

Nieman Reports

January, 1950

THE PRESS AND THE CVA Richard L. Neuberger

Wake Up Angry

James S. Pope

Making Makeup Matter

Hays Gorey

Report of a Conference

Henry A. Singer

Law and the Newspaperman

Emanuel Goldberg

What to Teach in a Journalism School

T. R. McConnell

Backdoor Editorializing?

John L. Hulteng

Anything for a Dateline

William German

Reporting: Past and Present

Murrey Marder

Nieman Scrapbook: "The A & P Case"; "Why We Run Pegler" — Reviews —

Letters — Nieman Notes

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, elected by former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession. Nine out of ten subscribers to Nieman Reports and very many of its contributors are not themselves former Nieman Fellows but share a belief in the purpose of the Nieman Foundation "to promote and elevate standards of journalism in the U. S."

Nieman Reports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: John McL. Clark, Claremont, N. H.; Paul L. Evans, Mitchell, S. D.; Lawrence A. Fernsworth, New York City; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Robert Lasch, Chicago, Ill.; Justin G. McCarthy, Washington, D. C.; William J. Miller, New York City; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Lawrence G. Weiss, Cambridge, Mass.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. IV, NO. 1

JANUARY, 1950

"A Lazy Press May As Well Not Be Free"

Walter R. Humphrey

It seems to me that the greatest threat to the newspaper in America is not the pressure of publishers or special interests. It is not even financial insecurity.

The greatest threat to the newspaper in America in my book is the lazy editor . . . the editor who has forgotten his people and who is satisfied with a neat typographical product, with his service club at noon, his golf game on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons, and his poker session on Tuesday night.

The great threat to a free press is the editor in a rut, the editor who is too lazy to pursue the truth and explain it . . . who is, therefore, too dull to inspire his reporters to dig and uncover and shed light on the dark places.

A lazy press may as well not be free, for then it is too flabby to stand up to its job, too ineffective to occupy the high place which it is entitled to hold only when it is vigilant.

Next to the lazy newspaper and the indolent editor, the greatest threat to a robust and responsible press is the newspaper worker who expects to succeed in a 40-hour week and whose only concern is security.

No clock-watcher ever made a good newspaperman, a really good newspaperman. He lacks the heart and the spark.

And the young man who leaves his university, devoted to the pattern of compressing his career within the narrow confines of five days and 40 hours, ought to seek some other resting place than a newsroom.

It's no place for him. The news room is the place for the young man who wants to set the world on fire.

The goal of any young man entering the field of journalism should be a goal of high professional achievement. Don't blame him if he wants to climb fast.

But feel sorry for him if he's afraid to work, or if he's so lacking in confidence that he won't bargain for himself before he lets somebody else do it, or if he's so worried about what's

going to happen after he's 65 that he won't gamble on his own genius and ability while he's young and full of promise.

Journalism today is attractive.

Newspapers are paying well in most instances. The wage picture is relatively advantageous.

There are ample opportunities to make good without starving to death. It hasn't always been that way, I know.

But even the guy with a degree has to prove himself. His sheepskin doesn't mean he can, or should want, to get by without an apprenticeship. It still takes some head-knocking by a tough city editor to make a newspaperman.

We who hire are looking for, and depending on, college graduates.

In a good newspaper office nowadays, the reporter who isn't college-trained is an exception.

That's because we're in a highly complex business, one which requires talent and judgment and background, if the newspaper is to render the service to which it dedicates itself . . . if the newspaper is to have respect and confidence.

The staffs that build a responsible press can't be built of shoddy material.

Sigma Delta Chi already has made a deep imprint on American journalism.

The idealism of its ritual is the heart of honorable, ethical newspaper practice in America.

"I do promise never to betray the ideals . . ." Remember that?

Those ideals are the sinews of a free press.

Talent is the sacred, inextinguishable flame entrusted to us. It must be cultivated that it may never diminish to dimness. Through it we serve . . . and the flame, when we depart, is the lantern by which other men will fight their lives and scan the script of their faith.

Energy is the will power which translates our native gifts into achievement. The fruits of our profession must be earned through toil. It is the means.

Truth is the goal. It is the only justification of our profession. It is the endless quest of mankind, and our mission is to search it out . . . and to bestow it as the gift of our profession, on the world.

What do we seek, after all?

To perpetuate a profession based on freedom to learn and publish the facts.

That believes in publicity as the forerunner of justice . . .

That is as jealous of the rights to utter unpopular opinions as of the privilege to agree with the majority.

That regards itself as the interpreter of today's events and the mirror of tomorrow's expectations.

That ascribes motives only when motives go to the heart of the issue.

That lays its own claim to service on a vigilance that knows no midnight and a courage that knows no retreat.

We have cut out a sound professional pattern for ourselves. It's full of idealism but as solid as the rock. Individually we have taken a big bite as we have dedicated our lives to the service of many communities, even of all mankind.

If we or any other group of newspaper people would honorably serve in this manner, our press **MUST** be free. If we would do it well, it must be responsible.

Walter R. Humphrey is editor of the Fort Worth Press, and a former president of Sigma Delta Chi. This is from his talk at the national convention of the fraternity, November 17, in Dallas.

THE PRESS AND THE CVA

by Richard L. Neuberger

In the majesty of a cathedral-like grove of Douglas firs, I covered the recent dedication of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest for the *New York Times*. To prepare myself for the event, I read the great forester's autobiography *Breaking New Ground*. The night before the dedicatory ceremony, in a little mountain lodge in the Cascades, I had reached the chapter telling of Theodore Roosevelt's efforts to set aside the last upland solitudes of the West in government reserves.

Pinchot described how opposition to the proposal centered in the very region where the trees stood. The Oregon legislature begged Congress not to turn over the woods to "hands unknown and untried and recommended only by theoretical learning." Pinchot added hopefully that "Eastern Congressmen believed in forestry as a general proposition and were perfectly willing to protect Western forests against the depredations of Western men."

My wife long since had gone to sleep but I read on, fascinated. Hadn't I been through this somewhere before? In the distance a creek trilled over a rocky riffle. Always Pinchot and Teddy encountered their angriest hostility from the area whose magnificent timber they wanted to protect. And at last the thread of the tale unraveled. "In the long run," wrote Pinchot, "it was the votes of Eastern Senators and Representatives that saved the National Forests of the West."

"Why," I said to no one in particular, "it's exactly like CVA."

And so, sadly, it is.

Early in 1949 President Truman proposed a regional authority patterned after TVA for the vast basin of the Columbia River. The new agency would conserve soil, generate water power, provide irrigation, improve navigation and check floods. Immediately, CVA was smote hip and thigh as "Communism," "dictatorship" and "tyranny." This assault has been led by the Republican Party, substantially financed by the utility companies and, unfortunately, carried on to a considerable extent by the press of the Northwest.

The partition described by Gifford Pinchot is being repeated.

With merely a few exceptions, the newspapers of the Columbia Basin are solidly aligned against CVA. Yet many of the outstanding dailies outside the Northwest regard CVA with high hopes and undiluted praise.

Some documentation is in order. Among the large metropolitan newspapers of the Columbia Basin, only the *Oregonian* of Portland is not determinedly opposed to CVA. It has taken no definite position on the issue, other than to decline specific indorsement of the President's bill but to add that "some sort of overall regional agency" is apparently necessary. With this neutral exception, the area's larger publications can detect only evil in CVA.

Four small dailies favor CVA. They are the *Wenatchee*, Wash., *World*, the *Pendleton*, Ore., *East Oregonian*, the *Hood River*, Ore., *Sun* and the *Lewiston*, Idaho, *Tribune*. Combined circulation of these adherents of CVA totals 35,454.

Once the granite confines of the Columbia's watershed are left behind, however, there is no difficulty in finding impressive circulation figures committed to CVA.

The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Washington Star*, the Scripps-Howard papers, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Sun-Times*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal*—these and many other dailies of notable reputation have indorsed CVA without equivocation. Indeed, the *Oregonian* has commented on the phenomenon:

"The trend is support of CVA by such influential and nationally-known publications as the *New York Times* and general opposition from editors of newspapers within this region."

Preponderantly, the press of the Northwest regards CVA as the ultimate in "statism" and radicalism. Yet the imaginations of Edgar Rice Burroughs and Jules Verne would not be long enough to consider radical the Eastern newspapers which have gone all-out for CVA. For example, the *Star* of Washington, D.C., and the Scripps-Howard papers are staunchly Republican and heavily conservative.

The *Star* has editorialized that "the weight of logic and common sense seems to be on the side of President Truman's proposal for the creation of a CVA to unify Federal activities connected with the development and conservation of resources in the Pacific Northwest."

No less fulsome has been the approval of the Scripps-Howard *Washington Daily News*: "President Truman has made an excellent case for creation of a CVA. . . . Among U. S. rivers, the Columbia ranks second only to the Mississippi in the volume of water carried to the sea. Congress should give earnest consideration to the President's plan for its better development."

Consider, by contrast, a sample of opinion from inside the Northwest. The *Capital-Journal* of Salem, Ore., looks upon CVA as "a three-man dictatorship," and Boise, Idaho, *Statesman* is even less complimentary. It calls CVA "an unjustified intrusion upon the affairs of this region . . . an abandonment of the rights of self-government."

Ordinarily the press of a hinterland region would be proud to unite in the company of such papers as the *New York Times*, the *Post-Dispatch* and the *Washington Post*. What excuse is given for this regional disconformance?

The excuse, at best, is a shabby one.

Numerous Northwest dailies claim that papers in New York, St. Louis and Washington are friendly to CVA because they themselves would not have to live under it. The implication is that the country's leading newspapers are so cavalier as to suggest for fellow Americans elsewhere in the nation an undesirable form of government, merely because it would be beyond the circulation scope of those papers.

The charge is untrue.

The Missouri scours the city limits of St. Louis, and the *Post-Dispatch* has led the fight for a Missouri Valley Authority. The *Chattanooga*, Tenn., *Times*, substantially owned by the *New York Times*, has supported the TVA, which operates throughout that paper's realm. All the Chicago and New York dailies indorsing CVA have been consistently for the somewhat parallel St. Lawrence Seaway.

Why, then, is the press of the Northwest hostile to CVA

Richard L. Neuberger of the staff of the Portland *Oregonian*, is the best known of Northwest journalists, a frequent contributor of regional articles to magazines, happily including *Nieman Reports*.

while leading papers outside the region favor the President's proposal?

I believe we must go back to Pinchot's era for the answer. Opposition to the setting aside of the National Forests came principally from the great lumber barons, who wanted to convert these fastnesses of fir and pine into profitable ship's decking and 2x4's. The influence of these men within the Northwest was great. Their minions filled the commercial organizations and the boards of trade. Their lobbyists were omnipresent in legislative halls. These currents rippled out into editorial offices. Pressures closed on Northwest Senators and Congressmen.

But the power of the lumber barons diminished with each passing mile from the Northwest. Unquestionably, the timber magnates convinced some sincere editors and politicians that the fate of the sawmills and the destiny of the region were one and the same. If the forest reserves were snatched from axe and saw, how could the Northwest prosper?

Outside the Northwest, editors and politicians were able to afford the luxury of a somewhat longer perspective. If the uplands were laid bare, what of erosion and floods? Where would the drinking supply of Seattle and Portland come from? Could salmon spawn in creeks choked with logging slash? What of recreation? People could not pitch camp in a charnel house of stumps and dead branches.

And so Pinchot, first chief forester in America's history, wrote: "The conservation bill was attacked by members (of Congress) from the West, who were directly concerned, and supported by members from the East, who were not. In the fight for the National Forests we were to see much more of that same partition."

Today, the basic, underlying opposition to the CVA emanates from the power companies of the Northwest. A clause in the President's bill would give the new agency the right to buy out utilities operating in the Columbia Basin. Obviously, the bill is not attacked from this exposed salient. Public ownership of power is far from unpopular, as witness municipal plants in such communities as Seattle, Tacoma, Cleveland and Sacramento.

The main assault stems from the alleged fact that CVA would take away the people's liberties. A pamphlet financed by the utilities warns that "Russia Has A CVA"! This concern for liberty on the part of the power companies is regarded with wry faces by residents familiar with the supineness of these companies to the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920's, when that unholy organization had sufficient strength in Oregon to secure passage at the polls of a bill closing Catholic schools.*

No elaborate brochures then were issued urging the populace to act now "lest our form of government be changed."

The organization ostensibly leading the opposition to CVA is known as the Pacific Northwest Development Association. It sends gaudy 48-page booklets through the mails by the tens of thousands, heralding the material as "Proof That We Don't Need The CVA Dictatorship Here." No effort has been made in the press to analyze Development Association sources of financing, although one can guess at considerable interest if, let us say, brochures of equal extravagance and anonymity flooded the region with an attack on utility companies.

Congressman Hugh B. Mitchell of Seattle contends that from 1945 until 1948 four power and light corporations paid

to the Development Association \$18,610. "The tabulation is partial," he adds, "because all companies have not filed detailed reports for all years."

A memorial indorsing CVA was introduced in the Oregon legislature. It was overwhelmed 19 to 10 in the Senate and that was the end of it. But what chance did it ever have? One utility company spent \$5,000 lobbying at the session, a sum only \$1,000 short of the annual legislative pay of all 30 State Senators!

Utility money can hire advertising agencies, skilled writers and printed material by the bale. Speakers on salaries and expense accounts appear before every civic organization. Conversely, debates are discouraged. Why give both sides? Governor McKay of Oregon, who came out against CVA the first day Mr. Truman proposed it, said sanctimoniously he might favor CVA if the people were allowed to ballot on the idea.

I suggested a special session of the legislature to conduct a referendum in Oregon on CVA and promised, as a member of the Senate, to cooperate with the Governor in framing a fair statement for the ballot. The reaction of a number of newspapers was to charge me with trying to put our Governor on the spot!

The Hood River Sun, published by a founder of the Young Republican Clubs of Oregon, has declared: "It is unfortunate that a power company or any other special interest should move in on a political party and force its beliefs on a group such as the Young Republicans."

A climate is created against CVA. This conservatism, in the words of William Allen White, "goes thrilling down the line." It becomes fashionable in many circles to oppose CVA. Editors often move in these circles. The Republican Party has made antagonism to CVA so much a touchstone in the Columbia Basin that even Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, a liberal who has hailed TVA in the most enthusiastic terms, has felt it politically advisable to denounce TVA's blood brother, CVA, as "a strait-jacket for the Pacific Northwest."

E. B. MacNaughton, 69, president of the Oregonian Publishing Company, has come out for CVA. "Business interests once voiced bitter opposition to Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams," he said. "But if Roosevelt had not given Bonneville and activated Grand Coulee, where would we be today?" MacNaughton, chairman of the board of one of the richest banks in the region, confesses that some erstwhile business associates are icily cool because of his views on CVA.

Some adherents of CVA, no less guilty of over-statement than the adversaries of the project, have accused various editors of venality. I doubt this, although I always have felt regional self-interest required support of CVA. It is my opinion that the editors who think CVA would destroy personal liberty are as mistakenly sincere as those editors of long ago who feared establishment of the forest reserves would destroy the Northwest economically.

After F. T. Humphrey, associate editor of the Oregon Daily Journal, had printed a series of articles hostile to CVA, the State Grange Bulletin charged him with receiving \$6,000 from the Pacific Power & Light Company during 1946. Humphrey replied that this had been while he was engaged in public relations work and not on the staff of the Journal. He also made the counter-charge that the master of the Grange had received \$11,200 since 1938 as a field examiner for the Bonneville Power Administration.

It is not my opinion that Humphrey's previous connections disqualified him for covering CVA, any more than I believe

*Happily declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. *Pierce, et al., v. Society of Sisters*. 268 US 510 (1924).—R.L.N.

the employment of the Grange master made suspect his indorsement of CVA. After all, a reporter who is an official of the CIO Newspaper Guild is fully entitled, in my estimate, to cover a labor dispute. So long as there has been nothing dishonest or shady about a man's associations or background, I do not think these should be cited against any effort from his pen. Material should be judged on its merits. The *ad hominem* approach is unworthy of a great cause.

I may be a prejudiced observer, but I believe the very vehemence of the attack against CVA has limited its effectiveness. The American people are suspicious of the extravagant phrase. Harry Truman does not look to them like a man who would "end local sovereignty" or "do away with personal liberty." And some voters in the Northwest remember when the same warnings were applied in 1938 to the imminent establishment of the Bonneville Power Administration. This agency has been in existence a decade now, and I know of no mayor who has been handcuffed or individual citizen ordered away from his church.

The tragedy to me, as a Westerner born and bred, is that our majestic region again must be saved from itself. Our fellow citizens in the East, the Middle West and the South must rescue us from our own subservience to local vested interests. Bernard De Voto of Boston did not exaggerate when he wrote in *Harper's* under the title of "The West Against Itself."

I look at the water in the tumbler at the dinner table. It is clear, cold and pure. It foamed off the ramparts of the Mount Hood National Forest. As I write these words, thousands of men, women and children are skiing in the National Forests of the West. Next summer many times this number will swim in blue lakes and camp beneath cavernous evergreens. But what if the nation almost half a century ago had listened not to the young forester with the handlebar mustache but to the political, civic and journalistic leaders of the Northwest?

Where would the Northwest be today? I think of the devastation where the axe has cut clear. I recall how the lumber

industry has moved inexorably southward from the British Columbia border nearly to the California line, as the stately trees have gone to satisfy the hunger of sabre-toothed power saws. What would have happened to the uplands of Mount Hood and Mount St. Helens and Eagle Cap, if Teddy's forester had not lined up faithful allies on the other side of the continent?

Today the Northwest faces a different kind of emergency, but an emergency nevertheless. Although it contains as a region 42 per cent of the nation's potential hydroelectricity, it also is the part of the country with the most critical power shortage! Population has soared nearly one half since 1940, and many of the newcomers are going on unemployment rolls. The rate of joblessness in the Northwest is three times the national average.

The soil of the Columbia Basin is its investment capital, yet Oregon, which would be the heartland of the CVA, has one of the sorriest soil conservation records of any Western state. Each day of the Columbia River flood of 1948 enough soil to cover 44 farms, each 80 acres in size, drifted seaward past Portland. And in the neighboring state of Washington 5 per cent of the land has lost all its topsoil and 43 per cent is on the way toward this ruinous end.

Yet the bulk of the region's press cries out that CVA will bring dictatorship and tyranny. People who were silent when religious schools faced compulsory closure now fear that public development of the Columbia River may threaten individual freedom. This is the circulation lineup in the Northwest.

Pro-CVA	35,454
Neutral	224,000
Anti-CVA	990,000

Of course, the Eastern press and politicians may save us from ourselves. I am no seventh son of a seventh son, so I merely can ponder and not predict. But half a century from now, when many hearts of men have been sifted before the Judgment Seat, I wonder what some Gifford Pinchot of the future will write about the great fight against the CVA?

MAKING MAKEUP MATTER

by Hays Gorey

In the busy newsroom, the harried news editor furrowed his brow. He pawed anxiously through stacks of news copy neatly arranged before him, as if he expected to find something which had not been there during previous examinations.

Finally, he wandered over to the city desk. His facial expression asked the question.

"Honest, Ray," said the city editor, "I haven't got a thing . . . not a damn thing. Want us to try to smoke something up?"

We shall leave these hypothetical men in their hypothetical dilemma, and let them solve it as best they can. What is important is that the situation arises too frequently on certain newspapers which in nearly all respects belong to the responsible segment of the press.

The men in our little scene were executives of a newspaper which ran a page one banner line every day. It never deviated from its pattern. It, in short, prejudged the value of the news of the day.

Besides creating a daily bugaboo for its editors, this policy

robbed the readers of their right to a daily picture of the fluctuating value of news.

Let us limit this argument. It does not concern the bombastic press. No idealist would be so impractical as to attempt to influence the makeup of the sensationalists. This is an appeal to those newspapers which in all aspects but makeup try to serve their communities and readers with objective, uncolored news coverage. Too many even of these good newspapers put the same suit of clothes on their lead story day in and day out. Some stories get a remarkably good fit. Others appear ridiculous in oversize dress.

To many writers—and many editors—makeup has lost its importance. They are blind to its purpose, and to the vital function it could perform, and indeed does perform on some newspapers. It has become a mechanical thing, a printer's function, in a sense, for too many papers.

The question boils down to this: You cannot apply an inflexible, straight-edged ruler to something that requires a slide rule.

Day by day, the news picture changes. And we are obligated to the man with the nickel, who considers us specialists in

Hays Gorey is city editor of the Salt Lake Tribune, now on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard.

news, to the extent we must make clear to him how much impact we attach to individual stories. "Russ Develop Own Atom Bomb" might carry the eight-column banner on Monday. On Tuesday, the same identical play might be given to "Sen. Blowhard Asks Truman to Resign!"

Some may say: "Any reader who doesn't get the difference in impact between those two stories should return to grade school." Perhaps the example is overdrawn. But even if it is, does it not suffice to show that daily banner newspapers have shackled themselves to a device which robs them of their ability to compare day to day news values?

Why dignify Senator Blowhard with the maximum play you can give a story? Why, because he happens to offer the best news you have on a given day, help him to startle your readers? By the attention you give his statement, you convince the reader that you believe what he said was vital. In how many cases can we honestly feel the rantings of a politician can fill the largest shoes in the newspaper shop?

For one thing, how deeply do many readers analyze the wording of a blaring headline? Do they conscientiously differentiate between a happening and a mere statement of opinion? Can you make it clear within the limits of your banner's count that the news is not fact, but based on more or less authoritative rumors? You can say, perhaps "Russ Troops Moving Towards Yugo Border—Report" but you cannot say that the source of your report is flimsy, based perhaps on the word only of a foreign propagandist. Neither can you do so in a one-column head, it may be argued. But the reader does not get the same overwhelming impression from a one-column headline—even in the lead position—that he gets from a banner line. Get the same news from unimpeachable sources and put it in a banner. That is a system whereby worth and reliability of news stories can be transmitted to the untrained man with the nickel.

This appeal for headline newsplay scaled in proportion with news value is vulnerable to all sorts of attack. One can say, first of all, that the banner sells newspapers, and no one would relegate such a consideration to the background. One also may argue that in this wide world, there is always something—even a significant something—worth stretching across those top eight columns. And another telling blow against the sliding scale in makeup may be found in the argument that news is relative—that the line story is represented merely as the best story for that particular day, and the reader so regards it.

To accept this argument is to decline the responsibility for keeping the changing news picture, day by day, in the reader's mind. How is he to know that the story under the banner one day is not held to be nearly so substantial as the one under it the preceding day?

In this day of the specialized reporter, with so much of the emphasis on training those who write the news, are we neglecting the systems for presenting the news?

Through expert writing alone, we cannot hope to achieve that elusive goal of sensible, fair, and objective evaluation of the news. We must worry not only about what a thorough analysis of the printed article will show we did say—but what the general impression of our entire presentation, headline, play, and article, had on the reader. Is it not only futile, but also dishonest, to answer a complaint regarding news presentation by defying anyone who objects to find one single word which would lead to the impression he got? "The story did not say Russ troops were massed near Yugo-Slavia. It said such was

the report of a man who had fled from Russia recently," an editor might argue, and be done with it. But might he not do better by analyzing the causes which made the reader attach undue importance to an inconclusive report? What did the banner say? Why was the story given a banner in the first place? Is not the reader entitled to attach significance to any article which merits the same display, virtually, as the one which tells of a declaration of war?

Why not present the news for what it is worth? Maybe it is worth the banner one day. The following day, it may merit a one-column head, and no more.

Again, the mandatory banner brings the tendency to "smoke up" news stories. Returning, say, from a United Nations meeting, a reporter might be told "It's got to carry the page one line. Make it good." If it is not intrinsically "hot," the story then might receive some artificial injections of significance or sensationalism, requirements for the eight-column head, but not for the more moderate ones. Perhaps this is a more vulnerable aspect of newspaperdom than newspapers will admit. Perhaps "play" is the basis of more fear on the part of news sources than is the actual composition of the article. Perhaps overplay by even reliable, well-meaning newspapers is the basic reason why there is not such a clear cut understanding by laymen of the sharp cleavages between the responsible and the irresponsible segments of the press. "Clothes make the man" and too many newspapers, of sharply divergent aims, policies and purpose, are dressing in nearly the same clothes.

A public official making mild criticism of a colleague, a function or an idea, probably trembles frequently in the thought that even some of those papers which are influential and considered entirely reliable will find themselves short of news, and place his views under distorted display. Topped by a headline in keeping with the conservative tenor of the remarks, the story likely would not seem such a monster in print.

And after all, is it not our avowed aim to reflect the news honestly? It is not enough to quote the man accurately, to record just exactly what he said. We should also give the reader the benefit of our analysis of the significance of what he said. By thoughtful display, we can do just that.

"But come out of the clouds," an editor might say, "We don't stay in business if we don't make money, and we don't make money if we don't sell newspapers. And we don't sell newspapers unless we make the sheet look like there is something in it."

Were this article concerning itself with newspapers in general, such an accusation would wither the argument herein presented. But, as emphasized, this point is advanced in regard to newspapers which in every respect save makeup try to be constructive, fair, significant and conscientious.

They are papers whose reporters are proud to work for them. They are papers which want to make money, but which realize they have other purposes, as well. And they are papers whose owners have set their long run goal as the respect and confidence of the readership. They are papers which are not dependent upon a hot story daily in order to be sold—and read.

Many responsible newspapers already follow the display practices recommended here. The others which class themselves as responsible need to awaken to the virtue of consistency. They may have the interior upholstery of Cadillacs, but to the man who doesn't get inside them, they ever will appear to be fire engines. All he can go by is their bright red exterior.

WAKE UP ANGRY

This is from an address by James S. Pope, managing editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, given as the 20th in a series "to perpetuate in the free press of America the spirit of Don R. Mellett, who was assassinated July 16, 1926, by enemies made in his crusade against vice, corruption, and lawlessness unchecked by the then city government of Canton, Ohio." Mr. Pope will be remembered for other articles in Nieman Reports.

by James S. Pope

I am convinced that the good editor—and perhaps any good and useful leader—has to wake up angry every morning. Not at the people who disagree with him on the numberless controversial topics of the day; in that arena he must maintain a tolerant calm. But he is not amused at all by the charming chicanery that surrounds him. He does not wait for the moment to crusade on a spectacular scale. He does not await an epidemic. He spots and cauterizes civic germs, regardless of the enemies gained, before an infection takes root.

Many voices in and out of journalism have been urging the press to face up to its responsibilities. If the first one, as I believe, is a responsibility for the ordinary, for the little intrigues we are too inclined to consider commonplace, then that is only the beginning.

What are the fundamental responsibilities of the press? I doubt if you could perform a greater service of leadership than to study and define them, and to insist that they are fulfilled. There is nothing academic about our responsibility. To realize this you have only to start grading your newspapers for irresponsibility.

A newspaper is certainly irresponsible if it refuses to give its readers unbiased news, if it distorts stories to reflect a publisher's personal whims.

It is irresponsible if it surrenders space to shrieking, intemperate columnists while making no effort to determine their fairness or accuracy.

It is irresponsible if, as a matter of policy, it habitually favors certain names in the news and ignores or discredits others. One powerful eastern newspaper tried to keep the late Frank Knox's name out of its columns even after he became Secretary of the Navy.

A newspaper is irresponsible if it does not carry enough straight news to give its readers the basic information needed by every citizen in a democracy.

It is certainly irresponsible if its headlines consistently stretch and magnify reasonable news significance to promote street sales. Too many reputable papers are edited with the mirrors you see at carnivals, making a story grotesquely huge in one edition and shrinking it to an emaciated ghost in the next.

Some of these abuses—and the list is incomplete—are generally acknowledged and combatted. Some unfortunately, have become fixed blind spots in the vision of editors who are victims of habit rather than of delinquency. Nor can the editor's ever-pressing obligations be comprehended merely by listing some of his faults. While correcting these he must always be reaching forward to grasp the reins of positive leadership.

In its simplest terms, his daily job is to reveal the hidden life of his community, which is no more transparent than the Chattahoochee River. And this subterranean scene is so deceptively camouflaged that only chronic indignation will drive him to penetrate its secrets.

But, having done so, he cannot rest there. At frequent in-

tervals the good editor must lift his eyes from the intricate currents traced in the news by passion and partisanship. In one of his multiple capacities, that of educator, he must help his readers to understand the vast tidal movements that are reshaping the very shores of our society.

Given sound news coverage, a reader should be able to reach some conclusions of his own as to whether a senator or a chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is more nearly right. But his editor must then guide him to the more important knowledge of what atomic power is, what it has done to our universe, and what it can do to our lives.

Given impartial reporting, a reader can decide how he wants to vote. He can choose for himself between two competing political syndicates—a donkey and an elephant, or just two species of donkey. But his editor must look further than today's elections. He must analyze the peril to our system of two vast national syndicates which virtually have outlawed all rivals through state laws governing the ballot, thus creating a monopoly so strong that they can cynically adopt almost identical platforms, and accommodate members who, having no common political denominator, duplicate and cancel each other in both parties.

A reader can judge the candidates if all these candidates get a fair showing in the news columns. But the editor must warn him not to accept the idiotic and prejudicial labels that would force every candidate and every movement into the iron molds of liberal or conservative, radical or reactionary. The editor must preach the tyranny of demagogic language.

The Hutchins Commission declared: "The Press has a responsibility with regard to the values and goals of our society as a whole."

Only by discharging this responsibility, also, can we regain a waning leadership based upon public confidence. The good editor must make of freedom of the press a living influence on the bewildered anguish of our times.

When the application of academic freedom to communism became a critical problem at the University of Washington, President Raymond B. Allen resolved it with these words:

"That academic freedom must be maintained in any university worthy of the name is beyond question. But academic freedom consists of something more than merely an absence of restraints placed upon the teacher by the university that employs him. It demands as well an absence of restraints placed upon him by his political affiliation, by dogmas that stand in the way of a free search for truth."

Similarly, the editor's freedom can never be solely the freedom from governmental restraints, the freedom to engage in industry under a constitutional shelter no other industry enjoys.

The gentlemen who adopted the Bill of Rights manifestly had no such expectation. They had never seen or imagined presses that could print a million or more Sunday papers in a few hours. They had never laid eyes on a comic strip or a col-

umnist, and their only cheesecake was pastry. Their naïve minds, engrossed merely with the creation of a free republic, were quite blank on love nests, fashion models, night clubs, bathing beauties, Gallup polls, crossword puzzles, wishing wells, or daily gifts of advice on loving, bridge-playing, investing in stocks, reducing the belly, playing the horses, or understanding the Holy Bible.

If freedom to ornament the news with a twelve-ring circus had been their only aim in 1791, there would have been no sense in a newspaperman giving his life to protect democratic government in 1926.

It takes more interplanetary stature to see our own world whole than to look at Mars through a telescope. It takes more to master daily the ordinary happenings, to probe steadily at the little grafts and home-town frauds, than to shoot crusades at them after they have grown too big to miss.

But the editor cannot work miracles alone. The people, the readers, have a responsibility too. It is you who must encourage

the editor to publish a better newspaper. You must refuse to accept mediocrity, and you must support the good paper against the enemies it will make.

Are you afraid of being called critical? If your editor charges you with this sin, just remind him that he blithely passes judgment every day (or claims the right to do so when he pleases) on the stage, on music and art, on road-building, on the quality of films and recordings, on authors and poets and judges and politicians, especially if the politicians are in Washington or London or Moscow. The truth is that every important institution receives a fairly systematic, and on the whole a beneficial, purge of criticism except one, the press. This should make every editor shudder at his area of unpatrolled error.

The agency, the technique for such appraisal has for some reason baffled our best brains. Yet the need for it remains fundamental. And if you, the readers, will only realize this, I believe you can evolve an implement that may electrify some of the processes of our democracy.

A "QUICK" LOOK AT THE ATOM BOMB

by Robert K. Bingham

Next to paying no attention at all to what's going on in the world, an occasional glance at the new magazine *Quick* is to be recommended as an effective means of avoiding the complexities of life. *Quick*, the pocket-size offspring of the publishers of *Look*, has relentlessly carried the rules of profitable journalism to the logical conclusion. A newspaper or news-magazine must not trouble its readers with a detailed account of the facts; the story should be told briefly, tersely, concisely—and there should be restful cases of cheesecake along the way to make the short journey seem even shorter.

Naturally, there are certain pitfalls to be reckoned with. The process of oversimplification—even in the hands of the most impartial practitioner—produces distortion. When a big story is to be told with only a few facts, the selection of those few facts becomes an expression of opinion.

The *New York Times*, an organ of public information which has for some reason seen fit to defy the rules of profitable journalism, handled President Truman's announcement of the Russian atomic explosion in the usual exhaustive way. On Saturday, September 24—the day after the Presidential announcement—the *Times* ran two hundred and thirty column-inches of news about some of the more important ramifications of the explosion. There were also thirty-eight column inches of straight opinion on the subject—a long editorial and Anne O'Hare McCormick's column. Figuring about forty words per column-inch, this makes something upwards of ten thousand words the *Times* devoted to the story the day after the facts became available.

Six days after the facts became available—on Thursday, September 29—the October 3d issue of *Quick* appeared on the stands with something upwards of five hundred words on the same story. This was an unusually long story for *Quick*, and it appeared under the heading "The Week's Biggest News" across from a picture of Guy Lombardo.

The first paragraph simply quotes the President's statement and declares, with somber tone and questionable accuracy, that "For the first time in history every American looked straight down the gun-barrel of foreign attack."

Then we come to an enticing paragraph in italics headed "Inside Story (*Quick*) Washington report." The magazine's operatives reveal that "The Administration held the pose that nothing new need be done because it had been planning with the idea that Russia eventually would have atom bombs." That deft phrase "held the pose" seems to suggest sweaty-browed men with frozen smiles, wringing their hands desperately as they try to convince us that nothing new need be done. Obviously something new does need to be done, we tell ourselves impatiently, and we read on eagerly, hoping that *Quick* will put us right.

Sure enough, *Quick's* italicized Washington dispatch fortifies us with the information that "Several high-placed men, including influential Senators, took another view after a sleepless week-end. Their conclusion (though they didn't want to be the first to suggest it publicly): the free world, led by the U. S., should go to Russia in the U. N. with an ultimatum: 'Either co-operate in effective international control and inspection of atomic weapons or in sixty days we will resort to atomic war to compel your co-operation.'"

The story goes on to describe the horror of Russia's intentions—about which the editors of *Quick* feel there can be no doubt—and the pressing need for "launching a preventive war."

The brief paragraph in italics is a minor masterpiece of journalistic legerdemain. No one is really identified. No one is really quoted. The opinions of some suspiciously self-effacing "high-placed men"—who might be the editors of *Quick* for all we know—are palmed off as the "Inside Story" of "The Week's Biggest News."

Quick is entirely free of the exasperating and bewildering thoroughness one finds in the *New York Times*. Even after a careful reading of the thousands of words the *Times* has printed on this problem, the reader would still have to make up his own mind. But in *Quick* the issues are simple and the course to be followed is clear.

Incidentally, the same issue of *Quick* which contains the definitive article on the atom bomb also includes the comments of French actress Corinne Calvert on the interesting changes in the size of her bosom since she came to this country, and thirteen pictures of Lana Turner.

Robert K. Bingham is on the staff of the new magazine, *The Reporter*.

BACKDOOR EDITORIALIZING?

What Are the Sound Limits of "Background" Reporting?

This is an editorial writer worrying about the tendency for "gobbets of opinion" to creep into interpretative reporting. John Hulteng is on a Nieman Fellowship from the editorial page of the Providence Journal.

by John L. Hulteng

Are the interpretative reporters usurping on a wholesale scale one of the functions of the editorial page in American newspapers? And if they are, is that encroachment a good thing for our press and its readers?

In my book, the answers to the above are, respectively, yes and no. If I'm right, perhaps other readers of *Nieman Reports* better qualified and positioned than I am to comment could—and should—speak out on the subject. If I'm wrong on one count or both perhaps someone of the same group could set me right.

The function being usurped, in my view, is that represented by the expository editorial—editorial column comment designed to expand the readers' grasp of the less obvious aspects of a news story of current issue and not to reveal the paper's pro or con position on a controversial topic. I don't mean by that term the courtesy pieces lauding Thanksgiving Day or the memory of a departed notable, or the light editorials made up of humorous comment on news oddities or human failings.

The expository editorial seeks to probe behind the facts of news, and sometimes ahead of them. Its success rests upon the experience and skill of the editorial writer. Ideally it should develop the news from two- to three-dimensional depth. At its worst, of course, the expository editorial becomes merely a clip-and-paste space filler for a dull day or a lazy typewriter.

But when properly used the expository piece gives a strength and reader value to the editorial page that could not be achieved in any editorial room guided by a rigid rule that every piece must "take a stand." There are many subjects in any day's news budget that do not lend themselves to pro-con editorial comment, but which could be treated to the reader's clear profit in an expository editorial. And there are many days when the news is altogether barren of developments on which the paper could plausibly "take a stand."

The role of the interpretative reporter may seem to overlap that of the editorial writer in this field. But that overlap should be apparent only. The background reporter presents the fresh facts of the news and couples with them other older or related facts which bear upon the new developments. His only concern, in the old and continuing tradition of American journalism, should be with the facts.

Admittedly, he should seek out all the facts that bear on the immediate story and not content himself with the newest ones alone. In his selection and placement of the supplemental facts he must exercise what amounts to editorial judgment.

But I submit that neither the spot reporter nor the background reporter has any business dealing in opinions orig-

inating with himself. Without having made a thorough study of it, I contend on the basis of personal observation that many reporters in this field are failing to observe that distinction. It is that failure that threatens a further and broader breakdown of the traditional dividing line between news and editorial columns in American newspapers.

It is quite true that such a breakdown took place long ago, with the rise of the syndicated columnists and the development of the "informed sources" gimmick. But columnists are set apart and identified as part-time opinion peddlers. They speak for themselves, and not for the paper. Background reporting now appears more and more frequently throughout the news columns, from page one, column eight to the business and finance sections way in back. It appears under standard heads, with or without staff bylines. It is represented as news reporting and should continue to be just that.

If Mr. Vishinsky makes a new statement about atomic energy, it is the proper function of the spot news reporter to get out the facts of his comment quickly and accurately. It is the proper function of the background reporter to fill in Vishinsky's earlier stands on the same subject, and the stands of British and American spokesmen, to describe the circumstances under which the new Russian comment was made, and the current status of atomic control proposals at Lake Success. And—if the editors see no occasion for a policy piece on the subject—it is the proper function of the expository editorial writer to suggest what may have led to the Vishinsky statement, what purpose it may be intended to serve in current discussions, and what rejoinders it may bring from the Western powers. In such a presentation in depth each component should be in its place. It should never be necessary for the reader to filter fact from speculation in the "news" report.

I am not trying to incite any sort of jurisdictional teapot tempest in the Navy-Air Force manner. The editorial page won't succumb even if the background writers lean ever more heavily on opinion. Nor would the trend to interpretative reporting be diverted by any closer adherence to factual values. There need be no intramural controversy.

And I don't believe I am blowing up a trivial technicality. Public confidence is a commodity too many papers are short on as it is—largely as a result of reader confusion in differentiating among news, columnists and "informed sources." If we make it official policy to spice our whole news report with gobbets of opinion in the guise of background facts we can't expect reader trust to hold up. Certainly maintenance of that trust ought still to be a primary objective of the American press.

WHAT TO TEACH IN A JOURNALISM SCHOOL

Dean T. R. McConnell of the University of Minnesota has served on many committees to plot the direction of university education. In this paper he defines the principles and pattern for the teaching and research of a university school of journalism.

by T. R. McConnell

Perturbed by widespread pressure for university expansion and for the development of new types of specialized training, Nuffield College, Oxford, recently issued a report of *The Problems Facing British Universities* which proposed a set of principles for determining the character and extent of professional education for which these institutions should accept responsibility. Although I believe that some of these premises are too conservative for application to our universities, others seem to me to offer us sound guidance.

"The universities have a function to perform, one of their oldest functions and one which no reasonable person questions," acknowledges the Report, "in assisting in the education of certain professions. But, just because they have this function to perform," the document continues, "they have constantly to safeguard the general character of the education they give, the balanced and comprehensive approach to learning and research for which they stand, against excessive specialization."

The Report then states certain characteristics which should distinguish the professional education carried on in the university from that which should be conducted in other more specialized and technical institutions. These characteristics seem relevant, not only to university education in general in this country, but also to professional education in journalism in particular.

"In the first place," we are told, "however specialized the ultimate outcome is to be, there is always an element of general education or culture in the teaching a university gives."

The Report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, of which President Hutchins was chairman, emphasized the same principle. Speaking of schools of journalism, the Report said: "Most of them devote themselves to vocational training, and even here they are not so effective as they should be. The kind of training a journalist needs is not training in the tricks and machinery of the trade. If he is to be a competent judge of public affairs"—which the Commission previously has said he must be,—"he needs the broadest and most liberal education. The schools of journalism as a whole have not yet successfully worked out the method by which their students may acquire this education."

Professor Ralph Casey and other leaders in education for journalism have vigorously objected to these sweeping indictments—the charges that most of the schools of journalism devote themselves to vocational training, that they give even this training ineffectively; the implications that the schools concentrate on the tricks and machinery of the trade and that they neglect general education. It seems distinctly unfair to criticize schools of journalism for not having worked out the method for giving their students a general education. This criticism might more justly be levelled against the universities, and particularly the colleges of liberal arts, with which the schools of journalism are associated, if the former have not made available a coherent program of general studies. Furthermore, Professor Casey has correctly pointed out that the major part of the work of journalism students is in the liberal arts

curriculum and that this has been the pattern of education for journalism since the very first establishment of the schools. At Minnesota, for example, preparation for a career in journalism is, as the catalogue points out, triple-based: It involves a broad cultural education, a thorough understanding of the social implications and professional responsibilities of a free press, and a fundamental knowledge of journalistic techniques and procedures. In addition to meeting the general requirements which all graduates of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, of which the School of Journalism is a part, must satisfy, the journalism student must plan an advanced program that supplements his specialized courses with extensive work in other fields, particularly the social sciences. According to the catalogue, and according also to practice, about three-fourths of the student's credit hours are devoted to these related fields. I think I can correctly say that education for journalism at Minnesota has been less narrowly specialized than major work in certain old-line academic disciplines.

I hope this pattern of professional education in journalism will be maintained, and in many instances strengthened. As the number of communication agencies and processes with which schools of journalism are concerned grows, and as these agencies and processes become increasingly complex, there will almost certainly be strong temptation to increase specialization and to multiply technical courses, a tendency that characterizes almost any applied field, such as education and social work, or even engineering. Basic knowledge about the communication agencies and practices with which the journalism graduate is professionally concerned is obviously necessary. Furthermore, the attainment of enough technical competence to enable the graduate to perform effectively when he gets a job, is essential and defensible. But to concentrate on technical skills beyond this basic competence would be undesirable, and could be done only at the expense of more general and fundamental professional study or by extending the undergraduate curriculum from four to five years. Such an extension may be desirable, but not for the purpose of expending technical sequences. The new program of accreditation in journalism, with its emphasis on particular vocational sequences, may, if not watched, result not only in increasing specialized work at the expense of broader educational background, both professional and general, but also in narrowing the field of specialization in journalism itself.

Perhaps faculties in journalism will take courage in holding technical training to a necessary minimum by looking to the law schools. The most distinguished of the university law schools do not give extensive instruction in legal practice; in fact, training in the practice of law, in offices or in courts, counts for but a slight part of the curriculum. Perhaps journalism and law are not entirely comparable, but I see no reason why schools of journalism should not expect their graduates to acquire much of their highly particular knowledge and skill through education on the job.

While discussing extent of specialization and emphasis on

technical training, it may be interesting to note that some of the best engineering schools, whose graduates are employed in a complex technology, are reducing the amount and broadening the area of undergraduate specialization, and putting much more stress on basic science and mathematics. Perhaps it is worth noting, too, that at the very moment the practice of medicine is becoming enormously more complicated, the medical schools are strengthening their work in the basic medical sciences, such as bacteriology and physiology. This trend is thoroughly sound, it seems to me; in fact, it is inevitable.

The discussion of the necessarily broad character of professional education in journalism has anticipated the second characteristic which distinguishes professional education in the university. "Specialization will be barren in research and narrowing in education," said the Nuffield Report, "unless it is based on an adequate study of basic sciences and other disciplines."

Those schools of journalism which consider the agencies of communication as social institutions will immediately recognize the cogency of this principle. To the student of communication and communications, the social sciences are not only essential components of general education for all citizens; they are the disciplines basic to his field of specialization in substantially the same fashion that physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology are the foundations upon which the medical studies must be learned. (I might remark in passing that one reason why the student's course in psychiatry in the medical school is often so elementary and unproductive of real insight is that in the past he has ordinarily had so little background in fundamental psychology.) Sociology, economics, political science, including international relations, geography, and psychology are no longer merely desirable in relation to the systematic study of communications, but mandatory. To these one must add intellectual, cultural, and social history, philosophy, language, and literature. Again, let me emphasize that these subjects are not to be looked upon just as desirable elements of general education; they must be recognized as related to the courses that compose the more specific curricula in schools of journalism. Some of these schools already put strong emphasis on these basic and related disciplines. Perhaps none of them, however, has gone as far as it should in this direction. I predict that we will recognize in the near future that professional education in journalism at a high level will take five rather than four years of the student's time.

After observing the development of the Minnesota School of Journalism, I have come to the conviction that it is not only sound but essential to have on the staff of the professional unit itself a number of men whose special interest is in systematic teaching and investigation in journalism and allied communication activities, but who have taken the Doctorate in the disciplines basic and relevant to study and research in the field of communications. I do not propose that these staff members should offer courses, let us say in the basic social sciences, for journalism students. I realize that most professional schools want to offer their own courses in related fields so that they can select what is directly relevant and omit what is only remotely useful, and apply the material immediately to professional subjects. Though this may be justified now and then, there is entirely too much of it in our universities. There are two principal reasons for having, in schools of journalism, faculty members who are trained in the social sciences. One is to enable them to put the agencies and proc-

esses of communication in their appropriate social context and to give them an adequate social and cultural interpretation. The other is to supply necessary background and methods of investigation for research on communications and to provide liaison with related departments and disciplines in conducting cooperative research and instructional programs.

I have now anticipated the next principle stated in the Nuffield Report, which is that university teaching is characteristically given "by scholars and scientists who are themselves working at the frontiers of knowledge—not exclusively, not perhaps predominantly, but to a substantial extent . . . ; an institution in which all the teaching was done by teachers who were not themselves engaged in research would not conform to our idea of a university, even if other non-teaching members of the institution were engaged in research."

This means, I should think, that if a professional school of journalism is to justify its university status, its staff must be engaged in research. This is obvious enough, and I shall not belabor the point. Neither shall I offer much gratuitous advice on the research problems with which the faculties might be engaged. I shall be content with one or two suggestions concerning the nature of the research which seems to me to be most appropriate in a university professional school.

In the first place, I should hope that the number of purely service studies would be limited, even in a state university. Little is to be gained in advancing the profession by wasting a lot of time doing piddling or at least repetitive and routine jobs. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not disparage what may be called applied research. I have done some of it myself, and have directed that kind of research on the part of graduate students. But I have discovered that it is possible to select research problems that have a two-fold reference—to practice on the one hand and to general knowledge, even to fundamental theory, on the other. It is possible, too, to use applied problems to develop or refine methodological tools of wider application. This is the kind of research that not only may be expected to contribute to professional knowledge and method, but also, in the long run, to high-level professional practice. And in their own long-range interest, it is this kind of research rather than that of a more limited though immediately useful service type, that the press and other communication agencies should subsidize.

Perhaps I can illustrate what I have in mind by contrasting with more fundamental investigations the ordinary type of readership study which indicates little more than who read what. Relating facts about reading practice to such factors as age, socio-economic status, educational and intellectual level, membership in various organizations, and such items is a decided advance, but still makes only a small contribution to the improvement of the newspaper's essential function of informing and interpreting. We need to conduct a long series of investigations of methods of presenting important facts and meanings understandably to the mass audience. I have just read another of Carroll Binder's able articles on international affairs in the Sunday Minneapolis Tribune. These articles probably reach only a relatively small number of the paper's readers. How could the same kind of authoritative, informational, interpretive material be prepared so that it would catch the interest, sustain the attention, and present essential ideas so that the ordinary man could understand them, realize their importance, and act accordingly? I doubt that it can be done by the simple method of casting the material into a capsule or two in *Quick*. The task depends on a great deal of knowledge

or reader interests and motives, of the way in which international affairs actually impinge on the lives of the farmers out New Ulm way, of the meanings which words convey in the experience of various readers, of the effect of vocabulary load on comprehension, of the influence of various kinds of compositional structure on understanding, of reader tolerance of statistical data and of the methods of their effective presentation, of the use of example and visual illustration, and many other relevant factors. The newspapers, the radio, and other communication media will have to have the cooperation of the universities, and particularly of schools of journalism, in conducting this kind of research. They seldom have the staff and other facilities to undertake it effectively. So far the commercial organizations which conduct readership studies have made little contribution to the fundamental problem. Furthermore, this kind of fundamental research is the particular province and duty of the university. And it is the sort of research the schools of journalism need to pursue in discharging their responsibility for improving the purpose and processes of communication.

My second suggestion for the development of research in communications is that much of it should and must be conducted as an interdisciplinary enterprise. The research on readership I briefly outlined above may involve the cooperation of research teams drawn from journalism, education, psychology, political science, and possibly other departments. Research in communications undoubtedly involves the pooling of knowledge and method in related fields in the same way that research in social relations is being conducted in interdepartmental laboratories in Harvard, Michigan, Minnesota, and other universities. In planning and prosecuting research in communications, the school of journalism, even the school with a faculty which includes staff members trained in several of the related disciplines, needs the active cooperation of other departments. The journalism faculty should undertake the leadership, but it will ordinarily be insufficient in itself to produce the research that needs to be done.

So far, I have followed the premises set forth in the Nuffield Report. With one of its propositions, however, I do not agree. The Report proposes to divide the responsibility for education in the basic disciplines and that in professional practice between the universities on the one hand and separate technical schools on the other. "The university," said the Report, "is . . . primarily concerned with the task of preparing the mind by relating the purely professional to the purely scientific element in the problem studied. On the other hand, practical training for a limited purpose can be done more economically by an agency different from a university; a wide range of technical schools exists to meet the need, and the main provision must be made, as it always has been made, in the course of practice of the profession or art." The Report suggests that the logical application of this principle might even exclude engineering from the universities—this in spite of the fact that the largest school of engineering in the British universities is at Cambridge.

I have already expressed the opinion that technical courses should comprise only a relatively small part of the entire professional and university curriculum in journalism and that much of the technical training ultimately needed can be secured on the job. But I do not believe that any such sharp separation between fundamental and practical education as that suggested in the Nuffield Report is desirable. In fact, I doubt that it is even possible to make the demarkation as rigidly as the Report apparently proposes. At any rate, I be-

lieve that there are advantages to both parties in the close connection within a university between the fundamental and the applied. Political science might be more dynamic in its emphasis instead of being mainly descriptive in its methods if political theory and the principles of government had been constantly forced to come to terms with the data of political behavior. Economic theory may take a different turn if developed in the light of extensive information about economic activities. It should be possible for the modern university to foster both the fundamental and the applied fields in political science and economics without making theory subservient to political administration or business administration. I believe, then, that fundamental studies can be enriched through their contact with applied fields. Certainly, the latter are almost certain to gain vitality by close association with their basic disciplines and with the creative, cultural, and intellectual spirit of the university.

Speaking at the UNESCO conference on higher education at the University of Utrecht last summer, I said apropos of the conservative English and continental position on the constitution of the universities:

"Here lies a fundamental difference between university education in the United States and in European countries. The state universities and Land-Grant colleges, and to no small degree, the private universities, have been responsive to the needs of a complex industrial society for specialized personnel. From the American point of view, it is desirable to keep these professional curricula within the university for at least two reasons: first, because specialized training at this level should be combined with general education leading to a rich personal life and to intelligent participation in public affairs; and second, because education in the applied sciences and in such professional fields as education, journalism, and social work should be based upon, and should be conducted in close relation with, the disciplines fundamental to them. If specialized training is to rise above mere technology, if it is to be broadly conceived rather than narrowly designed, if it is to be concerned primarily with general principles rather than the details of practice, it needs to be given in a university setting.

"We are rapidly discovering that the same holds true in research. Purely routine research, whether in technical and professional fields, or in the arts and sciences, is out of place in the university. But we ought not to make the mistake of assuming that routine research and applied research are synonymous. Only profound ignorance of the contributions to fundamental knowledge that have been made in recent years in university departments of agriculture and medicine would lead one into that fallacy."

There is another reason why I think many kinds of professional education should be conducted in the atmosphere of the university: That is the more likely way to cultivate high standards of professional integrity and responsibility. I remember that the Commission on the Freedom of the Press took a dim view of the possibility of developing in such fields as the newspaper and the radio a profession comparable to medicine and law, or even teaching, in its ethical ideals and standards of individual practice. "Here," said the Commission, "the writer works for an employer, and the employer, not the writer, takes the responsibility. In the mass media, except at the higher levels of writing, the identity of the individual writer's product tends to be merged in a joint result, as in newspapers, where it is divided among reporters, copy desk, and makeup desk. The effective organization of writers on professional lines is therefore almost impossible."

The Commission continues: "But if professional organization is not to be looked for, professional ideals and attitudes may still be demanded." And it then pointed out that these ideals and attitudes are cultivated by the professional schools of law and medicine, but that "The schools of journalism have not yet accepted this obligation." Again, I believe this sweeping criticism of schools of journalism to be unfair. Certainly those schools which purport to cultivate "a thorough understanding of the social implications and professional responsibilities of a free press" would make a hollow mockery of their educational professions if they did not turn out an increasing number of men and women who will not prostitute their talents to the unworthy or sinister purposes of some publishers or owners or other mass media. I am appalled by the skillful writers—not a large number, relatively, I should think, but too many in any case—who lend their talent and even their names to willful distortion or misrepresentation. There

are many competent practitioners who, though they surely do not condone the methods of their employers, remain unprotesting on their payrolls. The profession will begin to come of age when more or these employees, even though they may not be asked personally to compromise their integrity in assigned tasks, decline to remain with an employer who flouts the standards of honesty and decency and public service in his communication enterprise. I am sure you agree with me that there is no more important responsibility of the school of journalism than to inculcate the highest sense of integrity in graduates, and to do so by every effective method; not merely by preachment, obviously, but by such devices as putting students to the task of evaluating the accuracy, thoroughness, and objectivity with which various media of communication are conducted. There are too few such critical studies flowing from schools of journalism, and their corrective is desperately needed.

READABILITY BY ARITHMETIC

by Charles H. Brown

We Americans will fall for almost anything presented to us as being scientific.

I wonder if we in the newspaper business—pedantic journalism teachers as well as hard boiled publishers—haven't been sold a bill of goods by the scientific hocus-pocus of readability tests.

The readability experts come in with their scientific measurement methods, yardsticks, and formulas, count words endlessly, figure out mathematical ratios and announce authoritatively: "Your copy is rated 'very difficult'; it could be grasped only by college students." Or: "Your copy is rated 'fairly easy'; it could be grasped by persons with a sixth-grade education."

Well, the newspaper publisher whose reporters write copy that could be grasped only by a college graduate knows that such a thing shouldn't be. His newspaper, the readability expert will tell him, could be understood by only 4½ per cent of the adult readers it reaches. And the readability expert—that being his business—comes up with the answer: Use short, simple sentences; avoid big words; use the concrete word rather than the abstract; mention people often.

It's the business of the newspaper publisher, the press association, the advertising agency, or the publicity firm if they want to pay out good money for such advice. I don't quarrel with it. It's good advice. The only thing is that it looks as if everybody should know it anyway.

But there arises a question. Are the yardsticks scientifically right?

The techniques for measuring readability are about the same. In one, you figure out the average number of words a sentence. You count the number of syllables, and get the average per 100 words. You count the mentions of persons and the sentences addressed to the reader. These figures have been correlated with others obtained by educators who have determined by tests given school children that the fourth-grader, for example, can easily understand a sentence with eight or fewer words, while a sentence with 46 words is difficult for even a college graduate. A scale is worked out rang-

ing from very easy (the level of the fourth-grader) to very difficult (the level for the college graduate).

Incidentally, one of the strangest assumptions of the readability experts is that newspaper copy should be written for the seventh- or eight-grade level of education, since this is the average schooling of the American people. I for one don't believe that people stop learning just because they stop going to school at the age of 15 or 16.

As an experiment, I have been led to apply the readability scale of one expert to a well known though not widely read author. In one passage, selected unscientifically at random, the average number of words a sentence was 17.3. The number of suffixes and prefixes used per 100 words was 24. The mathematical score, figured on the expert's scale, was 3.15. According to the scale used, the score is "standard." This means that the passage could be readily understood by a seventh-grade student, the difficulty of the reading material being about on the level with that of a popular digest magazine.

In another passage from the same author, the average number of words a sentence was 14.1 and the number of suffixes and prefixes per 100 words was 23. The score was 2.5, which means the passage was considered "fairly easy" and could be quickly and easily grasped by a sixth-grader.

I submit the "fairly easy" passage:

A violent luck and a whole sample and even then quiet.

Water is squeezing, water is almost squeezing on lard. Water, water is a mountain and it is selected and it is so practical that there is no use in money. A mind under is exact and so it is necessary to have a mouth and eye glasses.

Fairly easy for a sixth-grader? Actually, this passage from Gertrude Stein's *Tender Buttons* couldn't be understood by Einstein working in collaboration with Kant and Hegel. It just doesn't make sense.

Could it be that the readability experts, with their scientific procedures and mathematical formulas, have overlooked a little thing—a little thing like meaning?

Not to mention such inducements to reading as flavor, tone, color, personality?

LAW AND THE NEWSPAPERMAN

by Emanuel Goldberg

It was refreshing and most coincidental to read of the Journalism-Law combination courses now being offered by the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism at the University of Georgia. Just a short time before reading this announcement, I'd prepared the following paragraphs, which emphasize the importance of such a correlation in actual journalism practice.

The deficiencies in our schools of journalism become most apparent when the working reporter, long after student days, suddenly discovers himself "boning up" on this subject or that during his evenings off.

Conspicuous, at least to a beginning Washington correspondent, is the sudden importance of a knowledge of the law, its nature and systems, legal procedure, state and federal aspects, and so forth. Schools of journalism, from my own experience at two good ones and from a perusal of numerous college catalogues, make only a week feint in the direction of recognizing the curriculum importance of legal knowledge as a sound background for the tyro journalist, especially the one who aspires to "cover Washington" or do political reporting on the state and municipal levels. These schools habitually offer an undergraduate course on "The Law of Libel" and possibly a graduate seminar treating the same discipline. The student may find the libel course helpful in developing a worthwhile conditioned reflex for caution and the attitude of 'check-double-check,' but, finally, he reduces it to a matter of common sense. The narrow segment of the whole body of law that a lonely libel course covers will later become ruefully apparent to the student.

The United States has often been accused of being a government of lawyers. As a hasty generalization, this is true. One critic of our system points out that more than two-thirds of the men who've been President were lawyers; the same figure holds for our federal cabinet officers. Since 1865, 72% of the U. S. Senate and 64% of the House of Representatives have been lawyers. Also, since that date, about 58% of our state governors have been lawyers. The lawyer is indeed "at the centre of almost all sources of public discussion."

Aside from the desire to meet politicians on favorable professional terms, the law-oriented newspaperman can respect the seemingly trite importance of committing to memory a glossary of basic legal terms. The reporter who can quickly scan a court decision, dissenting opinion, or his own office files, and who can instantly comprehend such terms as "ad damnum," "deponent," "easement," "intestate," and the remaining jungle of gray, familiar, albeit precise legal terms, will save himself much time and work. This is true not only of political writers, but also of the less sophisticated, less specialized reporters, who daily bump into stories of crime, arrests, litigation, etc.

The first assignment I ever handled in Washington looked like an impossible legal mess to me. The story involved Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland investment banker, who was verbally

and legally sparring with the Securities and Exchange Commission. A U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals verdict of that day, affecting Eaton's Otis & Co. and the SEC, had prompted the news assignment. The abstruse, current verdict, it developed, was only one aspect of an involved picture that could only be properly unraveled and focused by intensive documentation of a much longer background of litigation. Speed was essential. I was fortunate to be able to find some friendly files of past stories in the office, plus a helpful SEC lawyer, and the sitting Circuit Court judge, who happened to be in Washington at the time. However, the momentary terror of being snowballed on a first story by a mass of legal material convinced me that homework was in order for awhile. It might be added that even if there were a plethora of obliging lawyers in Washington (which there are), willing to be called upon for assistance in a pinch, the newsman was not always safe when writing against a deadline.

The Eaton story was a precursor of others. Occasionally, it was possible to bump into a newspaperman in Washington who was also a lawyer. For example, at luncheon one day in the National Press Club, I was surprised by one correspondent for NANA, whom I'd known in the darker days of the China war as a Columbia journalism product, when he related that he'd gone to a Cleveland law school and had passed the bar. As I recall, he counted only the fingers on one hand before he exhausted the names of others in the Washington press corps who were also ex-lawyers. I've omitted my informant's name in this article because he told me that he made it a practice to say very little about his legal antecedents to newspaper friends.

Perhaps with the advent of some expertly-trained legal-journalists who could also fruitfully embrace the study of political economy as an added pursuit in university days, such obstinate beats as the U. S. Supreme Court, so often the silent repository of the truly significant news of the times, whose justices do not now formally grant press interviews, may be cracked wide open with assurance to a responsible press. This might be worthwhile even if it involved an informal accreditation system.

What can be done at present by the academicians to improve things?

One suggestion is that one or two full courses on the general subject of the law be offered in all journalism schools to students who wish to specialize in the reporting of public affairs. Those schools which are fortunate enough to have a law school within their university system might prevail upon law professors to come regularly into the journalism school for lectures on the layman level.

In the latter situation, it is also conceivable that a formal liaison could be effected with the law school so that the newspaper specialist could spend at least one semester (perhaps auditing courses) of four undergraduate years at the law school.

Best of all, but most ambitious, would be for journalism graduates to spend a couple of additional years studying in law school alongside our future legislators, administrators, and judges.

The University of Georgia combination course in journalism and law, as outlined by Dean John E. Drewry, is ideal. It is re-

Mr. Goldberg has been a Washington correspondent for *Newsweek* and has taught journalism at the University of Wisconsin (1946-47). A graduate of Boston University, with an M.A. from the University of Wisconsin, he studied toward a Ph.D. in government at Harvard.

ported that Georgia now offers a six year course leading to two degrees, a bachelor of arts in journalism and a bachelor of laws, with the first year of law school replacing the usual fourth year in journalism.

It will be interesting to study the result of the Georgia ex-

periment and others like it over the course of several years.

I trust the reader has not misinterpreted me. I think we have enough lawyers, especially in public life. But we sorely need someone to disengage the Mumbo Jumbo. And who better than the journalist?

REPORT OF A CONFERENCE

An Analysis of the New York Press Treatment of the Peace Conference at the Waldorf-Astoria

The box score of hits and errors and fouls for the performance of the New York press in covering the famous Waldorf-Astoria Conference is far less exciting than the orgy of synthetic excitement that readers will remember. But the score is worth noting for the record, and Nieman Reports is glad to encourage score-keeping even if it makes dull reading. The author is one the staff of the Center for Research at New York University.

by Henry A. Singer

Last spring, one of the "most controversial meetings in recent New York history," to quote the New York Times, took place at the Waldorf-Astoria. A group of leading American scientists, educators, artists and writers invited their opposite numbers from other parts of the world, including the Soviet Zones, to a World Peace Conference in New York City. Suddenly a week before the conference, the United States State Department condemned the world meeting as communist-inspired and refused visas to many delegates—both communist and non-communist—primarily from Western Europe. The effect was immediate and within a few hours, a series of provocative events began to take place.

The newspaper account of the conference ran from sweeping sensationalism to a running battle between the conference sponsors and the press. The controversy became so heated, the issues so critical, that a rational analysis of the news treatment of the conference seemed inevitable. Now, a few months after the conference, objective evaluation may be possible.

This is a preliminary analysis of the events that were reported by the metropolitan press during the days preceding and following the Peace Conference at the Waldorf, the weekend of March 27, 1949. The project was expanded into a major study through the aid of Professor Louis E. Raths, director of the Center for Research at New York University in which organization the writer has been employed.

This study involved some sixty editions of the nine metropolitan papers covering the period, Wednesday, March 23, 1949 to Wednesday, March 30, 1949. The papers studied were the New York Times, Herald Tribune, Post-Home News, Sun, World-Telegram, Brooklyn Eagle, Daily News, Daily Mirror, and the Journal-American.

In setting up the criteria for a content analysis on the New York Press Treatment of the Peace Conference one soon discovers how many discrepancies and limitations there are in the field of the media analysis itself. This writer drew rather heavily upon Dr. Clyde Miller's material from the Institute of Propaganda Analysis. Doctor Miller had set up a criteria for propaganda which included seven categories. They were: NAME CALLING (serving to discredit by attaching labels),

ROSEY GLOW (attaching socially approved words in news accounts to the editorial position of paper), TESTIMONIALS (by using recognized social leaders to testify for or against position or issue it tends to influence public opinion), TRANSFER (by using popular symbols to obtain quick acceptance or rejection of idea, person, practice, group or cause), CARD STACKING (over or under emphasis), PLAIN FOLKS (using popular, socially accepted clichés and phrases and attaching them to editorial position), BANDWAGON (creating the impression that the editorial position of the paper is universal or majority position). It was felt by the writer that the foregoing together with words that relate to violence, force or coercion beyond the evidence, would constitute emotionally charged words or phrases for the purpose of this analysis.

The frequency of such emotionally charged words or phrases in a news story would indicate considerable editorial coloring of news reporting. By taking the frequency of emotionally charged words or phrases, the number of verifiable inaccuracies of facts, the number of unsupported charges made against individuals or critical issues without including reliable source or evidence, and by analyzing the dominant slant of the article, i.e. pickets, violence, conference proper, etc. we can apply the pro-con-neutral classification to the article itself.

A breakdown was set up for every paper, each day of the period under observation. There were eight basic items in each paper, plus such additional items as feature columns, articles by feature writers and letters to the editor. These last three were included with the editorial classification. Wherever more than one secondary article was included within a classification that category was increased in weight proportionately. The unsupported charges against individuals and critical issues were included as were all verifiable inaccuracies.

The items under Dominant Slant ran as follows: Picketing (P), Violence (V), Personalities (PE), Conference Proper (CP), Incidents (I), Counter Rally (CR), State Department Announcement (SD), Russia (R), Freedom of Press (FP), National Association of Manufacturers Invitation (NAM), General (G).

Perhaps the peak coverage was reached by the New York

Journal-American in its Saturday edition, March 26, 1949. Here is a breakdown of that issue:

	Emot'y. Charged Words or Phrases	Unsupported Charges	Dominant Slant	Verifiable Inaccuracies	Pro, Con, or Neutral
Feature Headline	2		I		C
Feature Story	8	6	I	4	C
Secondary Head.	5	1	1 CR 1 PE 1 CP		3 C
Secondary Stories	19	9	1 CR 2 CP		3 C
Editorial	8	3	P		C
Editorial Cartoon	1		R		C
Pictures			5 PE 4 P		1 P 7 C 1 N
Captions	19	2	5 PE 4 P	2	9 C
Totals	62	21	2 I 2 CR 3 CP 1 R 9 P 11 PE	6	26 C 1 N 1 P

Here we see out of twenty-eight items in the issue, twenty-six were unfavorable, one was neutral and one favorable. The news treatment was slanted predominantly upon personalities and the picketing (eleven and nine respectively). The investigator discovered twenty-seven unsupported charges and verifiable inaccuracies and in all, there were sixty-two emotionally charged words or phrases in this one edition.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the newspaper treatment of the peace conference is the influence of the pre-conference treatment in creating the bizarre atmosphere itself. This was commented upon by Don Hollenbeck of *CBS Views the Press*, Saturday, April 2, 1949 at 6:15 p.m. He pointed out the wide disparity between the call for 100,000 pickets made by the *Journal-American* and the actual turnout of something less than a thousand. It is significant that some of the pickets carried the front pages of the *World-Telegram* and the *Journal-American* and one might speculate as to what extent the pickets would have turned out even in the few hundred numbers they did if the papers themselves hadn't sounded the clarion call for the demonstration but had instead buried the story of the conference or treated it as a straight news story.

The *Journal-American* spearheaded this campaign headlining on Thursday, March 24th and again on Friday, the 25th, the announcement that 100,000 pickets would demonstrate. The *Brooklyn Eagle* and *World-Telegram* were next with 50,000 pickets. The *Daily News* and *Mirror* promised tens of thousands and the *Post* and *Sun* indicated that mass picketing would begin Friday. The *Times* and *Tribune* more conservatively estimated 1000's would be expected.

On Saturday several papers began revising these sweeping estimates. Whereas the *Mirror* claimed in a 6-column bold face, page two headline that there had been 9000 demonstrators, further along in the story it was reported that only

800 were actually pickets while the others were sympathetic crowds across the street from the Waldorf. By 7 p.m., Friday, the *Mirror* claimed there were over 200 pickets. The *News*, calling the demonstration the greatest since VE and VJ day, went on to report that the demonstrators were 150 in number by 6 p.m. and 550 by 7:45 Friday.

The *Eagle* said the picketing started with 30 and reached its height with 400 at noon on Friday. The *Post*, whose Editor was a sponsor of the Conference, reported the demonstration began with 50 and reached its maximum with 850 by noon according, they noted, to police estimates. The *Post* reporter himself observed that there were only a few hundred pickets. The *Tribune* reported the picketing began with a handful and reached 800 by noon. They estimated 3550 by 7 p.m. and listed a police estimate of 2000 by 8 p.m. The *Times* indicated the maximum by day was 500 and by night 1000. The *Times* reporter went on to add that it was "less than a 1000 . . . closer to a few hundred."

The investigator by reason of his attendance at some of the scenes was able to observe directly the accuracy of the reporting, especially the numerical items since they were easily verifiable.

The keynote session of the conference was held at Carnegie Hall, Saturday morning, March 26. This writer observed the proceedings from 9:30 a.m. before the session began to 12:40 p.m. when it ended. At 10:10 as this observer went inside the hall they were by actual count 26 pickets and 16 uniformed patrolmen. At 11:45 when the writer was in the lobby he counted 35 pickets and 22 policemen in front. At 12:45 when the hall emptied there were no additions to the picketline although a crowd of some three hundred had gathered across 57th Street watching the demonstration.

Only one newspaper was close. This was the *Brooklyn Eagle*. The *Eagle* reported 35 pickets at Carnegie Hall in its feature Sunday story. However, somewhere along in the story a figure of 200 was given for the number of demonstrators. The *Post* reported 100 pickets of an expected 300. The *News* 200 to 400. The *Times* claimed it began with 65 and worked up to 250. The *Tribune* listed 300 pickets and the *Journal-American* unwilling to recant on its sweeping predictions estimated that the pickets ran in the thousands.

On the other side, the press was far less generous with the number of delegates in attendance. Whereas the claims of the pickets ran far in excess of the actual numbers, the listing of the delegates in attendance at the conference was far below the actual attendance.

The *Eagle*, *Post*, *Journal-American* and the *News* listed 1500 in attendance inside Carnegie Hall. The *Times* said the hall was filled to its capacity, 2700. The House Manager of the hall stated to this writer that every seat was occupied according to each section's chief usher's report. The House holds 2840. It was this observer's estimate that there were from 75 to 150 standees. It is to be noted that with the exception of the *Times*, almost all the other papers halved the number in attendance at the keynote session. There were many other discrepancies in the reporting of the keynote session.

The *News* showed a photograph of Dmitri Shostokovitch in its March 27th Sunday edition addressing the keynote session at Carnegie Hall. Although Shostokovitch was at Carnegie Hall he did not at any time speak.

The *Eagle* reported what Professors Schumann and Fedeyov said at Carnegie Hall. However, neither one of these gentlemen spoke and Professor Schumann was not even in attendance.

The *Journal-American* reported and quoted the speeches at Carnegie Hall of Dr. Guy Shieler, Dr. Keniston, Professor Warne, John Howard Lawson and Victor Bernstein. These men were neither listed nor did they appear at the keynote session. The *Journal-American* then went on to report that a resolution was passed calling for support of the 11 top Communist leaders on trial in Federal Court. No resolutions were discussed, mentioned or acted upon and the only reference to the communist leaders' trial was an oblique one by one of the speakers.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the press treatment is the disparity between points made in the reporting and the distortions in the editorials by the papers.

The *World-Telegram*, for example, in its feature story of March 26 reported that Doctor Shapley, "apparently struck the keynote of the conference with his 'plague on both houses' talk. Two of the speakers, O. John Rogge, former Assistant U. S. Attorney-General and Ted O. Thackery, publisher of the *New York Post Home News*, had criticism for both sides."

The *Sun* had an 8 Column, 2 inch Bold Face Banner Headline claiming, "SHAPLEY CRITICIZES SOVIET." Yet the editorials of these papers blasted the conference as one-sided and Soviet controlled. The *World-Telegram* further presented this novel observation in its editorial of March 26: "... the Russians in addition to raising hell generally, also raise a lot of beets for borscht. But frankly how can you get culture from a beet?"

In several of the feature columns and editorials, attempts were made to establish complete guilt by association alone. The *Mirror* appeared most forceful in this connection. In its editorials of March 23rd and 24th, it cited Thomas Mann, Dr. Harlow Shapley, F. P. Adams, Louis Untermeyer, Howard Fast, Langston Hughes, John Lardner, Donald Ogden Stewart, Dalton Trumbo, Dashiell Hammett, Ira Hirschmann, Leonard Bernstein, W. E. B. DuBois, Arthur Schwabel, O. John Rogge, Dr. Robert Lynd, Max Weber, John Sloan, Dr. Theodore Roseburger, Herman Shumlin, Helen Tamaris, Canada Lee, Arthur Miller, Mary Van Kleeck, Artie Shaw as "American Stooges" and a "bunch of woozy Americans" who fixed up a "propaganda show at the Waldorf." "We say, throw the bums out . . . We don't want them. We don't like them. We intend to insult them too, if you like . . . The Constitution gives us the right to decide each one for himself who is an enemy of his country."

The *News* in its March 24th and March 29th editorials noted that the personalities previously mentioned were "U. S.-born stooges" and "U. S. Communist fellow travelers" and as "having sympathies openly on the Red side of the world conflict."

On March 28th, in the face of the newspaper accounts already indicated, the *Herald Tribune* considered in its editorial that the affair had been covered by "The sober and factual accounts of the reporters." And they added that an "atmosphere of outrageous burlesque hangs over the whole proceedings." It is interesting that the *Herald Tribune* took this editorial position on the 28th, when on the 26th of March, in its editorial of that day it commented that "Picketing is understandable . . . and it is not to be expected that Americans will always respond with sweet reasonableness and broadminded tolerance, or only choose the most practical methods of making their protests heard." It would appear that the Conservative *Herald Tribune*, along with its less conservative competitors, the *News* and *Mirror*, as already cited, preferred a more blatant and violent type of demonstration.

It was Mrs. Roosevelt, in her column of March 29th in the *New York World-Telegram*, who wrote, "The reports in the

newspapers during the last few days on the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace and the counter rally of the Americans for Intellectual Freedom seemed to me rather depressing.

"I cannot understand why, in the first place, we had to exclude certain people from coming to this country for the so-called peace rally . . .

"I wish we had treated the 'peace' meeting more casually, not giving it so much prominence, answered what needed to be answered, and send people back to their various countries with a realization of what freedom means to us and with a conviction that we really are not afraid of facing their ideas and finding our own more worth while."

As much of the analysis is still in process final evaluation will have to wait. However, using the equal weight items one can give some preliminary trends. The following chart depicts some basis for these generalizations:

	Words or Phrases Emot'ly. Charged	Unsupported Charges	Verifiable Inaccuracies	Total Items		
				Con	Neutral	Pro
Times	47	10	6	37	41	5
Tribune	119	11	6	53	13	10
Sun	120	15	12	60	5	1
Post	21	4	3	41	26	1
World-Telegram	110	7	4	55	0	4
Brooklyn Eagle	103	25	10	31	20	7
Journal-American	295	70	51	94	8	0
Mirror	192	49	16	60	11	0
News	83	14	31	37	18	0

This chart represents total items (Headline, Feature Story, 2nd Headlines, Secondary Articles, Editorials, Editorial Cartoons, Pictures and Captions) and total for the period between March 23rd and March 30th. It does not include length of items, placement of qualitative weighting. The lower numbers for the *News*, *Sun*, *Telegram* and *Mirror* do not reflect a true picture since the *Times*, *Tribune* and *Eagle* devoted at least 2 to 3 times as much space to the conference. The *Post*, *Times* and the *Eagle* made the greatest attempt to be objective with the edge to the *Times* and *Eagle* since they gave more space than the *Post*.

This article is only an initial draft of a study in progress. It is possible that some shifts will occur in subsequent rescoring and evaluation. One should be cautious in stating which of the papers were more or less distorted until a depth analysis is completed. If one generalization can be made it would be in the overall area of accuracy and bias. Of the latter every paper was guilty to some degree. As for the former, no paper had less than three. The *New York Post*, and the *Journal-American* had as many as 51 verifiable inaccuracies and misstatements.

In any event the people of New York who did not attend the conference but learned about it through the newspapers and the radio in no case received a clear or accurate account. The public in fact, in most cases, received rather distorted and slanted articles and in some cases, pure fabrications. The implications are quite sweeping when one considers the total impact of the *New York* press and news services upon national and international media and thought.

Letters

Integrity in the News

To the Editor:

The discussion of the professional standards of journalism in the October issue of *Nieman Reports* was of particular interest to me. I was quite pleased to see that your youthful magazine is taking a firm grip on the fundamentals of our craft and holding them up to inspection. Better understanding among like minds is bound to result. Effects will be beneficial not only to veterans who have wrestled with the problem themselves but to newcomers who have yet to form their own basic standards of ethics.

The problem with me is entirely personal. Some two years ago the United Press saw fit to appoint me overnight cable editor. The task is to lay down by 8 a.m. a foreign news report which will meet the needs of afternoon client editors for their early editions. Our clients' tastes vary from the sensational to the rigidly conservative.

In this day of hot and cold wars, big and little, there is the temptation to appeal to the prejudices of the western world as opposed to those of the Soviet world. I have cause for suspicion that the editors who use our service would in the majority like it that way. The nut of the problem is the responsibility to present the story objectively. "The issue is whether it goes into the paper straight," you say.

Reston's remarks on the difficulty of reporting foreign policy sum up the case. For a wire service there must be a delicate balance of the "exciting" and the "dreary" without distorting or emasculating the basic story. We place our dispatch in the hands of the editor with no guarantee that it will see the light of print. It must conform to his needs as well to our own standards of professional integrity and good reporting. In a sense it can be said that a wire service dispatch is submitted for consideration to the editor much in the same way an article or a story is submitted to a magazine. His is the decision to print or discard.

Discussion of this phase of integrity in the news will help acquaint editors with the problem their wire services face in trying to present them with dispatches dealing adequately with intricate international situations. Woodress' article on

"Objectivity in Foreign News Reporting" indicates some confusion in the field.

I believe editors are intensely interested in seeing their problems discussed in print and learning what the other fellow has to say. The lack up to now has been a publication devoted to this field. I certainly hope your magazine will grow and find its way into the hands of every editor and potential editor in the United States, down to the man with only 5,000 circulation to inform and entertain.

Good luck and my best personal regards.

Woodrow Jarvis
234 East 39th Street
New York City 16

Trials and Libel

To the Editor:

Next to *The New Yorker* magazine, the *Nieman Reports* is getting to be my favorite journal of opinion.

In regard to Alan Barth's most considerate and tender piece entitled "Trial by Newspaper" in your last issue, I would suggest that someone take a look at the impact of libel laws on this subject. A myth exists among the American people, and more particularly among newspaper owners, that any quote from any bit of testimony in any court room or before any Congressional committee, is privileged. This just is not so in most jurisdictions. Of course, it would be much better if newspapers could be reformed from within, but as I see the situation the trend is in quite the opposite direction, namely: give the public what it wants, look for the lowest common denominator, fall for the Roper-Gallup polling bunk, etc. There is very little news left in newspapers space-wise. You have no doubt seen the latest figures showing that advertisement accounts for 60% to 80% of the space and that the percentage of advertising is increasing. Of the remaining space left for so-called news a high percentage is, of course, not news in the strict sense but falls into the entertainment field. In other words, it is not given over to the reporting of events that have happened recently. Sometimes, unfortunately, legal sanctions are of value to society for correcting social evils.

I wish you would have someone do a piece on the law of libel in relation to the issues raised by Alan Barth. At the same time someone might do a good job on the inadequacy of the newspaper reporting of the courts and the legal processes. I was amused to note that after months of trial in the Communist case,

where the entire theory of the case was predicated on the danger of secret words as distinguished from public speech, and where the Judge's charge took cognizance of the fact that the defendants were operating underground—more or less like an iceberg with only one-seventh above water—how practically every newspaper screamed that the decision would drive the Party underground. I was particularly delighted to see Russell Porter's piece in the *Times*, which represented the first intelligent discussion in New York City of the legal principles involved.

Congratulations on the job your magazine is doing.

Morris L. Ernst
New York City

Intelligent and Practical

To the Editor:

Herewith my check in amount of \$4.00, covering a two-year renewal of my subscription to *Nieman Reports*.

Nieman Reports is the most intelligent and practical method to promote the continuous and beneficial results in the science of journalism, and I offer you my sincere congratulations and best wishes for its continued success.

F. L. Mays
1808 Petroleum Building
Houston 2, Texas

Improves

To the Editor:

Nieman Reports improves with each issue, and I derive much pleasure and satisfaction from every copy. Congratulations on a fine job, and all good wishes for continued success.

By all means, renew my subscription.

Hannah R. Bloom
2647 Halldale Avenue
Los Angeles, Calif.

For Lecturers and Seminars

I find *Nieman Reports* very useful in lectures and in seminar. I feel that they contain more pertinent information and opinion on modern newspaper work than any other single publication.

Please accept my congratulations on the high calibre of the job you are doing.

Everton Conger
Department of Journalism
University of New Mexico

The Guild and Education

To the Editor:

When I read Norval Neil Luxon's "The Guild and Education," I recognized that this was, no doubt, something a little different from the old (as old as the Newspaper Guild) "professional" anti-Guild argument. I recall, for example, in the Guild's early days, when the New York Guild was up to its neck in a strike for its life, the irritating question of a certain self-proclaimed Lover of Labor. In a public address he praised the Guild with, as it were, one hand and with the other added, "I would like to know what the American Newspaper Guild has done to improve the professional competence of the members for whom it speaks?" (It had done nothing.)

Well, I think the gentleman was a fraud, as much of a fraud as the publishers who in those days also asked that question, being very eager to transform the Guild into a brotherhood which would interest itself in education—or anything else except the business of getting newspaper people better pay and hours.

In those days—I know, for I was the strike chairman—the Guild, in New York at least, was too busy with life-and-death matters to have any energy left for education, and the gentleman knew it. And he also knew that, willy nilly, the Guild was, to all practical intents, barred from doing a school of journalism job—which might produce highly trained potential reporters but could not bring them to the stage of holding down a reporter's job. For it was the publishers who had—and still have—the sole say on hiring, and then as now they did not hire people with a Guild background.

I can see that Professor Luxon's gripe does not have that motive. He seems to be sincerely upset by the Guild's failure to do an educational job. But he shouldn't be. There are other organizations, as close to the newspaper industry as the Guild is, which do not indulge in education. For example, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, which really could do a job! A diploma from an ANPA sponsored school could just about guarantee a young graduate a job (something much to be desired). The same from a Guild school of journalism could only be its own reward. But somehow no one seems to ask what the ANPA has done to improve the professional competence of the people whom its members hire.

Aside from this argument ad hominem, let's see. HAS the Guild ignored pro-

fessional education? My own experience is less at the convention level and more in the Guild and in the newspaper shops. And here I find that the answer is far from a complete negative. For instance:

During the early years of the late war, NY newspapers found themselves suddenly in a position where, because of the drafting of young reporters, they had to do some rush hiring. In almost no time, every city editor had a flock of strange cubs: girls fresh out of schools of journalism, high school graduates with a 4-F rating, ex-secretaries and limping ex-publicity men. They had one thing in common: a minimum knowledge of newspaper work and no knowledge at all of the newspaper's own routines. In my own shop (the Brooklyn Eagle), this problem was met by the Guild unit which set up its own class in journalism, continued it for many months with an attendance of almost 100 per cent and disbanded it only when it was generally agreed that its purpose, of giving the newcomers a substantial degree of professional skill, had been achieved.

Before, during and since the war, the Newspaper Guild of New York conducted voluntary classes in commercial as well as a great variety of editorial subjects. Hundreds, who paid nominal registration fees, attended each year and some reported that they attributed their subsequent promotions to their Guild schooling.

While I have first-hand knowledge only of the New York Guild, I am certain that like instances could be found in other local Guilds.

In addition let me cite this. Like Professor Luxon, but to a lesser extent, I have had some school of journalism experience. As of now I am listed as a journalism instructor of Long Island University—whose Journalism Department, incidentally, is made up almost exclusively of working newspapermen and Guild members.

Only a union like, for example, the Typographers, with its closed shop contracts or their equivalent, can undertake to do a real education job. For there a young fellow has to qualify for union membership before he can get a job and his printing education is part of his prerequisites for both.

But the Guild does not even think of a future with conditions like that. It can't. Because it is bound to a concept of freedom of the press which includes the right of the publishers to express

what they want by hiring whom they please to express it. Any minimum standards of competence required—by the Guild—for hiring would be an interference with that right, which we must need shy away from.

It adds up to this: That the publishers maintain their freedom-of-the-press to hire even incompetents and the Guild cannot stop them.

J. Kaufman
Brooklyn Eagle

"The Character of the Newspaper Job"

To the Editor:

Just a word to say how much I enjoyed the article, "The Character of the Newspaper Job," in the latest Nieman Reports. It said, with happy clarity, many of the thoughts I have had about education for journalism, especially in regard to mature training in the studies of economics, government and history.

A. Lawrence MacKenzie
Assistant Sunday Editor, Boston Post

To the Editor:

I was delighted with "The Character of the Newspaper Job" in the current issue of Nieman Reports. It is superb, and heartening to have evidence that there are reporters and editors who will fight for standards. I am going to borrow some of this material when I appear at the Sigma Delta Chi convention in Dallas, November 18, on a panel, "The Challenge to Editors."

I was delighted to see Erne Linford's editorial reprinted and I intend to send it to all Colorado editors.

A. Gayle Waldrop, Director
College of Journalism
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

To the Editor:

I wrote you a week or more ago that I liked your piece, "The Character of the Newspaper Job," in the October Nieman Reports so well that I intended quoting it liberally in the next issue of The Quill of Sigma Delta Chi. I also said I'd send proof and here it is.

It might interest you to know that Gayle Waldrop, director of the University of Colorado College of Journalism, beat me to you. In the course of a panel debate of journalistic ethics before some 250 or more delegates from undergraduate and professional chapters, he quoted you even more extensively and to very good purpose.

Carl Kesler
Editor, The Quill

Book Reviews

REPORTING: PAST AND PRESENT

by Murrey Marder

A TREASURY OF GREAT REPORTING, edited by Louis L. Snyder and Richard B. Morris. Simon & Schuster. New York. \$5.00. 784 pp.

"Personally, I don't think reporting is as good now as it used to be. To this perhaps dogmatic and nostalgic generalization there are some notable and distinguished exceptions . . . (but) reporters are not so resourceful today as they used to be."—Herbert Bayard Swope, in his preface to *A Treasury of Great Reporting*.

"For several years the editors have lived in the company of great reporting and have found no evidence indicating that the art is senescent . . . Today reporters write with greater subtlety and depth than did most of their predecessors."—Louis L. Snyder and Richard B. Morris, the editors of *A Treasury of Great Reporting*.

These two conflicting opinions have probably been voiced, in varying form, wherever newspapermen have gathered to ruminate over the past after the last edition has gone to press:

"There were giants in those days. We'll never see reporters like that again." "Thank God!" cries out a young, irreverent voice in the rear.

Ward Greene in his collection of outstanding news stories, *Star Reporters and 34 of Their Greatest Stories* (Random House, 1948), agreed with Swope's view.

"Better when?" Greene asked himself rhetorically. "Why, when reporters, not rewrite men, wrote them. When reporters had hours in which to write, not minutes between editions. When editors gave greater appreciation and more space to good writing. Before Hollywood, the slick magazines, public relations and other inventions more lucrative than reporting had drained talent from the city room. Before the cult of the camera—'one picture is worth a thousand words.'"

Most "old timers," and a sizeable proportion of the contemporary generation of reporters, probably side with Swope and Greene. It is of interest, therefore, when two men who might be considered impartial "outsiders" add their arguments to the debate.

In *A Treasury of Great Reporting*, Snyder, an associate professor of history at

the College of the City of New York, and Morris, professor of history at Columbia University, declare:

"True, for bravura reporting few of the present generation can equal a Victor Hugo, a Russell, a Forbes, or a Richard Harding Davis. Nor do the current run of stories sound quite the lurid note of the effusions of the roaring twenties. . .

"The cheering news is that rhetorical pyrotechnics and raucous sentimentality are disappearing from the better grade of news stories. Today reporters write with greater subtlety and depth than did most of their predecessors. They are better grounded in scientific and technical matters. They have better linguistic equipment when working in foreign countries, and they have by no means lost the touch for finding the social pulsebeat in their stories."

In an extensive anthology, the editors present a panorama of reporting: newspaper reporting, some examples from news magazines and reporting books, a sprinkling of radio reporting and a few examples of picture reporting—embracing the period from the 16th century to 1949.

Unfortunately, the editors have short-changed their own argument in this ambitious work, so that the contrast between "then" and "now" is not nearly so clear as it might be.

Their "Treasury" has already encountered general criticism on this score, which particularly detracts from this worthy collection: while making a sincere effort to depict the best reporting of all-time in major categories, they have somehow almost completely ignored political and economic reporting in all their forms—local, state, national and international.

Can it be that none of this ranks with "great reporting?" In the post-World War II period, these two categories of reporting have wrought what is surely the greatest change in the appearance of modern daily newspapers. In hundreds of cities the news of fast-breaking political and economic developments have shoved off the front page what used to be top-play news of crime, sex, and minor disaster.

Whether that is good or bad for the

American press is a major subject in itself, but it does point up the question, "What is great reporting?"

Editors Snyder and Morris boldly set out their studied view of this delicate issue:

"To begin with, great reporting must reveal perception, disclose its creator to be the possessor of 'the seeing eye and the hearing ear' capable of discerning the deeper implication in the chance event he has witnessed. . . .

The reporter must be constantly on the alert to question, to challenge, to probe. His acute powers of observation must be implemented by that X factor—the detective instinct. . . .

"The reporter must be prepared to take risks, to stay at his post of danger, and at times to operate on his last reserves of adrenalin. . . ."

Most reporters will smile at the deriding-do aspects of this portion of the definition and say, "That's a large order."

But reporters generally will agree that the definition thus far is not inexact. There will be far more debate over the remainder of the evaluation:

"Once the reporter has determined what is true by sifting the evidence and discarding the false, there is no continuing obligation on his part to remain neutral. The great reporter is a partisan for the truth. The great reporter has a social conscience. In this book the great reporters are not neutral."

That brings us to that great, round word, "objectivity," which has probably been weighed and debated ever since the first word was placed on copy paper.

How far should a reporter go in interpreting what he sees? Is there such a thing as complete objectivity? If so, is it worth striving for? Should the reporter merely report what he sees and hears, even though he knows what he is told is false? Is it true that the great reporters are not neutral or is it that facts are not neutral? And so on, ad confusion.

The farther back we dip into reporting history, the clearer it is that reporters then were not neutral. They made, no pretense about their non-neutrality; the issue is frequently faced less honestly in contemporary work.

Editor Isaiah Thomas, reporting the Battle of Lexington in the May 3, 1775 issue of the Massachusetts *Spy*, wrote:

AMERICANS! forever bear in mind the BATTLE OF LEXINGTON!—where British troops, unmolested and unprovoked, wantonly and in a most inhuman manner, fired upon and killed a number of our countrymen, then robbed, ransacked, and burnt their houses!"

Over the story was the streamer: AMERICANS- LIBERTY OR DEATH! JOIN OR DIE!

To prove that newspapering has not changed as much as many of us believe, the Scripps-Howard newspapers last November employed Editor Thomas' technique with banners over page one appeals, shouting: ANGUS WARD ALIVE—OR ELSE.

Readers of *A Treasury of Great Reporting* will probably be struck by more significant similarities between past and present reporting. Many of us are familiar with the lush, descriptive prose style—and what modern editors would call the "buried leads"—employed by such great reporters as Henry Morton Stanley, who saved his discovery of Livingstone for his final paragraphs.

But relatively few readers probably realize that many reporters of the past also wrote in "modern" straightforward style, employing adjectives sparingly.

Henry Villard, reporting Lincoln's departure from Springfield in 1861 for the *New York Herald*, wrote, in a manner which should endear him to sentence-analyst Dr. Fleisch:

Springfield, Illinois, February 11—President-elect Lincoln, accompanied by his lady and a number of friends, left his hotel at half-past seven a.m. and rode up to the Great Western depot. Over a thousand persons of all classes were assembled in the depot building and on each side of the festivity-decorated special train to bid farewell to their honored townsman. The President-elect took his station in the waiting room and allowed his friends to pass by him and take his hand for the last time. His face was pale and quivered with emotion so deep as to render him almost unable to utter a single word. . .

Among numerable examples of the same technique was the *New York World's* account, on August 29, 1901 of Carry Nation's trek to Manhattan:

Here is what Carry Nation did during a six-hour stay on Manhattan Island yesterday:

Lester Grant Wins Westinghouse

The George Westinghouse Award for the best science writing in a newspaper in 1949 went to Lester Grant for his series on cancer in the *New York Herald Tribune*. Grant was a Nieman Fellow studying science and medicine in 1948. Three of the eight Westinghouse prizes since the awards were instituted have gone to Nieman Fellows. The other two were to Frank Carey of the Associated Press and Steven M. Spencer of the *Saturday Evening Post*. An honorable mention this time went to Herbert Yahraes, also a Nieman Fellow, for his *Harper's* article, "How to Keep Away from the Dentist."

Gave Police Commissioner Murphy the most uncomfortable quarter of an hour in his life.

Scared Chief Devery into dodging her. Gave John L. Sullivan a bad attack of the frights.

Kept Acting Mayor Guggenheimer in a state of nervous agitation.

Had a row with her manager and left town as happy as a lark.

With a two-foot hatchet strapped to the girdle under her linen jacket, her beaded black poke bonnet pushed down firmly on her head, her broad jaw set at its most pugnacious angle, the Smasher strode into Colonel Murphy's room at Headquarters at eleven a.m., plumped into a chair close to him, and in ringing tones demanded:

Don't you think New York is an awful bad place?

Yet in that same era, the *New York Journal's* famed James Creelman and others were writing in what we generally think of as the style of the period. Creelman, later to lead a bayonet charge up a Santiago hill and capture a Spanish flag for the glory of the *Journal* and W. R. Hearst, wrote in 1898:

Wheeler's Headquarters at the Front, June 28, by the *Journal's* Dispatch boat Simpson to Kingston, June 30—We are almost ready for the last dread scene of agony on the intrenched green slopes that guard the doomed Santiago . . .

No man who has not gone over this trail, no man who was not in the terrible downpour of rain which drenched our army to the skin this afternoon, can understand the suffering of our troops and the heroism with which

they bore it . . .

In many respects, Villard's story of Lincoln, the Carry Nation report, and other examples of reporting, appear to have more in common with modern style than do more recent examples.

For illustration, Herbert Bayard Swope's famous account reporting his cracking of the Rosenthal-Becker case in the *New York World* of October 27, 1912, began:

"Herman Rosenthal has squealed again."

Through the pallid underworld the sibilant whisper ran. It was heard in East Side dens; it rang in the opium houses in Chinatown; it crept up to the seimpretentious stuss and crap games of the Fourteenth Street region, and it reached into the more select circles of uptown gambling where business is always good and graft is always high.

Rosenthal had squealed once too often . . .

An almost identical style was still in vogue two decades later, as in Jack Lait's memorable account of the killing of John Dillinger, serviced by International News Service on July 23, 1934:

John Dillinger, ace bad man of the world, got his last night—two slugs through his heart and one through his head. e was tough and he was shrewd, but he wasn't as tough and shrewd as the Federals, who never close a case until the end. It took twenty-seven of them to end Dillinger's career, and their strength came out of his weakness—a woman. . . .

As another facet of the indication that in reporting as in women's clothes, there are recurring styles, there is the highly personalized form of reporting—the reporter employing his own experiences as a vehicle for his story.

A prime example of this, out of the past, is Winston Churchill's report to Pearson's *Illustrated War News*, of his escape from the Boers at Pretoria:

Lourenco Marques, December 21, 10 p.m.—I was concealed in a railway truck under great sacks.

I had a small store of good water.

I remained hidden, chancing discovery.

The Boers searched the train at Komati Poort, but did not search deep enough, so after sixty hours of misery I came safely here.

I am very weak, but I am free.

I have lost many pounds, but I am lighter in heart.

Then, in the next sentence, the Wins-

ton Churchill we know, of World War II days, comes shining through, and you can almost see his heavy black cigar pointing the way:

I shall also avail myself of every opportunity from this moment to urge with earnestness and unflinching an uncompromising prosecution of the war . . .

World Wars I and II brought us many examples of this personal type of writing. Larry Allen's Pulitzer Prize-winning account of the sinking of the Galatea was typical of many.

As for "human," deep-moving accounts of news, *A Treasury of Great Reporting* offers such brilliantly-told stories as George Weller's Pulitzer Prize report of an appendectomy performed aboard a submarine in 1942.

That well-remembered story in the

Chicago Daily News might be very favorably compared to Sergeant Alexander Woolcott's famous story of Verdun Belle, "a trench dog," reported in the *Star and Stripes* of 1918.

Other contrasts are ready for the making: Bill Laurence on the Nagasaki bombing vs. H. G. Wells' account of the first tanks, which revolutionized ground warfare; Rebecca West's version of the Nuremberg trials vs. Irvin S. Cobb's memorable report of the trial of Harry Thaw, and so on.

What, then, of the answer? Is present reporting, worse, better, or equal to the past?

The readers bold enough to reply are no more likely to agree among themselves than the reporters who debate, "What is great reporting?"

It probably depends on where you sit.

The Solid South

by Clark R. Mollenhoff

SOUTHERN POLITICS, by V. O. Keys, Jr. Alged A. Knopf. \$6.00. 675 pp.

V. O. Keys, Jr., has unmasked the politics of 11 southern states in a scholarly analysis of race relations and political institutions.

Southern Politics is a 675-page study that combines an interesting presentation with statistical support. The "Solid South" is broken down into 11 state units with unique personalities.

In this state-by-state analysis, Keys has filled his work with humor, personality and an abundance of facts. He has covered the field from the "dignified machine" in Virginia to the demagogues of Louisiana, Mississippi and Georgia.

In pointing out the evils he has not tried to condemn. Even the clowns who have dominated state governments as political demagogues are presented in an objective manner. Keys points out the factors that allowed them to rise, and the unity they brought to confused politics without excusing the way they deceived their followers.

The last chapters of the book, dealing with the south generally, do not have the same easy reading quality and humor that characterizes the state-by-state surveys. The general reading public will probably find the facts too cumbersome and the light touches too few in these later chapters.

However, those interested in governmental research and politics will find even these chapters well worth the effort.

Keys presents well documented criticism of the one-party system, the poll tax and the abuses of the primary. The "Hoovercrat and Dixiecrat" elections are dissected and mapped as well as the voting records of southern Congressmen.

Southern Politics shows clearly that the south is not solid. Although the Negro has a direct affect on nearly all politics, Keys asserts that all southerners are not in accord with rabid Negro baiting.

The interests that have the most severe racial feelings have a voice in state government and in national politics far out of proportion to their numbers. Keys poses no solution but points out statistically that Negro baiting is becoming less a factor in many states and that the tendency is for even greater improvement.

The months of research necessary for *Southern Politics* was done through the Bureau of Public Administration at the

Writing for Readers

By Robert H. Fleming

THE ART OF READABLE WRITING,

By Rudolf Flesch, Harpers, New York. \$3.00. 236 pp.

Here's a book many newspapermen have been looking for. They are the men who have seen good writing butchered on the copy desk. But it's also a book that many newspapermen should be looking for. They're those, probably of the majority, whose writing has been salvaged by the eye-shade men with the black pencils.

Rudolf Flesch's name is known to most newsmen, just as his work is known to many. He's the Associated Press consultant on readability. His new book isn't aimed at newspapermen alone, but it has much for them. Its forceful argument for simpler writing is supported by excellent examples. For the zealot on readable writing, it provides support for his "I told you so." And for the man whose precious literary style has not been appreciated, there's material that should bring forth a "Maybe you're right, after all."

The book has a complete explanation of Flesch's mathematical formula for measuring readability. There are helpful lists of words that are shortcuts to simplification. And there are many forthright statements of principles.

Here are some samples:

"If you remember too many of the rules from your school days, they will get in your way . . . The more you know about the kind of people you are writing for, the better you'll write . . . 'Write as you talk' is a good rule as long as you understand that, like the Golden Rule, it's really unattainable . . . The main characteristics of spoken English seem to be two: loose sentence structure and a great deal of repetition . . . Spoken English doesn't care for subtle distinctions in verb forms."

That's enough, I think, to sample the book, especially when it's noted that only two of these excerpts come from one chapter. The examples, however, omit one major feature of the book, a discussion of grammar. This contains the example I liked best: When Winston Churchill was chided for ending a sentence with a preposition, he answered "This is the type of arrant pedantry, up with which I shall not put."

There's another, not in the book, that has the same devilry:

"The policeman arrested the brawling pair, took it to the police station, and locked it in adjoining cells."

Flesch says "Ordinary people show more sense than grammarians in the use of the plural." It may be added that Flesch shows more sense than the grammarians in many uses.

University of Alabama with funds from the Rockefeller Foundation.

That research has paid off. It is one of those few books that lives up to most of the adjectives used by the publishers.

Fundamentals of Good Writing

by William M. Stucky

WILLA CATHER ON WRITING. Knopf. \$2.25. **THE HUMAN NATURE OF PLAYWRITING,** by Samson Raphaelson. Macmillan. \$4.00.

Willa Cather and Samson Raphaelson have little in common as writers except success, but their beliefs about the fundamentals of good writing are, as might have been guessed, strikingly alike.

They could hardly be more differently expressed, however, than in Miss Cather's slender book of "critical studies" and in Mr. Raphaelson's rambling and discursive transcriptions of the proceedings of a playwriting class he taught at the University of Illinois.

Miss Cather so thoroughly practiced in her writing what she preached in the few prefaces and essays she wrote on the art of writing that anyone moderately familiar with her work will find little in the present volume that he could not have induced from her novels. Chief among her convictions, of course, are the importance of painstaking craftsmanship, of drawing from one's own experience, refining and condensing, of treating writing as "an art, which is always a search for something for which there is no marked demand, something new and untried, where the values are intrinsic and have nothing to do with standardized values."

This collection of four letters, four prefaces, four essays and an unpublished fragment doubtless will have little market demand. There is none of the "do and don't" about it, no handy hints to hopeful writers, no attempts to analyze the creative act and pin down its components. It does, however, have the intrinsic value Miss Cather ardently believes in and, like much of her fiction, is sheer delightful reading because of her conscientious craftsmanship and complete integrity.

The Human Nature of Playwriting, on the other hand, does—in a curious way—what most novelists and playwrights try unsuccessfully to do: Show 'em don't tell 'em. In the process it is too often tedious and somewhat repetitious, but

Recognized as one of the finest jobs of political research yet done, **Southern Politics** is already taking its place on college government reading lists as required reading.

as an experiment in teaching and an object lesson to beginners in any field of creative writing it has a real merit.

Mr. Raphaelson explains in a brief introduction that he was asked in 1948 to teach a course at the University of Illinois in "creative writing with emphasis on the drama." He goes on to admit he completely lacked experience in teaching and that his approach was frankly experimental.

That approach was to insist to the thirty young people who took his course that their own lives must and did contain the basic stuff of any worthwhile writing they would do, that the job before them was to find that material, examine it, rework it imaginatively until it took form and then—and only then—try to put it on paper.

The book, as noted before, consists entirely of Mr. Raphaelson's editing of verbatim discussions of the class, taken down by a secretary who attended all class sessions and many of the "group sessions" of five or six students at his home. Mr. Raphaelson apparently pulled no punches in insisting that his pupils delve into their own backgrounds for dramatic material, with a success that in some cases would make a psychoanalyst envious.

The important thing that emerges is that not one of the students failed to improve on his original plan for a play or come up with a much better idea when he got on the solid ground of the familiar. Salted through their discussions of possible plays, of involvement of plot and elaboration of character, are Mr. Raphaelson's observations on the theater he knows and the writing pitfalls in it.

The Human Nature of Playwriting, obviously, is not a great book. It is an illuminating book, though, and the tyro should find it valuable in demonstrating that he has all the creative writing foundation he needs within his own background, no matter how meager it may seem to him.

Our Reviewers

The book reviewers in this issue are all currently Nieman Fellows at Harvard. They are:

William German, chief of copy desk, San Francisco Chronicle;

Robert H. Fleming, political reporter, Milwaukee Journal;

William M. Stucky, city editor, Lexington (Ky.) Leader;

Clark R. Mollenhoff, reporter, Des Moines Register;

Melvin S. Wax, feature writer, Rutland Herald;

Murrey Marder, reporter, Washington Post;

Donald J. Gonzales, diplomatic reporter, Washington Bureau, United Press;

Max R. Hall, labor reporter, Washington Bureau, Associated Press;

Richard J. Wallace, state political reporter, Memphis Press-Scimitar.

WRITING FOR LOVE OR MONEY, edited by Norman Cousins. Longmans. \$3.50. 278 pp.

Norman Cousins has gleaned from the pages of the **Saturday Review of Literature** an "A to Z" variety of articles on writing.

The articles, all published previously, have been drawn together under one cover to deal with writing in the form of problems it presents to authors pre-eminent in major literary fields. There is no attempt in its pages to tell the novice or the expert how to write.

Discussed are novels, short stories, crime in fiction, essays, articles, humor, writing for juveniles, criticism, editorial and column writing, and how to make an index among other things.

Among the contributors are Thomas Wolfe, Somerset Maugham, William Rose Benet, Elmer Davis, Stephen Leacock, Ellen Gylasgow, William Saroyan, Pearl Buck, and Henry Seidel Canby.

The 278-page compilation is divided into 35 chapters, which demonstrates mechanically, at least, that quick treatment of each subject is all that should be hoped for by the reader. Nevertheless, the book is pleasant reading and informative. For most of those who face writing problems, it should prove stimulating and worthwhile.

Donald J. Gonzales

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY

by Max R. Hall

CHARACTERISTICALLY AMERICAN.

By Ralph Barton Perry. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. \$3. 162 pp.

In the slender but meaty volume which he calls *Characteristically American*, Ralph Barton Perry approaches the American heritage coolly; Americanism to him is not a glorification of Americans as a chosen people. Yet this is a warm, mellow book, the grist of a philosopher's ripe years—an understanding and practical book that describes the philosophy that makes Americans tick, whether they know it or not. The "American faith" which he describes—a faith in man—is also his own faith. I think that he presents his America very clearly and effectively, and that his book makes a valuable contribution to an understanding of this country.

In the first essay Mr. Perry discusses our common traits, some attractive and some not so attractive, and concludes that the main idea underlying the American cast of mind is *individualism*. He conceives of this not as the isolation of one individual from another, but as a *collective individualism*, expressed by a buoyant confidence in achievement through the voluntary association and combined effort of individuals.

The last essay is on American democracy. The word "democracy," he says, means many things, but the basic idea that gives it meaning for Americans is "the idea of a social group organized and directed by all of its members." Democracy consists of two distinct but interdependent parts: 1) political democracy, which concerns the question of control, and affirms that it shall be exercised by the people at large; 2) social democracy, which concerns the question of benefits and affirms that they shall be enjoyed by the people at large. The political history of the United States is a record of increasing popular self-government. The development of social democracy is best understood as a "series of withdrawals" from the "too optimistic doctrine" of *laissez-faire*. American democracy is a "moral democracy" and the American people are a "moral people"—in the sense that their institutions are founded on moral principle; they don't always live up to it, but when they don't, they suffer from an uneasy conscience.

Mr. Perry says the "gravest of problems for American democracy in the mod-

ern age" is how to create a popular will that shall harmonize our special, selfish interests, and how to create a public opinion that shall create a thoughtful agreement. He is not happy with the performance of the American press in creating such a public opinion. Newspapermen may be shocked to note that his principal reference to the press and radio comes during a discussion of "anti-democratic forces." He lists two such forces as being of grave concern. The first is "selfishness, aggravated by the self-seeking and self-assertiveness characteristic of Americans and sanctioned by their competitive economy." The second is "the vulgarization of sentiment and opinion."

It is in connection with this "vulgarization" that Mr. Perry brings in the press. He says Americans do not easily accept authority from above, but they are "highly vulnerable to the impersonal and unorganized authority of their social environment"—that is, a tendency to mass uniformity. This tendency, he asserts, is strongly reinforced by the modern techniques of mass communication. Then he declares:

The press and radio seek that wide attention which is the condition of their commercial success by providing suitable stimuli to reflexes, instincts, habits, and prevailing emotional attitudes. If for any combination of reasons large number of people are moved by fear or rage, their attention is attracted by that which caters to their fear and rage. . . . In order to create the mentality of a crowd or a mob it was once necessary that a large aggregate of persons should be gathered in one spot; now it is only necessary that they shall read the same headlines or listen to the same news commentator. . . . Ideas and sentiments have become packaged commodities, produced and distributed in mass, and designed for mass-consumption.

Mr. Perry says there is "hope" in a growing awareness on the part of the press and radio of their public obligations, and in their increasing self-criticism. But in the end, he says, American democracy must rely on the long-range effects of education. He isn't very happy about education, either, saying that "as things stand at present even the graduates of universities are scarcely less

vulnerable to the appeal of selfish interests and to the making of the tabloid mind, than their less privileged fellow-citizens."

Mr. Perry's views concerning newspapers deserve the most careful consideration by newspapermen. Without getting too far into a defensive posture, I do think it reasonable to comment that his notion of "the press" is oversimplified. His conception of ideas and sentiments as "packaged commodities" hardly does justice to the variety and spontaneity of the flow of news that daily gets into our newspapers, nor to the considerable amount of honesty and responsibility that creeps into its preparation, nor to the value of a free flow of information in maintaining democracy.

In the essay, "The Development of American Thought," he discusses philosophical movements in their American setting. He gives an entire essay to "William James and American Individualism," and another to the American religious heritage. Mr. Perry calls it "Hebraic-Christian-Biblical." He says America may truly be called a "Christian country," but not if the term is meant to exclude Judaism. He calls attention to the importance of Hebraic ideas embraced under the term Christianity.

The author gives a long discussion of Catholicism and Americanism, quoting much from Papal encyclicals. He says Catholicism is *uncongenial* with Americanism in a number of ways, including its authoritarianism and the passive obedience which this implies. He says Catholicism is *congenial* with Americanism in other ways, including its insistence on the priority of moral principles to the authority of the state. He makes some tentative, interesting suggestions for the "reconciliation" of Catholicism and Americanism, at least in action.

Mr. Perry is professor of philosophy, emeritus, at Harvard University. Now 73, he was active on the Harvard faculty for forty-four years. He was a pupil and close friend of William James. His *Thought and Character of William James* (1935) won a Pulitzer prize. William James and John Dewey brought into vogue the broad movement known as Pragmatism, which Mr. Perry calls distinctively American, "too American for the alien palate." Pragmatism affirms the union of thought and action; the moral will is the limited will of man, not an absolute or hypothetical will; the meaning of moral principles is found in their practical consequences, and thus they become rules for a cooperative pursuit of happiness.

Anything Under a Dateline

by William German

THE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW. By George Seldes. Gaer Associates Inc., New York. \$3.00. 342 pp.

Many of us working newspapermen are annoyed with George Seldes. Whenever we look up, there he is pointing an accusing finger—at us and our employers. In case you haven't looked up recently be assured that Mr. Seldes is still there, still pointing his finger and still calling us liars, distorters, conspirators, warmongers and several less polite terms.

As usual some of Mr. Seldes' salvoes fall short or wide. Sometimes he blames the wrong people. Sometimes there is no blame at all. Despite this, too many of Mr. Seldes' shots strike home. And they hurt.

It is not the object of this discourse to weigh accurately the merits of Mr. Seldes' book. To do so would be unfair to both the accuser and the accused. A fair presentation of the Seldes charges needs the documentation of the book. The defense for the American press would require an equally lengthy brief—a brief which would probably include detailed analysis of the Seldes adherence to the Party Line. Such a discussion would be pointless and not entirely pertinent. Party Line or not, right or wrong, the Seldes book does call for some soul-searching by the American press and the people who work for it.

The crux of Mr. Seldes' argument is that the press is warmongering. Suppose it is. Is this good or evil? It might easily be demonstrated that the press was warmongering in 1938 and 1939. It might just as easily be demonstrated that this was good, that war against fascism was both inevitable and necessary and that bias against Hitler was perfectly legitimate. For those newspapermen who feel that today's situation is analogous to that of 1939 the soul-searching should end right here. If war against Russia is both inevitable and necessary then any anti-Soviet bias is for the public good.

But for those of us who feel that there is yet some hope for peace the warmongering charge deserves further consideration. If it is to the national welfare eventually to reach an understanding with Russia then it should be the duty of the American press not to hinder such an understanding, either by malice or carelessness.

In his book Mr. Seldes cites a dozen

or more major news stories by which, he says, American newspapers helped warm the cold war. Among his cases are the reports on Protocol M, the Stepinac trial, the Czech coup, the Mindszenty affair, the Soviet rocket bases in Yugoslavia, etc. In the welter of this material there is enough proof of factual error to make an honest newspaperman start wondering just how honest he really is. More important it should start him asking why he—and his colleagues—should be guilty of making such errors, be they errors of reportorial commission or errors of editorial judgment.

In the course of reading Mr. Seldes' accusation this writer tried asking himself that question and came up with a series of notes which smack strongly of pangs of conscience. (Inevitably, too, they smack strongly of the copy desk point of view.) These notes, with some polishing, are what follows:

The root of many irresponsible foreign reports is the readiness of news editors to accept almost anything under a dateline. A story from London somehow automatically acquires all the authenticity of Big Ben. We tend to forget that American reporters abroad are open to as much error as human beings any place.

We still lean heavily on the "Ankara reports" and "Scandinavian travelers" type of stories. A new twist to these old standbys of rumor is news culled from some strongly biased, minor league European newspaper. How valid is a banner line scoop about Tito when we get it out of the Trieste *Voce Libera*?

Too many hot interviews are of the planted variety. We even quote former Nazis who, surprisingly, turn out to dislike Russians. Much more common is the practice of setting up interviews in Washington. We get a Senator of our own political leaning to pop off on a news development, then play the Senator as big as the spot news. Let's be critical about who says what. (This doesn't preclude the legitimate and well-rounded "reaction" story.)

We kid ourselves that we are being fair when we print doubtful news with veiled qualifications. To the average reader "authoritative sources" means just that. Too often these sources turn out to be not so authoritative.

Much of Mr. Seldes' case is built upon the depredations of the Hearst press.

Against these depredations there is almost universal agreement. There is also little hope of reforming Mr. Hearst. Then why don't more honest newspapers? Hearst cities take on their lying rivals? The Hearst (and McCormick) techniques are not deserving of the be-kind-to-the-opposition policy which is the general rule.

Even responsible, intelligent newspapers often give prominence to news they have reason to doubt because "the damage is already done" by other publications. Another facet of this bandwagon operation is the very real fear of appearing too friendly to the Soviet Union by playing down an anti-Kremlin story. Neither of these attitudes has any place in honest American journalism.

Most of us still approach international affairs the way we do local crime. We stress the bad news over the good, the conflicts over the agreements. Added to this is the pressure to be first on the wire, or on the streets, with the strongest lead. All this is in the best tradition, but hardly makes for accurate, rational reporting of the world's complexities.

The real answer to Mr. Seldes and his warmongering charge probably does lie in tradition—the tradition of fairness and independent, unbiased thinking. If enough of us could stick with that tradition we could probably make the next Seldes book look completely ridiculous.

February 1 Deadline For Lasker Entries

Writers on medical science have until February 1 to enter in competition for the new Lasker Awards any articles published in 1949 on medical research and public health.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation established two awards last year for journalism in the field of medical science and public health. One is for newspaper publication of an article or series or editorials or columns in this field. The other is for magazine writing in the same area. Each award is for \$500. The announcement specified that articles to be considered deal with "the improvement of health and the prolongation of life through medical research or other relevant means."

Entry blanks may be obtained from the Nieman Foundation, 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass., which is administering the Lasker Awards this first year. They will be judged by a jury of distinguished journalists, doctors and non-professional persons.

The Faith of David Lilienthal

by Melvin S. Wax

THIS I DO BELIEVE. By David E. Lilienthal. Harper and Brothers, New York. \$2.50.

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

This quotation is from the constitution of UNESCO, but it can be cited here as a fairly accurate spelling out of what David E. Lilienthal, the retiring chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has to say in *This I Do Believe*.

Though Mr. Lilienthal's pioneering public career has been involved in the two most spectacular technological developments of our time, his interest, his faith and his hope rest not on science, but on man, individual man.

In his retort to Senator McKellar during a joint congressional hearing on February 4, 1947, Mr. Lilienthal said:

"I believe—and I conceive the Constitution of the United States to rest, as does religion, upon the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual; and that all government and all private institutions must be designed to promote and protect and defend the integrity and dignity of the individual; that that is the essential meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as it is essentially the meaning of religion.

"Any form of government, therefore, and any other institutions which make men means rather than ends, which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power over men as a fundamental tenet of government are contrary to that conception, and, therefore, I am deeply opposed to them."

Again, in this book, he states:

"I believe that the progress or decline of democracy, in any particular set of circumstances, or at a particular time and place, can be measured by finding out the answer to this question: What is happening to the individual?"

In this context, Mr. Lilienthal examines our democracy and, from his own experience, illustrates how science, government and society can serve the individual in a democracy—not solely in terms of physical welfare and security but ethically and spiritually.

The book is a series of 15 essays. A few titles indicate Mr. Lilienthal's credo: "An Informed Public May Control Its Own Destiny"; "The Atom Can Be Used to Strengthen Democracy"; "The Well-springs of our Vitality are Ethical and

Spiritual," etc.

This reads like Rotary rhetoric; but any man who can point to so successful a record as Lilienthal's after almost 20 years of self-sacrificing work in highly controversial social and administrative experimentation merits faith in his sincerity.

America's fears, he says, center around this question: "How can this people . . . best protect democracy and individualism against the menace that is embodied not so much in the threat of Communist force and violence as in Communist ideas, practices and philosophy of life?"

Here, again, is the emphasis on individualism and on the battleground of ideas—not force.

The answer, according to Mr. Lilienthal, is to bolster democracy by making it a more affirmative living reality. Eradicate its sore spots and give it the moral and ethical impregnability that will guarantee survival.

Coming from many people, this would sound like an admonition to "achieve a good world by abolishing sin." But Mr. Lilienthal is able to point to concrete examples from his experience as administrator of TVA and chairman of the AEC to show how reforms can be accomplished.

He calls for a term of public service by all competent individuals:

"It seems to me that a moral obligation to engage in the public service during a part of every qualified man's best

years has become, for the generation that lies ahead, an actual necessity; that there must be increased movement into the public service by exceptionally qualified people who would not in ordinary times consider public service as any part of their life's work; it is equally important that we put increased emphasis on rotation in the public service, in order to augment the flow into private responsibility of men with knowledge of government gained from actual experience."

In his plea for a more affirmative democracy, Mr. Lilienthal does not blind his eyes to cancers. He recognizes the increasingly impersonal attitude of both big business and big government, the conflicts of labor and management, the racial antagonisms, the dangers of super-science, over-specialization, small men in important government positions. Surely he recognizes, as well as any man, the terrible potentialities of the atomic energy.

But in all these things, Mr. Lilienthal says, we must not become obsessed with negatives.

"Ours is a time of great expectations in the face of unprecedented destruction. There is open before us an unparalleled opportunity to build new and firmer foundations under our feet

"The necessary skills of organization and technology exist today We must have the will to set out boldly on the adventure, the resolution to begin from where we are. We need the will and the faith, we need a sense that this is the historic hour to turn the first shovel, to take the first steps."

What's Happened to ERP?

by Richard Wallace

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY, by Sumner Slichter. Alfred A. Knopf. New York. \$2.75. 214 pp.

"The American Economy," by Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard, provides the best insight I've found into the problems of international economical policy.

Americans, I believe, have had a feeling of futility when they realized that the European Recovery Program (Marshall plan) hasn't done a great deal toward accomplishing this nation's Number 1 objective—to make the countries participating in the program economically self sufficient.

Prof. Slichter's book gives the reason. Actually, as far as production is concerned, Europe has been recovering much more rapidly than is generally realized. In the first quarter of 1948 industrial pro-

duction exceeded prewar in Britain, France, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark.

International trade, however, hasn't kept pace. As a result the countries participating in the recovery program can't pay for their imports. Therefore, they aren't self-sufficient economically.

The big trouble is that the United States is such a big exporter, but such a poor customer. In 1947 the U. S. sold \$19.6 billions of goods and services to the rest of the world, but bought only \$8.3 billions worth. That meant a deficiency for the rest of the world of \$11.3 billion.

Unless there is a great increase in imports to the United States, ERP will fail of its essential objective, Prof. Slichter says.

"It will increase the productive capac-

REVIEWS (Continued)

ity of some European countries without making those countries really self-sufficient," he writes.

In view of this our tariff policy seems a little ridiculous. With one hand, we're trying to help Europe recover. With the other, we're making that recovery more difficult. If we'd buy enough of Europe's stuff, the cost of recovery wouldn't be so expensive to us.

"If the increase in imports were large enough," Prof. Slichter writes, "there would be no net cost to the United States—this country would obtain goods equal in value to the goods it provided for Europe."

Prof. Slichter recommends that the U. S. increase its imports within the next four or five years to 7.5 or 10 per cent of the national income—which would be no higher than the ratio of imports to national income 100 years ago, and which would be considerably lower than the ratio of imports to the national income in most other countries. This would create, roughly, from \$17 billions to \$22.5 billions annually of dollar exchange.

Prof. Slichter shows how it can be done—actually by buying things that the U. S. can well use, among them iron ore, lead, copper, zinc, bauxite, petroleum, lumber, wool, cheese, pottery, china and many other products—some of them now victims of heavy tariffs.

International policy is just one facet of the American economy covered in the volume. Prof. Slichter also examines the shift in power from management to labor, industrial relations, and the problems of economic stability. He discusses the American economy's prospects for the future and evaluates it.

His comments and recommendations are conservative. Sometimes the reader has a sense of important omissions. For instance, in discussing incentive for labor-management co-operation in industry, no mention is made of profit-sharing plans which have been tried. In discussing international tariff and monetary difficulties, no mention is made of proposals for common currency and elimination of tariff barriers, through a union of countries for those and possibly other purposes, as envisioned by the Atlantic Union Committee.

It's too bad that Prof. Slichter apparently hasn't read "The Art of Readable Writing." He obviously has some important things to say, which should be read and understood. One undergoes considerable punishment in the process. My recommendation, however, is to take the punishment and the book. It's worth it.

New York Times—Oct. 23, 1949

Talk With A. B. Guthrie Jr.

by Harvey Breit

Just the other week A. B. Guthrie Jr.'s new novel *The Way West* (a follow-up on *The Big Sky*) came out, and the line in this paper's review that seemed to be the phrase *juste* was: "This novel is almost entirely free of contrivance." Well, at least that's how Mr. Guthrie himself strikes you—free of contrivance, and no almost about it. A modest man is Mr. Guthrie, who cares about what he thinks and tries to say what he thinks with exactness and concreteness; and so, if sometimes Mr. Guthrie's statements are slow in coming, they lose nothing in earnestness, or honesty, or depth.

Mr. Guthrie has a design—and it must be said at the outset that Mr. Guthrie is not an ambitious man. "I want to write," he said, "a series of at least four panels on the Western movement. In them I want to try to interpret American life to the American people. It disturbs me to see people highballing over the trails without any idea of what they're doing. You know about my first two books. The third will be the story of the cow camp and/or gold camp days. Maybe both. I'm not sure. The fourth book will be interior Northwest from the turn of the century to the present."

What sort of research had Mr. Guthrie done? "There were some swell journals around that time," Mr. Guthrie said. "Joel Palmer had kept some. I drew on that—he was a good reporter—and a good many other sources. The day-by-day journals are prime sources and better by far than the journals written out of memory. The professional writer I borrowed from in degree was Francis Parkman."

What about historical novels? They were read, certainly, but they were also in literary disrepute. How had Mr. Guthrie escaped the stigmata? "What offends me about historical novels," said Mr. Guthrie with scrupulous care, "there are two things I guess—are the buxom gals bouncing around on stage davenport; and second of all, of a novelist simply relying on history as props for the book. It is the history lugged in lock, stock and barrel. It is the bringing in of great chunks of undigested history. There is a notion that one proves himself a good novelist by proving he knows history. It is the perfect non-sequitur. The history is secondary and has to be digested and in its place."

But what about Mr. Guthrie himself? What was his principle of literary action? Mr. Guthrie thought, and after a bit he said: "I'm not proposing that this is the way historical fiction should be written, but it is my way. I believe in fidelity of time, place and circumstance, but I believe in keeping the actual characters out of the book. I don't like to do violence to the character, to history. It seems to me like disfiguring a headstone. Historical personages seem to me to have an integrity that we'd better not monkey with."

This sentiment was, perhaps, related to what Mr. T. S. Eliot had meant about not tampering with nature. "Yes," Mr. Guthrie replied. "It is this: if you deal with actual people, then you are imprisoned in the annals of history. If you do do with actual characters, and treat them with respect, you will not have as true a novel as you would if you were to create your own people."

The Big Sky had been so acclaimed that one wondered how Mr. Guthrie thought about *The Way West* alongside of it. "The two novels," he said, "are quite different in tone. *The Big Sky* was largely negative. They were a people who destroyed and only that had meaning and zest for them. *The Way West* is affirmative; they were the people who were going to make homes. It is a kind of affirmation. In either case I'm flat."

Mr. Guthrie gets back to Montana every summer. He's got a mountain home on the front range of the Rockies. "Though I've lived out of the West for a long time," he says, "Montana will always be my center of the universe." What he likes about it are the people, the distances, and the opportunities for solitude. There was a long period when he didn't have much opportunity for solitude. From 1926 to 1947, to be exact, when Mr. Guthrie worked in the newsroom of the Lexington (Ky.) *Leader*.

"When I quit," Mr. Guthrie said, I was executive editor. (He had begun as a reporter.) I had the shaky hope, after *The Big Sky*, that maybe I wouldn't have to ride a payroll."

So far that is the way it has worked out. Mr. Guthrie may be riding herd or the wagons, but not a payroll. The critical consensus around here is that that is the way it should be.

Nieman Notes

1939

Frank S. Hopkins of the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department addressed the International Studies seminar at Harvard November 21 on the work the Institute is doing in training people for the human relations side of diplomacy.

Irving Dilliard, editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial page, was speaker at a Nieman dinner November 25, just after the Atlantic Monthly for December came out with his article on "Truman Reshapes the Supreme Court."

Christmas news from the Ed Allens at Geneva, Switzerland, includes the item that Mr. and Mrs. J. Edward Allen and their daughters will sail for the U. S. in July on home leave from the International Labor Organization, where Allen is chief of the Information Section.

1941

George Chaplin, managing editor of the New Orleans Item, reports a new Sunday edition of that paper is to be launched March 5. Thomas Sanction (1942), who was a New Orleans reporter before he went to New York for the AP, has joined the New Orleans Item staff and, according to Chaplin, "is going great guns."

Lowell M. Limpus of the New York Daily News guided a group of current Nieman Fellows through the News plant November 11 after organizing a discussion for them with the News managing editor, Robert G. Shand. On the 10th the Fellows were dinner guests of the publisher and editors of the New York Times after a full day at the U.N.

A second daughter, Barbara Wilkinson, was born to Lucille and William M. Pinkerton, October 25, weight 7 lb., 2 oz.

1943

The Scranton Times sent city editor Edward J. Donohoe to the annual dinner of the American Society of Travel Agents in New York to receive for the paper a special merit plaque awarded for a travel series published last summer.

1944

A. B. Guthrie, author of *The Big Sky* and *The Way West*, gave most of the fall to handling publicity for the successful

move to amend the Kentucky State Constitution. The amendment removes the top salary limit of \$5,000 for any State official, which applied to the President and faculty of the University of Kentucky.

Guthrie writes of his work:

"This, so far as I know, is purely a labor of love; but the project seems to me one that a man might devote himself to only after a year as a Nieman Fellow."

1945

Herbert Yahraes reports from Stanfordville, New York, where he writes for the magazines:

"Maybe you'd like to know that the Democrats in this three-to-one Republican town got me to run for justice of the peace and town board member and that I took a nice two-to-one shellacking."

Nathan Robertson is chief Washington correspondent of the new Labor Press Service.

Charles Wagner, Sunday editor of the New York Mirror, has finished a history of Harvard College for publication by E. P. Dutton next spring. His son, Carl Aben Wagner, is a freshman at Harvard.

1947

Clark Porteous of the Memphis Press-Scimitar staff filled the role of "Bob Moreton" in the Cleo Johnson Fox play "Smoke Rings," sponsored by the Beethoven Club of Memphis November 1 for the benefit of its building fund.

Reader's Digest for December ran a chunk of William H. McDougall's book, *Six Bells Off Java*. His second book, *By Eastern Windows*, is to be re-published in England during 1950.

Richard E. Lauterbach was speaker at the Brookline (Mass.) Forum, December 5, and visited the Nieman office en route.

Dr. Gilbert W. Stewart, father of "Pete," died on November 9. Pete Stewart had just completed arrangements for a dinner of the New York Nieman Fellows the night of the 9th, for the current Fellows, on the eve of their visit to U.N., the details of which Pete also had arranged, in collaboration with Wilder Foote of the U.N. secretariat. Stewart

was unable to be present, but Leon Svirsky carried through the dinner program and next day Stewart's colleagues at the U. S. Mission to U.N. briefed the current Fellows on the program for the day at U.N. and arranged their transportation to Lake Success, where they heard the Italian colonies issue come to a vote and heard Vishinsky.

1948

Mr. and Mrs. Walter G. Rundle have adopted two small war refugee children in their home at Frankfort where Walter Rundle is United Press manager for Germany.

Mr. and Mrs. Emory H. Sager of Dallas, Texas, announced the marriage of their daughter, Lois Sager, State capitol correspondent of the Dallas News, to Mr. Lewis Styles Foxhall on October 31, 1949.

Walter Waggoner is now covering the State Department for the New York Times, a shift from the Pentagon.

Carl Larsen has taken leave of absence from the Chicago Sun-Times with the blessing of publisher Richard Finnegan, to serve as Information Officer for the Special ECA Mission to Sweden. He writes of the move:

"Richard Finnegan gave me a leave of absence from the city desk after one of Paul Hoffman's aides wrote him that I was needed in Sweden. The city editor, of course, had been reluctant to let me go although he did not put any obstacles in my way.

"Finnegan said it was a 'wonderful opportunity' and benevolently arranged for my Sun-Times insurance policy to be in force during my absence.

"I believe that this stint in Sweden as Information Officer for the Special ECA Mission to Stockholm will give me a good piece of background to become an even better reporter when I return. The ECA has been able to line up on a leave basis some damned good men—such as Alfred Friendly, Helen Kirkpatrick, Roscoe Drummond, etc.

"I'm not certain of just what I'll be doing in Sweden except of the broad job of explaining the objects of European recovery and the Marshall Plan to the Swedes. I'll be working under a good mission chief, a 33 year old man named Michael Harris. He formerly was a member of the CIO Steelworkers executive board and is one of the two labor men named to such posts by Truman. The other is an AFL man, named Gross, in adjacent Norway."

1949

Robert R. Brunn, back in the San Francisco office of the *Christian Science Monitor*, after a summer in England and a week in the Boston office of the *Monitor*, writes:

"We are well settled here now, living at 625 Locust Road, Sausalito, Calif. It's good to be back and the trip West was productive, taking about three weeks. I thought that you might be interested in the results—a series starting November 11 in the *Monitor* and running for a month or so. Have you seen Bob de Roos' series in the *Chronicle* on California water? It's one of the best things he has ever written."

Pete Lisagor was assigned in October from the city staff of the *Chicago Daily News* to cover the U.N. at Lake Success.

Since his return to China for the *New York Herald Tribune* in the summer, Christopher Rand has contributed to a "Round-Up" of articles on "Asia's Red Riddle" in the *Herald Tribune* and has published two articles in *The New Yorker*: "The Egg Family" and "Letter from Hongkong." He left Chungking in October for a month's trip to eastern Tibet.

Medical Research Story Award to Yahraes

"Baby Blue Research," a story published in *Life* magazine March 15, has been chosen as the best report on the techniques of medical research printed in popular magazines during the first half of this year. The \$500 best research story prize will be given to the science staff of *Life*. A \$100 runnerup award will go to Herbert Yahraes of Stanfordville, New York, author of "Science Tries You Out on the Dog" published in *Popular Science* for February.

The award-winning *Life* story showed the ways in which the now-famous "blue baby" operation was developed by Alfred Blalock and Dr. Helen Taussig at Johns Hopkins. The similarities between an experimental dog's heart and a "blue baby's" heart were vividly portrayed in word and picture.

Mr. Yahraes' second prize story with photographs by W. W. Morris dealt with the research work at the Jackson Memorial Laboratory at Bar Harbor, Maine, where the behavior and emotions of "Man's Best Friend" are studied for clues to what makes people tick." Together, the stories told why the dog is an irreplaceable research aid for the progress

of both experimental surgery and psychology.

The judges who chose the best published research story were R. E. Dyer, Director of the National Institute of Health; Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of

Nieman Scrapbook

Louisville Times—Dec. 10, 1949

Why Does The Times Publish Pegler?

In the letter column today, the *Times* is asked a question it has heard more than once before. The question is, in effect: Why do we publish Pegler? Why, especially, did we publish the singularly offensive descent into ghoulishness which appeared under his name last Tuesday? Harry W. Schacter, who want to know, is a good and highminded citizen. We would have easily guessed without being told how he would naturally feel about much of what Pegler writes and, specifically, about such a column as the one mentioned. We feel the same way.

However, we publish Pegler, we published that column last Tuesday, and we are asked a fair question. In the first place, we believe that a newspaper has an obligation not only to express its own opinions in its editorial columns but also to make room elsewhere for the opinions of others—including notably letter writers and syndicated columnists.

We believe this obligation is deepened in a case like ours, where we are the only daily in the afternoon field. We believe it is still further deepened when the city's only two dailies, morning and afternoon, are under the same ownership and have similar lines of editorial thought. Louisville's newspaper readers have a right to know how the opinions of the *Courier-Journal* and the *Times* stack up against other opinions—in particular, those of readers who write letters taking direct issue with us and those of columnists who have national audiences and with whom we may frequently disagree.

We supported Franklin D. Roosevelt in his four presidential campaigns. We advocated much of the program that he offered. We grieved at his death and we venerate his memory. We have unlimited respect for Eleanor Roosevelt. We think she is probably the greatest woman of her time, just as her husband probably will rank among the greatest Presidents. Pegler holds and has held for a long time

the A.M.A. *Journal*; Stephen Spencer, associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*; David Dietz, science editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers; and Watson Davis, Director of "Science Service."

views exactly opposite to those. He is more extreme in his hatred of the Roosevelts than most people, but undoubtedly the *Times* has readers who think the *Times* is extreme in the opposite direction.

Unbridled, atrociously unfair attacks have been made upon all our Presidents, especially on the greater Presidents. It is, we think, a measure of Mr. Roosevelt's impact upon his time that, while reverent tourists constantly throng the Hyde Park estate, there are so long after his death some maligners still in active and incredibly vindictive practice.

Once or twice some years ago we killed a Pegler column that seemed peculiarly scurrilous to us. But we got to thinking about it and came to the conclusion that the problem for us is not whether to publish Pegler on any particular day, depending on our opinion of his content, but whether to publish him at all. If we were going to publish him at all for the sake of presenting opinions generally different from ours, then we thought that we ought, to be strictly honest, to publish him in entirety, instead of attempting to edit him through the eyes of such long-time Roosevelt supporters as ourselves.

Up to now that has been our policy. It is a policy, of course, subject to change. But the change, if it were made, would be to drop Pegler altogether, rather than intermittently on a basis of how violently we happened to object to him one day or the next. After all, our dropping him would not be the end of him, except for a relatively few of his readers. He would still be available in Lexington, Evansville, Cincinnati, Indianapolis and Memphis, among many other places. He would only be unavailable to what following he has in Louisville without access to outside papers.

We hope this explanation will seem adequate to Mr. Schacter and others of his mind. If not, we then hope they won't hesitate to let us know.

Boston Globe—November 3, 1949

They Stood in Silent Tribute-- Hokey's Plane Would Never Come In

by Katherine Merriam Hulen

WASHINGTON, Nov. 2—Helen E. Hokinson, the cartoonist, was about to make one of her reluctant public appearances in behalf of the Washington Community Chest on Tuesday. She was flying from New York to speak at a luncheon rally of 350 chest workers in the fashionable Mayflower Hotel, due at the Washington National Airport at 11:46 a.m.

She had also donated one of her cartoons to be auctioned for the benefit of the chest that was on display at the entrance for the delectation of the arriving workers. It depicted one of her incomparably futile society matrons introducing her chic little maid to a second plump dowager who acknowledged the introduction with, "So Mary is working for the Community Chest, too. How brave."

The ladies waiting at the airport to welcome Helen were scarcely more real people than the loveable, human characters with whom Hokey—as she was known to her friends—has peopled the pages and occasional covers of *The New Yorker* magazine since 1925.

At 11:44 the airport crash siren sounded. Helen Hokinson's plane would never come in.

Two hours later, on the announcement of the luncheon chairman that Helen Hokinson had been killed in the plane collision at the airport, the group of Hokinson admirers stood for a minute of silent tribute, and left.

Helen Hokinson was born in Mendota, Ill., about 50 years ago. After several years of art study in Chicago, she went to New York in the early 1920's. She was immediately successful with fashion drawings while continuing her study at the Art Students League.

The principles of dynamic symmetry captured her interest so deeply that she decided to revolutionize her style of drawing, which she estimated would require a year of study and practice before she would be ready to market her product.

Before the end of that year editors began to seek her work and she found herself doing a comic strip called "Sylvia In The Big City." She was also doing considerable illustrating for motion picture magazines.

When *The New Yorker* was started, her

drawings were a natural for its type of wit and humor and her connection with that magazine has been maintained up to the current number as the main field of her output.

Hokey was ever a hard worker, but of a fun-loving nature that made play of her work. Her devoted friends were always happy to go about with her, seeing the world through her eyes, contributing what they could by extracting the pith and non-malicious humor from the words and actions of the people around them, that she translated into her drawings. Although she became labeled a cartoonist, she was ever insistent that she was portraying character, not caricaturing people.

* * *

In the late afternoon of the fateful Tuesday, while salvage operations were proceeding feverishly, coffee was being served to tense relatives and friends of the crash victims. The aroma of that coffee recalled to this writer vividly her first recollection of Hokey, characteristic of her friendly impulsiveness and the little known domestic side of her nature. At the club where we both lived in New York City, I was awakened one morning by the fragrance of fresh coffee. Presently, Hokey's face poked in my door and her pleasant voice inquired: "Wouldn't you like a cup of nice hot coffee?" We were fast friends from that moment.

With a fine capacity for friendship, Hokey's work always had a top priority with her, long before the phrase "top priority" was coined, and occasionally at the expense of her friends' feelings. Once, going to spend the weekend with friends in the country, she got an idea for a drawing at the Saturday night dinner table. With an uncontrollable urge to get it down on paper, she returned home by the next train.

* * *

Hokey had a way of never giving offense for long. When during the war she used an old friend's name in the caption under a drawing, the friend had acquired something of the plump proportions of Hokey's inimitable clubwomen. But the girl in the drawing who bore the friend's name was slim, so there were no lasting hard feelings, just a merry exchange of

pleasantries and an autographed copy of the drawing for the friend.

Helen Hokinson's best drawings were collected in book form twice, *My Best Girls*, published in 1941 by E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., and *When Were You Built?* in 1948.

The popularity of her famous club presidents and her ageing hostesses evoked the novel product of a Helen Hokinson Club and caused women all over the country to hold up the mirror to their own frailties and either accept them laughingly or struggle against them. Her unique, unmalicious humor and penetrating comedy will long be missed, for she made the world happier.

Critics Circle Will Evaluate Race Pictures

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Leading Negro cities and newspapermen, spurred by the success of the three current Hollywood films dealing with stories of Negroes in American life, have formed the Negro Critics Circle with Ludlow W. Werner as executive secretary, and at the same time expressed the hope that standards of future productions will be as high as "Home of the Brave," the first and thus far judged best.

The Negro Critics Circle, paralleling the New York Film and Drama Circle, will be a membership body and annually, after vote has been taken, will make awards to films, plays, books and other creative efforts both by Negroes and dealing with stories affecting them.

Forming the Circle at its inception were Miss Lillian Scott of the *Chicago Defender*, James Hicks, NNPA correspondent in New York and feature writer for the *Afro-American* and *Norfolk Journal and Guide*, Bill Chase of the *New York Age*, George Schuyler of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, Julius Adams of the *Amsterdam News*, Dick Campbell of the *Sphinx*, and Ludlow W. Werner of the *Oracle*.

Expressing the belief that motion pictures and the theatre are strong influences on the educative processes of people and a democratic process at work, the Circle said it feels obligated to "extend, encourage and develop opportunities" for Negroes in those fields, to assume "full, purposeful participation of Negroes in the motion picture industry and theatre on a high level and plane." *Louisville Defender*, November 26, 1949

Boston Globe—Dec. 8, 1949

Charges Against Hopkins Aimed To Dim the Roosevelt Legend

by Doris Fleeson

WASHINGTON—Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves did not substantiate the charges of a former Air Force major that Harry Hopkins was a Communist traitor who handed Russia the atomic bomb on a platter.

Gen. Groves did agree that Washington in 1943 and 1944, was doing its best to give its wartime ally, the Russians, who were then killing Germans on the Western front, all that they needed to pursue that then laudable end. If Hopkins were alive, he would certainly plead guilty to possessing that sense of urgency about winning the war. In the end he died of it.

Thus, another chapter in the continuing effort to break down Franklin Roosevelt's place in history is apparently ending. It is not the first nor will it be the last. American politics is like that, which is one reason why it confuses foreigners.

Assessing the episode, a leading atomic scientist asks gloomily whether all these "wolf, wolf" fiascos will mean that Americans will not pay attention to real atomic-energy dangers when they arise. He views with real alarm the possibility that atomic matters will move into the "just politics" compartment of American thinking. They already had a strong shove in that direction, he feels, from Senator Bourke Hickenlooper's charges of "incredible mismanagement" against David Lillenthal, and another sensation that fizzled.

How much it is possible to accomplish politically with these maneuvers is often discussed in the trade. As for Roosevelt himself, many politicians now think that his image is fixed in the minds and hearts of the American people; that, like the Lincoln legend, the Roosevelt story had a phenomenal growth with an overwhelming body of favorable literature and that it cannot now be tampered with.

The young people today, it is argued, are the depression-born generation who will remember him favorably and are not likely to be impressed by the wranglings of their elders about what could have been done better. It is admitted that the feelings of the antis may deepen with each fresh assault, but it is doubted that converts are made.

The incessant pilgrimages to Hyde Park support this school of thought. Like the mail carriers, the visitors to the

Roosevelt home and library are not daunted by rain nor snow nor heat nor cold. Not only on vacations but on frosty Monday mornings, they keep coming. Mrs. Roosevelt, who often takes the road through the woods that comes out near her old home, has expressed surprise at the steady influx of tourists throughout the year.

Abundant evidence exists that the American people judge their Presidents, but do forgive them. They blamed Her-

bert Hoover for the depression but, whether or not they accept the new version that he was not responsible, they are warm to him and cheer him when he appears.

The "that man" school, however, continues to be vocal and with James and Franklin Jr. now in politics, their emotions are freshly assaulted. If the two sons have their father's talent for exacerbating their enemies, the show will continue to flourish for a long time.

Littleton (Colo.) Independent—July 8, 1949

An Editor's Beliefs

How often we have picked up a periodical and wondered what ideology governed those who publish it. The reader cannot always tell from the title, for we have known several papers called "The Blankville Democrat" to be edited by Republicans and vice versa. Communists often hide their identity behind some word like "Christian," "Progressive," "Democratic," or "American." It takes prolonged study, in some cases, to detect the propaganda line of the editor. Millions of readers never discover the forces that are influencing them.

The Littleton Independent no doubt has readers who are curious about the policy of this newspaper. So we shall set forth our beliefs.

1. We believe in the brotherhood of man and the human experiment, and we are ready to alter lesser convictions in favor of man and his future. Our goal is the Good Society where the dignity of the individual is respected, where as many billions of people can occupy the earth in comfort and happiness as possible. All our other purposes are secondary to this, and they are valued solely as an end to the service of man. Things like democracy, freedom of the press, capitalism, marriage, the Jewish-Greek tradition, certain religious sects, or the United States of America all seem worthy instruments for the progress of man. But we are prepared to modify our beliefs in any or all of them if it can be shown that something else will serve mankind better. Our ancestors believed in kings, the Crusades, slavery, the caste system, and in the primacy of the white male,

but we have cast aside their beliefs. No one need be dismayed to find that our children will cast aside our ideals so long as they do not lose sight of humanity and its flowering destiny.

2. We believe in trying to find techniques that will hasten our approach to the Good Society. As citizens we can do this by widening our reading so that we may select the best thinking of our day. As newspapermen we can sit down with intelligent critics of the press and seek to better our performance.

3. We believe, as newspapermen, in avoiding situations which may cause us to be prejudiced. This includes the holding of public office and ownership of certain securities.

4. We believe the ownership of a periodical should be known fully to its readers. In the case of the Independent this ownership resides entirely in the family of the publisher and the editor.

5. We believe that readers should be aware of the manner in which the periodical is supported. Parisians in 1939 were not told that Hitler subsidized their press, and South Americans did not realize that Germany supplied much of the wire "news" free to their papers. American newspapers which are supported by advertisers come nearest to being free—expecting that unusual case of the Reader's Digest. Business exerts less pressure on the organs it supports than do the church, unions, government officials, or organizations on the periodicals they subsidize. Moreover, publications supported by advertisers cannot hide their support. It appears on every page for

the world to see. In the case of the *Littleton Independent*, support is derived about as follows: Subscriptions 11%, commercial printing 24%, advertising (display, classified, and legal) 65%.

6. We believe that editorials should be our own and not those of some corporation publicity man in Denver, San Francisco, or New York. And to the end that these editorials may not express absurd or obsolete opinions, we advocate constant consultations between the editor and the social scientists. As life grows in complexity, the need of a sabbatical year of study will become increasingly important to the editorial writer.

These are our principles and our secondary beliefs. They have nothing to do with the latitude or longitude in which we live. We like to think they are convictions which we would hold were we born in Moscow, Shanghai, or Delhi.

* * *

Whenever our family sits down to the table made sallow by uncolored oleo, someone always asks why Colorado's two senators won't let us have it artificially colored as butter is. Attractive margarine would cheer mealtime considerably.

Houston Waring, editor of the *Independent*, was a Nieman Fellow in 1943-44.

On James B. Reston

I'd like to see a lot more opinion on what the press ought to be doing to make a better informed America, from journalists themselves if possible. I wish there were more newspapermen like James B. Reston of the *New York Times* who are able to go beneath the surface of our job and question its basic purpose and success. His distinction between "literal" truth and "essential" truth, made before Sigma Delta Chi at Milwaukee and more recently before the Twin Cities Guild in Minneapolis, is a classic example of the sort of professional criticism the press needs. The *Nieman Reports*, which reprinted Reston's Minneapolis talk, is incidentally the most promising new venture in the field of journalistic criticism that I have encountered.

—Carl R. Kesler, in
The Quill, for Sept., 1949

Mitchell (S. D.) Republic—Oct. 18, 1949

Newspapers Should Not Act As Monopoly

The editor of the *Daily Republic* has received the following letter from Stanley J. Friedman, of the *Yale Law Journal*, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.:

* * *

"The Editors of the *Yale Law Journal* have been following with great interest a suit brought by the government against the Lorain, Ohio, *Journal* for alleged violations of the Sherman Act. The government claims that the paper is attempting to freeze out the Lorain radio station by coercing the station's advertisers: the coercion consists of denying radio advertisers the use of newspaper space. As part of the relief sought, the Government asks that the Lorain *Journal* be enjoined from this practice.

"We are writing to you and to the publishers of fourteen other newspapers in the United States of comparable size (selected at random from *Editor and Publisher*) to learn how this proceeding strikes other members of the newspaper business not directly involved. What we are specifically interested in is your reaction to the government attempt to make the *Journal* take ads. We feel that this case might have great implications for the future of the press in this country, but we believe that for a proper evaluation, the opinion of at least a sampling of professional opinion is indispensable. Assuming that the government proves its case—i. e. that the newspaper is using its competitive position in the advertising field as the lever to pry the radio station out of business—do you believe that the government has the right to remedy this situation by making the newspaper carry ads."

* * *

This is the reply of the editor of the *Daily Republic*:

Whether or not the specific acts of the Lorain, Ohio, *Journal* constitutes a violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust or other anti-monopoly laws, its conduct is morally indefensible.

It is regrettable that in most cities only a monopoly daily paper is published. Because the cost of publishing newspapers has so increased, the community should receive better service than from two daily papers, neither of which could afford as good a product as the single paper.

But, this creation of virtually a natural monopoly (without the regulation that would apply if they were legal monopo-

lies) offers opportunities to take advantage of the absence of competition. This most commonly takes the form of indifferent service and excessive profits. It is a rare publisher who possesses and will use the initiative for a progressive publication which often has in the past resulted, in some fields, from competition.

That is why the appearance and development of the radio in the very period in which daily papers were becoming monopolies may be regarded as an act of Providence. It has prevented many of these daily papers from degeneration into routine sheets or even barefaced propaganda organs.

For the Lorain paper to attempt to put a local radio station out of business by coercing advertisers, is not only indefensible and contemptible policy, but could be regarded by the people of that community as an indication that it would take advantage of the even more exclusive monopoly it is endeavoring to create.

This example is evidence supporting the FCC's policy of refusing to allow newspapers to own local radio stations. Single ownership of competing media of communications should never be allowed. The public, and any part of it, should always have at least one alternative to rejection of desired publicity. Any other policy would be more than anti-democratic; it would be anti-social.

* * *

As a matter of fact, the government could be performing a service to the daily newspapers in the country by this action. Once they become monopolies, their publishers have usually pursued the policies of selfish interests. In the past five elections, voters have repudiated the counsel of an estimated 90 per cent of daily papers.

Only a free press can have influence. This, to be true, must be and is reversible: the press must exert influence to be free. Because so large a percentage of the newspapers obviously do not have the confidence of their readers, to the extent of influencing them in elections, it may be said that the publishers themselves have all but destroyed the freedom of the press in the United States.

If the action of the government against the Lorain, Ohio, publisher in any way awakens in him the responsibility that attaches to monopoly, he will find a new respect for his publication.

THE A & P CASE

The courts often complain of trial by newspaper. The A & P case has been a trial by newspaper advertisement, with the spending of millions by the defendant to present its one side weeks before the case came to trial. Readers in Boston and New York had to be diligent to discover any bits and pieces of news of the government side of the suit. The Christian Science Monitor was unique in saying editorially that there were two sides and the A & P offered only one. Yet on the basis of this purchased partisan publicity the Gallup poll took a census of the public attitude.

An ad by a grocery group competing with the A & P chain was rejected by three of the four papers in Washington, D. C. The Louisville Courier-Journal was almost alone in thinking this was news. CBS twice reviewed the failure of the New York newspapers to inform readers of the issues in the case.

CBS Views the Press—November 26, 1949

This is Chapter Two in the story of the government of the United States versus the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company; a few weeks ago we discussed some of the aspects of the case in which the government accuses the A & P of continuing violation of the anti-trust laws, and seeks to follow up a 1946 conviction of the food chain on charges of conspiring to monopolize the food industry. The present case has not been tested in court: the A & P has until the ninth of December to file its formal answer to the government's charges, but you might say the case has been continuously in the court of public opinion since the filing of those charges more than two months ago. Our previous discussion dealt with the way the pros and cons of the A & P suit had been presented to the public, and briefly, it led to the conclusion that the public had been given adequate information on the grocery chain's side of the dispute, but rather less than adequate information on the other side. So the result of a public opinion survey by George Gallup, published the other day in the *World-Telegram*, seems pertinent: it showed that public sympathy up to this point is heavily on the side of the A & P—that among persons who have read or heard about the suit, almost twice as many side with the company as with government.

The reason for this is plain: the A & P had jumped into the fray at once with an intensive advertising campaign in the daily newspapers, and day after day, it hammered its message home to the public, and the gist of these advertisements was repeated in news stories. By contrast, the other side of the story was inadequately told: the newspapers gave comparatively little space to arguments on the other side after the original filing of the government's briefs, which

had to be presented in the form of news, rather than as advertising. On the basis of the way the case has been presented to the public, tried, you might say, before the bar of public opinion in advance of a formal court proceeding, the wonder is that the Gallup poll showed as many people taking the government's side as it did; in answer to the question, "from what you have heard and read, with which side do you agree, the government or the A & P?" the answer was 30 per cent for the A & P, 16 per cent for the government, 20 per cent with no opinion. That adds up to 66 per cent—which the Gallup poll said was the number of persons questioned who had heard anything at all about the case.

Now we come to Chapter Two in the A & P story, and from what we've seen in the New York newspapers, it will be all news to a lot of listeners, so we'll deal with it in some detail. In October, the National Federation of Independent Business, which claims 140,000 members in small business around the country—many of them grocers—prepared an advertising counter-attack against the A & P. The intention is to present the campaign in 500 newspapers, and as a test, eight papers were selected: one each in Texas, California, Iowa and Massachusetts, and the four dailies in Washington, D. C.

The advertisements ran without question in Texas, California, Iowa and Massachusetts, but in the capital, it was different: three of the dailies refused to print them. They were the *Star*, the *Times-Herald* and the *Post*, accounting for most of the daily newspaper circulation in Washington. The one paper which accepted the ad was the tabloid *Daily News*, a member of the Scripps-Howard chain which publishes the New York *World-Telegram*. Now newspapers can

accept or reject advertising as they like—they are of course, under no obligation to print just anything anybody offers them, and that is quite proper. Sometimes one wonders about their judgment, as when the dignified New York *Herald Tribune* printed early this month a full page advertisement by Tommy Manville offering \$5,000 reward to anyone who could prove that his telephone was tapped. That bit of nonsense meant \$2,880 to the *Herald Tribune* business office, however much it made *Herald Tribune* readers wonder what we're coming to. But to return to the anti-A & P advertisements which were turned down by the Washington papers. Ordinarily, the advertising a newspaper accepts or rejects isn't news, but this time it was different. Two weeks after the copy had been submitted and turned down, the Democratic National Committee in its weekly newsletter accused the three Washington dailies of censorship. Both the Associated Press and the United Press sent out full stories about this from Washington, but they didn't get much space in the New York papers—the only place we could find anything at all about this accusation of censorship was in the *Post* and the *Herald Tribune*, both of which printed watered-down versions of the original Associated Press account.

In the *World-Telegram*, columnist Douglas Larsen referred to the A & P controversy, and mentioned that the Federation had intended to touch off its advertising campaign, but made no mention of the fact that the three big Washington papers had blacked out this first attempt to answer the A & P on its own ground of paid space. There are one or two points made in Larsen's column though, that are worth keeping in mind in this discussion. The column was headlined, "Vast propaganda war

spurred by A & P suit," and it began as follows:

"Anti-trust suits used to be titanic legal struggles that lasted for years. Now," Larson went on, "they've apparently become titanic propaganda struggles, at least if the current case against the A & P is any indication." Titanic it may be, but certainly not on the basis of what had appeared in the New York papers: brief stories in only two of our nine dailies, a complete ignoring by the *Times*, the one newspaper where one does count on finding things, just for the record. The *Times* next morning, though, did find room for almost column-length stories on the revival of art in Leningrad, and about the authorship of the eighteenth century polemics against George III known as the Junius letters, and it also devoted some space to remarks by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, to the effect that the newspapers and the radio stations are not adequately informing the people on significant events of the day. These remarks were made to the convention of the National Association of Radio News Directors holding their convention in New York, and Mr. Canham pointed out that recent polls had indicated that thirty per cent of the population was unaware of major national events, and only twenty-five per cent was informed enough to answer a simple question on a significant development.

"We should realize," Mr. Canham said, "the need of turning into human interest the significant news which is important to people's lives everywhere. We must," he said, "achieve larger public confidence." Now the A & P controversy is certainly significant news, important to to people's lives, and we will not belabor the point that all aspects of it deserve to be given the fullest possible publicity so that the people can know what's going on. The only daily newspapers which we've found dealt adequately with the Washington A & P situation were the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *Louisville Courier-Journal*; the latter's capital columnist Robert L. Riggs was far ahead of everyone else in the daily field in getting to the story. Riggs's story said, "three of Washington's four daily newspapers have jockeyed themselves into a position which apparently is going to bring forth another of those bitter attacks upon the integrity of the nation's press. They have done so by refusing to publish advertisements written to answer the full page advertisements purchased in many papers throughout the country by the A & P." The Washington

Post said it turned down the anti-A & P ad because it seemed possibly libelous; the *Star* said it was not its policy to permit any advertiser to discredit the advertising of another, and for that reason, the copy as submitted was not acceptable. The *Times-Herald* had no comment.

As for the *News*, which did print the ad, Riggs contributes an amusing sidelight; he writes that subordinate executives in the paper's advertising department refuse to pose as virtuous about their action, and he quotes one of them, naturally anonymously, as saying, "It's perfectly clear why we published the

Louisville Courier-Journal

Ads Answering A & P Ads

Stir Up A Washington Row

by Robert L. Riggs

The Courier-Journal, Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON, Nov. 5.—Three of Washington's four daily newspapers have jockeyed themselves into a position which apparently is going to bring forth another of those bitter attacks upon the integrity of the nation's press. The three have done so by refusing to publish advertisements written to answer the full-page advertisements purchased in many papers throughout the country by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company.

The A & P, as it is known to most shoppers, bought its ads to arouse consumers to its support in the anti-monopoly suit brought against the grocery chain by the Department of Justice. Its argument, as presented in its ads, was that it has enabled the housewife to buy groceries at lower prices; that if the Justice Department wins its suit, she will have to pay bigger food bills.

The answer to this argument was prepared by an advertising agency in San Francisco, working for George J. Burger, vice-president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. This reply declared that the A & P charged lower prices by suffering a loss in those regions where it had independent competition, but that when it had got rid of its competition, it raised the prices.

Test Run Tried

The ad prepared for Burger used some vigorous language, charging the A & P with using "such vicious un-American weapons as boycotts, blacklisting, price

reply and the three other papers refused to do so. I have no doubt whatever," the executive went on, "that if we carried A & P ads regularly, we would also have refused the reply."

In Washington, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath in an interview with David Lawrence's magazine *U. S. News and World Report*, developed a point that millions would benefit through lower prices if the government were successful in its suit, and the interview was given adequate coverage in four of our nine newspapers: the *Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, the *News* and the *Telegram*.

wars and threats." Burger said that such language was taken from previous Federal Court decisions in suits against the A & P.

It was—and still is—Burger's intention to seek to purchase space for this reply to A & P in 500 newspapers throughout the country. But, for a test run, he and the San Francisco agency selected eight papers, one in California, one in Texas, one in Iowa, one in Massachusetts, and the four Washington dailies.

All four papers outside Washington ran the ad without question or quibble, Burger said. But three of the Washington papers turned it down. They were the *Times-Herald* recently purchased by Col. Robert R. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*; the *Washington Post*, which prides itself on its liberal editorial policy, and the *Washington Star*.

The only Washington paper which accepted the ad was the *Daily News*, member of the Scripps-Howard chain. Like the three other Washington papers, the *Daily News* had previously carried the A & P ads denouncing the suit. But subordinate executives in the advertising department of the *News* refused to be smug or to pose as virtuous about their action in carrying both sides.

"It's perfectly clear why we published Burger's reply and the three other papers refused to do so," said one of the *News* executives. "The other three get grocery advertising from A & P every week. We don't get any. I have no doubt whatever that if we carried A & P ads regu-

larly, we also would have refused Burger's ad. However, if you quote me by name on this, I will take an oath that I was sick in bed at the time you did your telephoning, that I never heard of you in my life."

The *Star* was the only paper which put in writing its reasons for refusing to carry the attack upon A & P. Burger said he had been promised that a member of the *Times-Herald's* advertising department would telephone him and give that paper's reasons, but the call never came through. In response to a telegram from the San Francisco agency, Smith, Bull and McCreery, the *Times-Herald* merely replied by wire that the copy was rejected.

An advertising solicitor for the *Post*, Allen C. Whitehead, told Burger by telephone, "We can't run it." When Burger pressed him for a reason, Whitehead replied, according to Burger, "They didn't give me any explanation. They just said the best thing to do was not to run it."

'Not Our Policy'

The *Star's* letter to Burger, dated October 25, was signed by Godfrey W. Kauffman, advertising manager. It said:

"It is not our policy to permit any

"The *Star* has no objection to any of another, and, for that reason, the copy as submitted is not acceptable.

"The *Star* has no objection to any individual or advertiser taking a positive stand for or against any issue, and we therefore would have no objection to your organization stating the reasons why it supports the Justice Department in this case. If you desire to resubmit the copy setting forth the Government's side of the current issue, we should be pleased to accept it."

Burger's reaction to this is that the sole purpose of any ads he might submit would be to tear apart the A. & P. arguments; hence the caption on his ad, "A. & P. Advertisement False," States U. S. Dept. of Justice." If he toned down his ads in line with the *Star's* suggestion, Burger said, he might just as well run one saying: "A Tree Grows In Brooklyn," and let it go at that.

Editor Quoted

Already the *Star* letter to Burger has been used in the preliminary skirmishing of what may develop into a full-negged attack upon the press. The publication *Labor*, put out once a week by the railroad brotherhoods, printed the Kauffman paragraph saying: "It is not our policy to permit any advertiser to discredit the advertising of another." Then, for contrast, it put in an adjoining

column a quotation from a speech made to a newspaper gathering in Texas this week by Ben M. McKelway, editor of the *Star* and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

The McKelway quote was: "As publishers and as newspaper editors, we should realize that the most unassailable position for the defense of a free and privately owned newspaper press today is to demonstrate, by what we print, that it is the only trustworthy guardian of that common property of the American people—the unbiased, accurate news of the world."

This device of quoting a *Star* news executive against a *Star* advertising executive is likely to get wide circulation in the labor press. The publicity division of the Democratic National Committee is prepared to make its contribution. Already, reporters from several newspapers, as well as one from *Time* magazine, which delights in needling the daily press, have interviewed Burger about his advertising troubles.

The interest of the Democratic National Committee in the situation arises from the fact that the A & P ads have brought a flood of protests to the Attorney General against the anti-monopoly suit. These protests come from ordinary

citizens who have accepted the A & P doctrine that the Government is trying to make their grocery bills larger.

What Burger Wants

So heavy has been the flow of protests that Attorney General J. Howard McGrath has resorted to answering the A & P ads in public speeches. This, in turn, has brought him criticism on the ground that he is trying to get his views carried free in the news columns while A & P has to resort to paid advertising. To this, McGrath has rejoined that the Government has no funds with which to buy space for its views; that he would not have resorted to the procedure of discussing in public a question pending before the courts had not A & P forced him to do so by its public discussion through advertising.

The National Federation of Independent Business has, according to Burger, 136,000 individual members who pay dues ranging from a minimum of \$9.50 a year to a maximum of \$100. Burger declares that the organization has no desire for additional legislation to curb big business; all it wants, he says, is for the Government to enforce the anti-trust laws which it already has on the books. There has been no vigorous anti-trust enforcement since 1912, Burger insists.

The New Yorker—Dec. 10, 1949

Old Scratch Serves

The thorniness of the monopoly problem has been amusingly illustrated here in the last few weeks by an incident in the A. & P. case. Recently, as the administration prodded the press associations into reporting, three Washington newspapers out of four turned down an advertisement of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., answering the advertisements placed in newspapers all over the country by the A. & P. The only Washington paper that accepted the anti-A. & P. copy was the *Scripps-Howard Daily News*, one of whose business managers explained to a reporter, "The other three papers get grocery advertising from A. & P. every week. We don't get any. I have no doubt whatever that if we carried A. & P. ads regularly we also would have refused the ad." When the story came out that the ad had been refused by the three other papers, the Washington correspondents for several newspapers that pride themselves on their liberalism and freedom from control by business in-

terests wired it to their home offices. In all but one instance, their reports were killed. Among the newspapers that didn't publish the story was the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, which has for so many years been one of the finest and more liberal publications in the country. It is conceivable that the *Post-Dispatch* objected to the story on literary grounds, but then there must have been an epidemic of bad writing in Washington that day. The one paper that printed the story was the *Louisville Courier-Journal*. And the most obvious explanation of why the *Courier-Journal* was free to publish this news is that it is a monopoly. The only other newspaper in town is the *Times*, which is owned by the same publisher. If the A. & P. wants to announce a bargain in wax beans, it has no choice but to place an advertisement in the *Courier-Journal* or the *Times*. Thus did monopoly, which is Old Scratch himself in the American ideology, serve freedom of expression.

—Richard H. Rovere

New York Herald Tribune—Oct. 20, 1949

ASIA'S RED RIDDLE

by Christopher Rand

This is the second of a series of articles by a team of five New York Herald Tribune foreign correspondents, headed by A. T. Steele. They have just completed a survey on the impact of Communism on Southeast Asia.

Mr. Steele, who has spent seventeen years in the Far East, wrote the introduction, separate articles on French Indo-China, Malaya and Siam, and a summary of the general findings of the group. Other articles are by Christopher Rand, who has returned to China after a year as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard; Allen Raymond, veteran foreign correspondent and head of the Herald Tribune's Tokyo Bureau; Margaret Parton, this newspaper's correspondent in India; and Dorothy Brandon, of the New York staff, who has completed an extensive tour of Indonesia and the Philippines.

HONG KONG.—The capture of Canton gives the Chinese Communists a new and difficult problem of big city management, but it also provides them with a new lifeline of trade with the outside world. It reduces to a minimum the chances for any effective American aid to the falling Nationalists—scant though these prospects were.

In some ways South China is a liability. It eats more than it produces. Its industrial capacity is unimpressive. Its people are traditionally the most volatile and the least regimentable in China.

Nevertheless the fall of the city is of tremendous political significance in China's civil war. The Nationalists are now left with little on the Chinese mainland but the southwestern provinces and the rich but teetery western province of Szechuan. They have lost their last major port (there are smaller ports to the south) and are beyond effective supply except by air. Formosa is another matter.

The unopposed occupation of Canton is but the opening move in what looks like the final showdown on the mainland of China. To the southwest and the west the Communists are deploying troops in apparent preparation for isolating Nationalist armies. It is difficult to see how anything can be done to prevent the mainland at least from being overwhelmed. Nationalist coastal pockets are certainly doomed. The islands of Formosa and Hainan alone remain fairly safe

for the moment from Communist attack.

Expansion Adds to Red Problems

The only consolation to the Nationalists is that the more the Communists expand, the more their internal problems grow. There is no doubt that the Communists are harrassed by many retarding factors. The big cities have been major headaches and are in a bad way economically. In a few places there is guerrilla resistance, but on no important scale. Floods, disease and unaccustomed climate—not Nationalist opposition—have hindered the Communist advance into China's deep south.

None of these factors is decisive. It will be two or three years before it will be possible to see clearly whether or not the Communists are going to be successful in solving their economic and political problems. Meanwhile they face the necessity of winding up the war on the mainland quickly in order to relieve themselves of the burden of maintaining a huge army of 4,000,000 men which is eating deeply into food supplies and revenues.

The best remaining Nationalist men under General Pai Chung-hsi—has retired into the southwestern province of Kwangsi where it awaits a Communist onslaught. It is threatened from the north by 200,000 Communist troops under Generals Liu Po-cheng and Chen Yi and from the east by the Red forces which have just erupted into Kwangtung. Still farther west, in and around the rice bowl of Szechuan province, which is apparently being isolated from Kwangsi by another Communist drive, there are 300,000 Nationalist troops with low morale and a record of defeats. North of them the Communist General Peng Teh-hui is still redispersing his army of 200,000 after his crushing defeat of the Moslem war lord, General Ma Pu-feng. In addition there are the provinces of Yunnan and Kweichow, not yet threatened and only lightly defended.

If the above areas go Red, the Communists will control pretty much all of the mainland of China except Tibet. High, inaccessible and sparsely populated, Tibet offers little promise as a base for prolonged Nationalist resistance.

Aid Opportunities Few

American policy makers, exploring possibilities for spending \$75,000,000 for anti-

Communist purposes in China, will find few opportunities on the mainland. General Pai Chung-hsi is almost the only Nationalist general who stands a chance of putting up any kind of effective resistance. Whether aid to Pai would do any good at this late hour is highly problematical. Moreover, there is no certainty that Pai will be able to stand up any better to concentrated Communist attack than did Fu Tso-yi and Ma Pu-feng, two other highly touted Nationalist generals before him. Both Fu and Ma turned out to be men of straw when the big test came.

As Communism spreads across the mainland, Hong Kong and Formosa, just off the China coast, became points of particular interest to Americans. These areas may stay non-Communist for an indefinite time, and while they do they will pose a problem for the United States. We can hardly avoid being drawn into their affairs, which are tricky and complex.

Here in the British colony of Hong Kong, the British have reinforced their garrison with the obvious determination of holding on. More than thirty thousand British and Gurkha troops are stationed here, with strong air and naval support. The Communists are not likely to risk attack. Were they to do so, they would probably provoke international complications, through the United Nations. Hong Kong depends heavily, however, on China and is vulnerable to boycott by any strong Chinese government.

Formosa Well Defended

Formosa is the island, 200 miles long, off the southeast China coast, where Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has taken the national treasury and the cream of the Nationalist military forces for a last stand. The island is protected by a 100-mile channel, by well over 100,000 infantry effectives and by the bulk of the remaining Nationalist Air Force and Navy. There has been much talk of launching a "counter-offensive" from Formosa, but this seems most unlikely. Since the Communists are weak in the air and at sea, Formosa should remain in Nationalist hands for a considerable period.

The Japanese ran Formosa as a colony for fifty years and built it up to a high degree. Since then it has deteriorated under a government of mainland Chinese, especially after the arrival of several

hundred thousand refugee followers of the Kuomintang government early this year. They brought with them the vices that sped their downfall on a national scale—nepotism, "bureaucratic capitalism," irregular and exploitative taxation.

There are several ways that American aid might be effective in bolstering Formosa's economy. The Japanese, during their half-century of rule, developed the island's industry beyond the capacity of China's present technical personnel to maintain. Plants have simply deteriorated in Chinese hands. American management and advice have proved useful on this problem and could be expanded. Formosa's external trade is also badly

maladjusted as a result of the cutting off of Japan and much of the Chinese mainland. The United States could be of great help in helping to tie up the loose ends with the outside world again—whether with Japan under Supreme Commander Allied Powers or with other countries.

Formosa is a delicate problem for the United States. Anything we do to bolster Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan position will displease at least two groups—the Formosans and the followers of Chinese Communism. The Formosans resent the mainland government bitterly for the excesses that followed the war. The Communists, on the other hand, claim

that Formosa is an integral part of China and must be "liberated" with the rest of the country.

It is amazing how the stubborn personality of Chiang Kai-shek still dominates the Nationalist political scene. Chiang's main zone of influence is the Island of Formosa and adjacent areas of the China coast. As Chiang sees it, Formosa can and must be held regardless of what happens on the mainland. He considers a third world war inevitable. Barring such a catastrophe, there is no apparent future for the Nationalist government but continued retreat and continued disintegration.

San Francisco Chronicle—Oct. 23, 1949

CALIFORNIA'S WATER

Lusty, Sprawling Los Angeles Gropes to Satisfy Its Thirst

by Robert de Roos

This is the third of a series outlining California's water resources and some of the bitter controversies which have grown out of the State's urgent need to harness and use all its water.

Southern California is hand made.

Nature—except for blessing the coastal plain with a gentle climate—gave the region little—at least at first glance.

There was no water, no apparent fuel supply, no harbor, no timber.

There was nothing but the broad alluvial plain protected from the desert by mountains and washed in the west by the sea.

And yet, in what appears an impossible place for a metropolitan center, Los Angeles has come into being.

It is the Nation's third largest city, but by the time you read this it may be second or even first, so rapidly does it grow.

This growth made Los Angeles and Southern California terribly proud. The citizens threw their berets in the air and waved their dark glasses.

The figures are proud, too. Southern California:

1860—24,700

1920—1,347,050

1940—3,572,000

And Los Angeles:

1860—4,385

1920—576,000

Robert de Roos, of the San Francisco Chronicle staff, was a Nieman Fellow in 1949.

1940—1,504,277

Last March, Los Angeles was supposed to have 2,021,000 residents in its 452 square miles, and the figure for Southern California was somewhere in the neighborhood of four million.

Along with the growth, of course, and particularly during the second world war, Los Angeles and Southern California were industrialized.

In the process it lost—temporarily, at least—its greatest asset, its climate.

Now smog, a cute word for an intolerable thing, blots out the famous sun and loads the gentle breeze with eye-stinging fumes from factories and back-yard incinerators.

The growth is the dramatic thing. Not many people stop to realize that everything on this dun-colored plain—the trees, the lawns, the orderly groves, even the weeds and most of the animals—was imported.

And they all depend on one thing for their life under the sun. Water.

In the beginning, the adobe pueblo (Sp., town) relied on the Los Angeles river for its water, diverting its flow into ditches for domestic and farm use.

Although its dusty course is famed in song and story, the Los Angeles river is a strong stream underground. Until 1868, this source was plenty for the town.

Then the city leased a privately owned water company and finally bought it out in 1902.

Meanwhile, the city had fought off some men who asserted a prior claim

to the Los Angeles river; they were upstream and wanted to irrigate the San Fernando valley.

King Philip of Spain, long dead, rescued the city from this threatened disaster. He had given the pueblo rights to the Los Angeles river in 1784 and the Supreme Court upheld Los Angeles' right to the flow of the river for the uses of the town.

By about 1905 (population 200,000), it was apparent that Los Angeles was outgrowing its water supply.

It went out after more water and its tactics were as rough as the West has seen. Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer of the Department of Water and Power, delivers the official version:

" . . . William Mulholland and Fred Eaton, ex-city engineer and former Mayor of Los Angeles, saw the need for additional water beyond the Los Angeles river.

"Their decision was not to acquire other local supplies which would reduce supplies of other communities or agricultural areas, but to go to the east side of the high Sierra and divert the waters of the Owens river through an aqueduct 240 miles in length.

"The citizens rose to this challenge and authorized \$24,500,000 in bonds by more than a 10-to-1 vote. The aqueduct was completed in 1913 . . . "

Other authorities tell a blacker story of how Los Angeles went out to get its water.

According to these, including Carey McWilliams, Los Angeles, author, the whole aqueduct scheme was dreamed up by Los Angeles powers who had purchased waterless land in the San Fernando valley. They wanted water for their San Fernando holdings; water would assure them profit.

An employee of the Bureau of Reclamation was sent into Owens valley, ostensibly to survey a reclamation project. Actually, it is said, he got all the information there was about the water resources of the valley.

He was followed by Eaton, who purchased land in a checkerboard pattern throughout the valley, and with the land the water rights. These rights were turned over to the city.

To insure passage of the \$24,500,000 bond issue—which was announced at the last minute—a fake water shortage was created by dumping water into sewer mains. An ordinance was passed prohibiting lawn watering. The people voted right.

When the aqueduct was completed, it was found to end not in Los Angeles but at the northern end of the San Fernando valley. Its water was available to the speculators' land—they are supposed to have made \$100,000 on the deal.

Critics contend that, by constructing a storage dam at Long Valley (which was later done), both the city and Owens Valley could have been served.

Later, in the dry 1920s, the city purchased 300,000 acres of Owens valley lands.

"When people said this purchase was destroying the towns of the area, we bought the towns, too," says Morris. "We bought all this property by negotiations with the owners—without condemning a single parcel."

The lands have since been leased for grazing, he said, and most of the town properties in Bishop, Independence, Lone Pine and Big Pine have since been leased or sold.

During the 20s, the dead-mad farmers dynamited the aqueduct. But they could not fight off the colossus. The water flowed steadily toward San Fernando valley fields and Los Angeles water taps.

Later, still rejoicing in growth, Los Angeles extended the aqueduct. Creeks tributary to Mono lake were siphoned into the conduit.

Today the long arm of the aqueduct stretches to Leevining creek—north of San Francisco—for the water Los Angeles demands.

Trouble with the farmers was not the

only pain produced by the Owens valley exploit. Owens lake, a saline sink, is owned by the State, which leases it to the Natural Soda Products Co., which salvages chemicals from the water.

In the "dry cycle" of the 20s the lake dried up. Then, with the rains of the 30s, the lake filled again. Meanwhile, the chemical company had found it more profitable to work a dry lake than a wet one.

It sued. Los Angeles paid \$170,000. Then the State sued, saying the city had no right to dry up the lake and then allow it to fill again. This was settled for \$6800.

Los Angeles is still worried about the valley. It is seeking to insure that a million acres of Federal land now withdrawn from entry will never be opened for settlement.

If settlers are allowed, Los Angeles will have to buy out their water rights. "We are anxious to protect ourselves against any new adverse rights," says Morris.

In spite of dynamite and the dehydration of Owens Valley, Los Angeles got its water. The aqueduct was the final solution.

This new water gave Los Angeles room to grow in and made the city grow immediately by accretion. San Fernando, Hollywood, Venice, Ocean Park, Eagle Rock, and a dozen other cities, gladly annexed themselves to Los Angeles. They gave up sovereignty for water.

But Owens river water was not enough, said the engineers.

In the early 20s, Mulholland, the chief engineer of the Department of Water and

Power, had to look around for new water. It was apparent that Los Angeles was going to be something special in the way of size.

There was only one place to look: to the Colorado—heavy with the silt of the western bad lands, now sluggish, now ripping through its bank and flooding the desert reaches.

The river was untamed. True, its waters were used in the Imperial Valley, but the threat of flood hung heavily over the below-sea level valley.

To put it to work would be a colossal task. Many men had been thinking about the job to be done and they had an answer: a dam at Black Canyon in the steep-sided valley of the Colorado would choke the river down to size.

It meant building the largest structure ever made by man. It meant creating the largest artificial lake in the world.

Most of all, it meant money. So much money that only the Federal Government could make such a project go.

But even before the money could be had, an agreement among the Colorado river States—Wyoming, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, California and Colorado—on a division of the river's water was needed.

In 1922 an agreement was reached—the famous Colorado river compact, steered through arduous debate by Herbert Hoover.

And out of that agreement has exploded the most monumental water fight the West has ever known.

This fight rages bitterly today. It is a fight which may cost you a lot of money one way or another.

New York Medicine—Sept. 20, 1949

INTERPRETING MEDICINE FOR THE LAYMAN

by Steven M. Spencer

Much of the public's information about medicine is obtained through the press. If that information is sound the public reactions on medical matters are more apt to be sound than otherwise. And I am sure the press and the doctors can work together to bring about and maintain this desirable situation. I would not have you infer that the doctors and the reporters always see eye to eye on

the details and that the task of presenting medical news to the public is therefore a simple one, performed by men and women whistling while they work and greeted, when finished, by the unanimous applause of editors, physicians and a hundred million readers. Such is not quite the case. There is still room for discussion.

We might stake out this area of discussion with such questions as these: (1) How much medical information does the layman want? (2) How much should he have? (3) How can medical reporting

Mr. Spencer, a veteran science writer, is associate editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*, was a Nieman Fellow in 1940.

and medical public relations complement each other? (4) What part can the physician play in seeing that the public obtains sound medical information?

As a layman who spends a great deal of his time looking over medicine's shoulder I wish to offer a few observations which may help us to answer these questions. The answers will not be final, but perhaps they will provide a working pattern of value to both of us.

The publication of medical articles in newspapers and magazines is not a matter of editorial whim. An editor retains his job partly on the basis of how well he can play menus that appeal to his readers. He tries to give them what they want, within the limits of his own ideas of good taste and with an awareness of his responsibility to provide editorial leadership. Fortunately he can obtain helpful clues from such thermometers and windvanes as readership surveys.

I can speak with detailed knowledge only of our own survey, but results of others are comparable. Every other week an organization carefully polls a selected sample of homes all over the United States to determine how the current issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* was received. Interviewer and interviewee sit down and thumb through the magazine, and the reader is asked which articles he or she read clear through. For purposes of analysis, the non-fiction is classified in six or seven categories—health and hygiene, people and places, war and peace, the United States government, applications of science (other than medicine), et cetera. The survey reveals that the medical articles, health and hygiene, consistently rank at or near the top in reader interest. In 1946 they led the whole list. In 1947 they were tied for third place, and all surveys to date this year show them once more in top position.

While this analysis applies to the content of one magazine, other periodicals have also found their medical features enjoy a high "Hooper rating." One reason is that the subject appeals to both sexes. Articles on football, politics, business and atomic energy will poll more men readers than women, and the reverse will be true of pieces on Hollywood, homemaking or children. But both men and women are keenly interested in new discoveries about heart disease, cancer, ulcer, deafness, backache.

There is another reason for the popularity of these features. Most medical news is good news. It has been said that the good and the peaceful make dull reading. But in this day when so much

of the news is bad, good news is doubly welcome. And medicine, in my opinion, is not dull at any time. Even when an article does not announce brand new treatment but simply presents a summary of the most up-to-date knowledge on the cause and treatment of any disease, or reports a promising development along the research front, it gets a good reading. For the reassurance which comes from a fuller understanding of a condition affecting the reader or a member of his family is itself ample justification for publishing the information.

Yet as reporters of current medical history we often stub our toes against the doctor's tradition, that bushel hiding his light and labeled "Don't quote me!" To be sure, in the twenty years I have been writing about medical activities I have seen the profession's attitude toward reporters change from definite coolness to warm and friendly cooperation. But the doctor's reticence at seeing his name in the public print still places obstacles in our path. It is part of the reason many physicians wish to censor every article written about their work or that of their junior associates. To assure scientific accuracy a magazine editor may ask a doctor to review a medical article before publication. But it strikes the editor as curious that frequently the medical critic, instead of questioning statements of fact, will assume the English teacher's role and make changes lying strictly within the field of editorial judgment, including the deleting of his name here and there.

Our argument for using names is simply that we believe the public has a right to know whose work is being described and whose opinions are reflected in the text of the article. To adopt a policy of not quoting authorities would open the way for unreliable reports on medicine by irresponsible publications—and there are a few. In addition, we feel the story of medicine's advance is the story of people as well as of facts.

At this point it may be of interest to tell how science writers perform their operation. The technic varies somewhat with the publication and the individual, but every conscientious writer goes to considerable length to obtain all the facts, negative as well as favorable. In reporting a new development or a newsworthy situation of issue he does not confine himself to one man's word but may talk with fifteen or twenty in an effort to arrive at a balanced appraisal. This may take him to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Omaha, Rochester and Minneapolis for material on one article

alone. In addition to interviewing doctors and attending medical meetings, the writer may review two or three dozen articles in the technical literature and thumb through several books. The whole task, from the first scribbled note to the finished and accepted manuscript, may consume five or six weeks or more, and after that may come minor revisions and the reading and correcting of the final proof. Medical articles handled by our own publication represent an editorial expenditure in time and money averaging about 20 per cent more than the average for articles in all other categories.

Because it is recognized that illustrations attract the reader and help tell the story, a great deal of energy is also directed toward obtaining good photographs. And the photographer is often tangled to the point of frustration in the coils of medical protocol. He may make a long trip to take a doctor's picture, only to find the doctor has changed his mind for one reason or another. If at long last he is allowed to set up his camera and lights, the physician may permit only the back of his head to be photographed, or he will request that his name be left out of the captions. It's a case, to paraphrase Mr. Whittier, of "Shoot if you must this old gray head, but please omit my name," he said.

Recognizing the importance of full cooperation between physicians and the press, the National Association of Science Writers recently discussed plans for threshing out with representatives of the medical profession a workable policy on medical news which would satisfy both sides. In the meantime we have noted with interest that a Code of Cooperation already has been adopted by the Colorado State Medical Society and the press and radio of that state.

The Code sets up a system of official spokesmen for each county society—usually the president, secretary and publicity chairman. These men and women, as well as the spokesman for the hospitals, are to make themselves available to the press and may be quoted "in matters of public interest for purposes of authenticating information." The Code states specifically that this action by the spokesmen "shall not be considered by their colleagues as a breach of the time-honored practice of physicians to avoid personal publicity, since it is done in the best interests of the public and the profession."

That single sentence cuts to the very core of the problem and in my opinion it is worth all the effort put into framing the document and carrying out its pro-

visions. Colorado's program is a tremendously encouraging sign that the physicians and the press are alive to the importance of giving accurate medical

information to the public. I hope the Code will work out and that plans of this type, perhaps broadened in some respects, will be adopted in other states.

Des Moines Register—July 5, 1949

A Look at Britain's Press -- And Our Own

The Register and Tribune are only two of many newspapers in the United States today which give a good deal of thought to the social responsibilities of a free press in a democracy. We think of our "freedom" of the press not just as freedom from restraint, but as the kind of freedom that entails social obligations, as all of Man's freedoms do if they are to remain secure.

We are aware that the press, like all other human institutions, is imperfect and not divinely wise, including ourselves. We are aware that there are some bad examples and some reasonably good examples of social responsibility in the newspapering profession and industry. We happen to think that the mean average has risen sharply over the past hundred years. Because a technological age has introduced "bigness" into so many aspects of our social and economic life—labor unions, agricultural organizations, industry, and all the rest—we think that all the more of such social responsibility devolves upon the inheritors of this bigness and influence.

So we, among others, try to live up to our charge. Of course we err, now and then. We can only hope that, by making this obligation to the society of our time one of our primary concerns rather than just a secondary and casual one, we shall help to "lift up" a little both the press and the whole structure of society, so as to pass along our ideals and human achievement shining a trifle more brightly and nobly.

We say all this, quite humbly, by way of introducing the conclusions and recommendations of the British Royal Commission on the Press, which are printed elsewhere on this page.

Of course this has to do with the British press, not the American. But it is a British counterpart to the study a few years ago of our own press by the "Hutchins Commission" on Freedom of the Press. Because we believe in such self-analysis and soul-searching both by

the press itself and by a free people about their institutions, in the conviction that the truth can only be got by this process, we welcomed the Hutchins Commission's criticisms. And because the democratic ideals of the British people are quite identical to ours, and their social and economic environment very similar to ours up to now, we also welcome this British study. In many ways its comments are just as applicable to the American press as to the British.

We hope that our readers will take note of these conclusions, therefore—keeping in mind the special circumstances which, here and there, are characteristic of the British press and not of ours.

Note that the same sort of "local monopoly" has evolved in the British press as in our own. As every Iowan knows—since there is not any real local competition in any of Iowa's 40 or so daily newspaper cities—it is simple economic evolution that has brought this about. The modern daily newspaper is a technological crazy quilt, so complex that it does not commonly survive local competition any more except in the very largest cities.

Note that the importance of this local monopoly is "qualified by the fact that (British) national newspapers circulate throughout the country." The United States is much larger, but the same forces exist. Many of the larger newspapers "cover" and therefore compete throughout entire states or several states—this same technology having made competition possible over far wider areas because of autos and highways and high-speed presses and airplanes and so on. Indeed, the report calls the press "a highly competitive industry"—for the lay citizen must not forget that it now competes with radio and magazines and television and a whole vast field of other media of information and entertainment, also made available by this new technological age of ours.

Note that the same variations in "truthful and unbiased reporting of the news" exist in the British press as, unhappily, exist in our own. And that "an opportunity for all important points of view to be effectively presented" is, in the Commission's judgment, a goal that needs urgently to be attained. American newspaper associations are wrestling with these problems every month of the year—and making, we hope, some progress.

In sum, says the Commission, the British press "acknowledges high standards of public responsibility and service"; free enterprise rather than "any form of state control" is the prerequisite of a free press; and the achievement of free expression rests ultimately upon "the press itself"—upon "those who own and conduct" it.

* * *

Now there are some things in this statement that we would quibble with, if they were important. For illustration, the Commission says blandly that any decrease in the number of national newspapers or of provincial morning newspapers would be "serious." We quite agree, at the moment. But if the economic facts of life in Britain in the next ten years should decree the failure and consolidation of some of these, what would the Commission propose to do about it? Surely it would not propose Government subsidies, for it concedes that this would lead away from a free press. And surely not special-interest or partisan subsidies, for this would narrow rather than broaden the social responsibility of the press in the aggregate.

We doubt that the Commission really thought this one through. The solution to an adequate and free press lies not in the preservation of unwanted and uneconomic newspaper institutions, but—as the Commission itself concedes elsewhere—in the rising of the press itself to its new and more urgent social responsibilities in a technological civilization: including the responsibility to print ALL the news, to print it FAIRLY, and to provide a forum for ALL shades of opinion.

When newspapers generally, in Britain or elsewhere, acquire this character rather than the character of biased partisan advocates solely, then the largely fictitious "monopoly" issue will disappear and the threat of interference by any truly democratic government will go with it.