection of the administration when prices were rising or were stable at a high level, they would have been right in 16 out of 18 elections. Their predictions would have been wrong 13 per cent of the time. However, these four failures to forecast the elections correctly, paradoxical as it may seem, provide further convincing evidence of the overwhelming power of prices at the ballot box.

"Thus, in only four cases were the results of the presidential elections other than would be expected when one considered only price movements. Three of these elections, 1824, 1876 and 1912, reflected not the failure of the people to respond to prices but rather the failure of the voters' opinions to be translated into victory at the polls. [The President elected had a minority of the popular vote.] The only real exception, 1852, was a result of the conflicting ambiguous implications of the level and trend of prices at that time.

"Several things can be said in conclusion. First, the historical evidence is

clear. With remarkably few exceptions—and these were attended by unusual circumstances—presidential elections have turned out in a way that confirms our theory about the relationship between fluctuations in the economic welfare of the voters and their political reactions. Second, in order to predict elections we have to predict the economic fluctuations that will occur until election time. In the present election the forcaster must decide whether the present high level of prices and economic activity will continue until November or whether there will be a break such as occurred in 1920. Third, forecasts must be based on an appraisal of the vote-getting potentialities of Wallace and the Dixiecrats.

"The only startling conclusion that this type of reasoning leads to is that Truman will win in November if the price level is stable at the present level or continues to rise—provided that Wallace and the Dixiecrats get few votes. If prices decline or the minor contenders have a substantial success, Dewey will be the winner."

Covering Henry Wallace

The New York Times Southern correspondent attached this explanation to his expense account.

The enclosed expense account will require a few explanations. I joined the Wallace tour in Richmond, Va., paying the railroad fare to get there from Chattanooga, Tenn. I paid all motorcade fares with the exception of the last trip by chartered bus from Nashville to Knoxville, for which you will be billed. I also did not pay the plane fares or the train fares.

The Wallace party, which is short on money, collected from all newspapermen aboard as much as they could along the way. Most of us were able to pay the motorcade fares, which were the ones they wanted most, since they involved local drivers on the scene, but let them bill our offices for train and plane fares. Thus, you should get billed from the Wallace group for plane fare from Richmond to Durham; train fare from Asheville, N. C., to Decatur, Ala.; train fare from Birmingham, Ala., to Jackson, Miss.; plane fare from Shreveport, La., to Little Rock, Ark.; train fare from Memphis to Nashville, Tenn., and the last chartered bus fare from Nashville to Knoxville, Tenn.

This was the most amazing trip in the

country's political annals, really fantastic from the press standpoint. We traveled around the mountains of the South for eighteen and nineteen hours each day. We grabbed meals wherever we could as there was no diner on the train. We moved morning and night, hopping from 5 A.M. to midnight or later, day after day. Toward the end reporters frequently roomed together on a share basis just to get an occasional shower or a nap between filing stories. You will note that on the last few days I have listed hotels. I have no receipts. We didn't have time to get a bill made out. We just dozed or bathed, and fled in haste when departure hour arrived.

The coverage itself was unbelievable. Wallace, as you probably read, was a villain in every community. In small villages he would get chased by mobs. The press was equally hated. That meant that for safety Mr. Wallace and his car had to race out of town and meet the press at rendezvous areas three and four miles away. Sometimes such things broke on filing deadlines and the press would stay in town to write, then grab taxis and join the mo-

torcade somewhere outside of town. Thus you will note motorcade and taxi fares are listed on expense items. The motorcade fare, for instance, on Aug. 30, was \$20, and I needed \$3 in taxi fares in several towns to catch up at rendezvous points. The taxi fares were usually much more than I have listed, but in each case I shared a taxi with one or more reporters, which keeps it down. That gave me a bus and taxi fare on Aug. 30 of \$23, which you will note on the expense item. That is the same set-up on each listing where there's a motorcade and taxi fare. Motorcade fares ran from \$15

to \$20 most of the time, and taxi rates were from \$3 to \$7 for a normal day.

We visited thirty towns in seven states. Naturally, tips ran high in spots like that—Western Union boys to handle copy in towns where night meetings broke on deadlines, tips to porters and drivers to give us that extra service needed to come out on top in such situations. Meals ran the usual figure of \$6 for three regular meals a day and sometimes a much-needed supper late at night after a long day. I have made all that separate as the usual \$10 per diem

would not have been enough to cover any such thing as the Wallace tour. All in all, considering territory covered, the time factor, the extraordinary conditions under which we had to file and write, I think you will find the total amount extremely reasonable.—John Popham.

One great lesson of this election is that it is long past time for the development of a press in our key centers which is closer to the people and more in sympathy with the main trends of the times.—Johnson County (Kans.) Democrat.

The ABC of News Coverage

by Paul Miller

From a talk to German Newspaper Editors at an American Press Institute Seminar, September 23, 1948.

Good reporting is the heart of good newspapering in the United States as it must be anywhere.

It is obviously my opinion, then, that the care and training of good reporters takes second place to nothing in successful newspaper making.

However, it often takes more than good reporters to get good reporting. Back of any big byline there is apt to be a smart editor.

So it isn't possible to put reporters in one class and editors in another. In the properly run newsroom you will find a team. Out of it all, out of teamwork among reporters and editors, comes the kind of news coverage that makes great newspapers.

Yet it is true that competent news reporting and writing is becoming more and more dependent upon specialization in the big newsrooms and news bureaus—a science expert, a union labor expert, a foreign affairs expert, a farm news expert, and so on. Any reporter, in these days of high pressure propaganda, government and otherwise, ought to try to know as much about a subject as the people who deal with it all the time.

On the Gannett Newspapers we have a farm expert who actually operates a model farm owned by the newspapers near Rochester. His name, L. B. Skeffington, is familiar in farm circles everywhere. Men like Skeffington are never misled in their fields. Nobody ever deceives them for long. Such men, such reporters, reporters

who know as much about their specialties as anyone else, are newspaper readers' best protection against the bad features of what American reporters call the hand-out system:—the distribution of officially prepared statements.

And what of the editor who cannot possibly be a specialist in everything and yet has an array of specialists reporting to him? I asked this question of one of the most competent Associated Press editors I know. He replied:

"The editor can be the public's specialist. For the public he can winnow and relate the products of his specialist writers and reporters. He can supply focus for those of his staff who need the benefit of a broad view. He can sift the important from the trivial and arrange in readable order the endless stream of new facts.

"The editor can train and employ personnel—his experts—to maximum advantage. Watching the whole scene, he can help reporters spot the news they might otherwise overlook. Countless stories have been lost because reporters have lacked the intelligence and background to inspire confidence and ask the proper questions. It is astonishing how blind a reporter-specialist often becomes to news outside his specialty. If one reporter can't get a story, another often can just a few hours later. If the editor knows his staff, and any good editor should, he'll know whom to assign to get that elusive yarn and just why that man is needed."

Parenthetically, it should be noted here that this editor's comment about the blindness of specialists to subject matter outside their own fields is one of the most common arguments against specialists. Many an editor contends that the ideal reporter is the seasoned all-round man. Also, it is true that relatively few news-

papers can afford the luxury of much specialization.

Perhaps the most helpful editor is the one who has a suspicious frame of mind and passes on his suspicions to the reporter. Going back a long way, I recall a Washington editor who telephoned a reporter one Saturday in August, 1944:

"There seems little reason for President Roosevelt to send Donald Nelson on a war production mission to China unless he wants to ease Nelson out of the War Production Board chairmanship in the United States. Please look into this."

The reporter telephoned one of Nelson's close associates and asked simply, had Nelson received a kick in the teeth? The associate said Nelson had indeed; that Nelson, who was at odds with the military because he wanted to get reconversion started before the war ended, was actually being exiled. It would leave the war production effort in the hands of the then War Production Board vice-chairman, Charles E. Wilson of General Electric.

The story, printed on Monday morning throughout the United States, quoted the unnamed informant as saying Nelson had received "a kick in the teeth." It was bolstered by comment from various senators in the same vein. They said Nelson was being exiled to Siberia.

The story, which never would have been uncovered had it not been for a newsman's suspicion, had far-reaching results. Wilson, apparently angered at "sniping" by Nelson's associates, went to the White House on the same day and offered his resignation. Nelson of course departed in due course.

Incidentally this story is still good. The argument as to whether the delay in reconversion contributed to shortages which in turn contributed to inflation is raging even now. Nelson mentioned it in a book.

Paul Miller, executive head of the Gannett Newspapers, was until last year Washington bureau chief of the Associated Press.

A former Nelson associate has written a book which treats the same point again.

Aside from the spot news breaks which fall into a newsman's lap when the staff is alert and well distributed at possible trouble points, there are two main fields productive of good stories.

One is the "buried" story such as that about Donald Nelson, which a reporter may dig out by knowing the right people and asking the right questions. The other is the "built up" story, which may result from putting together a number of seemingly unrelated items until they suddenly fall into a pattern.

Few single reporters, for instance, can determine when a number of separate wage increases suddenly become a new nationwide wage formula. But the editor who is watching and relating all the news in his own mind can see it. Then, the editor having noted it, the reporter can piece the story together easily, from labor sources, government bureaus, associations of business and industry and elsewhere.

There is seldom a story which can be developed at only one source. Almost any story can be confirmed elsewhere if the first source tried is non-productive. Washington reporters covering Congress frequently hear rumors or reports of something at the White House or other Executive Departments, but are unable to obtain enough information for a story. However, if the fragment of information is made the basis of a request for comment or elaboration at the White House or elsewhere, the whole story may be broken out into the open. So it may go between all Washington departments and agencies or officials, and this is true in city or local government scarcely less than in Washington.

An American reporter goes after any story with the conviction that he is entitled to all the facts. Whether all the facts are printed is a matter for him and his editor—his newspaper—to decide. The American public looks with disfavor on any public official or agency which attempts to conceal or hold back news.

The American reporter is the representative of the American public. It is the American reporter's job to fight for full access to the truth, to the facts, all the time.

Looking back on the war years, which I spent as a Washington newsman, I can say that no conviction growing out of that experience is firmer with me than this:

Nine times out of ten the whole country loses when the government tries to withhold legitimate news. This was true even during the war as we know to our sorrow now. Take some of the instances with which all of us are still familiar from the war.

For one, there was the famous soldier slapping incident which involved one of our great soldiers of World War II, General George Patton.

Then there was the story of China's weaknesses in the war effort.

And, the story of the Yalta agreement on Russian and United States voting power in the then proposed world organization.

The facts about all these things were covered up—for a time—and doubtless by well-meaning people. I believe the attempts to cover up hurt all of us. They hurt all of us because of the jolt and shock of disillusionment when the truth finally did come through. The public logically wonders: "What else is being held back or misinterpreted?" The truth can never hurt anybody as lastingly as does a lie. American newspapers try to bear that fact in mind always. It is part of the religion of a good reporter.

A man coming to this country to study newspaper methods would not get the same answers to the same question from any two newspapermen he might approach. So I will not attempt to say that the reporting techniques I am going to describe would be accepted wholly by other American newspapermen without exception. As you know, we are a group of 21 newspapers, ranging from a newspaper that appears twice a week, all the

way to major newspapers with multiple editions daily. What is good practice on one newspaper is not always good practice on another. But as for news handling, I am going to let follow what I believe I am safe in calling the A, B, C of the Gannett news coverage program.

Go after the truthful inside story. Try always to beat the handouts. When you take a handout, don't be content merely to base a story on it. Go behind and beyond it, asking questions of any responsible person you can reach. Put the top premium on original reporting.

Write simply. Do this by substituting words that are generally understood for words that may not be familiar to all.

Explain as you report, if you can. (If the reporter handling a spot story is not able to write in the interpretation and background as he goes along, another reporter or re-write man may be assigned, if available, to explore the subject further. Then the two stories may be printed side by side, one as an interpretive if desired, or combined in a later edition.)

Remember that every reporter is a representative of his newspaper with the public. Let every reporter conduct himself with this in mind. The cynic, the smart alec may get an occasional story first. But, over a period of time, the reporter who commands respect—for himself and hence for his newspaper—also commands confidence; and the reporter who gains and holds the confidence of his news source is the one who will consistently produce.

Write interestingly. An important story need not be dull.

Get all the facts, then use those which are necessary.

Make sure readers learn they can trust you, then they increasingly will believe in what you write. Try to present both sides of a controversy.

Be economical with space. Many stories require full treatment. Most can be handled briefly and will be better read, more effective for it.

Take pride in your profession. The newspaper represents power and influence for good—your work counts.

“SEGREGATION DOESN'T WORK”

A Negro Editor Sees It As a Cover for Discrimination in Public Services

by Fletcher Martin

During the last days of the political campaigns, two of our Louisville Defender reporters covering Governor Strom Thurmond's rally in Louisville were not-too-politely told to leave the main floor of the municipally-owned auditorium for seats in the balcony because the meeting was to be segregated. They left the building instead. Later we were informed that M. L. Sharpley, copyreader for the Louisville Times and States'-Rights official, issued the order.

During the meeting, leaflets were given to passersby on the outside. They carried the message:

“The unfair FEPC in force in New York and Soviet Russia would force you against your will, to hire, work with and for, eat with and live with Negroes in restaurants, theatres, schools, etc. If you voiced an objection to the violation of your constitutional rights, you would be branded a Fascist and pounced on by a federal counterpart of the dreaded Russian Secret Police.

“Communistic agitation for Negro-White mixing has caused the raping and robbing of white women by Negroes to go sky high. Only segregation and lawful execution of all rapists will keep down this crime. Segregation is fair because it segregates both white and black. Decent Negroes want it that way”

In the April Nieman Reports, Hodding Carter said four of President Truman's civil rights have aroused the majority of white southerners. He believes they are federal legislation to eliminate the poll tax in national elections, to create a fair employment practices commission, to end segregation in inter-state public conveyance in the South, to make lynching a federal offense.

Editorially, Harry S. Ashmore of the Arkansas Gazette has said, according to Nieman Reports, “There are valid objections to every one of the specific proposals

the president has endorsed—constitutional objections, objections in principles, above all practical objections. The Gazette, as an exponent of gradualism, has opposed them all and will continue to do so.” Going farther, Mr. Ashmore believes the South will not yet yield to revolutionary legislation, whether the intent behind it be destructive or humanitarian. It is therefore inevitable and proper that the South should fight the program outlined by President Truman.

There are many others, whites and Negroes, who follow, as Mr. Ashmore does, the line of gradualism. But on the point of segregation of races, be it in church, school, or on the trains, the majority opinion in the South would seem to be unclouded. 1942 found the proven liberal Mark F. Ethridge, Louisville publisher, in facing the issue, telling a Birmingham audience that all people in America, despite race or creed, must be given an equal chance to develop, but the South will never give up, willingly, the division of whites and blacks. And it is safe to assume, I should think, that this opinion goes far beyond the reaches of the South.

Recently, Davis Lee, Negro editor of the Newark, New Jersey, Telegram, has received much notice in the South after an editorial reportedly written by him pointed out:

“The entire race program in America is wrong. Our approach is wrong. We expend all our energies, and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are, that we are an equal . . . Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this, the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends”

It must be obvious to these men that segregation of people, as such, is not the issue. To segregate voluntarily would seem to be a human right. But when that division carries an implication, a below-the-belt implication, that the separation is

based on the assumption that the segregated or segregator is mentally and physically superior or inferior because of skin pigmentation, or for some other cause just as sophomoric, that is when it becomes a very human “Pearl Harbor.”

There are those who condemn segregation—Louisville's Mayor Charles P. Farnsley said, in advocating co-education in the public high schools, “Segregation of any kind always means degradation and subjugation” Many Americans would seem to overlook, knowingly, this aspect of segregation. Rather, they choose to use it as a magic word serving as passport into a world where discrimination, based on color, reigns supreme. The term becomes a huge camouflage with blazing symbols—white womanhood, rapist, states' rights—lighting Bear Mountain. And from this foul fantasy erupts the single reverberating curse—NIGGER.

The issue is not the Negro, the human being who exists and struggles, John Ed Pearce wrote in the Courier-Journal. It is Nigger, that non-existent creature which lives only in the hate-filled minds that conceived it. The word is seldom spoken, but it hangs in the air, sweaty, rancid, brutish, hulking and menacing, bespeaking the fear and ignorance of the minds that bore it, Pearce said. By the use of this word segregation is justified to its partisans.

Current history demonstrates that where segregation is found, its companion is discrimination in the provision of services bought with public funds. In the two tax-supported institutions of higher learning in Louisville—the University of Louisville for whites, Louisville Municipal College for Negroes—one sees how the system works. A white student may take law, home economics, engineering, dentistry, business training, medicine, music, social work, elementary and secondary teachers' training. At the school for Negroes the field is narrowed to elementary and secondary teachers' training.

At the public-supported University of Kentucky a student working toward his first degree can select from 27 departmental sequences in arts and sciences alone not to mention 25 or more areas of study in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Engineering and Com-

Fletcher Martin, city editor of the Louisville Defender, served as war correspondent for the combined Negro press, and in the recent Presidential campaign covered President Truman for a number of Negro papers including his own. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1947. This article was done in response to suggestions by his contemporaries of that Nieman group.

merce. At its Negro counter-part, Kentucky State College, the student can major in only 14 areas of study.

Recently the state, in compliance with the Supreme Court decision in the University of Oklahoma case, decided to erase the differential. With \$45,000 from the governor's emergency fund and several faculty members from the University, Kentucky State College can now grant the graduate degree. But segregation remains.

A suit is pending.

Sometimes the system takes a rather comical turn. Recently I accompanied a Negro delegation to the Jefferson County attorney's office. They went to protest the light sentence given Negroes for killing Negroes. At the present time 36 Negroes have been slain since January 1 by other Negroes. Motives—a bottle of beer, women, small change and "I just felt evil." The county official listened patiently, then remarked, "Well, these are just country boys who have come to the big city. And they get a little drunk on Saturday night. You know how that is."

Here were black people asking that the same justice be meted to Negroes that is meted whites in the same circumstance. The lawyer explained that the Lord would smack them down, if they continued, in the same way He smacked the Jewish people down in biblical times when they got bigger than their pants. Then he shook hands all around.

Mr. Lee must know that people whose majority are ill-schooled, ill-housed, ill-fed, can't always demonstrate that they are equal with their neighbors whose opportunities are so often greater. Sometimes their world is no larger than the smelly room in which they find themselves—nor does their ambition often go beyond the walls. Let him "tote the bar and lift the bale" all week, knowing that his children, because they're Negroes, attend an aged firetrap school, that the street and pavement in front of his house are badly in need of repair—have been for years—then perhaps Mr. Lee will realize the cry for equality must go on. There is much more to this argument.

What is the solution? Should we migrate to some sparsely settled land, as Mr. Bilbo proposed, and come in under the Marshall Plan? Should we keep quiet about this hateful thing for fear we might discourage those whites who speak in our behalf? It is not a mere assumption, it is a proven fact that the separate-but-equal plan has not worked—no matter how noble the efforts of the designers. Negroes, if they are people, cannot hide their faces to this obvious conclusion. So many make a loud noise about equality. And when

you study their demands they boil down to the ambition of wanting the good things America provides for most of her non-Negroes—whether they get them or not. They don't wish them given on a silver

platter. They realize these things come as the result of hard work. This they are willing to do, I believe. But they despise the 'color' road-block thrown in the path. And who wouldn't? *

The Cliche in the Campaign

by James Reston

The tedium of the Presidential campaign was occasionally relieved for New York Times readers by the sophisticated reports of James B. Reston, the Times' diplomatic correspondent, who considered the manner and matter of the candidates' speeches as news. This is one of a number of Reston's campaign contributions:

The political cliché has made a startling comeback in the Presidential campaign. For a time, when Robert Sherwood, Samuel Rosenman, Russell Davenport and Archibald MacLeish were constructing Presidential addresses, the shining verb gave the exhausted adjective some competition, but the well-battered phrase is now back in all its tarnished glory.

President Truman's speeches, written mainly by Charles Ross, Clark Clifford and Jonathan Daniels, have been brisk and tart, but his back-platform gab has been as colloquial as a ball-player's:

Question: What are you going to do to them, Mr. President?

President: "We're gonna give 'em hell!"

Question: What is the Democratic party for, Mr. President?

President: "The Democratic party believes in the people. It believes in freedom and progress." (Indianapolis, Oct. 15.)

'Selfish Interests' Charged

Question: And the Republican party?

President: It is the party of "powerful selfish interests. Here is the vital issue: Between the people and the selfish interests." (Milwaukee, Oct. 14.)

The Dewey technique, however, is entirely different. He looks over the speech drafts, prepared on this trip by Elliot Bell, Allen Dulles and Stanley High, for what Paul Lockwood calls "tonal effect." He doesn't scold the voters like Mr. Truman; he exhorts them. He works more copy-book maxims into his speeches than any candidate since Calvin Coolidge. For example:

Question: What would you say, Governor, this country really needs?

Governor Dewey: "As never before, we need a rudder to our ship of state." (Speech in Kansas City, Oct. 14.)

Question: Anything else?

Governor Dewey: "*** And a firm hand on the tiller."

Question: Haven't we had this?

Governor Dewey: "Certainly not. The

Truman Administration 'is coming apart at the seams.' But the Republicans are going to correct that." (Kansas City, Oct. 14.)

Question: Splendid. How do you propose to do that?

"There Is No Magic"

Governor Dewey: With "know-how" in "your next Administration people are not going to get in each other's way, but over the same ground, or fall over each other's feet. * * * There is no magic formula for competent administration. I know of only one formula for getting things done. There is no patent on it. Appoint the right kind of people in the first place, give them full authority to do the job; make them fully responsible and hold them strictly accountable. * * *"

Question: Governor, former President Roosevelt said once that the United States had a "rendezvous with destiny." What do you really think of that?

Governor Dewey: "We are ready to keep our appointment with our greatness. * * * Our country is at the crossroads of its history. * * *" (Kansas City, Oct. 14.)

Question: Which way should we go, as you see it?

Governor Dewey: "We have come to the time to look ahead instead of backward. ***" (Pittsburgh) *** The first of our tasks is to "lift the shadow of war from our homes and lead the way to a just and lasting peace. The second is to go forward here at home to such increased abundance and prosperity * * * that the prophets of boom and bust will be proved as everlastingly wrong as they are.***" (St. Paul, Oct. 15.)

Question: Can we do this without a large and expensive military establishment?

Governor Dewey: "The one rock of hope in the world is a strong America * * * a band of zealots is striking at the ramparts of freedom.***" (Louisville, Oct. 12.)

Question: One other point, Governor. President Truman has said that the Taft-Hartley Act would increase strikes instead of stopping them. What do you think of that?

Governor Dewey (in Pittsburgh): "The moving finger of history has already exposed this as baseless propaganda." In Washington, "the left hand doesn't know what.***"

Question: Thank you Governor.

—New York Times, October 19, 1948

An Editor at College

Harvard Year Gave Her Chance to Put Ideas to Work

by Rebecca F. Gross

The two questions people ask of a Nieman Fellow, newly returned to the editorial desk of a daily newspaper commonly classified with "the small town press," are these:

"Did you learn anything at Harvard?" and

"Didn't a year at Cambridge make you dissatisfied with your job on a small paper?"

At least those are the two questions that have been bounced at me by my fellow citizens of Lock Haven and many of my fellow newspapermen of Pennsylvania.

While it might be hard for me to demonstrate to any investigating committee exactly what I learned during my Nieman year at Harvard, I know that all eleven of the group I was with learned a great deal and I feel confident that I took on a valuable cargo of information, comprehension and insight which will be useful to me as a newspaper editor. Harvard University, very wisely, does not require its Nieman Fellows to write examinations on their academic pursuits. What one acquires in attending classes or pursuing courses as a Nieman Fellow is more likely to shed new light or open new perspectives on what one knows already than to reveal whole new areas of unsuspected knowledge.

To those who assume that a year back in the academic pastures would turn one's eyes to the supposedly greener fields of the larger newspapers and away from the fenced-in area of the community press, I could make two answers, one of them a very practical consideration.

While it is probably a lot easier for a good small-city editor to learn to run a big paper than it would be for a metropolitan editor to acquire the art of running a good community daily, that opportunity is not often extended to women in the newspaper business, unless they are millionaires or the wives of publishers. A woman who is

interested in the editorial-executive side of newspaper production, who tries to become expert in the art of planning news coverage, delving for the undercover strata of news, and directing the operations of a staff pursuing the news through the ramifications of the community structure, finds more frustration than opportunity in big-city journalism, with its prejudice against women as news executives.

There is another answer, however. I happen to think that the smaller newspapers of the United States are a lot more important, in the aggregate, than the big newspapers. Few people realize how many smaller newspapers there are, how good they are, and how much influence they actually have in the development of their communities. A man like John Gunther, after years as a journalist, admitted that he got an eye-opener from his experience as a judge in the Ayer typographical contest, when he had to take a quick look at most of the smaller newspapers in the country.

In community journalism, and in small-city editors who are experts in their job, lies the greatest opportunity for progress by the American press, in my opinion. I went to Harvard with the idea of increasing my effectiveness and expertness in this field.

Not many people get a chance to take a 20-year-old college education back to the campus for a face-lifting. The Nieman Fellows can make a second stab at getting the kind of education they think will do them the most good—and the chance comes after they have had enough experience to know what education they need. Time says 25 per cent of college graduates would take a different college course if they had it to do over—Nieman Fellows are among the handful who really can!

However, after 20 years in the newspaper business, one does not go back to college to learn the first principles of psychology, economics or English composition. Yet a time-seasoned editor can go to such classes, surrounded by undergraduates, and learn more than the professor knows he is teaching. The real advantage of going to college in maturity is that the student knows when he is learning something useful to him—and can put the new

knowledge to work immediately against his background of experience. To the newspaperman, such learning is particularly stimulating because his background is filled with assorted experience in so many areas that the whole range of academic curricula has an appeal for him. My chief problem as a Nieman Fellow was that nearly everything in the catalog at Harvard seemed to offer something useful in the re-education of an editor, especially an editor in the community newspaper field, where you can use the knowledge and wisdom of the philosopher, the economist, the anthropologist, the psychologist, the historian, the accountant, and, of late years, the linguist.

To such an editor, a Nieman year is a tailor-made, Heaven-sent opportunity to use the facilities of a great university, the way he ordinarily uses the World Almanac and Webster's unabridged—to catch up quickly with the knowledge he can use immediately.

As a community editor whose area of operations, though smaller, is just as varied as that in which Roy Roberts, or Paul Smith, or Edwin L. James, have practiced, I concentrated on three fields of study during my year at Harvard.

One field was people—the readers of a newspaper. Another field was the operation of political and social ideas in American history and in the current scene. The third was the inter-relation between the United States, including the communities that constitute the American people, and the rest of the world.

The courses in psychology, mass communication, anthropology and social relations which I followed had a sound application to the editorial task, and should help improve the technical equipment of an editor to perform that task well. One example is a class in clinical psychology taught by Dr. Erich Lindemann, which provided a rich background for editorial understanding of the human motives and reactions which often produce the news an editor handles daily.

In my courses in politics and history, I was looking for a better background for interpreting American institutions in a world where competing political ideas force Americans in small communities as well as large to become better acquainted with the sources of American democracy and the application of its principles in modern life.

The time I spent in study of European history, international diplomacy and the history and character of Russia was not I think, off the straight line of my attempt to improve the performance of a small-city editor. We are in a period when all

Rebecca F. Gross is editor of Lock Haven (Pa.) Express, an exceptional community newspaper. She was a Nieman Fellow last year. On Oct. 12 the Express put out a 30 page special section on the playground baseball league program and the recreations needs of Lock Haven, one of many fields in which the paper has taken community leadership.

news is local. Events in the far corners of the world reach into the local news field of the smallest newspaper.

I did not stay in these three categories entirely. President Conant gave a course in the principles of the experimental sciences for non-scientists. As a prominent non-scientist, I dug into that, and reaped more insight and understandings of the potentialities, limitations and procedures of science, than I had ever gained from previous education and experience. That knowledge is essential to an editor and paper of any size.

Not the least of the advantages of being a Nieman Fellow for a year to an editor from an average American community,

are the informal gatherings which bring eminent scholars of Harvard and well-known writers within range of questioning and easy conversation. More free and easy than a press conference, a Nieman Seminar with such a savant as Dean Payson Wild of the Harvard Graduate School or such a journalist as Walter Lippmann is as pleasant a way to lap up knowledge as was ever invented.

Louis Lyons, the friendly and capable curator of the Nieman Foundation, has written a book based on his 10-year experience with the care and feeding of Nieman Fellows. That will give a better view of the experiment, its aims and

achievements, than an alumnus can offer a month or two after plunging back into the storm and strife of the old job.

Perhaps the best thing about a Nieman year is the opportunity it gives, to people whose lives are one long scramble to meet deadlines, to practice the more leisurely processes of thought. I cannot claim that a Nieman year teaches a newspaper editor to think, but it gives him the time and the chance, if he takes it. A year, however, is not long enough to make a thinker, so he is not likely to become so overlaid with academic moss that he cannot quickly resume the city room pace and vocabulary.—PNPA Bulletin, Sept., 1948.

-:- LETTERS -:-

The Country Weekly

I'm glad you were able to use my piece, "The Country Weekly Dream," but I'm sorry you referred on a following page to my "disillusionment with the small newspaper."

This isn't the case. The Fauquier Democrat, published by Hubert B. Phipps at Warrentown, Va., was, and is, in my opinion, one of the good weeklies. Far from being disillusioning, my three years of running it gave me a rich, fruitful and, I think, humbling experience. It also left me with a desire to try it again in some similar town eventually, and although I would specify different conditions, still they have nothing to do with the theme of my piece.

Rather than a disillusioning personal experience, my article was based on observation of weekly newspapers in California, Arizona, Louisiana and elsewhere, plus rather intimate acquaintance in Virginia with the weekly field as a whole. I would not for a minute detract from the achievements of such editors as Houstoun Waring of the Littleton (Colo.) Independent, many others I could name and, of course, many I don't know. But I'm pretty confident that the conscientious, able country editors would agree with me that they're outnumbered forty or fifty to one.

Incidentally, a typo made it "country paper" where it should have read "county paper," a term used for weeklies particularly in the South.

Fitzhugh Turner
N. Y. Herald Tribune.

Good Money in Weeklies

It is a pleasure to renew my subscription to the Nieman Reports. There is no single publication which has been of greater interest and value to me than this most stimulating quarterly.

I wrote you once before about something in the Reports (your own keel-hauling of the Hofer outfit) and you published my letter. Naturally, I have no objections, but I want you to know that it is not in the hope of seeing my name in the "Letters" column that I now mention another matter to you, namely, Mr. Turner's article on the country weekly in the October issue.

Certainly you can find someone in the Nieman fraternity who can do a better job on the weeklies than Mr. Turner did. So much of what he said was apt that it was regrettable to have the whole effect spoiled by his tendency to indulge in off-the-beam generalizations. For example, he says, "Weeklies, the fact is, just don't make money." Good Lord! when did he write that piece? Offhand I can't name a weekly publisher of my acquaintance (and I know a lot of them) who isn't making good money.

That is only one of several statements which, to my mind, indicate that Fitzhugh Turner has an altogether too narrow and stereotyped view of the weekly field. Can't we look for a sounder, more comprehensive, better-documented treatment of this important aspect of journalism in the Nieman Reports soon?

Charles T. Duncan, Assistant Professor
Univ. of Minnesota School of Journalism
See Waring article on page 4.

Sense of History

I have seen a lot of Europe—a lot of France, Italy and Switzerland, that is—in my short stay here, but not nearly enough to get the real feel of the continent. It certainly is a boiling and unhappy place, especially in France now that the coal strikes are underway. And the old chasm between the poor millions and rather flamboyant if few wealthy is as deep as ever. The people in between, the French and the Italian middle class, seem more blind than ever, according to my colleagues and friends here. The result is not very much progress toward eliminating the troubles and inequities which lead to such things as the current miners' strike.

I have not been able to tear away from UN long enough really to see what is going on, but I understand that the newspapers (for once at least) are definitely not exaggerating either the seriousness of the situation or of what actually is taking place each day in the trouble areas. The government in France is having a helluva time and the French bureaucracy is dragging its feet, apparently. But even at that, a lot of my supposedly savvy Paris acquaintances say that there is a good chance the strikes will be halted in time to prevent irreparable damage to the Third Force and to the Marshall plan.

Both Maggie and I have found our trip an exhilarating experience. Above all else, we have found by coming to, and seeing the sights of, the scenes of centuries of civilization a sense of time which we never had in America. By that I mean, I

have developed an understanding of the youth of our own country and perhaps a more robust opinion of what we might be able to do with it if given even half the time the peoples of Europe have had to experiment with their continent and environment. My impatience with the wrongdoings and shortcomings of my own country, while I hope it never shall disappear, will be tempered with a better sense of history.

Bob Manning.

Paris, November 1.

Toward a Profession

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of our anniversary bulletin, "Towards a Profession of Journalism," which I think may be of interest to you and to the Society of Nieman Fellows. You will note in several places in the bulletin references to the Nieman Foundation and to some of the foundations associated with it.

You may also be interested to know that we are offering this second semester a seminar on press problems which will have as its text the book "Your Newspaper" by several Nieman Fellows. I have been somewhat amused at the excitement this book has generated in some quarters, although it had not occurred to me that selecting it as a text would be particularly daring. My only criticism of it is that it focuses exclusive attention on metropolitan newspapers, and our aim in this seminar will be to transpose some of its arguments to the small community press.

I want also to tell you how much I have enjoyed reading and re-reading "The Nieman Fellows Report," a review of which I hope substantiates several fundamental principles which our faculty have agreed to in the process of reinventory of our own teaching program and objectives, and naturally it is gratifying to have one's own thinking so effectively confirmed.

William F. Swindler

Director, U. of Nebr. School of Journalism

Neuberger in Politics

Here is my check for renewal of Nieman Reports. They are dandy and I wouldn't be without them. Did you know I was elected to our State Senate Nov. 2? I thought sometime during the coming legislative session there might be a story for Nieman Reports on political coverage from the other side—by a politician who has covered politics himself. What do you think?

Richard L. Neuberger
Portland, Oregon

Pepper Martin Among the Arabs

Just a short note to let you know I'm getting around the world but not very fast, and it looks as if the communists in China have beat me to the punch. But I'll be there shortly, after spending the last 6½ months trying to get there via the Middle East and way points.

I will probably kick myself later for this, but I've been suffering from a slow burn for the last two months, and the only way I can get rid of it is by writing about it and seeing if you are interested.

All through the Middle East, including the Arab States, Israel, Greece and Turkey, I've been watching the vernacular press and getting slightly unhappier by the minute. I've seen a large part of the world, but I have never seen a free press so abused and misused as in that area, not even excepting China and pre-war Japan. I wondered if you would be interested in an analytical article on this.

The second subject burns me up even more, because I suffered considerable pain, anguish and grief while trying to be

a correspondent. But without question the Arab States and Greece constitute one of the most difficult places in the world to operate. Official pressure, threats, phony charges, unavailability of officials and a general all-around effort to keep Americans from writing and reporting constitute the run-of-the-mill experience. Are you interested?

If not, then I will just either burn myself out or into a crisp, and there will be no hard feelings anywhere.

Please give my best to the Durdins and the Rands, who are among my favorite people. I haven't seen Chris for a year but did have the good fortune to see Til and Peggy in Athens.

Must close now, and get to packing. If you are interested, please drop me a line, care of AAG, Shanghai Detachment, APO 917, U. S. Embassy, New Delhi.

Pepper Martin.

(The answer to both Mr. Martin's queries was "Yes, please," and we look forward to both pieces.—Ed.)

Putting the President On the Market Page

A Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir:

My interest has been particularly attracted by the debate on your pages engendered by Forrest Seymour's defense of monopolies in the press written in response to a suggestion that we need more competition. Being a former employe of Mr. Seymour's paper, the Des Moines Register, I must confess a little skepticism concerning some of his arguments. It was my observation that the citizens of Des Moines had only one morning newspaper, the Register, and that its coverage of local news was not as ambitious as that which I have observed in competitive cities. I believe that the Register could have been substantially improved by competition.

The particular field to which I have applied Mr. Seymour's observations, however, and found them wanting is in my own home town of Sandusky, Ohio. It is an average city of 30,000 population not far distant from either Toledo or Cleveland. Until 1941 it had three daily newspapers and competition was keen. Now all are merged into one. I have noticed a sharp decline in quality.

While criticism of the press for its prejudiced coverage of the recent presidential campaign still rings in our ears, let me cite one example that, flagrant though it may be, is but typical of journalism in this

one-newspaper town. On Friday, October 22, it was announced that President Truman's train would stop in Sandusky. As evidenced by the clipping which I am enclosing, this news—the first visit of a President of the United States to Sandusky since 1913—was mentioned in the middle of column 3 on Page 9 in the "sports and markets" section. The 3-column head over this political roundup piece declares "Bricker, Herbert Fire Guns at Democrats; Lausche Replies." A sub-head announces "Truman to Stop Willard, Here, Monday, Tuesday." The only reference to the President's visit is carried far, far down in the body of the story. This was the first announcement that the President would speak. His speech was just four days hence.

I think this ought to stand as a classic example of how to bury a story for political reasons.

This is but typical of news treatment during the campaign. When Democratic gubernatorial candidate Frank J. Lausche spoke, he rated Page 16. When Senator Robert A. Taft spoke he got two columns on page one. A Republican sheriff, accused of corruption, was swept out of office by a vote of more than 2-to-1, a veritable revolution in this GOP area, but during the course of the campaign no news space was devoted to any local issue.

Metropolitan competition, which Mr. Seymour suggests as a healthy factor, does enter Sandusky. Both the Cleveland Plain Dealer (morning) and the Toledo Blade (afternoon) have carrier-delivery circulation. When the Plain Dealer ran an expose of gambling and political corruption in Sandusky, the local paper did pick it up, with copyright permission, and run it on the afternoon of each day without comment. But by and large, a majority of Sanduskians never read any newspaper other than the local journal and I am convinced that they get a far more colored view of national news than they did when

the city had competing dailies. The low quality of local news coverage surpasses description.

In short, I cannot escape from weight of personal observation that competition is healthy for newspapers and for the communities which they serve. A reduction in publishing costs through scientific invention perhaps offers the best answer. Metropolitan competition, even where it is strong, simply does not do the job.

Glenn D. Everett
National Press Bldg.,
Washington, D. C.

Scrapbook--

How The Times Covers The Fillums

by Thomas F. Brady

Though the New York Times has maintained a full-time correspondent in Hollywood for nearly fifteen years, the coverage is still regarded by many motion picture folk, who are subject to a certain sense of inferiority, as an incredible example of intellectual slumming. The reaction has been the same to all three of us who have held down the job: Douglas W. Churchill, my predecessor, who died in January, 1943, and with whom I worked; and Fred Stanley, who took over while I was in the Navy.

There are still actors and producers who say, when I meet them: "Finest paper in the world, you work for. I read it regularly. Only way I can get any news out here. And how did you leave things at 21?" Without pointing out that the Times has carried a daily special dispatch under a Hollywood dateline for more than a decade, I try to explain that I am a permanent West Coast fixture. Then, almost invariably, the reaction is, "Oh, you're from the Los Angeles Times." When I repeat the original identification, I usually get a blank stare of incredulity. More than once, on the telephone, I have been accused of being an impostor by modest souls who refuse to believe that the New York Times could have any interest in their cinematic enterprises.

But even though they feel there is something anomalous about a Times correspondent in Hollywood, word somehow filters back to these same people with amazing speed if their names are omitted from any item of film production news in which they are involved.

Since 1946, when Gladwin Hill established a regular Southern California office for the Times after he came back from overseas, the Hollywood job has

lost a measure of its isolation from reality. When Hollywood news spills out of the department category, as it did during the 1946 strike, for instance, Hill's operation and mine merge, with the understanding, as he puts it, that we will share all Pulitzer prizes. Indeed, we have worked out a system of inter-communication which is a daily source of information to the Hollywood man from the outside world on such matters as cinematic litigation in the Los Angeles courts, and to the Los Angeles man on the whereabouts of wayward actors and Hollywood nihilists.

The Times Hollywood office, a block north of Hollywood Boulevard, is housed, for reasons of economy, in one of a group of bungalows which have been converted into offices. The other inmates are a completely unsuccessful helicopter salesman, a chiropractor who specializes in electrotherapy and high colonics, some novelty manufacturers known as the Wolverettes of Hollywood, and, until recently, the "contemptuous ten"—the men who refused to tell the Thomas committee whether or not they were Communists. The curious atmosphere has, at least, the virtue of repelling press agents.

The really tough part of the day's work comes at 9 o'clock in the morning, when the chiropractor's neon sign has a peculiarly lethal look. To start out the day by reading the Hollywood gossip columns, including Louella Parsons and Hedda Hopper, is an occupational hazard faced only by local newspapermen and beauty parlor operators. The job is necessary, though, because despite the writers' efforts to disguise it, the gossip columns contain a wondrous amount of motion picture industrial news, if only one can find it.

If there is nothing of desperate moment in the columns and the local trade papers, the next duty is to sally forth to one or two of the fifteen studios where the town's product is manufactured. On a good day a reporter has a specific objective, but on a bad day he may fall into the hands of a press agent and find himself interviewing one of the legion of minor geniuses who have absolutely nothing of importance to say.

For instance, one may find oneself, as I did the other day, lunching with a producer who is determined to talk about nothing but his pending divorce and remarriage and how much it is costing him. The same man, when I changed the subject and asked him how much his next picture would cost, where he was getting his financing, and what censorship problems he was facing in preparing his scenario, intimated that I was showing an impertinent curiosity about his business affairs.

Luncheons, however, are not leisurely affairs. At 4:30 Pacific time the telephone rings, and a round-up of Hollywood production news must be ready to read to a recording machine. The news is gathered from some hundreds of potential sources by telephone between 1 P.M. and the time of the call. Once the daily dispatch is gone, letters may be written and items for Sunday composed. Finally, comes the evening and previews, which can be almost as bad as the gossip columns. Then the Hollywood correspondent goes to bed and listens to the wind among the palm trees.

—Times Talk, Oct., 1948.

"Newspaper Court"

Publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the New York Times recently suggested a thought-provoking remedy for some of the graver excesses and deficiencies of the American press. In a speech to the New York State Publishers Association, Mr. Sulzberger noted that in the medical and legal professions disciplinary bodies have been established to maintain certain standards of practice. The time has come, he observed, for something similar in journalism. While he supports vigorously the principle of private ownership of the press, he recognizes that "the news lies, in a sense, in the public domain and we are the trustees of a great national interest." Control, therefore, must come from within. "On the structure of press freedom," he asserted, "must be imposed the responsibility of the press. . . . The community has the right—and indeed the duty—to insist on such responsibility."

The idea of some body to review press performance has long been attractive to critics and reformers. The great argument among them is who should do it. The Government is out of the question, because the end result would be a governmentally controlled press, and a principal duty of the press is to review the Government. The Hutchins Commission on Freedom of the Press suggested an intermediate ground with an independent agency, outside the realm of both press and Government, to report annually on the performance of the press. But the men who served on the Hutchins Commission showed that such a body would be deficient in inside knowledge both of the press and of the complexities of the problem.

The Sulzberger proposal would confine responsibility where it belongs initially—to the press itself. Self-police of this sort has potentialities, for if the press can correct its own defects there is much less likelihood of any outside agency attempting to do it. There has been a reluctance on the part of most newspapers to criticize their contemporaries for even the most egregious misstatements and unwholesome practices. Indeed, as the issue of gross violation of a code of ethics did come before one association of newspapermen some years ago, the only remedy—expulsion—was voted down. There are relatively few instances of bad deportment severe enough to infringe on the public interest. But continued silence is hardly a courageous answer to situations with which most newspapermen of conscience are concerned. Nor does it become journalism as a profession, if the pretensions to that classification are justified.

The obstacles to the successful functioning of a newspaper court are formidable. For example, the selection of members would be an extremely touchy point; the wrong persons on such a body could have a devastating influence. Likewise, the court would have to grapple with the age-old dilemma of what constitutes legitimate news and interpretation. News, like truth, is not always altogether objective. The court would immediately invite dissolution if it attempted to question editorial opinions. Nor could it be expected to impose penalties for misconduct, other than proscription and publicity. It could only deal, of course, with the most flagrant cases of impropriety.

Where a court could be of value is in setting objectives of fair presentation of news and proper redress for persons wrongfully stigmatized. Beyond that, it could endeavor to assay the general performance of the press, calling attention to incidents that violate the servicing of

news which the public should expect. Any such body would be bound to occasion controversy, but the very knowledge that a vehicle for skilled criticism existed might be a healthy influence in bringing about more introspection among newspapers. A tentative approach is all that could be expected, and even before such an approach were made the idea itself would require study to determine whether

anything of the sort were practicable or would do more harm than good. However, the thought is a challenging one which such organizations as the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspapers Editors and the American Newspaper Guild might well explore in the public as well as their own interest.

—Editorial, Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1948

Professor Bites Journalist: Neither Party Poisoned

Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago administered a big dose of medicine to the press last week. The occasion was the meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers in Louisville. And his audience swallowed the dose without undue outcry, if they did not exactly lick the spoon. As a group they displayed a highly healthy attitude to criticism. They listened to their attacker with respect, reserving the right to disagree heartily with some of his conclusions, but enjoying such a demonstration of that freedom of expression by which they as American journalists live.

This response was a curious and interesting thing. For Dr. Hutchins had charged the press with exhibiting "neurotic symptoms" every time it is criticized. He had built up his accusation with quotations from many newspaper editorials dealing with the Report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, a document he and a group of eminent non-journalists had issued. Some of these comments were definitely neurotic. They justified the Hutchins charge that newspapers like to dish out criticism every day of the year, but can't take it when the slightest adverse comment comes their way.

Why did the Louisville gathering so completely avoid this cry-baby attitude? One answer is that these were editorial writers, not publishers. They had met for mutual and earnest discussion of the problems of their craft, not to drink together and scratch each other's backs. Even the barbed words of Dr. Hutchins were no sharper than some of the comments these men had been slinging at each other in their private seminars. There was nobody in this crowd who was prepared to make a noise like a publisher, drape himself in the First Amendment, and proclaim that all criticism of the press is subversive and disgraceful. All publishers do not behave that way, but there are some

exceedingly prominent ones who do, with monotonous regularity.

Another answer may lie in the professional admiration which these newspaper men felt for the competence of Dr. Hutchins' presentation. His Louisville speech flashed with conspicuous virtues which his Report on the Freedom of the Press lacked. It was sharp and witty, it cited specific instances of newspaper dereliction, it left no doubt at any point about what it meant. The report, on the other hand, was dull and turgid in its expression. That was the main fault this newspaper found with it when it first appeared.

Seriously, the editorial writers liked Hutchins' high view of their calling. They responded to his challenge that they must be teachers, and good teachers, not merely entertainers or "the hired hands and voices of men who happen to have enough money to own newspapers." Many of them would stand him down on individual points of mission, in their work. Dr. Hutchins, whose family have been missionaries and teachers, found the same sort of fervor in an audience of editorial writers.—Louisville Courier-Journal, Nov. 23.

Mr. Hutchins' Second Round

Robert M. Hutchins met a readier response in his talk to the editorial writers conference in Louisville than came earlier to his Report on Freedom of the Press. This editorial in the Louisville Courier-Journal is an instance of the response. Another significant instance was the proposal of Editor & Publisher which gave a whole page to Dr. Hutchins' talk. Their proposal was that he appoint one half of a committee of 12 to appraise performance of the newspapers and let them name the other half from newspapermen. Editor & Publisher offered to share expenses of two meetings of such a committee and to publish their results.

Reviews--

Buck Rogers -- Reporter

by William M. Pinkerton

COMMUNICATIONS IN MODERN SOCIETY. Edited by Wilbur Schramm. University of Illinois Press. \$4.00. 252 pp.

All this book lacks, for anyone caught up in the newspaper-magazine-radio-TV complex, is one of those flashy, four-color Man-from-Mars cover jobs. Like Astounding Science Fiction. Anyone in the business who is willing to let himself go can get more dazzling fantasies of the future out of this than out of a year's reading in the science-fiction pulps.

For instance? Try a few of these ideas on your sub-conscious:

Magazines: Leo Lowenthal of Columbia ("The Sociology of Literature") does not go so far as to suggest that future editors select their authors by a battery of psychological tests. But he reports his own prediction of Knut Hamsun's fascist sympathies from the internal evidence of earlier writings. "More or less consciously, usually less, the author is a manipulator who tries to get over certain messages that reflect his own personality and personality problems." He reports that social psychology now can diagnose with a high degree of reliability whether a person is authoritarian or anti-authoritarian. It will be interesting to know, some day, where Little Rollo, the late George Apley and that Amber woman stand.

Magazine editors are warned to beware of a booby-trap in this one, guaranteed to crack the stream-of-consciousness wide open. Along toward the end of his piece, Lowenthal casually takes a swipe at "the commonly accepted notion that the main function of mass literature is to provide an outlet for the escapist drives of frustrated people." He doesn't believe it!

Radio: Elmo C. Wilson ("The Listening Audience") does not go so far as to predict that all announcers of the future will be selected by a battery of psychological tests. But he does report that, down at CBS, they're toying around with Dr. Henry A. Murray's projective techniques, and he says: "It may be possible to take well-known radio characters and study them in an effort to compile an accumulation of the personality traits which make for suc-

cess in radio." Perhaps with Howdy Doody, the Charlie McCarthy of video, in mind, he adds: "The obvious application of this technique to television is immediately apparent." (A recent scientific study of a war-bond drive analyzes Kate Smith. For selling war bonds, her type is peachy.)

Newspapers: Raymond B. Nixon ("Implications of the Decreasing Numbers of Competitive Newspapers") does not go so far as to suggest that reporters of the future be selected by a battery of psychological tests. (Well, honestly, he doesn't even come close.) But there's an element of stark horror in his listing of the Five Ages of American Journalism: 1) The fight for freedom; 2) Political party domination; 3) Personal editorial leadership; 4) Business office emphasis; and 5) —the Future—Scientific direction.

All this is heady stuff, and the reader must beware of an overdose. Like a good apothecary, Wilbur Schramm, the editor, includes the antidote in the package.

And after milling around in the Wellspan future, it is a relief to plod comfortably through the carefully factual report of Ralph O. Nafziger ("The Reading Audience") on an intensive survey of a group of newspaper readers in Minneapolis. Rejecting the skim-the-surface approach of most readership surveys, he worked out ratios for Seen/Read-Any and Read-Any/Read-All for each item in the paper. Some notes from his findings: "Aside from comparatively high readership of the items on the front page no pattern or sequence of 'best read' pages was found. . . The appeal of the content of each item and page appeared to determine the readership level. . . The largest headlines on the page were not necessarily the 'best read' items on the page. Emotional content or human interest elements in the item were more likely to account for relatively high readership than the size of the headline. . . Of the six items which scored highest among men during the six days (of the survey) for 'Read Any', all were on the front page, but only two bore the largest headline on the page. . . Among six 'best read' items by women all were on the front page but none bore the largest headline on the page."

These finds could be somewhat upsetting to the boys on the copy desk, of

course, but the real comfort comes in his modest conclusion: "Assuming the reliability of the methods used in these readership studies and the validity of the results, much more study is required before the meaningful dimensions of newspaper readership are discovered."

Equally down-to-earth contributions are made in the report of Ralph D. Casey ("Professional Freedom and Responsibility in the Press") of chats he had with several editors on the difficult question of publisher-editor relations, and in the thinking-out-loud of the *Des Moines Register* and *Tribune's* Robert J. Blakely ("The Responsibilities of an Editor"). Of his ideal editor, Blakely writes: "He will not be popular, but neither will he be lonely. He will be in the fellowship of the great spirits of all ages, including his own."

Back in the realm of fantasy—or maybe not—Paul Lazarsfeld ("The Role of Criticism"), who has done research work for the National Association of Broadcasters, suggests a research center in each Federal Reserve district to provide the newspapers and radio stations with objective data which could be used "for self-improvement as well as for defense against 'undeserved' criticism."

Behind this suggestion is a good deal of solid talk about what we don't know about newspapers and their effect on the public.

And this brings us to a curious fact: Some of the nicest people in this book are worrying about the lack of effect of newspaper campaigns on their readers' opinions. A Jeffersonian living in an age of one-paper towns may wonder how effective he wants them to be. As effective as the best propaganda? Effective within what limits of good newspaper practice?

Reminds you of the remark B. F. Skinner, the psychologist, made the other day in reviewing a new book by Stuart Chase:

"Perhaps it is just as well that too many ways of controlling human behavior have not turned up, for no guide to their use was forthcoming either. Mr. Chase seems to believe that once we are able to deal effectively with human affairs we shall do so benevolently. . . But any new technique for influencing people will be snapped up by the politicians and gangsters, too—vide Nazi Germany. A little more help from the social sciences and another such venture may succeed."

(NOTE ON DATE OF PUBLICATION: This volume came out before the head-on collision between Public Opinion Polls and Public last November.)

HOW DO WE GET THAT WAY?

by Peter Lisagor

THE NEWSPAPER: A study in the workings of the daily press and its laws, by Ignaz Rothenberg. Staples Press. 351 pp. \$5.50.

American newspapermen, commonly characterized as a breed which takes nothing for granted, probably rank high among the nation's takers-for-granted when it comes to their own professional rights and privileges. Far too many view their domain as something staked out by the apostles, duly sanctified and then put forever beyond the reach of the desperate politicians.

An editorial writer can follow the dictates of his bile and condemn with impunity, so long as he observes certain undefined rules of good taste (whatever that might be) and shies away from a vague line labelled "libel." A political writer, overlord of a vast and important vassalage in American life, can describe two presidential candidates as a "militant cipher vs. a nullity wrapped in mystery" (to use a genteel, passionless and recent example) without blinking. And countless reporters can pursue their quasi-official function as "guardians of the public interest" without being asked for a search warrant.

You may better recognize the species by an example. A Chicago reporter was assigned by his paper—a great journal, by its own accounts—to cover the press conference of an ex-premier of Italy, a distinguished visitor scratching humbly for a U. S. loan but distinguished nonetheless. The ex-premier was late. Twenty minutes had passed when the impatient reporter demanded righteously of the sponsors of the conference: "Who the hell does he think he is . . . keeping the whole Chicago press waiting like this?" When the Italian arrived, the reporter repeated his diplomatic query through an interpreter, adding: ". . . and tell him I'm going to report this to my desk and he'll be lucky if he gets a red cent."

How do we get that way? Ignaz Rothenberg helps explain it in this calm, readable, often entertaining study of newspapers and the laws that govern them throughout the world. In many ways, it is a quiet assault upon the taking-for-grantedness of American reporters. The Chicago reporter, who felt protocol of the Chicago press had been violated, would

take off his hat momentarily to our founding fathers who put together the First Amendment and the heirs who kept it relatively inflexible if he could get a look at the legal restraints on his brethren elsewhere.

For instance, it would break an American police reporter's heart if he were a reporter in France (which also has constitutional guarantees of press freedom), where criminal investigations must remain secret and proceedings are not releasable until they become a matter of record. In Chile, Estonia, Greece and Turkey, he couldn't cover suicides, no matter how ingenious or important, because they might have "a contagious effect upon depressed people."

In Peru, if he caused to be published anything adjudged obscene, he might wind up interring bodies in a cemetery for four months unless he could pay a fine equivalent to 1,500 copies of the publication. In Greece, robbery tales are banned because "some susceptible reader" might imitate them.

Our reporter would surely blink to learn that a 1931 law in the American state of Illinois prohibits "the offering for sale to a minor of publications devoted to crime news, police reports or pictures and stories of bloodshed, lust or crime." Since the word "exclusively" is omitted, one must conclude the law has not been enforced.

Rothenberg's analysis of comparative press laws weaves a scholarly but seldom dull path through such topics as anonymity (protection of sources), corruption of newspapers (including free passes and other minor gratuities), false news, libel in all aspects, the headline, circulation, advertisements and responsibility for the newspaper's contents.

Our Chicago reporter with his aggravated sense of power is but a minor echo of booming voices of the past, as Rothenberg shows in detail in a chapter titled, "Circulation—the Life-blood of the Newspaper." Lord Northcliffe is quoted: "There is no doubt of our power over the public.

We can cause the whole country to think with us overnight, whenever we say the word." It was a trans-atlantic credo, to be sure; said Pulitzer, "You may write the most sublime philosophy, but if nobody reads it, where are you? You must go for your million circulation, and, when you have got it, turn the minds and the votes of your readers one way or the

other at critical moments."

Among the famous newspaper fictions related is the New York Herald story on Nov. 9, 1874, shrieking that all the wild animals of the Central Park zoo were loose (Herald publisher, James Gordon Bennett, had informed friends the night before that all the people of New York would stay home); Roorback's noted lie which added a word to the lexicon of the press (he was said to have seen a presidential candidate of 1844 branding slaves with the initials of his name); the New York Sun's accounts of human life on the moon, and many others.

But Rothenberg graciously concedes this is not typical of modern papers. "As the social standard of journalists has risen, they have grown more conscientious," he says.

In a section on newspaper's reliability, the author observes: "The trouble with modern journalists is that the tasks they set for themselves become more and more difficult. Some say the modern pressmen make the mistake of writing about the things which will happen tomorrow instead of reporting about the events of yesterday." This somehow seems a particularly appropriate observation to be made by a Viennese transplanted to Britain and somewhat removed from what has been described as "poll-cat prophecies."

On headlines, the author quotes an English journalist: "Just as it is a legal offense to place a false label on goods, so it is a moral offense to put misleading headlines on news." Hearst said that "in a busy nation the first necessity is to attract attention," while Pulitzer more moderately wanted headlines "attracting attention without repelling belief and good taste." Upton Sinclair speaks for somebody, obviously, when he says: "I am an American and can no more resist sensational headlines in a newspaper than a donkey can resist a field of fat clover."

By way of completing his impartial coverage of the headline function, Rothenberg adds the calm, intelligent voice of the Christian Science Monitor, which instructs its editors: "Headlines must be an index to the story, not a characterization of it; descriptive, not opinionated; concrete, not abstract."

The book deserves a reading by serious newspapermen. The public which is sometimes bemused by its Daily fare and perhaps curious about some of the limitations of the chef will find it good, instructive reading. The author has served as a consultant to the United Nations Secretariat at the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information.

Reviews--

Harry Hopkins and the Press

by E. L. Holland, Jr.

ROOSEVELT AND HOPKINS.

By Robert Sherwood. Harper & Brothers. \$6.00. 979 pp.

Sir John Dill, who knew, wrote during one of Harry Hopkins' periods of debilitating illness: "Harry, this war has hit you very hard. I know of no one who has done more by wise and courageous advice to advance our common cause. And who knows it? Some day it must be known. . . ."

The failure of the press to do justice to the man Hopkins, to the patriot Hopkins, is a jolting corollary to the recent failure to have judged, and reported on, the temperament of the American people facing an election. Not all the press was guilty of stimulating old wives' tales about Hopkins, of course. But a noisy few seemed to choose the game and set the rules. Multitudes followed after, all too sheeplike. Perhaps they thought it was fun to belabor Hopkins.

Harry Hopkins' relations with the press always were poor. Even so, Mr. Sherwood makes it reasonably evident, through extensive use of newspaper quotations from every period of Hopkins' career, that it was not newsmen themselves who so often provided him with a poor press. Usually these respected him, knowing they could always get a straight reply from him on almost any question.

He wrangled under stings, and particularly so when they affected his family. In this he was much like Roosevelt, who rolled with most (if not all) punches directed at him, but bridled at attacks on his family. Since Harry Hopkins became Roosevelt's alter ego, perhaps it was to have been expected that he would be subject to the same type of underhanded attacks which whipped at the president through his period in the White House. But in some respects, Hopkins took even more.

When Hopkins died, the *Los Angeles Times*, as recorded by Mr. Sherwood, wrote: "Americans need not concern themselves now whether Harry Hopkins was great or little or good or bad; their care should be that the phenomenon of a Harry Hopkins in the White House does not recur." Mr. Sherwood agrees—but for quite different reasons.

Press lords who never gave Hopkins a break achieved their purpose, in some respects. They never beat the man down,

but they went far toward insuring that his place in history would be filed under "Leaf Raking," and cross-indexed under "Squandering" and "Wasteful." Needed file folders with such headings as "Service," "Loyalty," "Devotion" and "Administrative Ability" are supplied in this book, and well.

Harry Hopkins in July, 1943, had an unusual experience. Someone said something about him which did not suggest he was the White House's personal Svengali. *The New Yorker* published a profile which showed it to be more discriminating than most American newspapers, as far as Hopkins was concerned. Robert Sherwood in his entirely readable dual study reports this as just another item in the long and discouraging list of comments about the frail but indefatigable Hopkins.

The fact that *The New Yorker* attempted to be objective in its piece, and succeeded, deserves newspapermen's attention. So do the facts of countless newspapers having slandered a man who, Mr. Sherwood reports, literally killed himself in the service of his government. It is a comment on our newspapers, sad to highlight yet necessary.

When Hopkins' name was rung in on the wartime discussion of who would be named supreme commander for the European Allied invasion, Mr. Sherwood writes, another clamor was aroused. The *Washington Times-Herald*, not surprisingly, sang joyously: "Global W.P.A. Seen Aim in Marshall 'Plot.'" This because an-

other report had suggested Hopkins preferred Brehon Somervell as Chief of Staff, and Somervell had been associated with Hopkins in W.P.A. activity. That large newspapers, claiming themselves responsible, would suggest that such motivations would underlie the decision as to whether Gen. Marshall would be removed as Chief of Staff to become European invasion commander is shocking, however callous we may have become to such outbursts.

Hopkins never got away from it. When in 1943 he "moved early in May from Rochester, Minnesota, to the Army's Ashford General Hospital in White Sulphur Springs, there were the usual protests from some of the press. 'Who entitles this representative of Rooseveltian squandermania to treatment and nursing in an Army hospital?' was one of the questions. . . ."

Mr. Sherwood had close association with Mr. Hopkins, as is generally known. His book reveals the "son of an Iowa harness maker" as a man with faults—but not the faults with which he generally was credited. It is a masterly historical document, drawn from sources that took its author over much of the world and kept him poring over strange assortments of notes for many months. Its fascination is the sense it gives the reader of being behind the scenes of the great war drama and watching the chief actors at work. It is material that peculiarly lends itself to the hands of one of our great dramatic writers and fortunately he was on the scene.

Writing With Roosevelt

One of the most compelling of Robert Sherwood's descriptions in his *Roosevelt and Hopkins* involves the ghost writing methods in the preparation of the President's speeches:

"When he wanted to give a speech for some important purpose, whether it was connected with a special occasion or not," Mr. Sherwood writes, "he would discuss it first at length with Hopkins, Rosenman and me, telling us what particular points he wanted to make, what sort of audience he wished primarily to reach and what the maximum word limit was to be (he generally put it far too low). He would dictate pages and pages, approaching his main topic, sometimes hitting it squarely on the nose with terrific impact,

sometimes rambling so far away from it that he couldn't get back, in which case he would say, 'Well—something along these lines—you boys can fix it up.' I think he greatly enjoyed those sessions, when he felt free to say anything he pleased, uttering all kinds of personal insults, with the knowledge that none of it need appear in the final version. When he stopped dictating, because another appointment was due or it was time to go to bed, we would go to the Cabinet Room in the West Wing and start reading through all the assembled material. . . . When the President was free to see us again, we handed him this draft and he looked immediately at the last page to see its number, whereupon he announced that at least ninety-

two per cent of it must be cut. He then started to read through it, pausing frequently to dictate 'Insert A,' 'Insert G,' etc. Each time he decided to dictate something he said, 'Grace—take a law,' a line he gladly borrowed from the Kaufman-Hart-Rodgers musical show, 'I'd Rather Be Right,' in which George M. Cohan played the part of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President himself had never seen this show but he enjoyed what he heard about it.

"When he had finished dictating inserts, the speech was far longer than it had been and farther from any coherent form. We then returned to the Cabinet Room and started a second draft. This process went on day and night. . . .

"Most of Roosevelt's work on speeches was done during the evening. . . . After dinner he sat on the couch to the left of the fireplace, his feet up on the stool specially built for him, and started reading the latest speech draft. Grace Tully sat next to him, taking more dictation until Dorothy Brady or Toinette Bachelder came in to relieve her. Sometimes Roosevelt read the speech out loud, to see how it sounded, for every word was judged not by its appearance in print but by its effectiveness over the radio. About 10 o'clock, a tray with drinks was brought in. The President sometimes had a glass of beer but more often a horse's neck (ginger ale and lemon peel). He was by now yawning and losing interest in the speech and he usually went to bed before eleven. . . .

"After leaving the Study, we would spend most of the night in the Cabinet Room producing another draft which would go to the President with his breakfast in the morning. Sometimes we would send a call for help to Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, who would come in late at night to help bring a diffuse speech into focus.

"We had to get up early in the morning to be ready for summons in case the President wanted to work on the speech before his first appointment. We generally had breakfast on trays in Hopkins' room and it was rarely a cheerful gathering. The draft that had been completed a few hours previously looked awful in the morning light and the judgment on it that we most often expressed was, 'I only hope that the reputation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt does not depend on this terrible speech.'

"Although the speeches were usually seen in advance by the War and Navy Departments and sometimes (though not always) by the State Department, they were kept otherwise under close wraps of sec-

recy. There were always various eminent officials who wanted to know what the President was going to say. They were particularly anxious to make sure that he was going to include the several pages of material that they had submitted on their own particular departments. They knew they could get nowhere with Hopkins in their quest of inside information; so they concentrated on Rosenman, who would fob them off with the misstatement that, 'The President is weighing that in his mind right now.' We used to derive enjoyment from the thought of various important personages around Washington listening to the Presidential broadcasts and then, as the strains of 'The Star Spangled Banner' broke out at the finish, cursing, 'He didn't use a word of that stuff I sent him.' It was even more enjoyable to picture the amazed expression of some anonymous citizen in Council Bluffs who had written a letter to the President and then heard something from that letter incorporated in a Fireside Chat.

"On the final two days of preparation of a speech Roosevelt would really buckle down to serious work and then what had seemed a formless, aimless mess of words would begin to assume tautness and sharpness. He studied every implication for its effect on various groups in the nation and on allies and enemies and neutrals. He paid a great deal of attention to the punctuation, not for its correctness but for its aid or hindrance to him in reading the speech aloud. Grace Tully liked to insert a great many commas, and the President loved to strike them out. He once said to her, 'Grace! How many times do I have to tell you not to waste the taxpayers' commas?' He liked dashes, which were visual aids, and hated semicolons and parentheses. I don't think he ever used the sonorous phrase, 'And I quote—' If he had to have quotation marks, he did not refer to them, knowing they would appear in the printed version.

"In the final draft of a speech, every word was counted and Roosevelt finally decided the precise number that he would be able to crowd into thirty minutes. His sense of timing was phenomenal. His normal rate was 100 words a minute, but he would say, 'There are some paragraphs in this speech that I can take quickly so I can handle a total of 3,150 words—and that did not mean 3,162. At other times, he would feel that he had to be deliberate in his delivery and the words would have to be cut to 2,800. Roosevelt's estimates were rarely off more than a split second on his broadcasts."

Politics in New York

by Aldric Revell

POLITICS IN THE EMPIRE STATE. By Warren Moscow. Alfred A. Knopf Company, N. Y. \$3.00 283 pp.

Politics in the state of New York is seemingly subject to the same pressure forces and sociological whimsicalities as in any other state of the union—only more so. This is the conclusion any reader of Moscow's book, who is familiar with state politics generally, must come to.

In this short book, Moscow, veteran political reporter for the New York Times, does a workmanlike, journalistic job of exposition. It might have been more helpful to the reader had the author drawn more upon his practical experience in giving conclusions as to the efficiency of American democracy as exemplified by New York. He touches upon this, but not with his characteristic methodicalness.

In his analysis of "Who's Going to Win," in the election, Moscow gives more credit to the bookies than to the pollsters in predicting the outcome. In view of the recent presidential election with Truman the only person predicting the outcome, Moscow's skepticism toward the Gallup and other polls is interesting.

He points out, what so many persons apparently forgot, that Gallup did not predict the presidential winner either in 1940 or 1944. In 1940 Gallup made no prediction at all, Moscow points out, while in 1944 he gave Roosevelt the edge on the last day but by a percentage vote which he always maintained was insufficient for election of a Democratic nominee.

To those who conceived of Gov. Dewey as a precision machine eschewing the mundane practicalities of politics, Moscow points out that as Governor Dewey used the power of patronage to get his way more than previous governors, that he brooked no opposition from his legislature nor independent thinking, and that he sought to have the press print only the ukases handed out by his publicity men, frowning upon any reporter who sought to dig behind the publicity releases.

At the outset Moscow states a truism which the rest of the book bears out. The state of New York, while larger and having more intense problems than others, he says, "has shown a remarkable capacity for being influenced politically and governmentally by the same economic, social, and religious forces that figure importantly in any state where there is a division between urban and rural popu-

lation, where one big city would dominate the government except that the rest of the state won't let it."

However, since our form of government is one of pressure groups more than of parties and since the stakes in New York are higher, politics in the Empire state is more lush in its color and patronage more pronounced.

Moscow points out with irrefutable logic that because politicians in New York operate in front of enormous publicity mirrors, these politicians take on national political importance to the extent that the governorship of the state is so often virtually a stepping stone to the White House. One must conclude then that a New York governor as he thinks in terms of state reaction, concurrently thinks of national reaction, thus turning into a sort of bifurcated or schizophrenic political personality.

The Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti

by Arthur M. Schlesinger

From his introduction to the book by G. Low Joughin
and Edmund M. Morgan

The postwar twenties afford the time setting of the drama. A triangular bit of Massachusetts soil, with its corners at Plymouth, Bridgewater, and Boston, provides the stage. Two obscure aliens are the central figures, though the whole cast includes many others of both high and low degree. The general public compose the audience and, in a sense, the jury. History stands silently by in the wings.

This combination of circumstances created an atmosphere of popular tension, dread and crisis without parallel in Massachusetts annals since the exiling rule of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson and the witch persecutions of the seventeenth century. To duplicate its national repercussions one would have to go back to the trial of the Chicago anarchists for the Haymarket bombing in the 1890's, and for its world effects to the Dreyfus case in France near the turn of the century. How this situation arose the present volume graphically sets forth, as well as the reasons interest in the case has persisted to the present day, exciting a continuing stream of books and articles by both lawyers and laymen.

Probably most Americans following the case at the time can remember where they were and just what they were doing when the word first reached them that Sacco and Vanzetti had lost their last chance of escaping death. So indelible was the impression that it is common testimony that only two other occurrences in recent

The power of democracy to triumph over machine politics in New York is well brought out by the author who points to the fact that liberal and even radical reforms have been instituted in the state, despite the power of entrenched lobbies. He also cleverly, without belaboring the point, asserts that the hinterland states which look askance at the corruption of Tammany Hall may well look to their own indigenous political machines which can often give Tammany Hall spades.

To those who have viewed New York through the wrong end of a telescope, *Politics in the Empire State* is well worth reading. It brings that colossus into proper focus to the rest of the country. Politicians, if they have the time or inclination to read, could also find a number of cute ideas upon which they could well improvise for the benefit of their own commonwealths.

years have made a comparable impact on the public mind: the assault on Pearl Harbor and the sudden death of President Franklin Roosevelt. Yet the latter two incidents directly involved the fortunes of the country as a whole, while the fate of the two lowly Italians might seem to have been unrelated to the national welfare, and, in any event, the questions at issue had divided the public into bitterly contending camps. This book, an arresting and cogent evaluation of the legal, social, and literary aspects of the case, will make clear to a generation fresh to the facts why the interest was so intense, as well as why historical scholars and textbook writers have deemed the affair sufficiently important to include it in general works on American history.

Professor Morgan, one of America's foremost authorities on the law of evidence, carefully examines the legal record, including the repeated attempts through six years to secure a retrial or executive clemency. With all the relevant matter presented to the reader in language which laymen can easily grasp, it is difficult to resist Professor Morgan's conclusion that Sacco and Vanzetti were "the victims of a tragic miscarriage of justice." The action of the Massachusetts legislature in 1939 in reforming the state's appellate procedure in such a way as would have enabled the two men to get their case reheard in the light of new evidence, constitutes at least an implied admission

at an official level that they did not receive full justice.

Professor Joughin, a student of literature and its social implications, then shows how society—in Massachusetts, in the country at large, in other lands—rendered its own verdict on the case. This rich and revealing record he finds in documentary sources, in newspapers, pamphlets, and magazines, in poems, plays, and novels. He shows, moreover, how "Throughout the world men and groups of men were forced to define their position on a large variety of ethical, economic, and political problems." Finally, he assesses Sacco and Vanzetti as human beings and as thinkers. Twenty years after the electrocution, in 1947, a group of distinguished citizens, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Albert Einstein, Herbert H. Lehman, Dean Wesley A. Sturges of the Yale Law School, and Provost Paul H. Buck of Harvard University, offered to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a bas-relief plaque of the two Italians—the work of Gutzon Borglum—for erection on Boston Common, but the Governor to whom fell the decision considered that public opinion in the state was still too divided to justify acceptance. Meanwhile, the statue of Anne Hutchinson in the State House grounds seems an assurance that some later Governor will decide differently.

This book is based upon a recognition, myths to the contrary notwithstanding, that judicial processes do not take place in a social void; that judges are men, not gods; that strict observance of legal forms does not necessarily assure the accused of a fair trial; and that judges and court systems are themselves judged by the society they are designed to serve. To treat the Sacco-Vanzetti affair from this all-encompassing point of view, two scholars, representing branches of learning commonly regarded as remote from each other, have joined forces in a collaboration of a most unusual kind. Specialization, the revered instrument of modern scholarship, entails the ever-present danger of concealing the whole truth by disclosing only a part. Even specialists working together may not do better than a patchwork job. Fruitful collaboration involves a genuine meeting of minds, a constant awareness of the interrelationship of each part to the whole. That Professors Morgan and Joughin have achieved notably in this respect no reader can have any doubt. Quite apart from the conclusions they reach, their method has significance. The success they have attained should light the way for all future ventures in co-operative scholarship.

Power and Water and Politics

by Robert R. Brunn

THE THIRSTY LAND. By Robert de Roos. Stanford University Press. 255 pp. \$4.00

California's magnificent Central Valley, running north and south for more than 500 miles between the Sierra and the sea, is one of the richest farm regions in the world. To keep it from drying up and to keep it rich, the government is planning to spend \$2,000,000,000 on dams, canals, power plants, and transmission lines.

In the process, the Bureau of Reclamation has found itself in the center of the most bitter political, economic, and social controversy in the Far West. Newsman Bob de Roos, of the San Francisco Chronicle, jumped feet first into the morass of claims and counter-claims with a sensitive eye for both words and statistics. That he has emerged with a valuable book is a tribute to his tenacity and perspicacity.

He is one of the few Nieman Fellows to enter a year at Harvard with a book already behind him. *The Thirsty Land* appeared in the same month with a Truman victory which must be a go-ahead for the President's pledge to push "public distribution of publicly produced power," and the river valley authority idea. This book offers an indispensable pro and con documentation of a controversy which in many ways is still central to today's liberal-conservative tug-of-war.

The dominant Central Valley Project issue, as Mr. de Roos sees it, is this: "Shall the Federal government, through the Bureau of Reclamation, maintain control over use of irrigation water and electrical energy produced by the project . . . for the benefit of many under the law? Or shall the Federal government complete the project and bow out, leaving its operation to others, without regard to Federal law?"

California has been watching the CVP bout for years. It is used to having "pat statements trot out at the sound of a bell," and to having "tempers boil over on cue" in the running battle for and against appropriations for transmission lines from big, white Shasta Dam. It is being fought between the Bureau and the

powerful Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

This book offers western newsmen and western voters a complete history of the controversy. Anyone interested in the tactics of pressure groups in fighting large-scale TVA-type projects will find *The Thirsty Land* invaluable.

By 1960, the Central Valley Project will not only be producing precious kilowatts for California's 10,000,000 population. It will be carrying tons of water from the wet Sacramento Valley to the dry San Joaquin. It will have added 1,000,000 new acres of land to the California farm economy.

It is the eventual use of this water and the ownership of this newly-valuable land, which poses another significant question in the turbulent Central Valley debate. Should the added value, the result of taxpayer investment, be given to large landowners who are sitting on farm and semi-arid land in the San Joaquin, waiting for the Sacramento's overflow to rush down through the great canals?

No, says the Bureau of Reclamation. It points to the limitation on land to be served by reclamation project water—160 acres (320 in California because of community property laws). Since 1902 the Reclamation Law has included the 160-acre limitation to prevent speculative gains and to encourage the family-sized farm—considered by many to be at the base of rural democracy in America.

The story of efforts to repeal the Federal 160-acre limitation as it applies to the Central Valley is told in detail by Mr. de Roos. Like every great social question, this one is neither black nor white. Large landowners who developed their great holdings in the drier-every-year San Joaquin do feel that they should not be punished for their initiative.

But their arguments should not be used as a screen for speculative profiteering at the taxpayer's expense. That is the Bureau's position, essentially, in seeking strictly to enforce the acreage limitation.

Most of California's farms are small today. But there are others that reach up toward 40,000 acres and more—sprawling "factories in the fields" served by thousands of homeless migrant workers. In enforcing the acreage limitation the Bureau is helping to prevent the spread of this efficient (in dollar terms) but humanly destructive system.

The 160-acre controversy must be settled long before 1960. To anyone who has seen

the miserable rural slums of the San Joaquin big-farm region, and compared them to the prosperous and democratic small-farm towns, the socially desirable solution is crystal-clear.

More newspapermen should take the time to write at length about the economic and social problems of rural America. The rapid spread of industrialized farming across the country, for example, has meaning for more people than just the farmer and his help. The implications of the 160-acre controversy reach to the roots of our way of life.

THE SOUTHERN COUNTRY EDITOR. By Thomas D. Clark. Bobbs Merrill, N. Y.

This is a mellow-ripe book, full flavored and delightful. Tom Clark browses through the country weeklies of the back country of the South over a whole epoch, and he lets his story ramble after the ambling pace of the country editor gathering gossip and telling stories. Prof. Clark would have made a good country editor. He has the patience and interest and human touch. And he loves a good story and tells it lovingly. He keeps the professor of social history in the back room and hides his assiduous researcher entirely out of sight. All you see is the ink-smudged printer and his cracker-barrel cronies as he assimilates the grist of the news and sets it on his primitive press to mirror unconsciously the folkways of the community.

So it's easy reading. And only as you set it down do you realize you have had dished up a rich slice of social history. Prof. Clark sees the customs and politics, the manners and attitudes of the rural South as the country editor saw and reflected them. He's winnowed through hundreds of weeklies over a period of 80 years from the Civil War and he hasn't missed much. After his prodigious searches, his story tells itself and he has had the wit to let it tell itself. You can read it for its choice anecdotes, for its accounts of the circus, for the fantasy of its chivalry toward white womanhood, or for its shrewd account of the editors' attitude on the Negro, on lynching, on the North. You see the serious-minded editor in his long crusades against one-crop farming, pistol-toting and public hangings. The chapter on public hangings with their macabre dramatics and oratory and camp meeting flavor is one not to be missed. In fact none of it should be missed, not even the bibliography with the names of the old time country papers: Jefferson Buzzsaw, Dadeville Spot Cash, Clarks-

The reviewer, Robert R. Brunn, is the San Francisco correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. The author, Robert de Roos, is a staff writer of the San Francisco Chronicle. Both, as reporters, have covered the issues in the Central Valley that gave rise to this book. Both are now Nieman Fellows.

ville Tobacco Leaf, Jackson Hustler, Sparta Ishmaelite, the Weekly Copiahian of Hazelhurst, Miss. and the Thousandsticks of Hyden, Kentucky. The reader of the Southern Country Editor will learn

more of why there are Dixiecrats in 1948 than he could glean from any quantity of campaign speeches. And he'll wish his luck had made him a country editor. An incidental acquisition will be a respectful

realization of the scholarship, literary talent and human quality that make the components of a professor of history at the University of Kentucky.

—Louis M. Lyons

Analyzing the Marshall Plan

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM. By Seymour E. Harris. 309 pp. The Harvard University Press. \$3.50.

Not only does Professor Harris give convincing indication of having read the record. He has summarized what is important for the everyday reader—and he accompanies it all with an interesting and reasoned analysis of the points of controversy. It is not an especially easy volume to read, and it is marred by some repetition. But anyone who wants either a quick or an exhaustive view of the economics of European aid, anyone who needs a standby reference to all the important data, will feel indebted to Professor Harris.

Professor Harris (and these sections of his analysis will repay the closest reading) is not confident that Western Europe will soon be able to eliminate the deficit in its balance of payments. He does foresee continued physical recovery, assuming reasonable political stability and ability to control inflation. (The latter, he makes clear, is not something a finance minister does one morning after getting some sound advice from the American press. In most countries it means sacrifice of needed investment or a lowering of consumption standards which are already "at levels which do not allow further reduction without serious political consequences.")

However, neither recovery nor internal financial stability mean, of themselves, that Western Europe will become self-supporting. While objecting to loose talk about a permanent dollar shortage, Professor Harris feels, none the less, that an urgent and unrequited demand for American goods is a fairly durable phenomenon of our time. He calculates that, in peace and war, the United States over the last thirty-three years had given or loaned some \$80 billions to other countries to help them buy what they wanted and had not the dollars to afford—and that, in addition, another \$20 billions in gold was "spent" in the United States. He is not hopeful that the Marshall Plan will correct this enduring disequilibrium.

This is a wise warning. Professor Harris shares what is obviously a majority view

of the American people, namely, that the Marshall Plan was a large-minded design for promoting Western European stability. In catching the imagination of Americans there is some possibility that the Marshall Plan captured it as well. Not a few have come to believe that, if all goes well, it will leave Europe self-supporting and happy and with all economic troubles nicely tidied up. It won't—and this book is a potent reminder. Those who are biding their time for an attack on the Marshall Plan should not be given the opportunity of attacking it on the ground that it didn't

work miracles.—J. K. Galbraith in N. Y. Times, Nov. 7

THE REVIEWERS:

William M. Pinkerton is director of the Harvard News Office. Louis M. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Fellowships. The other reviewers are Nieman Fellows this year: Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News; Aldric Revell, Madison (Wis.) Capital Times; E. L. Holland, Jr., Birmingham News; Robert R. Brunn, Christian Science Monitor.

Kentucky Nieman Dinner

Nineteen Nieman Fellows attended the second annual meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers in Louisville Nov. 18 to 20. Three of them had speaking parts, Irving Dilliard, Harry Ashmore and Hodding Carter. All 19 got together for a rousing evening at the Kentucky Nieman Conference Dinner as guests of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Irving Dilliard, editorial writer on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, led off in the conference discussion of "The Editorial Attack on Public Questions" to describe the Post-Dispatch campaign to force strengthening of mine safety laws following the Centuria mine disaster. He told the story of the Post-Dispatch follow-through from this issue to the exposure of protected rackets in Peoria which led to the shabby political indictment of its star reporter Theodore Link, a misplay that boomeranged in the election against the Green machine of Illinois.

Harry Ashmore, executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette, and Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, each led a group in analysis and criticism of editorial pages.

The Nieman dinner discussion centered on the future of the new free press in Germany, with Werner Friedmann, publisher of the Munich Abendzeitung, as guest speaker. Dinner guests included Mark Ethridge, publisher, and James A. Pope, managing editor of the Courier-Journal, Pres. H. L. Donovan of the Uni-

versity of Kentucky, Herbert Brucker, editor, the Hartford Courant, Carroll Binder, editor, Minneapolis Tribune, Vermont Royster, associate editor, Wall Street Journal, Robert U. Brown, editor of Editor and Publisher, and several members of the Courier-Journal staff.

Singing under the direction of Mark Ethridge continued after the dinner at Leo's Hideaway.

The Fellows at the dinner:

Harry Ashmore, Arkansas Gazette; Robert Bordner, Cleveland Press; Hodding Carter, Delta Democrat-Times; Neil O. Davis, Lee County Bulletin, Auburn, Ala.; Irving Dilliard, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Ed Edstrom, Louisville Courier-Journal; Paul L. Evans, Republic, Mitchell, So. Dakota; Miss Rebecca Gross, Express, Lock Haven, Pa.; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; Paul J. Hughes, Louisville Courier-Journal; Weldon James, Louisville Courier-Journal; Robert Lasch, Chicago Sun-Times; Francis P. Locke, News, Dayton, Ohio; Louis M. Lyons, Nieman Foundation; Fletcher Martin, Louisville Defender; Justin McCarthy, United Mine Workers, Washington; Cary Robertson, Louisville Courier-Journal; Osburn Zuber, Birmingham, Ala.

The Fellows are indebted to Paul J. Hughes for the idea and management of the dinner and to the exceptional hospitality of the Louisville Courier-Journal as host.

NIEMAN NOTES

1939

Ed Lahey covered the Presidential campaign and got what little fun there was in it into his stories. A quite different story of his was October 28 on a Dewey speech in Cleveland. But Ed didn't report on Dewey that night. He wrote about Taft, who had to introduce Dewey and then listen to him.

In a ceremony at the British Embassy Nov. 12, Ambassador Sir Oliver Franks bestowed the Military Division of the Order of the British Empire on Irving Dilliard for his duty in the Joint American-British headquarters—SHAEP—on Gen. Eisenhower's staff.

1940

Down between the Democrats and Dixiecrats on the Mississippi Delta, Hodding Carter came out for Dewey in his *Delta Democrat-Times*, first Mississippi paper to go Republican, it is said, since the Civil War. This was probably the Deepest South defection from its historic pattern. Other Southern papers to break their Democratic tradition included the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, largest paper in the Carolinas, and the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent.

Hodding Carter had the inside cover position of "This Week" on November 14. Writing to the title "You Need Enemies," he said:

"Most of us spend overmuch of our time seeking to be popular with everyone and fretting because we've heard that so-and-so doesn't like us. Too often we measure our standing in our communities by the number of backslaps, the frequency of party invitations and the relayed reports of what Bill or Joe or Mary say about us. We are so busy trying to make friends that we don't take time to make the right kind of enemies.

"Yet one of the saintliest men I ever knew, a lawyer in a small Southern city, was hated by some of his fellow citizens with a hate surpassing Cain's for Abel. I know he took strength from their ill regard; and he once said that he became concerned only when he could not identify the reasons his enemies had for disliking him.

"The reasons were almost always evident: a tainted official, seeking to ridicule him for his insistence upon decency in public office. A standpatter, uneasy because of his forthright support of equal

rights for racial and religious minorities. A rigid fanatic, aroused because of his gentler and deeper interpretation of moral laws. A suspicious realist, unable to understand a grown man's love of beauty. A careful financier (at eight per cent), decrying his impetuous generosity and disregard for business orthodoxy.

"All his life he was libeled, but the attacks left him untouched and undisturbed, and in the long run caused him to be held in honor, respect and affection.

"Of course, no one enjoys—or should enjoy—unpopularity as such. But neither should we be afraid of making enemies.

"Tall trees must cast long shadows, and the man for whom everyone has a passing good word is but a fraction of a man and empty of purpose."

The 1940 group of Nieman Fellows has elected Weldon James representative on the Council of the Society of Nieman Fellows, in succession to Carroll Kilpatrick, their first Council member, whose two-year term expired last Summer. Weldon James left Collier's Magazine in November to join the editorial page staff of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

1941

For his book on the Dust Bowl, *Heaven's Tableland*, Vance Johnson received the second prize award of the Texas Institute of Letters for the best book about Texas or by a Texan. In his case it was both. The \$500 award was given by the Dallas News. The first prize award of \$1,000 went to Prof. Herbert S. Gambrell of Southern Methodist University for his biography "Anson Jones, Last President of Texas." A special \$1,000 award went to Dr. Herbert E. Bolton of the University of California for his lifelong work in the field of Latin American history. A special award of \$250 was made to David Westheimer, local columnist of the Houston Post for the best Texas first novel, "Summer on the Water."

Harry M. Davis was married October 2 to Gertrude Macarof. Their new home: 105 Arden Street, New York City 34. Harry Davis is science editor of *Newsweek*.

The Page One Ball of the St. Louis Guild has a distinguished program, with a number of biographical sketches of great figures in the lusty journalistic past of that city. Irving Dilliard (1939) contributes an article on O. K. Bovard, late

great managing editor of the Post-Dispatch, which is the most extensive biographical sketch of him yet to reach print. Another article is a sketch of Florence White of the Post-Dispatch who became general manager of the New York World, by Charles Edmundson. Both Dilliard and Edmundson are Nieman Fellows on the Post-Dispatch and both until recently on the editorial page, which had its difficulties over the Presidential campaign. Ralph Coghlan, the editor, walked out on the campaign in protest at Publisher Joseph Pulitzer's decision to support Dewey. Dilliard, next in line, couldn't support Dewey either. Edmundson took over the Dewey campaign on the page. When the election was over Coghlan returned from his vacation. Edmundson was transferred to the Washington bureau. Dilliard had kept busy with the P-D campaign against the corrupt Green machine in Illinois, which dominated and distinguished the page right through the Presidential race.

The Saturday Evening Post for December 4 ran a story by Lowell M. Limpus, "This was Mickey Marcus" on the late Col. David Marcus, killed in the Palestine war.

1942

Upon retirement of the managing editor of the *Arkansas Gazette* in September, Harry S. Ashmore took over supervision of the news department in addition to the editorial page. His new title is executive editor.

Neil Owens Davis, Jr., third child of the editor of the Lee County Bulletin, was born last Summer.

Neil Davis' paper was one of three in Alabama that supported Truman in the Presidential campaign. The others were the Birmingham News and the Anniston Star.

1943

In a first of the year move, John F. Day, Jr., left the *Dayton News*, where he was managing editor, to join the Louisville Courier-Journal, where his first assignment is with the Washington bureau.

Frank K. Kelly completed his campaign work as director of research for the Democratic National Committee, began his appointment as professor of journalism at Boston University, and had his first novel, *An Edge of Light*, published by Little, Brown Company all at approximately the same time. His professorship has also transformed Frank Kelly from the old Bohemian of 9 Patchin Place in Greenwich Village to a South Shore commuter at Stoughton, Mass. An AP man before and

after his Nieman Fellowship, Professor Kelly is the only person who ever held a Nieman Fellowship twice. He had half a Fellowship in 1942 and the other half in 1946, with three years of the Army between. He was one of the nine authors of *Your Newspaper*.

Kelly claims authorship of the much used Truman campaign statement: "The issues of this campaign are peace, prices and places to live."

The *Louisville Courier-Journal* started a farm supplement December 1, with appointment of Erwin W. Kieckhefer as farm editor. The appointment came after a national search for a man capable of handling agricultural issues both on the editorial page and in the news columns. Kieckhefer left the editorial page staff of the *Minneapolis Star* to take the post. Thirty-three, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin '36, he served the United Press in Milwaukee and Chicago from 1937 to 1941 and since then has been with the Cowles' *Minneapolis papers*. He early began to specialize in farm news, became the farm editor of the *Minneapolis Star-Journal*, studied agricultural economics under Prof. John Black at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship in 1942-43, and thereafter wrote editorials in *Minneapolis*. Last year he received Wallace's Farmer's first prize award for editorials best interpreting farm problems to city readers.

1944

Isabel and Lawrence Fernsworth announced the arrival of a daughter, Jean Isabel, September 20 in Cambridge. Weight 1 lb. 9 oz.

1945

Nathan Robertson had an article in *Harper's* for November: "What Do You Mean, Free Enterprise?" A consultant for the Department of the Interior and the American Public Health Association, Nate was one of four members of the National Press Club who picked Truman to beat Dewey.

Kendall Foss became the editor, in November, of the largest of the German newspapers licensed by military government in the American zone, *Die Neue Zeitung*, published in Munich with a circulation of 840,000. It is described as "the *New York Times of Germany*." Foss came to Harvard from *Time, Inc.*, and in 1945 went to Berlin as correspondent of the *New York Post*. He succeeds Jack Fleisher as editor of *Die Neue Zeitung*. Except for a few key men, his staff are Germans.

1946

Leon Svirsky has been elected the new representative of the 1946 group to the

Council of the Society of Nieman Fellows. Former science editor of *Time*, Svirsky has been for the past year one of the founding editors of the new *Scientific American*. He edited *Your Newspaper*, a composite book by nine of the 1946 Fellows. Robert Manning, who was in Europe covering the UN for UP during the election, was chosen alternate.

Robert C. Elliott, a 1943 Nieman Fellow who calls his job as executive assistant to Henry Kaiser "the most wonderful job in the world," persuaded Frank Hewlett to join the Kaiser public relations staff in October. A United Press war correspondent before his Nieman Fellowship, Hewlett was one of the staff of *World Report*. He had his initiation into public relations last year, working for Hawaiian statehood.

Arthur Hepner began a new assignment on *The Nation's Business*, with an article October 22 on the Textron case.

1947

One of Mrs. Roosevelt's columns from Europe described a plane trip into Germany with a group that included Gilbert W. Stewart, Jr., information officer of the U. S. mission to the United Nations.

Fletcher Martin toured on President Truman's campaign train to cover for the *Chicago Defender* and *Michigan Chronicle* besides his own paper, the *Louisville Defender*. "President Truman has as much energy as Mrs. Roosevelt," he reported.

On this campaign assignment he stopped off at Salt Lake City to visit William H. McDougall, then just finishing his second book, sequel to *Six Bells Off Java*, and Ernest H. Linford, on the editorial page of the *Salt Lake City Tribune*. Fletcher and Mary Martin had a daughter, Patricia, born Sept. 30.

1948

Robert M. Shaplen joined the staff of the "new" *Fortune* in October. One of his first pieces, on Tobacco and ECA, was about the pressure of business interests to dump surpluses abroad on ECA funds, contrary to ECA principles to limit those funds to the essential needs of the countries aided.

Appointment of Walter G. Rundle, Berlin bureau manager of the United Press, as manager for all Germany was announced October 1.

Robert W. Glasgow, labor reporter on the *New York Herald Tribune*, spent much of the Fall on an extensive field trip on labor news that included covering the C. I. O. convention in Seattle.

Charles Gilmore left the Atlanta office of the Associated Press in the Fall and went to the *Toledo Times* as special writer.

1949

The Twin Cities Newspaper Guild made its annual award for the "best single news or feature story of the year" to David B. Dreiman, science writer on the *Minneapolis Star*. The prize story dealt with a successful experimental project to produce 100 per cent pig iron from taconite. The story suggests the probable future source of iron in Minnesota, chief source for the nation. The high-grade ores are due to run out in another 25 years. This was Dreiman's second top award in two years. Both times he was absent at the award, this time in Cambridge on a Nieman Fellowship.

The *New Yorker* in November published a letter from China by Christopher Rand, *Herald Tribune* China correspondent now at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship.

Stanford University Press published "Thirsty Land" by Robert de Roos in October. A study of the power and water issues in Central Valley, California, it grew out of the articles de Roos did for the *San Francisco Chronicle* on the Central Valley. Its publication date coincided happily with a house warming attended by the contemporary Nieman families in the old house de Roos has renovated for his year at Harvard.

Life for Nov. 1 published Prof. Arthur W. Schlesinger's article on "The Presidents," which had its debut as a talk at a Nieman seminar. It will appear in permanent form in a book of historical essays by Professor Schlesinger soon to be published.

New York Dinner

The New York Nieman Fellows held their first dinner of the Winter, Dec. 6, with Television as the topic for the evening and Andrew Heiskell, publisher of *Life*, and Adrian Schneider, television director of NBC, as guest speakers. The Fellows and their guests made 27 for dinner, including the following Fellows: Wesley Fuller, Louis M. Lyons, Volta W. Torrey, William M. Pinkerton, Lowell M. Limpus, Herbert C. Yahraes, Charles A. Wagner, Frank W. Hewlett, Arthur W. Hepner, Leon Svirsky, Ben Yablonky, Jay G. Odell, Richard E. Lauterbach, Robert W. Glasgow, Robert M. Shaplen, and Lester H. Grant. Arthur Wild, former member of the Nieman Committee was among the guests. Volta Torrey, who with Harry Montgomery arranged the dinner, presided. Leon Svirsky was elected to the dinner committee to replace Torrey in the rotating system by which the New York dinners are run.