

NiemanReports

January, 1953

The Campaign Coverage: How Fair?

**Robert H. Estabrook
Barry Bingham**

An Editor Answers the Russians

Charles A. Sprague

The Hutchins Report – Five Years Later

Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

Freedom Is Indivisible

James S. Pope

An Independent Editorial Page

Lindsay Hoben

A Study of Our Foreign News

Frank K. Kelly

Some Rules for Attractive Headlines

Reginald Coggeshall

Justice Douglas: The One Un-American Act; Aldai Stevenson: The Duty to Speak Out; Leslie Moeller: Challenge to the Mass Media — Freedom of Press Photography — Coverage of the Presidential Campaign — McCarthyism and the Press — The Science Reporter's Job — Nieman Scrapbook — Reviews — 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.

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Malcolm C. Bauer, Portland, Ore.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John L. Hulteng, Providence, R. I.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, Ohio; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, Ohio; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, New York City; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Washington, D. C.; 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. VII NO. 1

JANUARY, 1953

The Duty to Speak Out

by Adlai Stevenson

Elijah Lovejoy embraced a great idea in an early and perilous stage of that idea's development. And that is usually dangerous, particularly when the idea is a new idea, disturbing to existing institutions, habits and prejudices. His idea was that the enslavement of black by white was wrong and should be ended.

Elijah Lovejoy, however, served a greater cause than that of the abolition of Negro slavery. And it was his devotion to this cause which we will remember long after the struggle over the abolition of slavery has been all but forgotten.

This greater cause was the right—and the duty—of the individual to speak out for the truth. I make the reference to "duty" advisedly because that was the way Lovejoy thought of it. To his fellow citizens of Alton in meeting assembled to protest the turmoil provoked by his outspokenness, he said something like this:

"I am impelled to the course I have taken because I fear God. As I shall answer to my God in the great day, I dare not abandon my sentiments, or cease in all proper ways to propagate them. I can die at my post but I cannot desert it."

There are many vigorous and powerful statements of the right to be permitted to speak freely, but I know of none more moving. And in these days of clamorous and jostling assertion of rights and privileges, it is sobering to be reminded by these words of duties as well as rights.

The greatest and wisest of living Americans, speaking in the detachment and wisdom of his retirement, found words for his countrymen when he said:

"I believe that that community is already in the process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor

as a possible enemy, where non-conformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent."

The American conviction could not find a more accurate statement than this by Judge Learned Hand. It has been the American conviction from the beginning that men are only free when they respect each other's freedom.

This is from Gov. Stevenson's talk at Alton, Ill., November 9, 1952, dedicating a memorial plaque to Elijah Lovejoy.

FOR SELF EXAMINATION BY THE PRESS by Barry Bingham

Few people are required to die for their faith in press freedom; but it is not easy for the owners of newspapers to live for that belief in all its moral responsibility.

Newspapers must always welcome criticism, however, for its sharpens our sense of responsibility. Many Americans have questioned the fairness of the American press in its handling of the news during this campaign year. We cannot dismiss those public doubts as ignorant or misguided.

I would like to see the American press make an exhaustive study of its own performance during the political campaign, to determine whether Stevenson newspapers slanted their news coverage toward Stevenson and Eisenhower newspapers toward Eisenhower. We have all heard these charges. If the press failed in that way, it would be far better for us to expose the failure ourselves, and try to avoid it for the future, than for the public to expose it and leave the press to a huffy defense of its virtues. Newspaper people are trained observers. It should not be impossible to get a group of journalists or journalism professors to make such a study without fear or favor.

I am not afraid of a one-party press in the United States for the reason that 75 per cent of the editorial pages endorsed one candidate for President. What else can the owners of papers do but speak their political convictions? They are living up to one side of their special obligation in doing so. But what of the other side? There, I believe, lies the only real danger: It is that the opinions of more and more newspaper owners may seep over from their editorial pages into their news columns.

We must remember that the mob can destroy the press of an Elijah Lovejoy, and can even take his life, but it cannot destroy the principle of a free press. The only way that freedom could be destroyed in this country is by the press itself.

Barry Bingham, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, made his proposal at the Elijah Lovejoy memorial exercises.

OUR FREE PRESS. HOW FREE?

An Editor Answers Soviet Charges Against the U. S. Press

by Charles A. Sprague

Mr. Sprague is editor of the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Ore. He was alternate delegate to the United Nations Assembly. This is from a statement made in answer to a Soviet delegate in the Committee on Freedom of Information, Oct. 28, 1952.

I am not unaware of defects in the press of the United States, and I relish very much those lines of Bobbie Burns: "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us, to see oursels as others see us."

But the picture which has been presented to us by the delegate of the Soviet Union and others of the Soviet bloc is so grotesque and distorted, that it seems to me a masterpiece of surrealist art. I am wholly unable to identify any of the elements of the picture which he has drawn as a true depiction of the American press.

Let me address myself to some of the specific charges which are brought.

The first charge was that of monopoly. Now, by monopoly we would understand that it is a monopoly of ownership or monopoly of control. Let me give you some information with reference to the number of periodicals and radio stations in the United States.

There are in this country 1,773 daily newspapers, 543 Sunday newspapers, 9,591 weekly newspapers, 1,421 weekly periodicals, 221 semi-monthly periodicals, 3,643 monthly periodicals, 625 quarterly periodicals. There are three nation-wide press associations. There are 4 radio networks. There are over 3,000 radio stations including AM and FM stations and television stations. Moreover, these are not in any single ownership by any manner of means. The ownership is most widely diversified.

Reference has been made to what is called the McCormick press. There are only three papers in the United States that might be so designated.

Reference has been made to the Hearst Press. I think it numbers only around 12 or 14; yet, we have among daily papers 1,773 scattered over the United States.

So it is folly to say that there is a monopoly of ownership or of control.

Let me cite my own case, because I am an American journalist and perhaps I might offer myself as "Exhibit A" for the press of the United States. I operate—my family and I own, and I am the publisher and editor—a small daily paper, relatively small, with a circulation of less than 20,000 in a city of less than 50,000. There are in that same city, one other daily paper, one weekly paper, and

three radio stations, all under separate and independent ownership and control.

That is a fair illustration of the diversity of ownership and control of the American press and radio stations. This ownership is largely either personal or family, or corporate. There are very few papers with stocks in public hands or stocks which are traded on the exchanges. And the same is true of magazines. The American press and radio stations are privately owned and professionally operated.

The charge has been made with some citation from American authority that the newspapers of the United States are controlled by their advertisers. Now, that is an ancient fiction. It may have been true and it may yet be true that there are isolated instances where advertisers on occasion exert undue influence in the editions of particular papers. However, that is not generally true. As a general rule, in the papers of the United States, there is strict segregation of responsibility between the business office, so-called, and the news and editorial departments. And it is one of the elements of ethics within the newspaper profession of the United States that the editorial and news departments shall be run professionally and that they shall not be subjected to the influence of the business office. I have had many experiences where advertisers have sought to suggest omission of news that they thought may be detrimental to them, but regularly we ignore them, reject any such overtures. That is the prevailing attitude among the newspapers and the responsible editors of the United States.

The second thing, I think, that is necessary is that we understand something of the nature of the development of the press of the United States. Let me quote from the Constitution of our country, the first amendment to the Constitution, adopted almost simultaneously with the adoption of the original document: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." You will note there that Congress is prohibited from abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

Now, when we say freedom in this country, we mean freedom; and just as you have exercised wide liberty of expression here in the presentation of your views on this subject, so we of the American press and radio exercise wide freedom in the expression of our views on public questions of all kinds.

When you have this freedom, you do open the way to abuse. There are those individuals who may be irresponsible, those individuals whose judgment may not be sound, those individuals who may not have had very much experience in affairs, individuals who may be driven by selfish interests or driven by emotional outbursts. They may vent themselves either in the columns of a newspaper or by putting out some handbill or by making some appeal over a radio station. That is one of the prices we have to pay for freedom. But in the United States, we relish that freedom so much that we pay that cost, and we feel that under this institution of a free press, the press of the United States has risen to a very high standard when it comes to the delivery of information that is true and valid to our people, and giving reasonable and honest comment thereon.

You have here in the City of New York an excellent example of the range of this freedom of expression in the newspapers of this city. That range will extend, let me say, from a paper like the *Daily News*, which is ultra-conservative, or the *New York World Telegram & Sun* in the same category, on to the other extreme of the ultra-liberal, *New York Compass*, or the Communist *Daily Worker*. You have here exhibited before you this very wide range of freedom of expression. You have within that group certainly that paper recognized worldwide as a superior medium of information, the *New York Times*, and one which is closely parallel to it, the *New York Herald Tribune*.

The decision as to the prosperity of those papers rests upon the persons who go to buy those papers. Our papers are not dependent upon any government subsidy. They are not dependent upon business for subventions. They are dependent on two sources of revenue. One is their circulation revenue and the other is their advertising revenue. And their advertising revenue depends very largely upon the extent and the nature of their circulation. So it is the customer who decides the strength of a newspaper. It is the customer who decides, as he goes to a newspaper stand and picks up the *New York Post*, or the *New York Journal American*, or the *New York Times*, or the *Daily Worker*. He is the one who decides what it is that he wants to read. And, that is his privilege. But we

put out these various organs of opinion for the choice of the public, and as they choose so is the prosperity or the continuity of that newspaper, or of that publication, or of that radio station decided.

Reference has been made in the presentation by the Delegation of the Soviet Union to certain criticisms of the American press. The Hutchins' Report, for instance, was cited, and that report has been replied to by certain other circles in the American newspaper field. However, I would call your attention to the fact that the Hutchins' Report was financed in whole or in very large part by one of the publishing organizations in the United States. I think virtually all of the citations that have been made by the delegation from the Soviet Union and the other delegations within the Soviet bloc have been taken from American publications, from reports and studies. We admit those abuses, but what we call your attention to is the fact that we are aware of them and that we are under constant pressure to improve the standard of performance of our papers. We are under pressure within our own professional circles. We are under pressure at our schools and colleges of journalism. And we are under pressure from critics in the general public scene. That very awareness, which is evidenced by these comments appearing in books, in magazines, in newspapers, certainly is proof that we are trying consciously and continuously to improve the character and the truthfulness of our publications.

I want to say something with reference to this accusation of warmongers which is leveled against the United States. Now, by the process of selectivity, one can prove almost anything when he has the range of opinion from A to Z, to draw from. We cannot judge the American press by any such process of selectivity.

Let me say this for my own part as the editor of a small paper. I write my own editorials, with some assistance from members of my staff. I am subject to no control from the government or from anyone else. And over, and over, and over, and over, I have emphasized the necessity of settling our international disputes through the process of negotiation and diplomacy, and through the use of the facilities of the United Nations which was set up as a great instrumentality for the maintenance of world order and justice.

I know of no responsible newspaper within my area, or within the United States, which is promoting consciously a Third World War.

I merely want to repeat that the press of the United States is not a warmongering press, that it is sincerely devoted to the cause of peace and justice in the world.

An Outsider Looks at the Press

by Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

Five years ago the privately constituted Commission on the Freedom of the Press, of which Robert M. Hutchins was Chairman and I was a member, issued its report in a small book, *A Free and Responsible Press*. The press, which is ready to criticize everybody else, does not enjoy being criticized itself. This is natural. Lawyers are equally sensitive about condemnation from laymen. Nevertheless law is ever so much better than it used to be because of the enormous reforming energies of Jeremy Bentham, who never practiced law, and medicine is what it is today because of Louis Pasteur, who was not a doctor. Every profession can learn something from outsiders.

A Free and Responsible Press was the result of much thinking. Although the attention of reviewers was concentrated on the final chapter of recommendations, which were unexciting because we rejected all sensational remedies as worthless, the real value of the book lies in the two opening chapters which wrestle with the problem of what the American public needs from the press in our free society. We said, for instance, that the American people needed information from the press which would enable them to make for themselves "the fundamental decisions necessary to the direction of their government and of their lives." Every member of the press will, I believe, find fresh and fruitful meanings in the 106 pages of this book if he will reread it now.

Our main conclusion, as the book's title indicates, is that the press ought to be responsible as well as free. We did not mean legal responsibility, we meant moral responsibility. So far as there are shortcomings in the press, the remedy for them will have to come almost entirely from the profession itself, not through formal codes but through professional training and the professional spirit.

There are two startling paradoxes about the American press. First, it comprises the only large, wealthy, and powerful business enterprises in the country which are subject to very little legal accountability. In the last one hundred years little news sheets issued by obscure printers have turned into enormous plants, in each of which a handful of men can inform and influence millions of citizens. Other business enterprises which have grown from small beginnings to great power during the same period, like the Standard Oil Co., the New York Stock Exchange, chain stores and chain banks, have eventually aroused public alarm and been put under substantial government control to restrain public abuses. They can no longer run loose. Yet it is the first principle of our Bill of Rights that the government must let all the powerful enterprises in the press run loose.

I am as sure as I am of anything that this ought to be so. My point is that this freedom from legal responsibility throws on the owners and managers of newspapers and press associations the heavy moral responsibility to do for themselves what the law does for other enterprises. It is the task of the press itself to prevent abuses of power and to make sure that it increasingly performs the services which the American people need from the press.

The other paradox is that newspapers and press associations are carrying out two oddly assorted purposes. They are something like schools and colleges in supplying to the American people indispensable facts and ideas, and at the same time they exist to put money into the pockets of a few owners. Indeed the ownership of newspapers is much more concentrated than the ownership of any other kind of large business enterprise. The death of a single owner of the Chicago *Daily News* has more than once changed the character of that paper, and a single owner killed the New York *Sun*. When we turn to smaller cities, it is obvious that the quality of the facts and ideas conveyed to the particular community from its single newspaper depends on one man or a handful of men. Suppose that this were also true of the facts and ideas conveyed through a school or a college. I am not saying that this situation ought to be changed. Certainly the law must not try to change it. What I am saying is that these few men have a weighty and difficult moral responsibility to adjust the demands of a profitable business to the demands of an educational enterprise of the highest importance.

There is no sense in blaming anybody for these situations. As with the serious problems our nation faces in foreign affairs, the real question is what shall be done about them. And the only men who can do anything about the basic problems of the press are the men who are actively engaged in the press. An outsider can suggest problems, but only an insider can handle them.

Newspapermen, I know, are very busy people. Professors don't have to meet deadlines the way you do. When you get together, you have all sorts of pressing questions to settle. The kind of problems I am talking about do not call for immediate decision. Still, President Lowell gave a very wise piece of advice, "Don't let the things which have to be done today or tomorrow crowd out the things that can be done at any time, for those alone are important."

To be more concrete, I should like to develop three matters discussed by the Commission on the Freedom of the Press.

In stating what our society needs from the press, the Commission put first of all "a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning." I greatly admire the care and competence with which newspapermen observe and report facts. I believe that there has been a great increase in the determination to identify fact as fact and opinion as opinion. The policy against editorializing news is cherished among you. Still I should like to raise some questions about this policy. Begin with headlines. They are the portion of a newspaper which is most read. I appreciate that headlines have to be written in a great hurry. Yet do they sometimes have the effect of editorializing the news underneath them more than is either necessary or fair? For example, although I think that Mr. Truman did not maintain so high a level in his campaign speeches as the President of the United States should, I felt several times that what he said was not nearly so bad as the headlines made out.

A more difficult question relates to the news column itself. Sometimes a fact is accurately printed and yet it leaves an altogether incorrect impression on the reader unless its significance is evaluated at the time it is printed. The Commission wrote that in simpler times a reader could do this for himself by comparing the newspaper statement with his other sources of information. "Today this is usually impossible. The account of an isolated fact, however accurate in itself, may be misleading and, in effect, untrue." We went on to point out that a single crime by a member of a racial minority may easily be accepted as a sample of group action unless the press has enabled the reader to fit this single event in its proper perspective. Similarly, international antagonisms can be harmfully aggravated by playing up the action of individuals, without giving the reader the means to judge whether these are simply bad men who happen to come from a particular country. We wrote of the responsibility of the press to report events "in such a way that they can be understood." "It is no longer enough to report *the fact* truthfully. It is now necessary to report *the truth about the fact*."

This difficult question about giving meaning to facts received some pertinent observations by Elmer Davis in the *Atlantic Monthly* last summer. The problem is acutely raised by newspaper reporting of damaging statements about individuals and organizations, which have been spoken under the shield of Congressional immunity.

If Senator A says in debate that B, a private citizen, is a hired helper of the Soviet Union, the press report that the Senator did say this is a fact. Yet it may not be a fact at all that B did these bad acts. It may be an outrageous lie. B's behavior is a second fact. In spite of the legal immunity of the newspaper from libel suits can it rightly

ignore this second fact? When the paper already has information about the credibility of the statement, or could easily obtain such information, a few additional sentences on that point would be of great value to its readers. The constant repetition of defamatory statements about American citizens by newspapers who suspect with good reason that these statements are largely untrue, is not a performance of which the press can be proud.

The same consideration applies to allegations about the subversive nature of particular organizations and the subversive nature of members of an organization. Is it right for the press to use these red-lists from legislative committees and thus help discredit citizens and organizations who are doing much useful work, without even mentioning their useful work or making an attempt to evaluate these red-lists? Surely newspapermen know their way around enough to realize the variety of motives which lead people to join organizations, the complexity of the purposes of these loose groups, and the inability of a donor for the legitimate purposes of an organization to scrutinize with a microscope the mentality of its officers and every act they do. It is high time for the press to pay some attention to the unreliable qualities of these lists which are now quoted as if they had the validity of the multiplication table.

Secondly, it might be worthwhile for newspapermen, perhaps with the help of lawyers, to consider the possibility of finding a better corrective than libel suits for mistakes in the press which are harmful to individuals. The idea of getting money for harm to your reputation is a crude idea at best. It no longer works well in this country as a remedy. It is too expensive and harassing for the plaintiff, and may lead to a divided jury or a small verdict in the end. The Commission felt that it would be a far more civilized remedy for the newspaper which has made the mistake, often unintentionally, to insert a corrective statement with equal prominence. We explored the desirability of a law, like that long used in France and Germany, to compel the newspaper to publish free of charge a short reply written by the injured person. Some discussion at meetings of newspapermen about the desirability of such a law was suggested. Still, its operation might be a good deal of a nuisance. It would be still better if all newspapers would make it a regular practice, as many of them now do, to insert a retraction written by themselves as soon as their attention is called to the mistake, or else give the defamed person the opportunity to make a counter-statement as soon as possible.

Third, the Commission was disturbed by the fact that so many cities have only one newspaper. In foreign and nationwide affairs, readers can obtain a different point of view from columnists in the same newspaper or from metropolitan dailies which come into a great many cities

promptly. The biggest lack of that competition in ideas which promotes sound judgments comes in the area of local affairs. Neither columnists nor metropolitan dailies are likely to say much about these. I see very little chance that this gap will be filled by starting of new newspapers. Is it not right for the single newspaper to make some attempt to fill it? Could there perhaps be local columnists, or solicitation of articles from leading citizens who have a different viewpoint than the editors? The Commission was firm that the law should not make newspapers be common carriers for all political positions, but we did think that they have a moral obligation to present to the public all the important viewpoints in their respective communities.

Turning now to the world at large, I feel that the press could do more to encourage significant efforts by the United Nations to promote the free flow of news throughout the world. The Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press and the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information were the response of the United Nations to the request of the united leaders of the American press for international action on freedom of the press. These UN bodies drafted the article in the Covenant on Human Rights about freedom of the press. That article is not perfect. You can help improve it. But it is not a blueprint for tyranny as Senator Bricker and many newspapers have asserted. It was drafted largely by men who risked their lives running underground newspapers. One of them was deprived of his editorship by the Nazis, spent five years in Buchenwald, and then was thrown out again by the communists. The Convention or treaty on the International Transmission of News was drafted at Geneva with the active participation and approval of leaders of the American press. When it was finally licked into shape by Erwin Canham and approved by the General Assembly, it was enthusiastically endorsed by American editorials and headlines. I

had nothing particular to do with this treaty, but when I was in charge of a committee of the American Bar Association on Freedom of the Press, I did want to do something to help American newspapermen to work in other countries and consequently I labored long and hard to make it possible for this treaty to be open for signatures. Except for an editorial in the Boston Herald, the American press gave no help to our efforts, and instead repeated all sorts of unsound objections to the treaty which it had previously acclaimed.

Finally, the cause of freedom of speech in the United States is in greater danger than it has ever been since all the Jeffersonian newspapers were suppressed by the Sedition Act of 1798. What is the press doing to protect against the rapidly increasing penalties on all sorts of heterodox ideas? It is not just a question of communists. More and more ideas are getting stigmatized as "disloyal" and "subversive". You do not agree with those ideas, I know, but their suppression is your concern. As a great New York judge, Cuthbert Pound said years ago:

"Although the defendant may be the worst of men . . . the rights of the best of men are secure only as the rights of the vilest and most abhorrent are protected."

Zechariah Chafee, Jr., university professor at Harvard, delivered this paper to the Associated Press Managing Editors Association in Boston, Nov. 14, 1952. Prof. Chafee was a member of the Hutchins Commission on Freedom of the Press which issued its report in 1947. This is in the nature of a reappraisal after five years. Prof. Chafee is author of the classic, "Free Speech in the United States", and of "Government and Mass Communications." He served on the first U. N. subcommission on freedom of information, and was U. S. delegate to the U. N. Conference, at Geneva, 1948.

The Press and Its Critics

by Barry Bingham

Some of the criticism that comes to the press is either unfair or uninformed. Some of it is based on a concept of the press that it at least half a century out of date. It relates to journalism of the era of Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle." Those were the days of "blacklists," of "sacred cows," of sometimes really vicious attacks on the personal enemies of the publisher. Those who do not realize how far the press in general has moved away from that standard of practice would do well to consult some newspaper files of the turn of the century. I can almost guarantee them a surprise, a shock, maybe even a blush for the methods of the past.

Some of the criticism of the American press comes not from reading the papers themselves, but from reading books about them. It is rooted in the doctrine that all newspapers are alike, that they are all dominated by their advertisers and all run strictly from the counting house. That generalization is grossly false, yet it is held by some people who did not hear it first from Moscow.

Some of the criticism is based on an honest failure to understand how a newspaper functions, where news stories originate and how they are handled, who is responsible for them, what are the limits of time, space and manpower that govern our daily coverage. It is abundantly worthwhile for newspapers to try to clean up such honest misunderstandings. I believe it can be done in most cases by patient effort and a little healthy humility on our part.

Some of the attacks on the press are unfair because they are blindly partisan. We all know the difficulty there. It is possible for an editor to take two exactly equal stories, both fairly written, one dealing with a Republican candidate and the other with a Democratic candidate. He can place those stories side by side on the same page of his paper. Violent Republicans will swear that their candidate's story was shorter and less prominent, while violent Democrats will raise the devil because their candidate got "inferior treatment." A national campaign brings on severe attacks of such blindness, but we journalists need to guard against the beam in our eye.

A more dangerous form of criticism rises from a confusion in the reader's mind. He does not make the distinction between the editorial page and the news columns. He will attack a paper for being unfair to a political candidate, when what he really means is that he disagrees with the choice the newspaper owner has made on his

editorial page. Such a misguided reader is unconsciously trying to deny a basic right of the free press. It is my feeling that a newspaper owner not only has a right to express views as clearly and vigorously as he knows how in his editorial columns, but I believe he has an obligation to say what he thinks in the space reserved for clearly labelled opinion.

The trouble is that if some readers fail to make the distinction between the news columns and the editorial page, some newspaper owners also fail to observe that fundamental difference. When the color of opinion seeps over from the editorial page and stains the news columns, the press has betrayed a very high trust.

I have never been worried about a one-party press in this country, in the sense of a one-party editorial page. What can an owner do but endorse the candidate he believes is best in his editorial columns?

No, the only newspaper that endangers our free press system is the one that lets its editorial opinions slop over into the news. Such a paper puts its head into a noose. Any intelligent reader will know how to draw the rope tighter.

Criticism is good for the press. It helps to keep our sense of responsibility sharpened. It is the greatest mistake for us to dismiss all criticism as unworthy, unfair or misguided.

We journalists can sometimes be awful intellectual snobs. We can pour the burning oil of our scorn over the head of a reader who fails to understand our business, when the fact is that we have failed to explain it to him. Worse still, we sometimes meet criticism with a sulky and injured silence.

If we can't explain our own operation to the average citizen, how can we expect to explain anything else to him adequately in this complex world?

The role of injured innocence is the poorest one the press can ever play. We look our worst in the snowy robe and blond curls of Little Eva. Wings do not fit well on our rounded shoulders. Yet in the face of criticism, we so often offer hot defense instead of explanation. We merely tell our readers in a loud voice that we are noble and pure, and that all respectable people must respect us.

Hollywood has tried that technique. It has plastered the country with the slogan: "Movies are better than ever."

The average American has a healthy grain of cynicism in his nature. When the press or the motion picture industry draws itself up in such proud self-justification, the citizen is likely to reply: "Oh Yeah?" Or if he has more of a literary turn of mind, he will crack back with: "Methinks the lady doth protest too much."

Why are we journalists so resentful of criticism? I believe the main reason is that we have such a high sense of our profession and its mission. We know that we are performing a vital service to our democracy. We fully believe that a free world requires a free press. It is too easy for us to forget that some readers not only do not appreciate our performance but do not even understand our purpose.

It is right for us to have a lofty view of the importance of our calling. We just have to watch ourselves to see that this sentiment does not degenerate into self-importance.

We newspaper people are especially allergic to smugness in others. We are the enemies of the stuffed shirt. Yet because of our sense of mission, we ourselves are subject to the twin sins of stuffiness and huffiness.

We laugh about the Washington theory that the U. S. Senate is a distinguished club whose members should never criticize each other. Yet we seem to lose our sense of humor when it is suggested that the members of the press criticize each other once in awhile.

We have all heard of an occupational disease known as "housemaid's knee." We newspapermen risk a similar occupational ailment. We might call it "journalists's elbow." It is all too easy to contract. It comes from the constant exercise of patting ourselves on the back.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger has given us some sound advice on that subject. The distinguished publisher of America's leading paper, *The New York Times*, said: "The responsible newspaper is one which welcomes criticism and one which admits that the way in which it presents the news is a matter of legitimate public concern."

That is why I am so happy that Sigma Delta Chi has authorized a study of press coverage of the 1952 cam-

paign. This kind of sponsorship means an informed and objective job that will command public respect.

All of us have heard charges of unfairness in the coverage of the presidential race. Let's not brush off such serious accusations. If Stevenson papers slanted their news coverage toward Stevenson, or if Eisenhower papers favored Eisenhower in the play of the news, let's get at the facts and lay them before the public.

It seems to me extremely important for the press itself to meet these charges. If there is dirty linen to be washed, let's do the washing ourselves. If we ignore the washing job, some others will do it for us, and it's quite possible that they will put ignorance into the water and prejudice into the cake of soap.

This proposed survey is a concern of every newspaper, even of the ones that are utterly convinced that their linen is spotlessly clean. You will notice that criticisms of campaign coverage are not so much directed against individual newspapers. They are aimed at "the press." It is the respect and prestige of the whole profession that is called in question.

John Donne observed long ago that "No man is an island unto himself." I feel the same way about the press. No newspaper is an island. We are all affected alike by the currents of public opinion. If the warm Gulf Stream of respect that touches all our shores should begin to turn cold somewhere at its source, the climate would quickly change for all of us.

No paper can be proof against that danger. If the readers of a substantial number of newspapers should turn away from those papers in disgust, I believe we would all lose our press freedom one day. A public wave of distrust would wash high enough to overwhelm us all together. And the loss would not be ours alone. The death of a free press would be a tragic loss to the whole American people. It would be a loss which democracy could hardly survive.

This is from an address by **Barry Bingham**, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, to the Sigma Delta Chi convention in Denver, Nov. 22, 1952.

Press Performance in the Campaign

A Consideration of the indictment of a "One-Party Press"

by Robert H. Estabrook

Mr. Estabrook is an editorial writer on the Washington Post, which supported Eisenhower. This is from an address at the University of Nebraska, November 19, sponsored by the School of Journalism there.

Let us consider the role of the press in the election. It might be said that it required a Republican victory this time to rescue the American newspapers. And that would be just as wrong, I think, as an inference that the newspapers had no influence because most of them editorially supported Governor Dewey in 1948.

According to the most recent *Editor & Publisher* tabulation, 67 per cent of the daily newspapers with 80 per cent of the circulation supported Eisenhower, whereas Governor Stevenson was supported by only 14½ per cent of the papers with 11 per cent of the circulation. Certainly, in sheer volume at least, these figures seem to justify Governor Stevenson's good-humored charge that we have a one-party press.

Now, I hold no brief for this division. It would have pleased me more to see the figures, if not equal, at least less one-sided—even though these figures do not reflect the attitude of the weekly labor press, which was of almost one voice for Stevenson. But I submit that those who say that the inequality of press support was a big influence in the election misconstrue the function of the editorial page and the meaning of political endorsements. And I am not exculpating, either, those papers which managed to fit every issue into a preconceived opinion.

Far be it from me to underestimate the influence of my own profession. I believe the editorial page has an important role—in discussing issues, in persuading and bringing understanding to its readers. If the newspaper has a record of calling the shots as it sees them, and if it uses reason to buttress its opinion, then its endorsement may mean something to the voters. But people instinctively resent being told how to think, and I believe this holds for political campaigns.

There is, of course, the possibility of a sort of osmosis—the possibility that people who have a certain opinion dinned at them day after day may in time come to believe it. But a much more important factor, in my judgment, was that this time the editorial opinions coincided with the meaning the people put upon what they read in the news columns. In other words, when editorials called for a change, there was evidence of corruption in the agency collecting the taxes to bear them out. In 1948, on the other

hand, no matter how much the papers suggested that the voters should like Dewey, they simply didn't like him.

Nor does it follow that because 67 per cent of the papers supported Eisenhower they were all organs of the Republican Party. A number of them, including the one I work on, are politically independent; some offered their endorsement for the first time.

The results do not prove, of course, that the papers were any more right this time than they were wrong in 1948; it would be a ghastly mistake for the press to get the idea that it won the election. The most logical explanation for the large number of Eisenhower endorsements, and the one which does newspapers the most credit, is that historically the press has been against the "ins." This has been, in the main, a healthy reaction.

Now, there unquestionably are some papers on which the endorsement was dictated by the economic prejudices of the publisher. I know of no way, in a system of private property, to prevent a publisher from identifying his interests with those of the Republican Party and from concluding that his readers' interests also are on the side of conservatism. Even if this is a bad situation—and I'm not sure it is—there is no kind of cure, no method of control, that would not be far worse than the disease.

But if some papers reacted atavistically, there were others that reached their endorsements only after serious weighing of the issues by many staff members. On many there no doubt was a schizophrenia. But editors presumably have access to more information than the bulk of their readers. And if a majority of them weighed the issues of corruption in office, of growing political irresponsibility, of the need for a change—if a majority of them weighed these issues and recommended a vote for Eisenhower, I see no reason to censure them for it. I see nothing surprising in the fact that a majority of papers were for a change after one party had been in power 20 years; I would begin to get worried if the reverse were true. And this is apart from any rationalization that may have entered individual editorials.

It is often said that a majority of the correspondents traveling with the candidates came personally to favor

Stevenson. I know of some individual instances, but I don't know how true the generalization is. I submit, however, that this is not a valid test. Stevenson, of course, struck a responsive chord among correspondents because he seemed to talk good and literate sense in refreshing contrast to the usual cynicism and hackneyed clichés of politics and politicians. It is understandable that their admiration bordered on veneration. It is also understandable, on the other hand, that correspondents who had been concentrating on covering one man became acutely aware of his flaws and shortcomings, particularly when he was a military man ill at ease with the press.

In any case, it seems to me a non sequitur to conclude that a reporter who has given all his time to following a candidate is in a position to have a balanced view of all the issues. The time for a change argument, for example, had validity irrespective of General Eisenhower's shortcomings. What was disturbing, anent the preference for Stevenson attributed to the correspondents, is that some reporters undertook to become active partisans. Political activity in behalf of either candidate is of course inconsistent with objective reporting, and the problem is one newspapers may have to worry about in the future.

Even though the daily press was in the main opposed to him, Governor Stevenson received many benefits from the press. President Roosevelt used to say that as long as he could make the headlines, what was said on the editorial page didn't matter. In this campaign, of course, the newspapers had to report the whistle-stopping of President Truman in addition to the speeches of Governor Stevenson. There has been little criticism of the coverage as such; the press associations, for example, took scrupulous pains to report fairly. How else, but through publicity in the news columns (and I include here radio and television) could a man who was as relatively little known outside his own State as Governor Stevenson have become a genuinely national figure in three short months?

No, the indictments of the press, such as they are, lie in a different category. First of all, there is this matter of creating myth-men. General Eisenhower has been a myth-man at least since his days in NATO, and the press is largely responsible. Our tradition of hero-worship built up almost a superhuman figure. When General Eisenhower returned and was disclosed to be an ordinary mortal, rather confused and certainly ignorant of many political issues, there was consequent disillusionment. Had we ever reported the real Eisenhower? Similarly the illusion persists that Governor Stevenson wrote all his own campaign speeches. Certainly many of them were brilliant speeches, but according to James B Reston in the *New York Times Magazine*, during the last month of the campaign or more they were almost entirely ghost-written, with Stevenson

only putting on the final polish. Who, then, is the real Stevenson?

A much more serious indictment concerns those papers which prostituted their news functions for partisan purposes—those papers which found Eisenhower good for a Page One banner every day but which found room for only a few lines about Stevenson when he came to town. For example, I have been told of one large paper in up-state New York which devoted its entire front page to a visit by Eisenhower, but when Stevenson spoke in that city the story was buried on the inside. One correspondent complained that while he was in Springfield he would have had trouble gathering from a local Republican paper that Stevenson was even a candidate, much less that his headquarters were in Springfield. In talking with correspondents I have heard similar complaints concerning papers in many parts of the Midwest and along the Pacific Coast.

There also is the case of the prominent national news magazine which, though it publicly proclaimed no editorial policy, consistently and flagrantly slanted its stories to favor Eisenhower. Likewise there were those papers committed to Eisenhower which buried the Nixon fund story under a small head inside, if they carried it at all. Faulty news judgment might have accounted for this the first day, but consistent underplaying invites only one conclusion. Several instances of this treatment have been reported not too far from Lincoln. Statistical tables of the amount of space given each candidate are not an accurate measure, either, for fairness depends on news play and the tone of stories. News photographs also have a part.

Now, I have no doubt that there were some partisan excesses by papers committed to Stevenson. I know of a few—though because of the smaller number of Stevenson papers the impact was less serious. I have no way of knowing how general the slanting of news was; my impression is that it was found more among the smaller papers than among the larger. But I think all of us concerned with journalism as a profession have an interest in focusing attention on these abuses.

It does no good to say that today's reporting and news play are immeasurably fairer than, say, the presentations of 40 years ago. If the press falls into disrespect in this country, it will be in no small part because of the abuse of the news columns for editorial purposes. The abuses I have mentioned are of course prime meat for those who like to carp about press irresponsibility, sometimes with the idea of some sort of governmental control. The reform of the press must come from within. Men and women of good conscience in the newspaper profession must speak out against the betrayals of our ideals. Several persons have suggested that an exhaustive objective, documented study of the press in the campaign would be a good project for a

research foundation. This is an excellent idea—and it commends itself also to schools of journalism, possibly in conjunction with research foundations.

While saying this, I ought to add that I know of no sure-fire way to bring fair treatment in the news columns except a disposition to be fair. In the first place, an instruction, say, to alternate the top play between the two candidates may fly in the face of genuinely objective judgment as to what the most important news is. One consideration making for apparent unfairness is the fact that the available photographs of Stevenson in action turned out to be almost uniformly bad. Conversely, there is no way of telling how much unconscious factors, such as an editorial endorsement, may subtly influence the judgment of the persons handling and playing the stories. All we can do is try to be fair.

The newspaper I work on went to special pains, because of its support of Eisenhower, to provide fair treatment. Shortly after the endorsement, a memorandum was issued to the news staff citing the "special obligation, in the news columns, to be scrupulously objective in the handling of news involving Eisenhower and his opponents." It called for special care in headlines as well as stories "to make sure that no inclusion or omission gives anyone a reasonable opportunity to accuse us of being unfair."

Another memorandum near the close of the campaign reminded the staff that the news department was "not supporting any candidate for public office, and the reporters and editors, without exception, should continue to gather and present the news impartially." It added that "candidates and their supporters frequently use the last days of the campaign to float outrageous charges that cannot be adequately answered in the remaining time, and we must be even more cautious than ever in handling such allegations and in dealing with inspired tips that are offered for partisan purposes."

Whether or not we lived up to it, this seems to me to be the proper objective.

There is an element in the potential stifling of discussion which ought to cause us some additional concern, but this involves television rather than the press per se. TV has brought a real revolution in campaigning; it has made a tremendous difference not only in the nature of political

appeals, but also in the cost. The Republican and Democratic Parties and their affiliates spent an estimated \$30 million on TV time. Inevitably this raises the point that the party with the most money can purchase the most time, especially during the closing stages of a campaign. TV popularized Governor Stevenson; it also enabled Senator Nixon to make his comeback. We need to give some serious thought, not only to the premium placed on showmanship, but also to the problems of future elections when there may be 50 or 60 million TV sets instead of 15 or 20 million. The sheer cost of TV campaigning may force a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act which limits campaign expenditures. And the strain of day-to-day harangues, both on the speakers and on the audience, may serve to bring about a blessed shortening of the period of the actual campaign.

I have talked about the press in the election. What worries me a good deal more is the job of the press after the election. One of the real dangers is that a press so heavily committed to Eisenhower will find itself apologizing for him instead of giving him the independent, constructive criticism that any administration needs. Certainly President Eisenhower will need a period in which to consolidate without having every minor misstep blown out of proportion. Some mistakes are to be expected and allowed for—even though the margin for error on grave national and international decisions in these crucial times is pitifully small. But it is also true that a press so committed to a change in Washington has an extraordinary responsibility to report objectively and view critically how well that change is being carried out.

One more thing. I have seen on the wall of a few newspaper offices what is described as the Eleventh Commandment; Thou shalt not take thyself too damned seriously. This seems to me a good rule, both during and after elections. There is another which that great jurist, Learned Hand, whose philosophy of skepticism in human affairs is a model, said that he would like to see inscribed in every court house—and I would add to this every newspaper office. That is to ponder frequently the words of Cromwell before the Battle of Dunbar: "I beseech ye in the bowels of Christ, think that ye may be mistaken."

Where Democrats Aren't News

by William Proxmire
Democratic Nominee for Governor of Wisconsin.

My charge against a majority of the newspapers of Wisconsin is not a blanket denunciation. But it is deadly serious. Some vigorously Republican papers have done a splendid job of reporting our speeches, while denouncing us editorially. Unfortunately, most papers have been less fair.

Here in La Crosse, as in many cities in Wisconsin, if you want to buy a local paper you have only one choice. You buy the *La Crosse Tribune*. That gives the *Tribune* the privilege of serving as your chief source of news. That also gives the *Tribune* the responsibility for giving you all the important news. I am told that in many respects the *Tribune* does a fine job of giving you the news.

Here are the facts:

Early in June I came into La Crosse for the two days of my campaign scheduled for this city. At that time, I, William Proxmire, was the only Democratic candidate for Governor, since the deadline for filing had passed and neither Governor Kohler nor I was opposed in our primaries. It was clear that for the first time in Wisconsin history the state had four full months to size up the rival candidates for Governor. La Crosse had good reason to be curious about the new Democratic candidate for Governor. In the last election for Governor in 1950 a majority of the voters in La Crosse county had voted for the Democratic candidate for Governor. What news did the *La Crosse Tribune* bring to the people of La Crosse about the new 1952 Democratic candidate?

When I arrived in town, the chairman of the La Crosse County Democratic Organizing Committee called the *Tribune* and told them I was here and that I was making plant gate and street corner speeches and where and when those speeches would be made. Later in the day I went down to the offices of the *Tribune*. I talked to the editor. I asked if he would publish an interview and invited the paper to cover my speeches so that the people could know my position on the leading issues. The city editor refused.

During the two day visit of the Democratic candidate for Governor to La Crosse, there wasn't one single line in the paper about my visit although this was the only time I could possibly spend in La Crosse during the entire pre-primary period. During this same two day period the Republican candidate for Governor was featured in the *Tribune* in several news stories and a number of pictures, all given very prominent display. Now the Republican candidate for Governor was not only not in La Crosse, he wasn't

even in Wisconsin during the two days that I was in La Crosse. He was at the Republican convention in Chicago where he played no part whatsoever in the proceedings. The Republican candidate was not a delegate or an alternate. He served on no committee. He neither influenced nor attempted to influence the convention in any way. In fairness to the *Tribune* it is true, of course, that the Republican candidate for Governor is the present Governor of our state and his presence at his party's convention was certainly newsworthy.

But was it not equally newsworthy when the Democratic candidate for Governor comes to La Crosse for a full two day campaign?

Now of course as a political candidate I don't like to be ignored. But that isn't the point.

The point is that when the Republican press of Wisconsin treats the Democrats like a bad headache—ignores them in the hope they'll go away and won't be a further bother—that press is keeping you from getting information you need to meet your duty as a citizen—the basic American duty of deciding what people, what party and what politics you want in charge of our government.

Of course, the battle is unequal—if the papers won't print our speeches it is difficult for us. But it is impossible for you, the voter. How can you tell the competence of our Republican state government when you haven't heard the story from the opposition to that government.

To date the press of Wisconsin is not reporting that story. In a story in the "official" Republican paper the *Wisconsin State Journal* itself, Sunday, Sanford Goltz reported that state Democratic candidates are having trouble getting before the public. Clearly we can only tell our story if the overwhelmingly Republican press of Wisconsin meets its obligation to report our speeches to you.

I hereby challenge the Republican press of Wisconsin to do just this.

The splendid fight of the Wisconsin newspapers to wipe out secrecy in our state government is hollow indeed if that same press chooses to print only those facts that support its opinion.

You have a right to know. The press has a duty to tell you. Let the newspapers of Wisconsin meet this challenge.

This is from a radio address by William Proxmire, the 1952 Democratic nominee for governor of Wisconsin, in La Crosse, Wis., September 25, 1952.

*Reporter's Eye View***Video Will Change Coverage of News**

by Thomas Sancton

Television made its first great impact on the American public during the Kefauver crime hearings.

Recently at the Republican convention in Chicago, it proved again that "it is here to stay"—as had the printing press, the automobile and the radio each in its own opening era.

One thing is certain: the banning of TV cameras from the GOP national committee hearings on the "stolen delegate" cases definitely helped to un-make Sen. Taft as a candidate.

During the banning dispute, the newspapers and the newsmen who favored Eisenhower found themselves in a strange position.

They were fighting hard to force the committee to admit a competitive news medium to the hearings.

Rep. Clarence Brown, Taft's floor leader who passed the resolution banning TV, came over to the press tables.

He said, with complete seriousness: "You boys ought to thank me—and not be jumping on me. Now people will have to read your newspapers to find out what's going on here."

Everybody laughed at the apparent childishness of this remark. But now that the convention is over with, and TV cameras finally were everywhere, Brown's statement is worth thinking about on the part of newsmen—in its broad implications.

How competitive are these mediums—the printed word, and the telecast scene?

In some areas they are not competitive at all. In others, they probably stimulate the interest of each other's audience, and are mutually helpful.

But in a third area they are directly competitive. And reporters who have ten years or more experience now find—at great events like a national convention—that they have come up against a machine that scoops them automatically, and can never itself be scooped.

But as a permanent record—a political form sheet—an official score-keeper of committee votes, who said what, how the fellow spells his name, the newspaper is still king.

Television may show you the various state delegation chairmen as they get up to vote, or to switch a vote.

But really to understand what has happened, there is no substitute for the printed analysis of the results. The reporter can ferret out connected events beyond the range of TV cameras. He can dig deeper into human motives.

The camera may show you the Minnesota chairman rising to switch his state's vote to Eisenhower. The printed news record will explain how Stassen actually wept at a closed caucus of his delegates, begging them to stay loyal. And how he was told they had decided he had no chance, and that they would therefore jump on the Eisenhower bandwagon.

When Senor Romani, of Puerto Rico, riots a GOP convention unexpectedly with a dialect involving the pronunciation of Spanish names, the TV audience can join the delegates in laughter, if the TV cameras are trained—and in this instance they were trained.

But a vast audience then wants to know what this dialect act was all about.

Not even reporters in the audience could figure it out, at first hearing. But after they talked to Romani, they found out that a complicated background of Puerto Rican Republican rivalry and chicanery was involved.

Romani's picture and the explanation then appeared in many newspapers. This story then had a news audience, people actually looking through the papers for the Romani story.

The reverse of this is the build-up newspapers give to many public figures, who then become the much sought-after objects of the television cameras.

Take Ike himself, for example. Or MacArthur. A lot has been said about their glamor. And that is nonsense, in a physical sense.

Errol Flynn has glamor, maybe. A 22-year-old jet ace has glamor. But a bald-headed 72-year-old general who combs it from one ear across his shiny pate—and has trouble with his dentures in a keynote

speech—has no innate glamor. Neither has Ike, in the matter of looks.

But those mighty names have been in the big black type of headlines so often that a kind of divinity now attaches to them. Millions of words of news copy have been written about these generals.

So they become prime objects for the TV cameramen. And when these famous figures flash on the screen, a press buildup of years causes a vast audience to stop, look, and listen.

Samuel Johnson would not have been so famous without his Boswell, Julius Caesar and Alexander would not have held their glamor through the ages without the printed words of that greatest reporter of all times, the historian Plutarch.

And TV, in this writer's opinion, will never be able to make and to sustain, singlehandedly, a great glamorous public hero—without the thousands of columns and millions of words of print in the daily press.

President Roosevelt often bypassed the press, which editorially was against him, by means of radio. But had he depended on radio alone, he would come out a second-rate figure.

His voice was good, but Ronald Coleman's was better. Lionel Barrymore was a better actor. H. V. Kaltenborn had a fancier pronunciation. Roosevelt needed the press to help sustain his stature. But, for the other side of the coin, he was splendid news copy partly because he could give with the personality to many millions in his fireside radio chats.

In building up one another's stars and heroes, in furnishing the contrasts, the visual scenes, the life tones, and the written data that makes the public image of a leader—the press and TV will probably continue to aid one another.

But there is a third level which belongs to TV, all the way. And we newsmen may just as well accept it—and revise our methods to take account of the fact.

This is in speed-coverage, "spot" coverage, of any great event which can be anticipated, or scheduled, and which takes place in a background where television crews and their massive cameras can operate.

At a great programmed event, like a national convention, five, ten or 20 cameras can be spotted at strategic points. In

a studio, an editor views all images. He has, say, 20 reporters actively producing at one instant. The TV "editor" then switches to the network whatever scene appears most interesting at the moment. And he can play one scene against the other, like an organist.

So it is true that the TV audiences, in many instances, saw more than any single delegate saw. When Mrs. Howard, the convention secretary, stood before the speaker's platform, with her expensive bonnet and war paint and glad rags, she was a well dressed woman enjoying the massed attention of some 10,000 spectators.

But under that speaker's reading stand, Mrs. Howard's feet hurt. So she kicked off her shoes and stood in stocking feet. She did not realize that a camera behind the platform was watching this ludicrous—yet charming, typical and womanly gesture.

I had one brief memorable insight into the impact of TV on the news business. Standing in a massed group of reporters at an Eisenhower press conference, two TV receiving sets carried his image as he spoke—and also, in the background, our notebooks and moving pencils as we wrote.

A reporter can't compete for speed with a machine gun that reports words and provides pictures, with something like the speed of light—186,000 miles per second.

But there is another way to go at this problem. And here too, in the long run, the solution may be of mutual interest to both the press and TV—and public education in its broadest sense.

Speed belongs to TV cameras. But thought, and feeling, belong to human beings. There is the monopoly that our reporters and editors will always hold over the machine. Interpretive writing, more personal and subjective writing, philosophical content—the essay in its oldest form—will tend to come back increasingly as a type of reporting, as the competition with TV camers becomes more standard and generalized.

—New Orleans Item, July 20

Thomas Sancton covered the national conventions for the New Orleans Item. Earlier in an Item series he explored the Louisiana Republican delegate contest which became a key fight at Chicago. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1942.

Times Talk, September, 1952

N. Y. Times Directive for Campaign

A directive issued to the political staff this month by managing editor Turner Catledge shows how the Times intends to find the pulse of the American voter before Election Day. The directive, he pointed out, is intended to "help safeguard the Times from incautious reporting, writing or editing of political news."

Mr. Catledge's memorandum runs to 1,250 words. It says, in effect, that the traditional method for determining trends must be changed from reliance on political leaders to man-on-the-street interviews—the outstanding lesson learned in 1948 when almost all newspapers failed to detect the strong tide to Truman.

Mr. Catledge placed first on a list of what he called "ground rules":

1. Predictions are to be avoided under virtually all circumstances. They are permissible only when the person making the prediction is unquestionably qualified to do so and may be quoted, or when the reporter obtains them from obviously knowledgeable sources with the proviso that the sources may not be named. We want the source named and the prediction hung on the source whenever possible; when that isn't possible, and it is a case of having the Times itself stand responsible for a flat forecast, we would prefer generally not to have any prediction.

2. Political leaders remain a strong source for reporters making a survey. But it must be borne in mind that, in these days of television and more independent voting, their judgment is not so accurate as it once was, and their forecasts are often self-serving. This year, therefore, we prefer to subordinate their opinions to those of the voters

themselves. We should like as much sounding of actual voters as is physically possible. As good sources, the following are suggested for obvious reasons: Filling station attendants, who are virtually automatic poll-takers; hotel desk clerks, hotel lobby cigar-stand operators; local newspaper polls, or those conducted by other responsible organizations; club cars on the railroads; taxicab drivers and similar working people who come in contact frequently with the public. Stories can be salted liberally with quotes from these "men-in-the street," with their names and occupations included.

The managing editor warned the staff to give careful consideration to all special factors in the "pulse-feeler" series, always considering the region being surveyed in relation to the issues of the campaign. "It will be useful to keep an eye out for any marked change in a candidate's comments on any issue while a survey is under way," he advised.

Mr. Catledge closed his memorandum with this paragraph:

The Times is supporting General Eisenhower on its editorial page. It goes without saying, of course, that the news columns should offer no clue to this position. The editorial page is no concern of Times reporters and news editors. It might be stressed conversely that bending too far in the other direction in an effort not to give any semblance of favoring the paper's candidate is also to be avoided. The rule—and this is a hard and fast one—is the same as they give the umpires: "Call them as you see them."

—Times Talk, September 15, 1952

New York Times Election Sweep

The Times put out 749,623 newspapers between 10:52 P.M. election night and sun-up next day. It had the full story—with major tables almost complete—of the Republican sweep, beside the Wednesday morning coffee in Washington, Boston and Pittsburgh and throughout the New York suburban area. Chartered planes flew the 4:02 A.M. edition to the capital.

Special motor trucks carried it to districts within fifty to sixty miles outside New York. An Election Extra, or "clean-up" edition, that started to roll from the presses at 5:00 A. M., got wide city distribution. Afternoon newspapers had little more that day.

This coverage and distribution, probably unmatched in the United States, was

achieved with deceptive smoothness. Actually a month of planning lay behind it—planning keyed to the possibility of another upset such as developed in the 1948 election.

Three weeks before Nov. 4, the publisher called a meeting of his department heads to discuss the election issue. News, advertising, circulation and mechanical branches were represented.

It was decided at this conference that the *Times* would hold back its election night press runs until it had something tangible to offer readers—no breathless rushing into print with undecisive fragments and guesses.

"With television and radio feeding the fragments," reasoned managing editor Turner Catledge, "we can afford to hold back until we have a fairly complete picture."

This was agreed upon, and it was decided that the *Times* would limit itself, barring miraculous upset, to four main editions, none before 10:40 P. M. and to be spaced, roughly, two hours apart. Provision was made in the planning for post-scripting, if situations warranted mid-run changes. Mr. Catledge was given unrestricted latitude as to when to let editions go.

The managing editor immediately ordered full preparations for election night. Dick Burritt, his executive assistant, drudged for weeks on physical details of the night's work plan. He worked out a scheme for swift copy distribution, set up a plan for providing writers with up-to-the minute reference and background material.

Joe Ingraham of the city staff worked up the complicated vote tables by which the *Times* rounds up the returns. Clifford Laube, day national news editor, set up direct Western Union circuits between the city room and *Times* correspondents in fifteen crucial states. Initial plans for the new Times Square bulletin board had been drafted by the mechanical department last January.

The Washington staff reached New York early on Election Day. Up from the Potomac came Arthur Krock, to write the lead, Scotty Reston and Peck Trussell to do Senate and House results, Bill White to cover returns from the South, Clay Knowles to handle Congressional tables,

and Bill Lawrence to analyze and interpret returns for WQXR listeners. At a 3:30 meeting with Mr. Catledge and the news editors, the Washington writers were briefed in plans for the night's operation.

By 7 P.M., the city room had warmed to the night's routine. Number standards had gone up on all desks to expedite copy distribution. First scattered returns began to trickle in and were posted in large numerals on the broadcast desk's changing scoreboard. Men on national stories hammered out secondary matter, clearing their desks for leads to come.

The first electoral vote count was flashed to Times Square crowds at 9:43 P. M.

Circulation director Nat Goldstein had told Catledge that he was prepared to handle later-than-normal press runs. The first edition rolled at 10:52 P. M., one hour later than usual press time. Though the outcome even then looked fairly definite, the initial banner headline cautiously said: "Eisenhower Takes Strong Lead." Fifty minutes later, the edition was post-scripted to read: "Eisenhower Men Claim Sweep." At 12:34 A.M., after 123,140 copies had been run off—the presses droned to a stop. That run was enough to make planes and trains on circulation's "must" schedule.

Huge platters of sandwiches and steaming caldrons of coffee were passed out all over the building at 11 o'clock—to the telephone room, Times Tower, mechanical department, pressroom, stereotype, photoengraving, circulation, editorial art and news room. Before the night was out 1,983 sandwiches, 2,530 cups of coffee downed the hatch.

Though early returns clearly indicated what the final result would be, this intensified rather than diminished work pressure. As more and more decisive returns piled up, writers not only had to rework their leads for each of the four main editions and four postscripts, but had to rewrite their entire stories at least twice during the night. In the bullpen, news editor Ted Bernstein and his assistant, Ernest von Hartz, kept changing banner headlines to conform.

The national and city copy desks moved mountains of material, kept it flowing steadily to the composing room where 45 printers were held beyond normal quit-

ting time, re-making as many as thirty pages between editions. Charles Plummer, make-up editor, supervised the changing inside make-up.

Throughout the night, individual staff men used their own personal contacts and sources to confirm trends. At 8:30 P. M., Bill Lawrence told Mr. Catledge: "I've just talked to the managing editor of the *Miami Herald*. He says Florida's in the bag for Ike." At 9:05 P. M. the vote from the industrial city of Rome, N. Y., showed Ike ahead by more than 2,000 votes. Jim Hagerty, on the State lead, walked over to assistant city editor Frank Adams. "Looks like it's all over," he said.

At 11:30 P. M., Mr. Krock told Mr. Catledge. "If this keeps up, we can call it for Eisenhower in the 12:40 edition," and went back to his machine to write the story that was to carry the top head: "Eisenhower Wins in Record Vote."

Way down below Forty-third Street, at 1:35 A. M., the presses thundered with the flat "Eisenhower Wins" headline. More than 65,000 copies carried the victory story.

At 1:40 A. M. the staff stood by for Governor Stevenson's conceding message. A top-line hanger insertion, "Race Is Conceded" was made ready; Mr. Krock had written a one-paragraph insert in anticipation of the message and Lew Jordan stood by in the composing room for official word that the Governor had conceded. He got it by telephone from news editor Ted Bernstein, who had turned on his bullpen miniature TV set and caught it the very second it was telecast. The presses slowed for a postscript, resumed their interrupted task at 2:02 A. M.

That was almost the end, but not quite. At 4:02, the edition intended for flight to Washington and for truck delivery to the suburbs, went onto the presses. This edition carried the full story, with tables, of the Republican landslide—Presidential, Congressional, Gubernatorial and the vote for lesser offices.

At 4:38, the Election Extra, with that legend in the front page weather ear, was sent down to the pressroom to supersede it. It was the clean-up version of the 1952 Republican sweep, an astonishingly accurate and complete story, including 18 columns of complicated tabular matter.

—*Times Talk*, November 1952

ASNE Bulletin, Dec. 1

Newspaper Conduct in the Campaign

Some Questions

Here are some of the possible improvements we should be debating:

1. Are some of our concepts of objective reporting and editing outmoded?

2. Have we fallen into the trap of accepting statements of officials and others and their press agents as objective news? To publish these statements without comment, or questioning or historical background may be just as bad as deadpan publishing of censored dispatches from Moscow.

3. This country is becoming more mature and better educated. Are we keeping up with the trend?

4. Can we find ways to make significant news more interesting?

5. Have we erred in applying the sports page techniques to all reporting? We must not permit ourselves to become so excited over political teams that we neglect the real reasons for elections.

6. Should we not re-examine the political columnists to see if we have lazily permitted them to usurp the space that belongs to the great reporter and the great editorial writer?

7. Are we paying sufficient attention to our copy desks? The men on these desks are the real assistant editors of our newspapers. If our papers are to be other than assembly line products we must find ways to bring greater dignity to these fine craftsmen.

Basil L. Walters,
Executive Editor,
Knight Newspapers

750 Letters

The *Times-Dispatch* did its level best to give both candidates a completely fair shake in its news columns. There were complaints, nonetheless.

We felt that one of the best answers to these complaints was to give everybody a maximum opportunity to let off steam in our letter column. We got more letters than we ever got before in a similar period, and we published more. We pub-

lished them, even when it meant leaving out two syndicated columns over a considerable period. No complaints from readers reached us as a result of these omissions.

Some newspapers carried a good many letters in the campaign, but cut them to 50 or 100 words. We allowed them to run to several hundred, on the theory that it was sounder policy to let the reader, whether irate or no, have enough space to develop his thought with a fair degree of adequacy. We published 750 of these letters between August 1 and November 4, and probably 725 of them came from readers who wrote us only once during the three months. The 750 letters occupied a grand total of 261 columns. We gave 97 columns to letters in the final weeks.

Virginus Dabney, Editor
Richmond Times-Dispatch

In the Campaign

Former Nieman Fellows who covered the Presidential campaign included:

In the Primary campaign

For the San Francisco *Chronicle*—Vance Johnson (1941)
For the Milwaukee *Journal*—Robert Fleming (1950)
For the Madison (Wis.) *Capital Times*—Aldric Revell (1949)
For the Chicago *Daily News*—Ed Lahey (1939) and Peter Lisagor (1949)
For the Chicago *Sun-Times*—Carl Larsen (1948)
For CBS—Everett Holles (1942)
For the New Orleans *Item*—Thomas Sancton (1942)

At the Conventions

For the UP—John Steele (1952)
For the Winston-Salem papers—Hoke Norris (1951)
For the Chicago *Sun-Times*—Carl Larsen (1948)
For the Chicago *Daily News*—Ed Lahey (1939)
For the New Orleans *Item*—Thomas Sancton (1942)
For the Kingsport (Tenn.) *News*—William Freehoff, Jr. (1952)

For Harriman—Arthur Hepner (1946)
—Frank Kelly (1943)
For Kefauver—Richard Wallace (1950)

On the candidates' trains

For Stevenson—Frank Kelly (1943)
—Robert Manning (1946)
For Eisenhower—John H. Crider (1941)
For UP (both candidates)—John Steele (1952)
For Newark *News* (both candidates)—John Davies (1952)
For Chicago *Daily News*—Ed Lahey (1939)
For Chicago *Sun-Times*—Carl Larsen (1948)
For *Time Magazine*—Robert W. Glasgow (1948)

In the home office

Irving Dilliard, editorial page editor, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* (for Stevenson)
Wellington Wales, editor, Auburn *Citizen-Advertiser* (shifted to Stevenson in Oct.)
David Botter, assistant managing editor, *Quick Magazine*.
Harry Ashmore, editor, *Arkansas Gazette* (for Stevenson)
Malcolm Bauer, editorial writer, Portland *Oregonian* (for Eisenhower)
Dwight Sargent, editor, Portland (Me.) *Press Herald* (for Eisenhower)
Hugh Morris, state political editor, Louisville *Courier-Journal* (for Stevenson)
George Chaplin, editor, New Orleans *Item* (for Stevenson)
William Freehoff, editor, Kingsport (Tenn.) *News* (for Eisenhower)
Robert W. Brown, editor, Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger* (for Eisenhower)
Houstoun Waring, editor, Littleton (Col.) *Independent* (for Stevenson)
Neil Davis, editor, Lee County *Bulletin*, Auburn, Ala. (for Stevenson)
A. G. Ivey, editorial writer, Winston-Salem *Journal and Sentinel* (uncommitted)
Thomas Griffith, senior editor, *Time Magazine* (for Eisenhower)
Sylvan Meyer, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Daily Times* (for Stevenson)
Hodding Carter, publisher, *Delta Democrat-Times*, Greenville, Miss. (for Eisenhower)
Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., editorial writer, Paducah (Ky.) *Sun-Democrat* (for Stevenson)

The Press Looks at the Press

In the Field of Foreign News

by Frank K. Kelly

What does Britain look like—reflected in the huge mirror of a large group of American newspapers? What does the United States look like—reflected in the British press, the German press, the Italian press?

What does India look like in the British papers, and Britain in the press of India? What kind of news flows back and forth between India and the western world?

As part of the most comprehensive study of world news in the history of journalism, the International Press Institute is preparing world-pictures of ten countries as they appear in the flow of the news—and asking editors in those nations to comment on the accuracy and quality of the pictures.

An organization of editors with members in 34 countries, the IPI is sponsoring a study of the press, and by the press. The study, financed by a special Ford Foundation grant, examines for the first time the nature and the extent of the news flow, and asks working members of the profession to say what the implications of that examination may be. Editors, news agency executives, and foreign correspondents have been enlisted in a trans-oceanic exchange of ideas and information, with the IPI serving as a channel of communication.

The press has been poked and prodded by many types of researchers in the past. People of all types have expressed their opinions about what the press should or should not do. But never before in history has there been a hardheaded examination of the activities of the press in an important field conducted by members of the press for their mutual benefit on an international level.

That is why the IPI study has no parallel. That is why it has aroused the interest and drawn the wholehearted assistance of leading editors, agency heads, and correspondents. That is why its reports are expected to have practical value in improving the flow of news among the free nations.

The IPI has no connection with the government of any country. It has no affiliation with the United Nations, or any other international body. It is a voluntary association of editors, dedicated to four main purposes—"the furtherance and safeguarding of the freedom of the press. . . the achievement of understanding among journalists and so among peoples. . . the promotion of the free exchange

of accurate and balanced news among nations. . . and the improvement of the practices of journalism."

It was first sponsored in April of 1949 by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, at the urging of the brilliant Sunday editor of the *New York Times*, Lester Markel. In October, 1950, thirty editors from fifteen countries decided it was a desirable and feasible organization, and in April of 1951 the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations made grants totaling \$270,000 to cover the costs of the first three years of operation. It was formally organized in Paris a month later, with Markel as chairman of the executive board. Headquarters were established in Zurich, Switzerland, a few months later.

In the spring of 1952 the Ford Foundation authorized a special grant for a survey of international news. The study got under way in September, when staffs were organized in Zurich, New York, and Madras, India. W. MacNeil Lowry, associate director of the Institute, formerly chief Washington correspondent for the Cox newspapers, was given operating responsibility for the entire project. Directors with extensive newspaper experience were appointed for the American phase and the other phases of the survey.

Arrangements were made with a group of ten leading researchers in U.S. journalism schools, headed by Dr. Ralph Casey of the University of Minnesota, to handle the task of measuring the amounts of foreign news printed in American papers. The news flowing on agency wires was measured by the IPI staff in New York. These tasks were assigned in Zurich to a number of skilled researchers with newspaper background, working in the IPI office there.

Four separate weeks—one in October, one in November, one in December of 1952, and one in January of 1953—were chosen for the measurement part of the project. One hundred and eighty-one newspapers—105 in the U.S., 76 in other countries—were placed on the study list. The wire reports of all the major news agencies were made available by the agencies for study during the same weeks.

Ninety-three of the American papers were put on the list through a statistical sampling method used by Dr. Chilton Bush, head of the Institute for Journalistic Studies at Stanford University. Under this system, every daily paper in the United States had an equal chance to appear on the list. The list gave fair representation to morning and evening papers, papers in different regions of the country, papers representing a cross-section of American

Frank K. Kelly is U. S. director of the Flow of News project that he describes. Former Associated Press reporter, he was a Nieman Fellow in 1945.

journalism. For purposes of comparison with this list, a separate list of twelve papers was made up, composed of leading papers such as the *Washington Star* and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, which had not been included in the Bush statistical sample.

The papers in Europe and India were selected by the IPI staff in consultation with editors in the countries involved, in order to get representative lists for each country. Forty-eight papers in Western Europe and 28 in India were chosen for examination.

Coding manuals were prepared by the IPI staff in New York and Zurich—with coordination by Dr. David M. White of Boston University in the U.S. and H. Sinding-Larsen in Europe—classifying foreign news into 14 categories: war, politics, foreign relations, defense, economic, cultural, education and science, religion, crime, judicial-legal, disasters, human interest, social, and sports. Using these manuals, the researchers in Europe, the United States, and India measured the newspapers and the wire service reports, tabulating the amounts of news in each category printed by the papers and sent along the wires by the agencies.

At the same time, the newspapers were studied to see how much foreign news was supplied by the major news services, how much by special or staff correspondents, and how much by syndicates. During the same weeks, editors handling foreign news—including a group of 35 telegraph editors in the U.S.A.—were asked to make reports on the daily editing problems occasioned by the flow of the news and to give indications of why they printed some stories and rejected others.

All of these activities were designed to show the sources and the nature of foreign news—the extent of its volume, the origin of it, and the use of it.

To tackle the difficult problem of estimating the value of such news, the IPI developed two instruments—the composite picture of one country in the press of another, and the case history of a news event occurring in one country and reported in another.

The composite picture was defined in a reportorial, objective summary of the facts concerning the life of Country A in one month's file of representative newspapers of Country B. For example, such a picture would present a summary of the facts brought to British readers by the British press about life in India, or a summary of the facts presented to Indian readers by the Indian press about life in Britain.

The case history was defined as a chronological, objective summary of the facts concerning a news event in one country as reported over a period of three days or more in a majority of the representative newspapers in another country. Such a history would deal with the coverage given to the British atomic explosion in the U.S. press, or the

coverage given to General Eisenhower's cabinet appointments in the British press or the press of another country under study.

These word pictures and case histories were prepared by the IPI staff members, on the basis of clippings drawn from newspapers in the countries being examined. The U.S. staff was assigned the job of preparing nine pictures—one each of India, Britain, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Switzerland, Western Germany, and Sweden—and 18 case histories, two from each of these nine countries. The Zurich staff and the Indian staff prepared other pictures and case histories, using Western European and Indian papers.

After completion, these summaries were scheduled to be sent to editors to obtain their comments on their accuracy and completeness. The editors also were requested to comment on the case histories of specific news events.

Twenty-seven correspondents of other countries stationed in the U.S. were asked to prepare reports done in specific terms in answer to this question: "Do you think the American press is giving an accurate picture of your country?" A composite picture of his country, based on one month's flow of the news, was sent to each correspondent, to help him make his report specific.

The third phase of the IPI survey was designed to cover suggestions for improvement. Many editors were directly interviewed by members of the IPI staff, both in the United States and Europe. More than 450 editors were sent questionnaires, seeking their views on the gathering and handling of foreign news at every stage.

Two questionnaires were prepared for news agency executives—one for the top men in the agencies, and one for agency editors and bureau chiefs. They were asked to give their opinions on the use made of agency dispatches by the papers, the influence of editors' demands on agency reports, and any suggestions they might have for the improvement of foreign news presentation in general.

Both in the direct interviews and in the questionnaires, the editors and agency executives were invited to express their ideas on the training required by foreign correspondents and foreign desk men in the modern world, and for their analysis of the ways in which correspondents and desk men did or did not measure up to their standards.

Under the IPI project, plans were also made to reach the readers of newspapers. Questionnaires were prepared for readers, and readers were asked for their views on possible improvements that might arouse greater interest in foreign news.

When all these phases of the flow of the news survey have been completed in the spring of 1953, the IPI will have the largest assemblage of facts and ideas about handling of foreign news ever gathered together. It will

be published in a series of reports next summer, after the annual meeting of IPI members in London.

Lester Markel summed up the objectives of the Institute, in this project and its other activities, in a statement he made early in December of 1952.

"The main objective of the Institute is to bring about greater world understanding through a better flow of

information," Markel said. "In this project, the objectives are the compilation of the first comprehensive analysis of the nature and extent of the news flow, the discovery of areas of ignorance in one country about another, indication of possible causes for these areas, obtaining suggestions for improving the flow of news, and promoting cooperation among editors and news agencies."

The One Un-American Act

by William O. Douglas

The other day I was rereading some English history that followed on the heels of the American and French Revolutions. England was suffering from tremors on account of the ideas of change that swept the world. We know from hindsight that most of England's fears were fancied. But the powers-that-be, the rulers, those who represented the *status quo*, were tense and fearful. Their fears were transmitted to the citizens; the epidemic of anxiety spread.

Each period of history has experienced these fears of change. America is no exception. At the end of the 19th century the spectre of anarchy and socialism stalked this country.

We witness today perhaps the most widespread suppression of views the country has known. The suppression comes not from fear of being jailed but from fear of being dismissed from employment, banned from radio work, disqualified for teaching, or unacceptable for the lecture platform. Those sanctions are effective and powerful. They often carry as much sting as a fine or a jail sentence.

We know that the Communist threat is the basis of the fears that sweep our communities. We know that that threat has substance to it. We know that Communist cells are much more dangerous than any Jacobin Club or Fabian society or Socialist party ever was. We know that there are sensitive areas in government where the employees must be beyond suspicion.

But we also know that the safety of our civilization lies in making freedom of thought and freedom of speech vital, vivid features of our life.

Our proudest boast has been a system that makes belief in the unorthodox a permissible way of life. It is not because we want to destroy existing institutions, nor to undermine an orthodox faith that we make room for revolutionary ideas. Ideas, like the people who have them, need expression. The market place tests them—accepting a few, rejecting many. It is the interchange of ideas, the challenge to prejudices that give any people the resiliency to meet changing conditions.

Political inventiveness is the great need of this age. Peo-

ple throughout the world have lost many of their moorings. The reasons are varied. But whatever they are, the result is a growing sense of insecurity. It is in that insecurity that Communism finds its greatest hold. Communists offer a world-wide fraternity that cuts across all racial, national, and color lines. It therefore has tremendous appeal among many people.

We who believe in a free society—and when I say we, I mean not only we of the West but Nehru of India, U Nu of Burma, Maghsaysay of the Philippines, Mossadegh of Persia and kindred spirits the world around—we can offer much more liberty and much more fraternity than any Communist regime. But we must invent new political methods, if we are to enlist the peoples of the world in a new front.

It is our attitude toward free thought and free expression that will determine our fate. There must be no limit on the range of temperate discussion, no limits on thought. No subject must be taboo. No censor must preside at our assemblies. We need all the ingenuity we possess to avert the holocaust.

The task of keeping our civil liberties alive is not an easy one in troubled times like these. But I believe our civilization will supply the necessary men. The people need leadership that makes a virtue of courage, of conviction and freedom of expression.

The pre-eminent problem of this age is the invention of new institutions, new political methods for aligning the people of the world in a true crusade for freedom. The ingenuity will be lacking if fear of Communism shrinks the world of ideas to one school of thought, to one point of view. Restriction of free thought and free speech is the most dangerous of all subversions. It is the one un-American act that could most easily defeat us.

This is a condensation of a talk by Justice Douglas to the Authors Guild Council in New York, December 3, on receiving the 1951 Lauterbach Award. This annual award for support of civil liberties was established in memory of the late **Richard E. Lauterbach**, liberal journalist and author, who was a Nieman Fellow in 1947.

On Headline Writing

Some Basic Rules for Attractive Heads

by Reginald Coggeshall

The city editor of one of the best small city dailies in New England recently wrote to the Boston University journalism division, saying:

In writing headlines we have for years tried to make each line of a headline a phrase. In any case, we have no lines ending in prepositions.

We should be interested to know what theory and practice you teach in this connection.

The purpose is to try to determine whether we should eliminate present restrictions in the interest of speed. In many newspapers today, lines ending in prepositions are common practice in headlines.

The inquiry was answered by Reginald Coggeshall, who handles the copydesk class. A little later, the city editor, acknowledging the answer, reported "It has already gone the rounds of present reporters and editors. New reporters and desk men will be asked to read it just as they are requested to digest the Gunning reports on the readability of our paper."

It said in part:

Any theory of the perfect head must give way, if necessary, to two unyielding factors: time and count. In the face of a deadline, anything that fits must go. In the face of some counts, you can only do your best.

In our copydesk class, we hold the students to lines expressing complete thoughts and penalize lines in which the thought *runs over* into the next line. We are quite careful, though, to give them counts that allow a complete thought to each line. During the second half-year, after they have developed a little fluency, we do give them heads with a count and a story in which the "complete thought" rule has to go by the board—and *CAPS and l.c.* heads in which we allow jammed lines—but we always tell them when the particular exercise will disregard the "complete thought" rule so that they will not waste their time trying to do the impossible.

The "complete thought" rule should apply equally to the drop-line or the flush-left head. There is nothing *right* or *wrong* about a line ending in a preposition or a head in which the thought runs over from one line into the next but a line that expresses a complete thought and does not run over into the next line is **EASIER TO READ**—the

quality which is the basis of a good head—one that the reader finds it easy to take in, to comprehend, at once.

Facility in writing "complete thought" lines is largely a matter of habit. If you have the habit, you start working on a head on the basis of complete thoughts and your thoughts fall naturally into approximate line-lengths so that your job is usually one of whittling down or filling out the lines to make them fit and balance. Because we think habit is important, we try to get the students to develop the habit as far as possible. When they write run-over lines, we show them how the head can be written according to our "rule." Some never acquire any facility but most of them do reasonably well by the end of the year, considering the actual working hours of the course.

We do give them some mean counts so that they can see what it is like to struggle with tight counts. The *Des Moines Register & Tribune*, from the point of view of the rimman, has a hell of a count, and we give the students a number of problems from the *R&T*. In the face of some counts, the most fluent old hand is up against it.

Considering the story the head must tell and the count, what can you do with the following head from the *Boston Post*:

SERVICE TO CHELSEA TO BE BETTER

**Dana Promises to
Give Relief to
Patrons**

The top deck of the last head can be criticized, of course, because, without attribution, it stands as a statement of the paper's opinion. Most of our students are from greater Boston. In one section only two in 20 knew "service" referred to transit (subway, elevated, and bus connections) service to Chelsea. The subhead is needed to explain whether "service" refers to gas or electricity or transportation or some other service. From long association, "Dana" means to older Boston readers the old "Boston Elevated," now operated under the Metropolitan Transportation Administration. To younger readers, to whom "Dana" means nothing, MTA would be the proper word.

Reginald Coggeshall, a veteran of several newspaper copy desks, is professor of journalism at Boston University.

That head might be matched by one from the Boston *Traveler* and one from the Baltimore *Sun*:

Bribe Request Defended as Hunt for Tien

**Atty. Carey Denies
Intent to Profit**

U. N. Refuses To Budge on Supervision

**Red Airfields Would
Weaken Allied Positions
Delegates Say**

The *Sun* head on the Korean armistice stalemate had a news problem as well as a count difficulty. The U.N. assembly was at the time in session in Paris and had been discussing universal disarmament. The stumbling block had been the issue of inspection or supervision. The Korean armistice talks, of course, also involved inspection or supervision. This story was about the Korean talks. Try rewriting the top deck:

U.N. Insists On Supervision In Armistice

but the second line is too long;

U.N. Demands Supervision In Armistice

As that had been the U.N. position from the beginning there is no news in that top deck;

Korea Talks Bog Down On Supervision

Use of the noun *Korea* as an adjective is an act of desperation, not of good usage. The second line just fits but the point of this story is that the talks on Korea are STILL bogged down—why *still*? Because the U.N. refuses to budge, it insists on, etc., inspection or supervision. You almost have to accept the *Sun's* "Refuses to Budge On." The top deck, though, stands equally well for a story from Paris—or Pusan. The second deck is almost mandatory, if the headline is to be more than a label.

There are certain verbal phrases that include a verb and a preposition. Obviously such phrases would not violate the no-line-ends-with-a-preposition rule, with the preposition capitalized. Note from the *Herald Tribune* (which sets heads flush left and right and which because of its

CAPS and l.c. style allows jammed lines):

F.D.I.C. Puts Up | Dulles Calls On Fund for Bank | Senate to Ratify In Loan Scandal | Japan's Treaty

and the Louisville *Courier-Journal*:

High Court Throws Out Negro Appeal

But certainly not this, from the Baltimore *Sun*:

FASCISTS FADE OUT IN LONDON

Similarly the possessive case may make a good line or may force a runover:

Truman's Plan | Need of West's For Tax Bureau | Unity Stressed Under Attack | By Eisenhower

With the story and the count, runovers are unavoidable:

From the *Herald Tribune* (Page 1; flush left and right)

Clean Street | 21 Senators Drive Bags | Ask Amerasia 371 Litterers | Case Transfer

Compare with a *Courier-Journal* head:

2 Big Banks In Somerset Plan Merger

This, set as a typographically perfect dropline, from the Baltimore *Sun*

CHURCHILL TO BEGIN D.C. TALKS TODAY

can be improved in phrasing but still gives lines that are difficult, or impossible, to balance into a perfect drop:

CHURCHILL BEGINS TALKS IN D.C. TODAY

You referred in your letter to lines ending with a preposition. Turning the pages of a Boston paper and of a recent issue of your paper, five heads were selected arbitrarily. As it is easy to find fault, the critic should rewrite them to avoid any line ending with a preposition. If you have the habit of framing your experimental lines in terms of complete thoughts, you will find it takes little time to phrase the lines you want—i.e., it would not take you appreciably longer to write “complete thought” lines than it did for the rimman to rewrite the lines that were used. The first two are from the Boston paper:

Winthrop Man Fined \$300 in Alleged Race Fix

The thought of Line 2 runs into Line 3, breaking the prepositional phrase (in Alleged Race Fix) after the *in*.

Alleged not only wastes space but is silly. He could not be fined on an allegation. The allegation must have been upheld. Throw out *Alleged*. The Boston angle of a Providence story is the local Winthrop man. In Boston, Narragansett and Lincoln Downs means a race track. A *Fix* means the “fixing” of a sports event or of an arrest charge, etc. Combine *Fix* and Lincoln Downs and you have a horse race. As *Fix* is a colloquial term, it might be put in quotes. The amount of the fine is, of course, not exceptional enough to be of headline importance

Winthrop Man Fined for ‘Fix’ at Lincoln Downs

Look at

Malik Cites Ransom For Four Flyers in Attack Upon U.S.

True, Malik *cited* the flyers during one of his repeated attacks on the United States, but what did he do when he *cited* them—one cites a fact as evidence of something—what did he make of the *ransom*? The head runs the thought of the second line over into the third line and it fails to tell the reader the point of the citation. Tell what he did when he *cited* the *ransom*:

Malik Says Ransom For Flyers Is Proof They Were Spying

You have a better news head and an improvement, perhaps, in eliminating the *in* at the end of Line 2. The incident of the flyers was recent enough and enough in the public mind not to need *Four* as a cue to which flyers Malik was referring. You still have the thought of Line 1 (*ransom* for what?) running over to Line 2. Is it a serious enough flaw to take another minute or so to rephrase the head to:

Ransom for Flyers Proof of Spying Role, Malik Tells U.N. Unit

To turn to three heads from your paper:

Middlebury Voters to Act on Making Study of School Situation

This is both an awkward headline and an awkward sentence. Because of possible confusion with Middlebury Colleges, you cannot use:

Middlebury Votes

But it is possible to avoid separating the verb, “to act” and to tighten the whole by using:

Middlebury Voters To Act on Survey of School Situation

This gets us out of our difficulties with both the first and second line of the head and certainly makes easier reading.

Eight Banned from Driving in Vermont

If this head had not been at the top of a column, it might have escaped notice. Is it worth bothering about? Why not let it go with the *from* at the end of the first line? Why not? But it is just as easy to write a head without the flaw. The story concerns the driving rights of eight men. They did not lose their licenses but only the right to use them for a certain period—the right was suspended:

Driving Rights of 8 Suspended by State

In the same issue, on Page 1, a top head with a maximum count of 16½ (spaces counted as *one*) read:

Vt. Couple Ordered To Appear Before Loyalty Committee

The story said: "... Grace and Max Granich, former publishers of the Shanghai 'Voice of China,' ... called the Communist party's official propagandists in China in the 1930's ... before the House un-American activities committee ... (the Granichs), who live in Wilmington, Vt., have been subpoenaed for next Wednesday ..."

If it is an office must that the local angle must be in the first line, no other first line is possible, including the *Vt.* abbreviation which is acceptable by necessity rather than by preference. To avoid the abbreviation the local angle would have to be relegated to the second line.

The thought of the second and third lines of the head used could have been condensed into one line, leaving the third line open for additional information:

Vt. Couple Called To Loyalty Hearing Loyalty Body Calls Vermont Couple

"Body" is used because "Group" makes the line $\frac{1}{2}$ too long. They have been called in connection with what? With the third line clear, you can tell the reader:

In Red China Case

The questions in your letter were directed not only at the school teacher but also at the man who must produce a given paper in time to make circulation deadlines. You were concerned about the dual problem of "restrictions" (i.e., the theory of the ideal head) and speed.

We know what we want to see in our ideal paper—heads that typographically are attractive, that are easy for the reader to grasp quickly, and that make each story promise interesting reading. Between the hope and the actuality

there are the difficulties of the pressures of time, of what should be said, and of the count in which to tell the story.

If the paper is committed to a head schedule that means the desk nine times out of ten cannot in the time available write a decent head, either the heads must be accepted—and it takes more time to write a poor head under a very tough count than it takes to write a good head under a reasonable count—or the head schedule must be revised to make consistently good heads possible.

If the head schedule has cut heads to a single deck, even on major stories, and the count is very tight, one cannot be too critical of the rimman. A two-deck head does give him a chance to bail out. A second deck, it might seem, should be optional to the extent that if the story is not simple and cannot be clearly stated in a single deck, a second deck should be used. If the story is so involved that a single top deck cannot tell it, it might seem that the story is unusual (i.e., interesting) enough to justify the display (in size of head and position) of a two-decker. (c.f., the heads on "Service to Chelsea" and the Korean armistice deadlock).

In one of the papers from which we draw editing and head problems for our copydesk class, a paper often spoken of as among the "better" papers, the editing is incredibly slack and the head writing perfunctory. I do not know why, but I do know that most of the city staff copy is very poor and the head count is damnable. It may be that the rim staff is not large enough to do more than skim copy for mechanical errors and slap down a head that will fit to get an open column filled. I do know that the reader of that paper, which suffers because it has no pressure from a competitor, is the victim of unbelievably poorly written stories that are run virtually unedited and of heads that are labels or that are clumsily written. To the extent that the rim is undermanned in relation to the volume of copy it must handle, *editing* will only amount to correcting typing and style errors and *head writing* to dashing off anything that will fit, regardless of appearance, thought, or interest.

Given elbow room and time a competent rimman can turn out good heads but the publisher must give him a workable head schedule and a volume of copy he can handle both speedily and well before the deadline.

An Independent Editorial Page

The Milwaukee Journal

by Lindsay Hoben

Editorial writers have, from time to time, been variously described, and not always in a manner that could be sent through the mails. One description sent to me about five years ago by a friend, who is an editorial writer on the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, was as follows:

THE EDITORIAL WRITER

His Roget and his Bartlett's at his side,
Omniscience his trade, the morgue his guide,
He freely draws upon his book-lined shelf—
The world his oyster, but no clam himself.
"Stalin has gone too far!" "Franco is through!"
"Governor, take heed!" "Mayor, here's what to do!"
"Dewey's Stupidity," "The President's Mistake,"
"We Trust the British People will Awake,"
He looks the Powers in the eye each day,
Fearless and brave, a thousand miles away,
Judging alike the living and the dead,
Unbending, unafraid, unswerving and unread.

Somehow I cannot completely accept the punch line and particularly the last word, because if the editorials were unread, I'm sure the editorial writers would be spared a considerable volume of fan mail and verbal comment, approving, disapproving, and sometimes downright violent.

I might illustrate this by an incident which occurred a few months ago when one of our editorial writers was filling in a blank at the Veterans' Administration. When it came to "Occupation," he wrote, "An editorial writer for the *Milwaukee Journal*." The VA employe looked up as though he had seen something unclean.

"So you're an editorial writer for THAT paper," he said. "I always told my wife I'd bust one of you guys in the nose. Some nights I read those editorials, and I practically jump up and down on the paper."

"My wife said, 'Ed, why don't you stop taking the paper if it bothers you so much—it isn't worth it.' Well, I don't stop. The truth is it's a hell of a good paper. I've lived lots of places and never had a better one. It's the best I know—I like the damned thing even when it gets me mad." I might add that this seems to be the atmosphere today.

The *Journal* editorial writers meet every morning at 8:30.

This is from a talk by Mr. Hoben, editorial page editor of the *Milwaukee Journal*, at a dinner of the Nieman Fellows in Cambridge, October 10, 1952.

The chief editorial writer presides. The meeting is attended by five other editorial writers and Ross Lewis, our editorial cartoonist. The assistant managing editor frequently attends, not as a member but in a liaison capacity to inform us of stories that the news department may be working on if they have a bearing on some editorial question under discussion.

Each of the editorial writers has his special fields and also secondary fields, so that there are at all times, theoretically at least, two men who could handle any major subject.

Of course, there will always be some subjects which are not permanently assigned and can be allotted after our discussion. In the morning conference we go around the table, each person bringing up subjects in his field which he thinks merit discussion. The chief editorial writer brings up other subjects which may otherwise be overlooked or subjects which Mr. J. D. Ferguson, our president and editor, has suggested. Occasionally, too, members of the news staff may have sent in suggestions for editorials—or even editorials. These we are always glad to receive. During vacation period we have had various reporters (including one woman) and our book editor helping out.

I'm sure that one question in your mind is: "Who makes *Journal* editorial policy?" It is not a simple question to answer. If you read the August 1950 issue of the *American Mercury* magazine you found the following statement in an article by Chet Vonier about the *Milwaukee Journal*.

"'No, by God!' Mr. Grant answered, firmly and pointedly, 'Harry Grant makes the *Journal* policy!'"

If you read the October 2, 1950, issue of *Time* magazine you found the following statement in an article about the *Milwaukee Journal*.

"Grant lets chief editorial writer Lindsay Hoben and his five assistants do the speaking for the *Journal*, rarely knows what the paper is saying until he reads it in print." These two statements may sound, in the words of Li'l Abner, somewhat "confoozin'."

The facts are these: By and large the *Journal* editorial writers decide collectively on the attitude the paper is to take. It is not a final matter of a vote, however, since the chief editorial writer is responsible for whatever is said. He is also subject to the superior jurisdiction of J. D. Ferguson, our president and editor, and of Mr. Harry Grant, the chairman of the board.

It would probably be simplest to say that Mr. Grant *can* make editorial policy if he chooses, but that he seldom does. He chooses, rather, to leave the decisions almost entirely to the editorial writers, working with the frequent counsel of Mr. Ferguson. If the paper was completely or repeatedly off the beam, as Mr. Grant saw it, he could, of course, make his views known. He hesitates, however, to impose a decision—never does it arbitrarily—or to override the editorial writers. So does Mr. Ferguson.

As a matter of fact, there have been very few basic differences of opinion, and very often there is complete and unanimous agreement, which means that serious problems seldom arise in the matter of deciding *Journal* editorial policy. Sometimes, to be sure, we have spirited differences of view among the editorial writers themselves. No editorial writer, however, is required to write a piece that is contrary to his own view.

Many of the paper's policies go back so many years that they are taken for granted and little discussion is necessary. This, of course, is true of basic matters and fundamental principles.

As Mr. Ferguson said in a talk, when he was chief of the editorial writers:

"Principles don't change. Men do. That's why the *Journal* does not, as so many newspapers do, go into ecstasies over the candidates it favors from time to time for public office. It will commend them for the principles they espouse. But it is afraid of men. Next week your fair-haired boy may elope with his secretary or rob the till and the public immediately blames the newspaper which has been holding up the scalawag as a paragon of virtue."

And I still quote Mr. Ferguson—

"I believe it was the first Joseph Pulitzer who set down for the *Post-Dispatch* the rule that the *P-D* should always remain unawed by predatory wealth or privileges, unswayed by predatory poverty. If you try to stick to simple principles you won't be swayed by either threats or flattery. And those principles, put in simple form, are answers to such questions as: 'Is it right?' 'Is it in the public interest?' 'Is it fair?' 'Will it work?'"

Occasionally, times and conditions bring such changes that the *Journal* editorial policy must change, too. A very simple example of this is our attitude toward our city's debt. After working for years to make Milwaukee a debt free city, we, along with many other leaders in this community, finally decided that frugality had been carried to the point of municipal stagnation. Our city was solvent, but it was also stodgy, and it was accomplishing too little in the way of city development. The *Journal* then decided to reverse its traditional stand against municipal debt and to favor limited bond issues for worthwhile projects in order that Milwaukee might progress.

There has long been a feeling, at least on the part of some outsiders, that editorial writers were run-down incompetents or, at best, impractical fellows living in ivory towers.

I may be prejudiced, but I do not think that the *Journal* editorial writers quite fit this category.

As a matter of fact, all but one of our editorial writers had thorough training and much experience as a reporter, and the other one had years of experience in the Sunday and feature department. The *Journal* editorial writers are comparatively young. You notice, I say "comparatively." Our ages are 40, 41, 45, 50, 53, and 60.

We get around a great deal to the direct sources of information in our fields. We believe, as Walter Lippmann said in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, that:

"Editorial writers have to know more than is printed in the news columns. They have to make their own contact with events and with leading figures who shape events. They have to go behind the reported news, behind the formal speeches and announcements, behind the communiques and the handouts. They have to get to know what public figures are like behind the buildup of the public relations experts, what actually causes them to do what they do. Editorial writers have to know not only the story that can be printed, but all the rest of the story that is off the record. Only then can they write editorials which explain and interpret the news."

I believe that the *Journal's* editorial writers meet these standards. In the last year they have traveled widely. A *Journal* editorial writer will go anywhere in the country necessary to get his material.

But as a writer in a national magazine wrote recently: "The Milwaukee *Journal* never loses the home touch. Daily and Sunday page one editorials, headed 'Milwaukee' and 'On, Wisconsin' and editorials in the regular inside editorial columns enlighten *Journal* readers on events and conditions and people—things of interest to community-minded citizens."

Another writer, David Wittels, put it this way in the *Saturday Evening Post*: "The *Journal* is Milwaukee's self-appointed civic conscience. It patrols Milwaukee and the greater part of Wisconsin with club poised to conk malefactors of all kinds, as well as any politician who dares lift his head to take a hungry look at public funds. And Milwaukee, unlike most cities, listens to its conscience. Because the *Journal* is against gambling, even bingo games at church socials and firemen's picnics are practically taboo in Milwaukee."

"Many newspapers make spasmodic crusades against gambling, but at the same time most of them carefully print horse-race entries, selections and results in full, to keep the trade of the betting fraternity. The *Journal* is more consistent. It never prints selections or 'dope,' and never prints

entries or mutuel prices, except for that American classic, the Kentucky Derby.

"This uncompromising attitude caused the *Journal* some embarrassment a few months ago when padlock action under the vice laws was begun against a property owned by the *Journal* itself. The *Journal* not only printed the story but announced in the first paragraph that it owned the property. It did not explain until the last paragraph that it had bought the place only recently, planning to tear it down to make room for its garage. It did not bother to explain at all that the reason it needed to change its garage was to make way for a Negro housing project which it had backed against public indifference and the active opposition of special interests.

"Though most of the executives and staff enjoy a few drinks—and sometimes more—the *Journal* promptly pilories with publicity anyone caught mixing alcohol with gasoline, not even sparing its own family. One Saturday night the *Journal's* publisher was arrested with a few drinks under his belt, following an automobile crash. Out of professional courtesy, the only other daily in town offered to hold out the story. The managing editor not only declined this gracious gesture but kept the story of the case against his own publisher on Page 1 of the *Journal* for several days. The publisher finally resigned.

"The *Journal* began its career of self-appointed civic conscience when a stubborn, bulldog type of man named Lucius (Lute) W. Nieman took it over sixty-five years ago. Soon afterward more than seventy people were killed when a hotel advertised as fireproof burned to the ground. While the city's seven other dailies tsk-tsked piously over the unpredictable and tragic vagaries of fire, the *Journal* charged that the hotel was 'a known firetrap' and blasted the owners and city authorities for greedy, criminal negligence. Milwaukee's almost religious devotion to high safety standards dates from that exposure."

I have already quoted too much from the *Saturday Evening Post* article. But if any of you are interested in the rest of it, it is called "Milwaukee's Dutch Uncle" and appeared Sept. 27, 1947.

The *Journal* editorial writers keep in close personal touch with many of their local fields.

For instance, four of our men are frequent visitors in Madison, especially when the legislature is in session. Some-time two are in the state capital the same day. Two keep in close touch with affairs in the city and county, attending, whenever they believe it is necessary, meetings of the county board, or the common council, or of committees. Another keeps in close touch with the social welfare organizations, attending many noon and evening meetings.

While we are on the subject of editorials on local matters, you may be interested to know that on Sept. 30 we started

an experiment which we believe to be the first of its kind in the country.

We expanded our front page "Milwaukee" editorial by using the medium of television. That is, we produced in advance on film a 15 minute television editorial in pictures with appropriate commentary. The television program was presented at 6 p.m. on our television station, WTMJ-TV, and was both a promotion of that night's "Milwaukee" editorial and an elaboration of it, using the visual medium.

We are going to do at least 13 of these television editorials. The experiment requires a terrific amount of work and costs a great deal of money.

It is hardly necessary to confide that *all* of the *Journal* readers do not *always* agree with *Journal* editorial policies, nor are they bashful, thank Heaven, about saying so. It would be a sorry thing indeed for a democratic and self-governing people if they swallowed hook, line and sinker the advice of a newspaper—no matter how wise or how sincere—or the advice of anybody else, without thinking about it, arguing, debating and disagreeing.

Many of the readers' reactions can be seen every day in the "From the People" column where the letters to the editor are printed. These are a pretty good cross section of comments by *Journal* readers, though, of course, there are some vituperative communications too profane, or anonymous communications which the *Journal* never publishes.

Some of the communications which we cannot use are downright filthy, others make no sense and some are the product of one of our State legislators who writes us thousands of words a month. Sometimes he signs his letters with his own name, but when they are particularly insulting he just signs them with a pseudonym and addresses them, to pick one of his milder examples: "For the information of you stupid fools."

The letters come not only from all over the state, and an amazing number from other parts of the country, but even from some foreign countries. We had one from Madrid recently with highly uncomplimentary comment. In most cases, these distant letters come from persons who do not take the *Milwaukee Journal* (we make no effort to circulate outside of Wisconsin and upper Michigan), but from persons who see our editorials reprinted in other newspapers, including foreign newspapers, and then sit down to write us.

Many *Milwaukee Journal* editorials are reprinted in the Paris edition of the New York *Herald Tribune* and are widely read throughout western Europe. Complying with a request by the *Herald Tribune*, we airmail to Paris several times a week *Journal* editorials dealing with foreign affairs and, occasionally, some domestic affairs concerning major congressional issues. The Voice of America also uses *Journal* editorials to beam to foreign countries.

Sometimes we get letters, even on subjects other than McCarthy, that make us wonder what is the use of publishing a newspaper. For example, here is a paragraph from a letter written by a reader in Ava, Missouri, a couple of years ago.

"In concluding, let me remind you that, reflect to the utmost, I can't recall ever reading an editorial in the *Journal* attacking that powerful butter lobby in Washington. Just wonder if you know there is such a lobby in our capital. It has something to do with oleo."

Of course, as some of you may know, the *Journal* has editorially opposed the discriminatory oleo taxes for at least 30 years, even though this stand has brought much criticism from our dairy farmers in this great dairy state.

As might be expected, the hottest differences of opinion usually arise over political matters, local, state, national and international.

In this connection the public sometimes takes a mistaken and an amusing view of the *Journal's* role. They seem to think that a newspaper, editorially, should try to pick the winner in a political contest. They seem to think it is like betting on a horse. The Milwaukee *Journal* never supports a person on the basis of whether he may win or not. It supports a candidate because it believes him to be better qualified for a particular office at a particular time.

I like the way the Sunpapers of Baltimore explain their relationship with the voter in a little booklet which they put out a few months ago. I quote:

"On local issues, such as referenda on loans or changes in the fundamental law, The Sunpapers and the people almost always see eye to eye. More often than not, they agree as to political personalities as well.

"One reason for this fundamental understanding and frequent agreement between the people of Baltimore and The Sunpapers is, almost certainly, that this is a local company, locally owned. The major stockholders are Baltimoreans whose welfare and that of their city and state are closely interrelated. They are convinced that the community needs a newspaper free to speak up for the general interest regardless of the personal concerns of any of its owners.

"These stockholders are men of different political and religious beliefs, different backgrounds, different outlooks. No newspaper could be run to suit the individual tastes of such a varied group."

This describes the situation which is very much like the *Journal's* in our own community—except that 75% of the *Journal's* stock is owned by 815 persons actively associated in producing the paper and running the radio and television stations. [In the discussion Mr. Hoben described the Milwaukee *Journal's* employee stock ownership plan in

considerable detail—as worked out by Harry J. Grant, chairman of the board of directors.]

Despite the fact that it has become popular, especially among our enemies, to speak of the *Journal's* endorsement as a "kiss of death," the actual record does not bear this out, and the political candidates themselves always seek our support and believe it helps them. I have never met one yet who did not think the *Journal's* support had helped him whether he had won or lost.

We are sometimes accused by readers of being politically partisan. We have been accused of aiding various parties in the past. Actually, the *Journal* has long been, and is, an independent newspaper. We backed Roosevelt for president in 1932 and again in 1936. Chiefly because of the third term issue, we backed Willkie in 1940. And in 1944 we expressed no preference, although I think if one added up the editorial comment on specific issues there would have been a slight balance in favor of Roosevelt. In 1948 the *Journal* unequivocally backed Dewey. This year we are, so far, uncommitted. We rather hoped that Gen. Eisenhower's campaign would enable us to back him. But he has made this almost impossible. [Two weeks later the Milwaukee *Journal* came out for Stevenson.]

In state politics, to go back a few years, the *Journal* backed Kohler (father of the present governor) in 1930. He was a Republican. We backed Schmedeman, a Democrat, in 1932. In 1934 we again backed Schmedeman. In 1936, we backed Lueck, a Democrat, in a three-way race between LaFollette, a Progressive, and Wiley, a Republican. In 1938 we backed Heil, a Republican, against LaFollette. In 1940 we again backed Heil. In 1942, we backed Loomis, a Progressive, because we did not think Heil was living up to expectations. In 1944 and 1946 we backed Goodland, a Republican, against Hoan, Milwaukee's former Socialist Mayor, who was running as a Democrat. In 1948, we backed Rennebohm rather mildly, and in many editorial comments since have indicated that we felt he was one of our better governors, despite his hot temper and the fact that too often he behaved rather undignifiedly in public while appearing as governor. In 1950 we expressed no preference but said that Thompson, the Democrat, and Kohler, the Republican, seemed well qualified.

The *Journal* has been accused by some of being Democratic because it has consistently backed this country's foreign policy and been opposed to those Republicans who are isolationists. The *Journal* has consistently fought against Communists and Communism but has taken a very critical view of Senator McCarthy's sledge-hammer methods and his repeatedly demonstrated irresponsibility.

On the charge that the *Journal* has been soft on the Communists in our government, I would like to say a few

words. We have never been soft on the Communists, and I think the record is clear if anyone cares to go through our files. We have always objected, however, to a careless and wholesale method of smearing people without fair hearings and fair investigations. We believe that it is important to maintain our fundamental liberties and freedoms—and that means for all Americans—and we believe that if a few guilty persons escape it is too bad, but better than destroying our American system.

Senator McCarthy, of course, has made speeches in which he has tried to convince his audience that the *Journal* editorial policy was Communist controlled or influenced. His reasoning, you may remember, was this: (and you'll have to follow pretty closely): That the late newspaper, *PM*, in New York, was pro-Communist; that it was owned by Marshall Field; that Marshall Field had a lawyer who was married to a woman who was the sister of the wife of the chief editorial writer of the Milwaukee *Journal*. From this devious reasoning, he concluded that the *Journal* was a tool of the Communists. This probably sounds funny to you, but some of his audience were stupid enough to believe it and I'm sure some of them still believe it.

The Senator then urged his listeners to punish the *Journal* by boycotting it and by boycotting businesses which advertised in the *Journal*. This kind of attack is not new to our paper. We have experienced it in the past.

One time, Governor Phil LaFollette campaigned bitterly against us and got nowhere. The latest campaign against the *Journal* was more than a dismal failure.

Our wonderful advertising department succeeded in rolling up the highest total of lineage that any publication in the world ever ran in one year (1950). They did this even after being forced to cancel more than 400,000 lines of advertising because of the paper shortage. They repeated in world leadership the next year (1951) and we are leading again this year (1952).

Nor did our circulation suffer from McCarthy's attack. Our circulation department pushed both the daily and Sunday figures to new *Journal* highs for all time. In the last four years, we have a gain on Sunday of 81,000 and daily of 19,000. This is in a period when many papers have lost badly. The Chicago *Tribune*, for instance, has lost 141,000 Sunday and 97,000 daily; the *Tribune*-owned New York *Daily News* has lost 603,000 Sunday and 188,000 daily, and almost the whole Hearst chain has lost badly. I know this sounds boastful, but the point I mean to make is that we have gained though under attack and in a period when circulations were by no means going up automatically.

To me it seems clear that the newspaper readers and advertisers admire and will support an honest, independent paper. I believe this to be fundamentally true even when they disagree and sometimes get angry.

The *Journal's* historic policy has been, as I have said, independent and pretty much middle-of-the-road. It believes in exerting its influence—which is always hard to measure directly—on the side that seems to deserve help. When labor seemed to be getting a raw deal, the *Journal* backed many of the laws to give it greater rights, including the Wagner Act and the Wage-Hour Act. Later, when some sections of labor and its leaders seemed to be abusing some of the privileges given them, the *Journal* supported modification of the Wagner Act. It has alternately been popular and unpopular with *both* sides and finds itself in that position, even from day to day, on specific issues.

In Mr. Grant's words, quoted again from the article in *Time* magazine, "The public can hate us, they can damn us. In fact, by God, I know we're right when both sides damn us. But whatever they say about us, they can't control us."

That statement by Mr. Grant is equally applicable to the Democrats, the Republicans, the reactionaries, and the Communists.

The First Lovejoy Lecture, 1952

Freedom Is Indivisible

by James S. Pope

Elijah Parish Lovejoy was born Nov. 9, 1802, in Albion, Maine, and on Nov. 7, 1837, in Alton, Illinois, he was shot to death by a mob because he would not relent in his editorial crusade against human slavery.

Freedom has many faces, but a single soul. The fight to preserve and extend it, as we can see clearer than any crusading editor or any slaveholder could have seen a hundred and more years ago, is the central impulse of our time.

The battleground and the target change, adversaries discover their errors and become allies. As our civilization grows more populous and more complex, the sovereign necessity for all the basic freedoms for all peoples becomes more and more essential to survival, and the peril in the loss of any one of them by anybody more acute.

THE SLAVES were freed.

It would be a misunderstanding of history to assume that they were freed simply, or even chiefly, because of a military victory by the Union over the Southern Confederacy. Force alone has never conquered the impulses of tyranny. To mention only two of many factors, the end of slavery was already approaching because of the maturing humanism of those who had inherited the science and technology which would have made slavery obsolete.

The will to hold fellow beings in bondage was weakening, and the day of emancipation was becoming inevitable because of the valor, the logic, the articulate spirit of men like Elijah Lovejoy.

Lovejoy died, not only for the freedom of human beings and the freedom of the press, but because deep in him was a dynamic concept of Freedom itself, the long-sighted certainty that men would lose everything if they surrendered or compromised their personal dignity and self-respect.

As the editor of a religious publication he did not have to espouse abolition against the sentiments of his community. His church did not require him to do it. As one of his presses after another was destroyed by angry mobs, he could in all reason have bowed to the weight of public feeling and tempered his condemnations.

Few utterances in all the literature of freedom have expressed so clearly, with such calm passion, the compulsion of the martyr as did his speech to a hostile mass

meeting just before his second press arrived in Alton. He said:

If I leave here and go elsewhere, violence may overtake me in my retreat, and I have no more claim upon the protection of any other community than I have upon this. I have concluded, after consultation with my friends, and earnestly seeking counsel of God, to remain at Alton and here to insist on protection in the exercise of my rights.

If the civil authorities refuse to protect me, I must look to God; and if I die, I have determined to make my grave in Alton. I have sworn eternal opposition to slavery and by the blessing of God I will never turn back.

I can die at my post but I can never desert it.

Three presses later a mob set fire to the building in which his new machinery was housed, and when he attempted to protect it himself he was shot to death.

Irving Dilliard, the distinguished editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, has recorded all these events dramatically and authentically in the October issue of the *Quill*, the magazine of the journalistic fraternity Sigma Delta Chi. Mr. Dilliard, adopting the technique of his craft, has told Elijah Lovejoy's story in the form of a contemporary news dispatch, with the dateline, "Alton, Ill., Nov. 9, 1837,"—the day of his funeral.

On Sunday, to complete the Lovejoy cycle which once more begins in Maine and ends in Illinois, Sigma Delta Chi will place a bronze plaque on the spot in Alton where he died for freedom of the press.

Today, freedom of the press in our country has become almost an invulnerable institution. It has grown slowly, with but minor setbacks, into an indispensable concept, an essential of the relationship between citizen and government so deeply imbedded in our minds as to be taken largely for granted. Not even the boldest politician would attack it openly, and only a few here and there continue any serious efforts to undermine it.

Since it is a peculiar and unqualified right guaranteed

in our Constitution, it has come to be the chief ingredient, along with freedom of speech and religion, of the very atmosphere of our national life. If it were reduced our citizens would react as violently as if their oxygen were drained away.

In a case brought by the *Corona Daily Independent*, the California Supreme court said:

The Four Freedoms—of speech, of religious worship, of the press and of assembly—are to be considered as a class of rights apart from and above any and all other rights an individual might have. They are placed upon a pedestal above the power of any governmental agency to require a license before they might be exercised.

Anybody has the right to print a handbill, a book, a circular, a pamphlet, or a 500-page Sunday paper and say in it what he pleases. The right to do this is guaranteed, not to protect an industry but to insure that all citizens (who in a democracy possess original power) will have access to a variety of information and opinion free of influence by any public official temporarily exercising some of this power by assignment.

This is a majestic right—so majestic that for much too long most of us in the newspaper field were blinded by it. When I became chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I found we had another fight on our hands. I suspect it is historically true that whenever a basic human right is dedicated, frontal attacks upon it cease and flanking movements begin.

In this case the flanking movement was a far-flung denial within all our governments—national, state and local—that the people had inalienable rights of access to the news of these governments. Almost undetected there had emerged a doctrine that public information belongs not to the public but to the custodians of public office, and that it is dangerous for the people to get information about the actions of their servants in any direct, unprocessed, uncolored form.

My committee's reports to our Society are filled with case-studies, with details of instances of suppression we had permitted to multiply without any united challenge. At long last we realized a sobering truth: the authors of the American Bill of Rights, conceiving only of a small and fairly open national governmental establishment as against one that employs 2,500,000 civilians today, had spelled out freedom of the press while its twin, freedom of information, they had taken for granted. They must have, for neither is self-sufficient. If government by and for the people requires the right to speak out and to publish, it requires implicitly the right to know.

We may be sure the founders of our republic had heard these words, already over a century old:

Give us liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all other liberties.

It was not by chance that John Milton had put first the liberty to know. Of what value is the right to criticize and to vote if based on false or flimsy knowledge? If people are the real source of power, how can this power be exercised wisely out of ignorance or part-truth?

Surely if the First Amendment means anything it means that all the news at every level of government belongs to the people; and it can never be a broad privilege of their elected and appointed agents to determine *how much* the people shall know.

Our committee soon reached the conclusion that the right to publish, existing alone, can become an empty one. To fulfill the true concept of this freedom, the government must keep its hands not only off of the press but off of the springs and channels of information that feed the press. We learned that vast areas of public information were being hidden behind a red-tape curtain.

And it was at this point that we realized our fight could have no ending. You can never establish freedom of information as a functioning principle in any nation as firmly as you can establish freedom of the press. When you get the right to publish an important phase of the battle is over. But what you then face is the perpetual cold war waged by these public officials who from timidity or for personal or political gain do not want the voters to know just exactly what they are doing.

Thus you have the spectacle—which surely would surprise Elijah Lovejoy because it surprises us—of editors in the United States, enjoying a degree of freedom of the press so enormous that to others it sometimes seems excessive, engaged now in a major and continuing struggle for the raw material without which free publication becomes a mockery.

For our fresh insight into the psychology of suppression and its legal pretexts, we have to thank a neighbor of yours, a distinguished newspaper lawyer of New York City who had retired to live in Skowhegan—Harold L. Cross. At least he thought he had retired, until we drafted him back into the front lines.

It was Harold Cross who discovered for us the innocent federal statutes upon which the pretense of official ownership of information was being based. As he said:

In the early days of the Republic, Congress, apparently as a sort of housekeeping measure for safety and preservation, authorized the executive departments to make regulations . . . for the custody, use and safe-keeping of their records, papers and property. . . Regulations have so tortured the statutes that, in the ab-

sence of a general or specific statute creating a clear legal right to inspect a particular record, there is no legal right to inspect any record of any executive department.

Another statute—the Administrative Procedure Act—is so cluttered with “ifs” that its practical effect, says Harold Cross, is to bar access to records of administrative agencies. As the American Law action of the Library of Congress aptly puts it, these qualifications “have enabled the agencies to assert the power to withhold practically all information they do not see fit to disclose.”

Thanks to warnings such as these, Congress has bestirred itself. There is a Senate committee appointed to study the information policies in the administrative departments, and a group of Washington newspapermen headed by Roscoe Drummond, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, is advising this committee.

It has dawned on members of Congress that they live in a goldfish bowl as compared with their administrative colleagues. Individual senators and representatives are writing legislation to restore to the people some of their lost right to know. To one of these Harold Cross wrote: “Determination of public interest has become, in effect, an official monopoly.”

This democratic phenomenon was manifested most clearly, perhaps, when the U. S. Board of Parole first refused, and then under pressure released to the *Courier-Journal*, the names of the endorsers of a parole for a notorious tax-dodger in Louisville. The head of the Board wrote our committee: “In the future . . . desired information will be supplied if, in our opinion, such information would be compatible with the welfare of society.”

This condescending concept we challenged immediately. There are many countries, we pointed out, where the State decides what is compatible with the welfare of society. This is not one of them.

What are the results of secrecy in government. We have only to look at the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue under its former leadership to find an answer.

The motives of secrecy vary; they are not always bad. But the effects are almost invariable—ineptitude, corruption, and some degree of despotism.

Within recent weeks we have heard members of a St. Louis grand jury charge that Justice Department officials duped them into releasing a report that whitewashed St. Louis tax scandals. (This is the department voted most sphinx-like by a group of Washington correspondents.) We have heard a sworn deposition by a Missouri federal judge that the Department of Justice obstructed a grand jury investigation of income-tax cases. We have even

heard the official integrity of a former Attorney General, who now is a Supreme Court justice, questioned by a Congressional committee.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue was shaken by scandals. Under Commissioner James B. Dunlap it has greatly liberalized its regulations. Those citizens who pay all their taxes honestly now for the first time can read the names of those who do not. Under this new policy, for which Mr. Dunlap deserves full credit, we learned that “Greasy Thumb” Gusik settled \$900,000 in federal tax claims and penalties for \$100,000. Many similar cases, of which the public knew nothing, now are coming into the open.

In our files are the records of an appalling number of cases where official bodies, with great power or controlling huge sums of public monies, said to the public, “You shall not know”—a school board in Connecticut and a tax abatement authority in Rhode Island; a city council in Maryland and a county commission in Georgia; a highway patrol in California and a sheriff in Texas.

In all these cases publicity was the weapon that routed secrecy, as light always destroys darkness.

Naturally, no sensible American wants access to information kept secret to protect our nation from its enemies. Herbert Bayard Swope revealed a profound misunderstanding of our committee’s work in a letter to the *New York Times* which questioned whether freedom of information might not jeopardize security. The press proved its capacity to safeguard national security by effectively operating a completely voluntary censorship in World War II.

But this does not mean that all military and diplomatic intelligence should be kept secret. Many thoughtful Americans—including Senator Benton and Stuart Symington—have pointed to dangerous abuses of the privilege of “classification,” which simply means the power to suppress government information. These abuses exist on an absurd scale even in the offices which classify constantly and should be able to draw a reasonable line—the Departments of State and Defense.

There probably are thousands of documents in the files of those departments containing information the public needs, and which have lost any security value.

President Truman himself demonstrated this in somewhat startling fashion two days before the elections. Because he thought it had a political bearing, he declassified a “top secret” document. Now “top secret” is defined officially as “Information and material, the security of which is paramount to the interest of national security, and the unauthorized disclosure of which would cause exceptionally grave damage to the nation.”

Did President Truman for political reasons put the security of this nation in jeopardy? We cannot think so. We

must assume that he declassified a document which bore the stamp "top secret" because it no longer contained any military dangers.

But what does this suggest? That we will never know what is hidden away under classification stamps until some high official of government finds it expedient to declassify? If there are documents with the sacred "top secret" legend on them which have lost their potency, how many uncounted nameless papers are there in the three lower classifications which are sealed away from the people of the United States for no reason except that perhaps they have no political value?

The truth is that classification is a vast continuous movement of suppression, and declassification is a sluggish, or indeed almost a non-existent process.

How can our people be expected to judge the prudence and necessity of military measures, or indeed be expected to understand their own unfolding history when the bulk of its documentation is buried in the deep-freeze of official inscrutability?

Now what does this battle between governmental light and darkness mean to you?

I want to suggest to you that for all our new military alertness, for all our ripening maturity as a nation which until 1940 had no more than a child's concept of world relationships (and not too bright a child at that), for all our fierce defensiveness and pride—despite all these I am afraid we have not yet recognized our chief, most dangerous enemy.

It is not Soviet military gangsterism. It is not the loss of a gadget to spies now and then. It is not, despite the impassioned warnings of the past few months, either of our major political parties.

Our first and fateful enemy is ignorance.

We still are essentially, as democratic citizens charged with the fearful responsibility of controlling our mushrooming governments, an ignorant people. We learn fragments of facts and we catch momentary glimpses of truth. But truth remains a flying saucer uncaptured and unrevealed.

We hear savage snarls from our great leaders about the defects of their political opponents, but how many of our staggering riddles of national and international policy have they really mastered?

Even on the highest levels, the basic necessity for freedom of information to implement our great natural wealth of popular judgment, to discourage graft in government, is little understood. One clear evidence of this was the contention in the recent political campaign that corruption is a result, not of official complacency, but of public apathy and indifference.

That simply is not true. What could have been said was that public apathy (paced for many years I am afraid by

newspaper apathy) has been to blame for enduring secrecy in government. And secrecy breeds corruption.

But the people manifestly are not apathetic to corruption once they learn of it. They cannot be charged with indifference to conditions that were unknown to them. To prove this you have only to look at what happened when the mess in Washington became public knowledge—the hurried efforts to dismiss some culprits and to show a cleaner face to the voters.

Newspapers have sometimes been apathetic about corruption, to the extent that they let it remain in the vague realm of rumor and conjecture, giving the people nothing tangible upon which to form an opinion. But they are never insensitive to exposed corruption. If they are, public officials certainly are confused about it, as witness their prompt reaction to any story on page one.

To me it seems foolish to deny that knowledge is the nemesis of corruption. And no office-holder, from the President of the United States down, can guarantee clean government unless he recognizes this.

In a Gallup poll taken after the two conventions, only 45 per cent of our citizens could name the Republican candidate for vice president, and only 32 per cent the Democratic candidate. Many other polls have revealed a widespread ignorance about the leaders upon whom we have blandly relied to solve our problems.

We are fighting not only brute force, but the weaknesses, the muddle-headedness of our own society, our own leaders. We are controlled to a shocking extent by shibboleths, by catch-phrases, by distorted words, by false gospels—and the educated have seemed as hopeless as any other group to repel these mental bullets.

We are spoken to in riddles; we are trapped into debating them as if they were radiant statements of principle, thereby compounding confusion.

From far-away India, from the mind of one of our great thinkers, Prime Minister Nehru, comes this warning:

Slogans are apt to petrify man's thinking . . . every slogan, every word almost, that is used by the socialist, the communist, the capitalist. People hardly think nowadays. They throw words at each other.

Our hope of finding truth, it seems to me, lies chiefly in two allied forces of education: an alert and fully informing press to bring understanding of the world of today, and the truly liberal college which equips the mind to understand the world of yesterday and of tomorrow.

In your Colby College Bulletin I found these words:

According to the best authorities, the "liberal" arts are those worthy of the free man. Colby is a college of liberal arts in the sense that it tries to provide an education worthy of the man or woman who is free from the narrowing effects of provincialism and prejudice. It is ded-

icated without reservation to the aims of unrestricted inquiry and to the task of seeking the truth wherever it may be found.

"Seeking the truth wherever it may be found." There is the plan of battle for the triumph of all the freedoms. And it is a battle that belongs not to the leaders or even to the martyrs; it belongs to you, and you cannot escape it.

But the fruits belong to you also. If you acknowledge the danger of ignorance then you will win your share of information, knowledge, truth. Freedom is never easy, either to win or to hold. That's why the words in your bulletin are bold words.

Trying to make the dream of a democratic society come true is not a soft and intermittent task. Citizens of a democracy are supposed to be a hardy lot. And from what do these hardy citizens have to be shielded by the man they place in office? Why is knowing the truth a threat to the public welfare?

Edward Livingston said:

No nation ever yet found any inconvenience from too close an inspection into the conduct of its officers, but

many have been brought to ruin and reduced to slavery by suffering gradual impositions and abuses.

That was the truth discovered anew by Elijah Lovejoy. He might have lived to see the slaves go free if he had suffered a gradual imposition on his own freedom of conscience. But that surrender would have put him in slavery. So he gave his life to illuminate the principle that freedom is indivisible, that if you break it into fractions you are on your way to zero.

The least we can do for him is never to forget that principle, because while most of us talk of our freedoms not many of us die for them.

This is from the first Lovejoy Lecture at Colby College, delivered November 6, 1952, by James S. Pope, executive editor of the Louisville *Times* and the *Courier-Journal*. Mr. Pope was first recipient of the Lovejoy Fellowship, established by Colby in memory of its alumnus, Elijah Parish Lovejoy, martyred abolitionist editor. The fellowship is dedicated to press freedom and Mr. Pope was selected for his work in that cause.

Another View of the Saalfelden Incident

by Alexander Kendrick

The Toledo *Blade's* indignation over "An Incident at Saalfelden," reported in the October issue of *Nieman Reports*, is commendable. It was a mistake for American troops to engage in the rough handling of British youth trying to get to Berlin, even though that rough handling was done under extreme provocation, which the *Blade* pamphlet fails to make clear.

It is true the Communist press magnified the incident and made a good deal of it propagandistically, no doubt with considerable effect. I don't know how American newspapers treated the story; just for the record, my own reports to the Columbia Broadcasting System included not only everything that the *Blade* discovered in its investigation, and a summation of the bad impressions created by the incident, but they also included some facts which the *Blade* is either unaware of, or prefers to pass over. Since these facts have a direct bearing on the professional labors of all American, British and French correspondents stationed here in Vienna, they may be interesting to your readers. The occupation situation in Austria seems to be obscure to most Americans, anyway. Perhaps this account will be useful for future reference.

In the first place, the *Blade* fails to make clear that the grey card, or military travel permit, which nationals of the four occupying powers must possess, is not a permit for travel in the American, British or French zones, but is a permit for travel *only through the Soviet zone*. The three

Western Powers long ago discarded all restrictions for travel through their zones. It is only the Russians who still insist that the grey card be produced when entering or leaving their zone, and since Vienna is inside the Russian zone, all travelers to and from the capital—if they are American, British or French—must have such cards and show them to uniformed Russian guards.

Now, what seems to be completely unknown to the *Blade* is the following: Under the Four-Power Occupation Statute, there are only two authorized entry routes into the Russian zone for Allied nationals. One is from the French and American zones in west Austria, with the Russian check-point at Enns. The other is from the British zone in south Austria, with the Russian check-point at Semmering Pass. American and French citizens are permitted to come from the west on grey cards *issued by their own authorities*, authorizing travel to Vienna through the Russian zone. British citizens are permitted to come from the south under the same conditions.

But, American and French citizens are not permitted to use the southern route, and British citizens are not permitted to use the western route, unless the grey cards issued by their own authorities have first of all been counter-signed by the British or American authorities, as the case may be, and then *counter-signed by the Russians*. A British subject wishing to travel to Vienna from western Austria—as the British youth of the Saalfelden incident were trying to do—

would have to possess a grey card issued by his own authorities, counter-signed by the Americans, and then counter-signed by the Russians. Because of Western liaison, British counter-signatures are easy to come by in the American zone, and American signatures in the British zone. But the Russians have no liaison with us *except in Vienna itself*. Therefore, in order to get to Vienna from the west, it is necessary for a British citizen to *be* in Vienna to receive Russian permission. This is manifestly impossible, but it is a rule that the Russians insist upon. Therefore, in practice, there are no British entering the Russian zone from the west, and no Americans entering from the south, unless they are returning to Vienna on grey cards which were issued there.

To get back to Saalfelden, the British youth seeking to go to Vienna did not need grey cards to travel through the American zone. The fact that they were at Innsbruck, in the French zone, and at Saalfelden, in the American zone, shows that. But they did need grey cards to enter the Russian zone, and those grey cards had to be counter-signed by the Russians, which could only be done in Vienna.

Why should American authorities, who have no travel restrictions in their zone, then prevent travelers from entering the Russian zone? Not for reasons of high politics, but for the same reasons that impel the State Department to stamp passports not good for travel in the Communist countries—that is to say, reasons of personal safety. I don't know how many scores of Americans have been taken off the train en route to Vienna, by armed Russian soldiers, because their grey cards were not signed, or because they were going by train instead of by car, or because of a typing error on their cards. Such procedure is so frequent that it is not even remarked upon.

In other words, however roughly the Saalfelden M.P.'s treated the young British travelers, they were completely within their rights, and in fact were acting under rules which the Russians insist upon, in preventing those travelers from entering the Russian zone without the necessary and proper documents.

It is true the Russians at that point offered to waive these documents, and they had a perfect right to do so, just as the other three occupation powers long ago waived travel documents in their zones.

But this brings us to the heart of the whole situation. The Russians can turn on and turn off travel restrictions in their zone at will. All the Western correspondents in Vienna have a great time trying to decide when to apply for a Russian-counter-signed grey card for travel through the Russian zone. We never know. After a particularly hot debate between American and Soviet representatives in the Allied Council, or after an incident involving American and Russian troops—such as the shooting of an American M.P. corporal by two Russian soldiers last year—all grey card requests are rejected. After a Russian holiday,

or a Four-Power cocktail party, grey card requests may be granted. There have been periods of eight or ten weeks when *not a single American request* for a grey card via the British route has been granted.

All these requests I speak of are for transit travel *through* the Russian zone, en route to Trieste, let us say, or Rome, or some other destination to the south. In my own case, I have been consistently refused Russian passes to go to Yugoslavia, obviously because the Russians saw a fresh Yugoslav visa in my passport, so that a normal 10-hour ride to Zagreb has taken two or three days.

American or British correspondents' requests to go to *some point inside the Russian zone* are almost invariably refused automatically. Thus it is impossible for me to travel to the Hungarian border, or the Czech border, or anywhere in the Austrian province of Burgenland, or Austrian cities like Wiener Neustadt, or the ski slopes of Semmering Pass, or the resort town of Baden, although the latter is only 15 miles from Vienna by electric tram. We cannot cross the Danube River, because we are leaving Vienna and entering the Russian zone, and we cannot go up or down the Danube by river boat.

In short, the Russians have imposed travel restrictions which make it impossible for Western correspondents to function as they should. But the Russian zone of Austria is legally quite different from the Russian zone of Germany. The Austrian government is sovereign over the whole country. Austrians can travel freely throughout the whole country and so can most Europeans. But citizens of the three Western Powers cannot, because of the Russian insistence on regarding an occupation zone as their own territory.

This is the background for the Saalfelden incident. It is why the three Western high commissioners have time and time again proposed the abolition of *all* travel restrictions in Austria, only to be time and time again refused by the Russians. This is not a "meaningless diplomatic exchange," as the *Toledo Blade* calls it. It is important in principle and in practice.

Finally, it should be made clear that if the British youth had proceeded toward Vienna from the south, along the authorized British route, they would have needed no grey cards except those issued by their own authorities, without Russian counter-signature, and could have entered the Russian zone without trouble. Thus there would have been no Saalfelden incident. But there is reason to believe they were deliberately sent the wrong way, in order to provoke an incident. Unfortunately, we let them do it, even though the right was on our side.

This background of the Saalfelden Incident comes from **Alexander Kendrick**, seasoned CBS correspondent in Vienna. He has served in Washington and Moscow. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

Nieman Notes

1939

A memorial to **John McLane Clark** is to be established at Dartmouth College where he was an honors student and editor of the *Dartmouth Lantern*. John Clark has a memorial also in the municipal swimming pool, in Claremont, N. H., named for him. He had launched the project through his paper, the *Claremont Daily Eagle*, and it was completed after his death two years ago. The paper itself, which his wife, Rhoda Clark, continues to publish, is a substantial memorial. Its managing editor is a later Nieman Fellow, **Melvin Wax**. The John McLane Clark Memorial Fund, Inc., started by friends of John Clark, proposes to establish a fund at Dartmouth, either for scholarships or a lectureship or some other contribution to student life. The fund treasurer is W. H. Ferry, c/o Earl Newsome Co., 597 Madison Ave., New York 22.

Irving Dilliard was the speaker at a Nieman dinner December 12 where he described the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* handling of the campaign.

A Christmas card from **Frank Hopkins** is postmarked Stuttgart, Germany, where he represents the State Department.

A distant cousin of Alben Barkley ended the first political experience of **Edwin J. Paxton, Jr.**, as county commissioner in McCracken County, Ky. "Beat the stuffing out of me for the nomination," Ed reports. He had been appointed to fill out an unexpired term. But he keeps busy as director of the Paducah *Sun-Democrat's* Radio Station, WKYB. He continues to write editorials on the *Sun-Democrat*, which supported Stevenson. "We've installed a new 48-page Goss universal press, doubling our press capacity. Circulation is up 25 per cent."

1940

Hodding Carter left in October for a four months Asiatic trip which will include India, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, Singapore, Hongkong, the Philippines and probably Formosa and Japan. It is sponsored by the State Department.

1941

After sharing in the Eisenhower campaign as a speech writer, **John H. Crider**

joined the staff of *Life Magazine*, to write editorials.

Harry Montgomery, traffic manager of the AP, led a discussion of the use of the teletypesetter before the Associated Press Managing Editors Conference in Boston.

Among the few newsmen to accompany Eisenhower to Korea was **Everett Holles** of MBS, representing radio.

Robert Lasch did a roundup article for the *Reporter* magazine for November 25 on the press performance in the campaign entitled "Pride and Prejudice: The Fourth Estate."

1943

Ernest Hill of the *Chicago Daily News* sent his Christmas card from Tokyo, where he went as replacement for Keyes Beech, now at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship.

William Townes left the *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* last fall at the completion of his four year contract to explore prospects of buying a newspaper. This brought him to New York in October and in a side trip to Cambridge gave the Nieman Fellows a chance for a seminar with him.

In one of his habitual off-season vacations, **Thomas H. Griffith**, senior editor of *Time*, Inc., with Mrs. Griffith, took a swing through Europe that included Turkey which he now names as his favorite country for a tourist visit.

Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the *Scranton Times*, returned from a year's study of coal mining conditions in Europe in time to be home for Thanksgiving. He used a Reid Fellowship to explore conditions in the mining areas of Great Britain and Europe.

Frank K. Kelly left his place with the Democratic Senate Policy Committee to work for Averell Harriman's campaign for the Presidential nomination, and then became executive secretary of the American office of the International Press Institute. He is directing a study of foreign news coverage in the American press, with the cooperation of a research committee of journalism school heads. The project is financed by the Ford Foundation and was set up by Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the *New York Times*.

1945

James P. Etheridge has left his family paper in Perry, Georgia, to become assistant to Nelson Poynter, publisher and editor of the *St. Petersburg Times*.

Houstoun Waring, editor of the Littleton (Col.) *Independent*, attended the NCEW and the Sigma Delta Chi meeting right next door in Denver. In sending notes of the nine Nieman Fellows who attended those meetings, Waring also writes:

"I got back two weeks ago today from Brigham Young University where I talked to 350 high school and junior college journalists. I spent an extra day in Salt Lake City to speak at the University of Utah and at a luncheon of the new professional SDX chapter of which Erne Linford is president. They have no press club there, and this will serve to bring the newspapermen together."

1946

James Batal left in November for Egypt, to make a survey of the organization of groups there for the Society for Applied Anthropology. He and his wife expect to be in Egypt for six months, with Cairo as headquarters.

Robert Manning took a leave from *Time Magazine* to serve as liaison between the Stevenson campaign organization and the Volunteers for Stevenson. Manning went out ahead of the campaign train as advance man to get meetings organized and plans coordinated.

Mrs. John Robling (**Charlotte Fitz Henry**) was chairman of the Volunteers for Stevenson unit in Darien, Conn., during the campaign.

Richard E. Stockwell moved from the editorship of *Aviation Age* to become editor of the *Monsanto Magazine*, last summer. "It is what is called an external house organ in the trade and has a circulation of 65,000," he explains. It is published by the Monsanto Chemical Company in St. Louis.

1947

A Sigma Delta Chi chapter was installed in Salt Lake City in October and elected **Ernest H. Linford**, editorial writer on the *Salt Lake Tribune*, as its first president.

Robert C. Miller, who has had a roving assignment for the United Press which included Israel and the Korean war, has been appointed manager of the Arizona UP bureau at Phoenix.

1948

Charles Gilmore was chairman of a public forum on the press, sponsored by the Toledo Guild, on November 13, with Tom Stokes and A. J. Liebling and with Louis Lyons as moderator. The topic: "How NOT To Read a Newspaper." Shirley and John Harrison (1952) entertained the speakers and the Nieman Fellows of that area at their house after the meeting. Prof. and Mrs. Fred Maguire (1944) of Ohio State University and Prof. Kenneth Stewart (1942) of the University of Michigan came for it.

Carl Larsen of the Chicago *Sun-Times* started covering Adlai Stevenson before the Chicago convention and stayed all the way through the campaign.

George Weller interpreted the Vatican's appointment of 24 new cardinals for the Chicago *Daily News* and its affiliated papers.

Robert M. Shaplen, after a long stretch of foreign correspondence, is back in New York working on a novel and free lancing for the *New Yorker* and other magazines.

1949

Lawrence G. Weiss represented the Department of Labor as U. S. delegate to the International Labor Organization sessions at Geneva last summer.

Christopher Rand's book, *Hongkong*, was published in October by Alfred Knopf. It included his articles on Hongkong familiar to his readers in the *New Yorker* magazine, but much additional material. Rand came home from Hongkong at the time the book was published and has remained in this country to handle some domestic assignments for the *New Yorker* before returning to the Far East, where he has spent most of his time the past ten years. His present address: Salisbury, Connecticut.

Robert de Roos, San Mateo author, was in New York, visiting publishers, in November.

1950

Max Hall resigned as Director of the Office of Public Information, Office of Price Stabilization, November 2, to take a position in the Office of the Director for Mutual Security, which will mean a foreign assignment.

Melvin S. Wax, managing editor of the Claremont (N. H.) *Daily Eagle* was elected vice chairman of the New England Associated Press News Executives Association for 1953.

1951

Recovered from a long illness, Bob Eddy, is back on the desk of the St. Paul *Pioneer Press*.

Dwight Sargent, editor of the editorial page of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald*, was elected chairman of the National Conference of Editorial Writers at its Denver meeting in November. Among the other former Nieman Fellows who took part in the Denver conference were: Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*; Phil Locke, editorial writer of the Dayton *News*; Rebecca Gross, editor of the Lock Haven (Pa.) *Express*; Delbert Willis, editorial writer of the Fort Worth *Press*; Ernest Linford, editorial writer of the Salt Lake *Tribune*; Paul Evans, director of information for the TVA; Joseph Givando, editorial writer of the Denver *Post*; Houstoun Waring, editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*.

Irving Dilliard spoke to the Sigma Delta Chi convention held simultaneously in Denver.

The editorial writers voted to hold their 1953 conference in Boston and Cambridge. Harvard and the Nieman Foundation had joined in the invitation to them and will share in the responsibilities of hosts.

Dwight Sargent served on the first committee for the Lovejoy Award established by Colby College in honor of its alumnus, Elijah Lovejoy, whose martyrdom was observed at the 150th anniversary of his birth with a convocation on Freedom of the Press at Colby.

The current Nieman Fellows were the guests of Colby to hear James Pope, the first Lovejoy Fellow, deliver the Lovejoy address.

Dana Adams Schmidt's book, *Anatomy of a Satellite*, published by Little, Brown in October, furnished contemporary background for a good many newspapermen on the Czech purge trials in November. Schmidt was in Czechoslovakia as the

New York *Times* correspondent in the spring of 1950, when he got out just ahead of arrest. He is now in Israel for the *Times*.

Wellington Wales, editor of the Auburn (N. Y.) *Citizen-Advertiser* is serving on the Pulitzer Awards jury for selection of the "distinguished editorial writing" award for 1953. Wales points out that the *Citizen-Advertiser* managing editor, W. O. Dapping, is on the Pulitzer jury for the cartoon award. "The only paper with two jurors" crows Duke. His paper was one of the few that started out supporting Eisenhower and switched to Stevenson.

1952

When Eisenhower's plan to go to Korea was announced, a syndicated article by Robert (Pepper) Martin, described what Eisenhower would find there.

Charles Molony left the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press to head the public relations staff of the Federal Reserve Board. The job is to explain the Federal Reserve System's operations and policies not only to the public but also to bankers.

Since returning from his year at Harvard as the first Canadian Associate Nieman Fellow, Shane MacKay of the Winnipeg *Free Press* has been stationed at Ottawa to cover national affairs for his paper.

E. W. Tipping returned to the Melbourne *Herald* after his Associate Nieman Fellowship at Harvard with a new assignment to write a column. He had been city editor.

Robert Crandall has moved over from the *Herald Tribune* Sunday paper to the foreign desk of the New York *Times*.

1953

A son, Kimo, was born Dec. 5th, in Cambridge, to Linda and Keyes Beech. His father is Far Eastern correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News*.

The engagement of Miss Nancy Marth of Rochester, N. Y. and Calvin Mayne, of the Rochester *Times-Union*, was announced Dec. 20th in Rochester. They plan to be married in May.

Nieman Notes

The current group of Nieman Fellows has accepted the request of the Cleveland Guild to judge the entries for Guild awards for the best news stories of the year, continuing a service performed for the Cleveland Guild by last year's Nieman Fellows.

The APME convention in November brought a number of former Nieman Fellows to the Boston meetings, among them Harry Montgomery, traffic manager of AP; John Day, managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*; William Dickinson, news editor of the Philadelphia *Bulletin*; Melvin Wax, managing editor of the Claremont (N. H.) *Daily Eagle*.

UN Visit by Niemans

The New York Nieman Fellows joined the current group of Fellows at a dinner at the United Nations December 4 and heard a talk by Charles A. Sprague, publisher of the *Oregon Statesman* and alternate delegate to the United Nations. The present group of Nieman Fellows spent the day at the United Nations, arranged for them by Gilbert W. "Pete" Stewart, information officer at the U. S. Mission. They were briefed by Senator Wiley, U. S. delegate and new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Gov. Sprague, and were piloted through a series of UN committee sessions by Pete Stewart.

The New York Fellows attending the dinner were: Dave Botter, *Quick Magazine*; Don Burke, *Life Magazine*; Bob Crandall, *New York Times*; Ed Donohue, *Scranton Times*; Dave Dreiman, *Life Magazine*; Steve Fitzgerald; Tom Griffith, *Time Magazine*; Arthur Hepner; Frank Kelly, International Press Institute; Lowell Limpus, *New York Daily News*; Bill Miller, *Time Magazine*; Harry Montgomery, AP; Jay Odell, Committee on Economic Development; Charlotte FitzHenry Robling; Bob Shaplen; Pete Stewart; Leon Svirsky, *Scientific American*; Volta Torrey, *Popular Science*; Ben Yablonky, New York University.

Time's Bill Miller

Dear *Time*-Reader

The cover story in this issue of *Time*, like many of the Business and some of the Press cover stories of the past six years, was written by Associate Editor Bill Miller.

Miller first met Oilman Alfred Jacobsen last March when he was working on a story about Amerada Petroleum Corp.'s successful wildcatting in the Williston Basin (*Time*, March 24). Impressed by Jacobsen's candor and executive ability and by Amerada's phenomenal success, Miller later suggested Jacobsen as the cover subject for a story on the oil industry.

One of Miller's cover stories was on his Chappaqua, N. Y. neighbor, *Reader's Digest* Editor DeWitt Wallace (*Time*, Dec. 10). Between the time Miller made his first phone call to Wallace in April 1951 and the time the story ran, *Digest* editors had selected two of Miller's cover stories for reprinting—on Du Pont's Crawford Greenewalt and U.S. Steel's Benjamin Fairless. The *Digest* also reprinted Miller's article on human relations in industry (*Time*, April 14), one of the most reprinted stories in *Time's* history.

Another of Miller's cover stories was on the Hartford Brothers of the A & P (*Time*, Nov. 13, 1950), a grocery chain with which Miller is closely familiar. At the A & P supermarket where he and Mrs. Miller shop, girls at the checkout counters count them among the store's best customers. The Millers, you see, have eight children.

Cordially yours,

James A. Linen

From "A Letter from the Publisher," *Time Magazine*, Dec. 1. William J. Miller was a Nieman Fellow in 1941.

IT'S HARD TO LIVE

UP TO OUR NAME

Another twelve months have gone, and the Littleton *Independent* is observing its sixty-fourth birthday Monday.

Each year, as we grow older, we place a slightly-different emphasis on our job of publishing a newspaper. On this anniversary, it seems that "independence" is the important value for an editor. This is not as easy to achieve as the uninitiated would imagine.

Independence should not be regarded as something desirable for the newspaperman himself. It is only by being independent that he can begin to serve his readers and his community.

We are not thinking particularly of pressure groups in connection with independence, as every editor is braced to face organized business, politics, and religion—to name a few. The things that rob a man of his independence of action are less obvious. For instance, an editor may become enthusiastic about causes, which is natural, and he may identify one or two movements with himself and his paper—forgetting that a wise newspaper editor must not oversimplify the problems of man and must not become fanatical in his zeal for a single program except the all encompassing, still-nebulous Good Society for the people of the earth.

Perhaps an editor will foresee this danger of one-track mindedness, but he may fall into another. While refraining from giving his whole heart to a cause, he may find that his friends—bound fervently in some effort—are controlling his editorial policy. The editor must steel himself to go counter to his circle of intimates.

The Littleton *Independent* has never felt that it must conform to do the popular thing. When, for example, all Littleton business establishments but three joined the Ku Klux Klan in the early 1920's, the *Independent* was one of those that stayed out.

We like the word Littleton, and we like the word Independent. It is our aspiration to make these two words fit together. The understanding of readers in supporting an independent newspaper these many years is appreciated. Their tolerance, we trust, has paid off for the community.

—Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, July 18

The Challenge to the Mass Media in a Time of Crisis

by Leslie G. Moeller

Very probably this nation has faced no greater crisis in its history than that in which we are now involved—and, at the same time, we find that many of our citizens are unaware of most of the implications of our involvements. Many of these citizens know little of the deeper, or even of the shallower, problems of national life—and probably even less of the increasingly important world beyond our borders.

What is “the challenge to the mass media?”

The challenge is this: To do all possible to aid the American people to become intelligently informed; to aid them in understanding and appraising the judgments of their delegated representatives, and to aid them in reaching wise and sound attitudes toward affairs at home and abroad.

This is no simple problem. Rather, it is complex and involved, a series of challenges rather than a single challenge.

The answer begins with the obvious need for “providing information.” Obvious though the need is, the effective fulfillment is not so simple. Let us for the moment pass over quickly all the many problems of getting information—the pressure of time, the great number of stories to be covered, the unavailability of sources, the problems of distance and of communication, the varying impressions of different observers, the general complexity of modern life—and go on to discuss the dissemination of this information to the consumer.

When this vital material appears in the mass media is it, first of all, truly understandable? We have heard much about the need for simple writing, in the sense that the text is easily comprehensible to the average citizen. How near do we come to that goal? Research men have told us much about “being understood,” but we need to know much more. Are shorter sentences the answer? We are told to use simple words—is it possible for us to use words that are too simple? There are other, and more difficult, problems. For example, how do we get facts into the mind which is “frozen,” which refuses new ideas, and which projects these frozen impressions into all the material which comes to it? If the mind of a consumer holds “frozen” attitudes about business, how can we thaw him out so he will listen to a new approach?

But providing information alone is seldom enough. Let

us suppose we give Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen 172,000 words of nicely prepared factual material about 172 different subjects which logically are important in their lives. Let us suppose we then say, “We aren’t telling you which of these experts are really good, or which are phonies. You’ll have to dig around and find that out for yourself. But we want you to read these 172,000 words, and then make up your own minds about these 172 different subjects, so that as citizens you will have a sound foundation for good judgments.”

Almost certainly this won’t work. Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen don’t have that much time, or the necessary skill, or, in many cases, the willingness, for “digging behind the facts.” The mass media must give this background material, and adequate interpretation as well.

Let us consider the proper presentation of an important problem—the continued satisfactory development of industry in the South. Only the mass media can gather, and distribute adequately, the kind of explanation that the South needs to provide the mental climate for properly accelerating industrial progress. What is the effect of the labor force? Of climate? Of traditional (and often erroneous) ideas about the character of the labor force, or of the attitude of the South toward industry? Which of these factors is the most important? The need here, as in many other civic and political and social problems, is to bring together a great many points, from a great many sources, so that the citizen gets a clear-cut, well-planned, large-scale picture, rather than a fuzzy little snapshot both out of focus and badly composed. He needs the essential truth, the truth behind the facts.

A news story that really digs into such a situation may be the answer. Or, perhaps, to give proper proportion to a problem, a series may be necessary. (Many times we give the public too much in one dose, so that the bulk is difficult to digest.) I do not overlook the editorial; it can tell the reader much, it can put the world in focus for him, and it can stimulate him to want to know much more. But I have the feeling that the editorial generally reaches only a section of the audience, and that the composition of this group does not change greatly from month to month. I have the feeling also that the citizen who does not read editorials is the one who most needs to read them. Getting him to read, and to use, editorials is another great challenge to the mass media.

In this area of informing, mass media generally are doing good work, and the product today is better than for many years past. Compared with the output of one hundred or

Prof. Moeller is director of the Iowa State University School of Journalism. This is from an address to the Southern Newspapermen’s Conference at Tallahassee, Fla., Jan. 26, 1952.

even fifty years ago, today's service is immeasurably better, and many people feel it is the best in the world. But is it good enough? Our society becomes more involved every day, and more difficult to understand. Is our skill at news gathering and news explanation improving rapidly enough to keep up with the complexity of an atomic world? Or are we falling behind? Certainly we must improve, and eventually we must do a *much* more effective job. Undoubtedly this will require great skill, and well trained and better paid workers. This will be a costly task—but it is a function which *must* be well performed, and the public *must* understand why this function *is* important, why it *is* costly, and why it *is* essential to our democratic system.

Indeed one of the greatest barriers to our doing this superb *and* effective information job lies in the fact that the public knows too little about the mass media and their importance in American life.

In addition, much of what the public does know is not true. Recently I talked to a reasonably well educated citizen who believed that an editor was *required* to publish all the letters he received. Another caller felt that a newspaper could publish a letter with no liability whatever, and that the phrase, "it is alleged" was a complete protection against any charge of libel.

There is also extensive acceptance for the various familiar criticism of the mass media, not universally or even generally true—advertiser control, extreme conservatism, lack of social awareness, the supposed effort to appeal to the lowest common denominator in audience tastes, and many others. How widely are these views held? How deep are the feelings behind them? Are these beliefs scattered evenly through the body of the citizenry? Or are they concentrated in a few classes? Here again we need more information; research men, including those from colleges and universities, can help much by spotlighting these "misunderstandings" of the press.

Certainly it is true that these media, newspaper and radio, movie and magazine, big and little, must be explained to the citizen, in their strength and in their weakness. If he holds at all to the feeling, "Aw, you can't believe what you read in the papers," how can the mass media be fully effective in helping build a better democracy?

In telling this story of how the mass media operate, we must be specific and detailed. We might well begin with the problems of news gathering as they exist in communities of all sizes. We must explain the vast quantity of news, the difficulty of gathering it, the strain of organizing and presenting it. (We should, for example, offer many more reports on "how we got this story"; most of these reports would be interesting in themselves, and a great many would show, without any obvious fanfare, the im-

mense effort and the great care which go into the digging out of an involved situation.)

We need to emphasize that it is never possible to publish all the news, and to show how news is chosen for publication from this vast overwhelming total which presents itself. We need to point out that selection is not suppression. We need to admit freely the human elements which enter into gathering news—for example, the fact that no two persons have ever seen any event in exactly the same way.

We must also restate firmly and repeatedly the conviction that most newspapers endeavor to present the news fairly and accurately. Many persons believe that editorial page policy rides over into the handling of news. If it does, we ought to say so. If it does not, and this is certainly the case on most newspapers, we must make clear that the editorial page and news columns are separate and distinct. Our case will be the stronger if we quickly admit that some newspapers *do* twist editorials. And we need to explain that the true purpose of the editorial is to stimulate thinking—and that it is not a Soviet-type thought-control edict.

We need to make clear to certain groups that newspapers cannot, as they would have us, dash miles ahead of the public. This rate of progress would be delightful, but it is not normally feasible. When a government gets too far ahead of the social climate of its citizenry, that government is almost certainly voted out of power. In the same way, the citizen can vote any newspaper out of business if it gets too far ahead of his interests, his tastes, and his standards.

We need to realize that the making of a newspaper does on the surface seem to be extremely simple. As a result, it is only a slight exaggeration to say that there are at least 150,000,000 Americans who know more about editing a newspaper than you do, and, what is more important, who are sure that they are better equipped for the job!

Because it is possible to read a newspaper in twenty or thirty or forty minutes, it is easy to get this impression that it is produced with no great effort. So we must emphasize the press and the linotype and the salesman and the news sources which refuse to talk and the problems of wire services and the two witnesses of an accident who tell very different stories and newsprint and equipment and maintenance and picture problems and rising postal costs and labor shortages and the pressures of competition. We must point out that there are hundreds and even thousands of workers, invisible as well as visible, and innumerable day-to-day operating problems, behind the mass media.

Along with this explanation there must also go a deepening internal awareness of the great responsibility of the mass media. In the United States, the mass media take

more of the citizen's time than any other activities except working and sleeping—a total of perhaps 500,000,000 hours a day. That budget of time is in itself a great responsibility. How does the audience use it? And what do the media put into it? We have talked of the information function, of the responsibility for giving the reader as complete a picture as possible, in proper proportion and balance. This picture should be neither all black nor all white, but an accurate presentation of blacks, of whites, and of an infinitude of grays. It may be helpful, from time to time, to check the tone values in this picture. Are they rendered properly? For example, consider all the news material, quiet or lively, sober or sensational, which the mass media present concerning any given college or university. What is the over-all picture which reaches the audience?

In discussing the functions and obligations of the press, and their explanation to the public, we should not overlook emphasizing certain obligations of that public—and I hold that it is a function of the mass media to remind the citizen of his responsibilities *as* a citizen.

One of these responsibilities is to be informed. It is difficult to have an enlightened government without an enlightened public. The media must accordingly remind the citizen gently that it is his duty to be informed. Reaching this goal will not be easy. We need to find a way to make clear that being informed is politically essential, not only from the standpoint of the welfare of the nation, but, what is much more important, from the standpoint of the adequate development and fulfillment of the individual. This is an area in which media editorial and promotion departments must work if we are to improve our present low levels of information.

This level of information is indeed low. Studies made by Dr. Gallup and other researchers indicate that on any important national or international issue, about 30 per cent of American adults have a general idea of the problem, and are familiar with a few points on it. About 45 per cent of the population have heard of the subject, but know nothing about it. The remaining quarter has never heard of the matter at all. Justice Felix Frankfurter has remarked that "in the years between the wars few things were more disturbing than the number of citizens who gave up the effort to understand our problems"—and the situation is almost certainly the worse since the ending of World War II.

A basic task will be locating these "areas of ignorance." They may lie in labor-management relations, or the working of the local school system, or in a dozen other fields. Research workers from colleges and universities again can do much to pinpoint these areas in any given community.

And when these areas of ignorance are found, it is an obligation of the mass media to fill this vacuum with

facts and background—presented in such an interesting fashion that the public will not only find it "pleasant to be informed," but will *act* on the information.

This is necessary even when today's good citizen *is* informed, for all too often he seems, without putting his thought into words, to think that it is enough merely to *be* informed. He does little or nothing more. He does not take part in local affairs, or in local or other governmental or political activities. He may not even vote—almost half our qualified voters do not go to the polls in national elections.

The mass media need to help find ways to awaken the public from this complacency, and to develop a widespread dynamic attitude of "public awareness." To get the most satisfactory results, person-to-person effort will be helpful. It will probably be necessary to encourage various local groups to work specifically for greater public participation in the democratic process. This means chambers of commerce, women's groups, service clubs, farm organizations, and many others. In this effort, it is especially important to include the young people. If we get them interested in government now, we have a much better chance of making them active adult citizens.

We have talked about the need for understanding and for action, and now it may be helpful to examine for a moment certain areas where understanding, and action, are currently very important.

The first of these is that which is often called the American way of life. Capitalism is generally accepted as a part of that way of life. But the meaning of the term has become confused, and weakened, and diluted. This is especially the case outside the United States, and more especially in Europe, where the term capitalism applies to a relatively rigid system, with less awareness of the consumer, less regard for the rights of labor, and less determination to get increased production, at lower cost, than is the case in the United States.

Whether we like it or not, capitalism and free enterprise, as practiced in the United States, are on trial everywhere, on the ground that they are predominantly "cash register." We need to make clear, and to proclaim, that there *is* a cultural and spiritual and a moral foundation for the free enterprise system.

It is important as well for us to be concerned with a clearer general understanding of all our rights and all our freedoms. Let me take only two, freedom of the press and freedom of information, and consider, in this area, only the immediate and pressing challenges to these freedoms.

Both are under strong attack, from many forces—and in many ways it seems that these attacks are more vigorous, and, unfortunately, more successful, than for many years past.

One form of attack is the "executive session"; there is an increasing tendency for governmental boards, commissions, councils, and legislative groups to make decisions in private, so that only the end result is made known to the public.

Another attack on press freedom comes through one of the undesirable uses of the handout. More and more governmental information comes forth in handouts containing formal statements by the administrative heads, rather than from news conferences where there are opportunities for questioning and for getting "the other side of the story." When the news is issued in this particular handout pattern, in the process of getting the material quickly to the public there is usually far too little time for determining and presenting any other side of the story. This makes it all the more important, of course, to have mass media which are willing, and equipped, to "dig in" on a story during the development stage—to be ready with background when the anticipated handout emerges.

In this trend toward secrecy and manipulated news, many federal agencies have welcomed the classification order of President Truman which gave them a much stronger sanction for controlling news. And this tendency is not found only in the federal government. A recent press dispatch from Birmingham told us that the county board of registrars has forbidden employes to "give reporters any information except matters of record." The move was taken, the board chairman said, to make certain that all information was coordinated by coming from a board member. And, as is usual in such cases, he said that the rule "was not intended as a gag rule."

Still another attack on press freedom comes more directly in the form of steadily increasing efforts to enact laws which will restrict the press.

Let us consider the situation in one state, Florida, as summarized by V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor of the *Tampa Tribune*, in his excellent report on freedom of information at the national convention of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, a few months ago. Commenting on the situation in this state, as a part of his survey of legislatures, Mr. Newton reports: "No less than 37 bills were introduced in the legislature which, had they been adopted, would have chained the press with intolerable restrictions, while not a single bill was introduced that would have helped newspapers in the dissemination of news."

Mr. Newton, after pointing out that the bill of rights plainly sets forth the principle that congress shall enact no law abridging the free press, remarks that "more and more legislators each passing year are rising up in the halls of state capitols and proposing legislation that would shackle the free American press."

Still another important restrictive approach is found in

the widespread tendency to refuse information to the press, or to make it extremely difficult for the press to obtain information.

For example, the Providence, Rhode Island, *Journal* fought from December, 1947, through the spring of 1952, in three law suits in two state courts and a federal court, to earn the clear cut right to publication of a resolution of the Pawtucket City council abating \$89,000 in taxes, and to set aside a city ordinance barring access to tax abatement records.

Several points may be made here. The first is that the fight to recover freedom of records is not easy, or quick, or inexpensive. A freedom lost is usually recovered only slowly, and with difficulty. The second is that a government unit may use funds from taxpayers in extensive legal efforts to keep proper information about the unit's activities from being made available to those taxpayers. A third point is this: If the Providence *Journal* can get equal access to records only after four years of litigation, what chance has the individual taxpayer in such a battle? And, finally, this question: Are we losing control of our freedom to government? To what extent has government become our master? Or is government still the servant of the people?

One further point of attack on freedom of information must be emphasized: in many, many areas, the laws on "the right of the public to know" are very clouded and open to many interpretations, most of them restrictive. It is exceedingly important that the mass media make every effort to obtain statutes which set forth directly and clearly the right of free public access to public records. It is good that we are disturbed about the loss of press freedom elsewhere in the world, as we have been at the death of *La Prensa* in the Argentine. At the same time we should be aware of the constant dangers to press freedom within the United States, and should realize that freedom of the press and freedom of information are never completely won; they must be fought anew each day, and almost every hour.

It seems to me also that the mass media may well be extremely disturbed about these two fundamental questions: Does the public realize that serious attacks are being made upon the right of the public to know? And, even more important, does the public care?

A few years ago the National Opinion Research Center, one of the best polling organizations, carried on a survey of attitudes toward freedom of the press. The survey found that 27 per cent of the persons interviewed felt that, in peacetime, newspapers should NOT be permitted to criticize the actions of government.

That is, on a practical workaday question of freedom of the press, many, many persons vote "no."

Nor is this attitude held only by the older citizens. During the past few months a survey of more than three thou-

sand high school students has been conducted on questions related to the bill of rights and various other social and political matters.

A third of these students would in some cases deny citizens the right to circulate petitions.

A third think the government should prohibit certain persons from making public speeches.

Almost half—49 per cent—believe that large masses of people are incapable of determining what is and is not good for themselves. This is a rather complete rejection of the theory of democratic government.

Only 45 per cent—less than half—believe that newspapers should be allowed to print anything they want, except for military secrets. That is, less than one half would oppose additional restrictions on freedom of the press.

So we may well raise the question: Does the public really care about having a free press?

To put the matter in another way: If today we had no constitutional guarantee of a free press, could we get strong public support in an effort to obtain such a guarantee? Do

we really have a deep public awareness of the importance of this freedom, and of this "right of the public to know?"

We can cite instances in which the public has recently worked to limit freedom of the press. How many instances can we give of active efforts, by the public, to protect freedom of the press?

In such a situation, do we in the mass media have any task more important than building public knowledge of the importance of this right, and of a willingness to act on behalf of this right? Can we be content in a situation in which the public, for the most part, considers freedom of the press to be the property of the press—and so the concern only of the press?

If we are to aid the citizen in maintaining his democracy as well as understanding it, we must engage in a vigorous, extensive, united effort to make him aware of the day-to-day meaning of the freedoms which are the foundations of that democracy, and of the great need for the average citizen to fight continually for the maintenance everywhere of those freedoms.

Book Reviews

The World of the Locality

by William M. Pinkerton

THE COMMUNITY PRESS IN AN URBAN SETTING. Morris Janowitz. Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1952. 256 pp.

"In 1950, eighty-two community newspapers were being published within the city limits of Chicago, with a total weekly circulation in excess of 983,000." A similar network of weeklies serves every city of over 1,000,000—except New York. Considering the amount of newsprint, ink and copy involved, it is surprising how little we know of this pattern. Morris Janowitz of the University of Michigan has taken a hard look at it in the Chicago setting. He finds that you can't dismiss these papers as mere "shopping guides"; they serve a definite community function.

His report runs counter to most of the prejudices in big-city newspaper offices.

In Chicago, the number of community newspapers has nearly tripled since 1910. Their circulation has increased 770 per cent. In the 10 U. S. cities of over 1,000,000, there are now 286 such newspapers—with another 463 in the suburbs.

The ratio of editorial matter to advertising is about the same as in the daily

newspapers (daily sample, 72.6 per cent; community sample, 74 per cent). Three-quarters of the news is strictly local, but sector and city-wide events get far more attention than they did 15 or 20 years ago. The big play goes to municipal services, organized religion, business enterprise, public affairs; but personal and social items and club news get the most space.

The community newspapers are low on controversial news, and when they do give it a play "controversies which are most popular are those of the local community against the outside urban metropolis." Janowitz believes that, in such matters as opposition to non-segregated housing, the community editors follow local feelings, rather than lead.

Janowitz observes: "Although the community press circulates in the areas where working class populations reside, mentions of labor unions are conspicuously absent . . . Although some of the publishers have a personal anti-labor bias, the community press generally is little concerned with labor unions, partly because they are not organized on a geographical basis."

He adds: "Seldom if ever do the names of the most prominent businessmen of the metropolitan district appear in the columns of community newspapers. The community press is a world of successful local personalities in both business and politics."

On that kind of limited coverage, the community newspapers get a high readership without trying to compete with the dailies. On interviews in three representative communities, Janowitz found that 11 per cent of the people were real cover-to-cover "fans," 40 per cent were regular readers, 33 per cent read the paper some, and 16 per cent were non-readers. Readership was higher among families with children to draw them into community interests.

Janowitz found the publishers and editors of these papers a harassed but relatively happy crowd. They feel a sense of inferiority to the big-city characters on the dailies. But he notes that they lack the "ever-increasing amounts of self-hatred and 'cynicism' typical of such 'mass media specialists' as high-priced movie writers. "The peculiar skills of the publisher and the role he plays in seeking to adjust conflicting interests sensitizes him to the evolving trends in the local community. Eco-

conomic interests, of course, condition his outlook. Nevertheless, he is less reluctant to accept the inevitability of adverse changes and more prone to press for desired change than the members of the business community."

(This book is attractively packaged, and offers much of interest to newspaper and advertising men. The reader should be warned that it assays high in phrases like

"low prominence" and "democratization of prestige." It is not above saying, "Given a lack of clear norms to deal with in allocating prestige to (these) symbols the result is perhaps an overrepresentation of the number of (these) symbols on the basis of their numerical proportion, but this presentation is—either consciously or unconsciously—'corrected' by allocating lower prominence to such symbols.")

The Humor of Herblock

THE HERBLOCK BOOK. Text and Cartoons by Herbert Block. Beacon Press. Boston. 244 pp. \$2.75.

Cartooning in America is a tour de force. Its leading exponents have emerged fullblown, like a J. P. Morgan, a Henry Ford or a Roosevelt. A Herblock or a Fitzpatrick may give our educationists pause, for they appear to owe nothing to professional training for the pungent art that has had such an effect on millions of newspaper readers. They found none grooved to their need. Nor did they find the market for their talents much broader. The fingers of one hand will do to count the established newspaper cartoonists who have made a mark with their impressions of our political scene. It is a notable deficiency of most newspapers that they neglect the cartoon, despite its historical significance and its incomparable impact. Very few papers maintain a cartoonist. His status has become more like that of the syndicated columnist, which of course eliminates any caricaturing of the local scene. An important part of the distinction of the editorial page of the Washington Post is the Herblock cartoon.

Herblock brings humor to the penetrating thrusts of his cartoons and gives them thus an added dimension. It is a delicious humor, immensely appealing for its own sake, even without the cutting edge of its editorial attack. Few have ever wielded a more deft pencil to puncture the fatuous, to lampoon pretense and to satirize equivocation and humbug.

Now we find that he writes with as delightful a wit and as much shrewd sense as he draws. We should have known, for the captions are ever an interesting

part of his cartoons and tell the story. As in the cartoon every one knows, of Marshall, saying to MacArthur as they look at their two different concepts of the world, "We've been using more of a roundish one." Or the Taft-Brewster cartoon "Well Owen, Things Are Looking Up," just as Owen drops down the manhole. Or Taft presenting Chiang Kai-Shek to J. Q. Public with "Now Here is a General I Have Confidence In."

Taft is one of Herblock's more amiable targets. McCarthy he hits in different mood and strips him naked. This book put Herblock's favorite subjects in series for us, so that we see the story as he saw it. The foibles of Congress and its susceptibility to lobbies is one; the GOP infatuation with Chiang Kai Shek is one; McCarranism is one; housing is one; the Russians is one; the pompous, humorless petulance of the DAR is a minor one. He slugs his messiest blotches at McCarthyism in what he calls "The Screaming Whimwhams." His most poignant drawings are reserved for Displaced Persons and the victims of bad housing and crowded schools.

In short, Herblock has a heart; there is feeling and humanity in his art, and a passion for democracy in his attacks on hypocrisy, special interests, demagoguery, fascism and communism. And the essence of Herblock's high talent and the cream of his wit is now accessible in a delightful book that makes us realize again what a practical philosopher, what a genial artist, what a persuasive and powerful caricaturist he is—one of our most effective forces for keeping democracy in good health.

—L. M. Lyons

What's The News?

by Donald D. Janson

THE NEWS IN AMERICA. By Frank Luther Mott. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. 218 pp. \$4.50.

A chief fault of American journalism, Dean Mott says in this book, is its emphasis on the titillating over the significant news. He blames both the press, for trying to cater to the readers' supposed desires, and the readers, for not demanding more adequate treatment of important stories. Many editors and readers could profitably pay some attention to this coaching. Others have long measured up without it.

The author makes a brief for newspapers acting as publications of record. This would elevate what he calls the "hard news" over the "soft." It would leave the feeling of urgent need for immediacy to a large degree to radio and television, with newspapers freer to dig beyond bulletins for accuracy and interpretation before running the story. Leading newspapers, of course, have set a precedent for this.

Dr. Mott makes the additional point that a big "advantage" in our increased number of one-newspaper cities is that papers freed of competition in the same media can more easily cast off the immediacy bugaboo and insist on thorough and reliable reporting. (He does not point out that the best of American newspapers have done this despite competition from other papers in their circulation zone.)

The News In America is a round-up on all phases of newspaper operation. It apparently is directed at the uninitiated, because it makes no substantial contributions to what already has been said about the press. It does, however, gather up and weld together a lot of past contributions that were highlights and sidelights in the history of journalism. And it is the first book to bring that history right up to 1952 and make a well calculated attempt at projecting it into the future.

But even those readers of this slim volume who know little of newspapering may rebel a bit at its often primer-like quality. "What's the News?" asks one chapter. Then it proceeds to explain that "news must be new." Later the author

worries because "a distressing confusion in discussions of the human interest story has been caused by a common failure to define the term." Happily, he gets the term defined to his satisfaction. But by the time he does, any newspaperman who had

gone that far with him is leaving for greener chapters in the back of the book. There is an excellent one, for the reader interested in general treatment rather than cases and details, on the history of censorship to date.

munism. McCarthy, who had used the communist issue with some success in Wisconsin in 1946, agreed that Washington could use a cleaning.

The time could not have been more appropriate for the appearance of a politician with simple answers for complex problems that were bothering many Americans. A short time after his talk with his friends, McCarthyism was born.

In a speech at Wheeling, W. Va., in February, the senator said that he held in his hand a list of 205 employees of the State Department known to be communists. Overnight, the senator became famous. Newsmen sought him out and reported his accusations and charges. The Wisconsin farm boy was big news from coast to coast, and pictures of him waving aloft papers which, he said, proved his charges appeared alongside columns of newsprint devoted to his speeches.

These were the days of McCarthy's attacks on Owen Lattimore, whom he described as the "top Russian espionage agent in the United States." He attacked United Nations delegate Philip C. Jessup as "preaching the Communist Party line."

From this ham-handed, blunderbuss attack, which the book describes in fearsome detail, McCarthyism has evolved so that today it has become a smoothly functioning weapon which has been used with great success on the educator, the public servant, the professor, and the politician. McCarthy's victims are no longer only State Department workers. Newsmen, authors, poets, news commentators—all who disagree with McCarthy's concept of Americanism—are labelled by the senator.

This new development is more dangerous than old-style McCarthyism. No longer are persons branded as spies or communists. Today, they are "good for the Kremlin and bad for America." Or they are "worth a million dollars to the Kremlin." This device has the advantage of being libel-proof and of covering persons in fields outside government who happen to feel that McCarthy does not belong in the senate.

Thus, a climate of opinion has been created in America. To be safe is to conform. Only the orthodox succeed. And so the drones are gradually moving into positions where the radical, the experimenter and the explorer used to flourish.

McCarthy: Who Made Him?

by Melvin Mencher

MCCARTHY, THE MAN, THE SENATOR, THE ISM. Jack Anderson and Ronald W. May. Beacon Press, Boston, 1952, 431 pp. \$3.75.

Among the many problems that Dwight D. Eisenhower will face early in his administration is one that may well set the tone of the General's four-year term—his handling of Sen. Joseph Raymond McCarthy. Just how formidable the task will be is indicated in this book by two newsmen who spent more than a year documenting their study of the senator from Wisconsin. The documentation is thorough and up-to-date, lacking only two significant developments that occurred after the book's October publication: McCarthy's re-election and the defeat of Sen. William Benton, McCarthy's most outspoken critic in the senate.

The book, which is intended only as a report of the senator's background and his activities, might well be subtitled, "The Success Story of the Wisconsin Farm Boy and Country Lawyer Who Went to Washington and Made Good." It takes McCarthy in sweeping jumps from his parents' farm to law school, to his introduction to politics, to the bench of the circuit court, to the Pacific during the war, to the senate in 1946 when he was only thirty-eight, and to the development of McCarthyism, which the authors define as "character assassination," and which McCarthy has defended as his "fight for America."

The picture that the authors draw of McCarthy is not that of a brilliant, scheming Machiavelli. McCarthy emerges as a fast-talking salesman who has hit on a successful product which he has peddled to the American people with increasing success—McCarthy's home brew for curing communism. McCarthy has been so

successful in selling his cure-all that his political career has grown so that today he is the most feared man in the senate.

McCarthy has achieved this position despite revelations about his activities and public censures that would have smothered any other man. In McCarthy's case, the senator has fought back with his only weapon, linking the accusers with communism, and he has been successful in almost every instance.

During his political life, McCarthy has had to cope with these disclosures which the authors explain in detail: criticism from the Wisconsin Board of Bar Examiners, which asked the State Supreme Court to disbar him; his record as a circuit court judge, noted for quickie divorces; scrapes with tax collectors; relations with Washington lobbyists, which at one time led to his being dubbed the "Pepsi Cola Kid"; authorship for a \$10,000 fee of a booklet on housing for the Lustron Co.

But to millions of Americans all this is excusable because the senator is the man who has exposed communists in government. Actually, as the book clearly shows, McCarthy has a negligible record as a spy hunter. Instead, he has created an atmosphere of fear and conformity that has had serious consequences in government, education, publishing, and many other fields.

McCarthyism was conceived early in 1950, the authors say, when the senator and three friends were chatting in a Washington restaurant. McCarthy confessed that he needed a big campaign issue for the 1952 election. His senatorial career had been ordinary; he was a member of a group, the class of 1946, whose major claim to prominence was the number of negative votes cast by the group. One of his dinner companions suggested com-

This is the price America is paying for McCarthyism.

In the development of McCarthyism, the press has played a significant part. In fact, there would probably be no such thing as McCarthyism today had there been no headlines the day after McCarthy's Wheeling speech. The senator would undoubtedly have looked further for a campaign issue.

But newspapers could not ignore the Wheeling speech. Nor could they disregard McCarthy's subsequent charges. A United States senator was talking about the activities of public servants. Even after McCarthy had failed to back up his accusations and it became clear to some editors that the senator was engaged in a calculated smearing of government workers for political advantage, the headlines piled up.

The authors finger the trouble: "How did Joe do it? Part of the answer lies in the newspaper fraternity's devotion to the principle of objectivity. It is a violation of the unwritten creed for newsmen to mix opinion with fact; and so they gave Joe's wild accusations complete and factual coverage. They were telling the truth when they wrote: **MCCARTHY CHARGES 205 REDS IN STATE DEPARTMENT.** Joe has indeed made that charge. As to the truth or falsehood of his statement, the reporters felt that was out of their line; appraisals of Joe's accuracy were left for the columnists and editorial writers."

The book quotes the puzzlement and indignation of one editor, Houstoun Waring of the Littleton (Colorado) *Independent*, who in March, 1951, wrote:

"For decades the American press has worshipped the God of objectivity. This seemed to keep the voters informed on all sides of a question until the invention of the technique of the big lie.

Under this technique, a public official can use totalitarian methods—knowing his utterances will be reported 'straight' and that truth will never catch up with his falsehoods.

This practice, particularly since the rise of Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin, has been subjected to re-examination by the press in recent months. Editors have been searching for a way to present something more than the naked facts, as the whole truth is often

not embodied in a news report. Editorial comment the next day never quite seems to correct the wrong impression made on the front page . . ."

It is evident that the press is still contemplating itself. More than a year after Mr. Waring wrote his editorial about the "whole truth" often not being in news stories, we find Elmer Davis calling for an agreement within the press so that we may achieve "the whole truth."

The coverage of McCarthy's attack on Gov. Adlai Stevenson in late October is the most recent example of how the press is now handling McCarthy. An examination of the coverage reveals that the press has made little, if any, progress.

As he had often done before, McCarthy issued a statement about the speech he was to deliver. (The authors point out that this is a McCarthy tactic: it gives him an additional play in the news.) The AP dutifully reported in its lead that the senator said he would "show connections between the Democratic presidential nominee and known communists and communist causes."

Despite the advance reports of McCarthy's intentions, the senator did not name a single "known communist" now a party member connected with Stevenson. Nor did he list a single communist cause. The AP story did not carry this fact. Evidently, it would have been non-objective reporting for the wire association to have stated that he did not say what he said he would. If someone had had the time to compare the two McCarthy statements and then had called him a liar, undoubtedly AP would have carried the criticism, for this is objective journalism.

Some papers played the story down on the grounds that McCarthy had made the same charges before and that therefore it was not news in the strict sense. The New York *Times* story stated in the second paragraph: "Sen. McCarthy did not present any new material in his speech." The Milwaukee *Journal* story contained in parenthesis a refutation of one of McCarthy's points, a practice the *Journal* has used for some time in covering McCarthy.

The fact that some newspapers bannered the story and that others gave it a one column head below the fold; that some listed all the accusations and that others eliminated much of the senator's detailed allegations; that in some stories the sena-

tor "blasted," "charged," and "accused," whereas in others he "tried to give his listeners the impression," "sought to impress," and "reviewed virtually all of his previous charges" . . . this would indicate that objectivity is actually relative to the reporter, the desk, the makeup man and to less tangible forces.

It would seem that the responsible press is straining hard to warn its readers not to believe everything McCarthy says. McCarthy has a record of distortions, half-truths and untruths. This probably was the reason the New York *Times* strained its facilities to run an editorial in the same paper in which the story of McCarthy's attack on Stevenson was carried. "Wild charges, gross distortions, and assorted forms of demagoguery. He preys on fear; he stirs up hatred; he uses every device to destroy the confidence of Americans in each other," said the *Times* in part.

Putting aside for the moment the delicate matter of whether or not objectivity can be discarded by the press in some cases, I should like to suggest four procedures that I think can be used to cope with McCarthy and others of his type within the present scheme of things.

The greatest injustice done innocent persons is that their denial never catches up with the accusation. Rarely does the accused have time to deny in detail the charges against him in the edition carrying the allegations. In order to permit the accused to have his say, newspapers and the wire associations should agree that McCarthy, and any other major speech-maker, submit a copy of the text no less than four hours before the talk is released.

Four hours is not much time. It took the Democratic National Committee five days to track down McCarthy's wild charges in his Stevenson speech. But it is something. And it would allow newspapers to carry the denial in the lead along with the charges, which I think is fair to the accused. Rather than run the denials in a sidebar, I think the press should, when McCarthy singles out a person for attack, allow the defendant his say in the lead. One would assume from the manner of handling McCarthy's victims that they are guilty until they prove themselves innocent. Both have an equal right to the lead story, and putting the ac-

cusation and the denial in one story is only fair.

The third suggestion is that the press by agreement require all documents to which the speaker has reference to be made available four hours before the speech is to be released. McCarthy's attempt to lead his audience to believe he is quoting texts accurately takes the form of repeating, "I hold in my hand . . ." several times during a talk. In his attack on Stevenson, McCarthy began by saying that what "I present to you tonight is that portion of it (Stevenson's record) on which I have complete, unchallengeable documentation . . ." He then referred to material in his hand or elsewhere 16 times, twice stating that members of the press were free to examine some of the material. This would lead the listener to believe that McCarthy had the real dope that the press would check on its accuracy. Of course, there was no time to check the documentation, and there was very little of it that McCarthy made available.

The AP took it on itself to check McCarthy's charge that Stevenson was in charge of formulating America's post-war policy in Italy which, McCarthy said, Gen. Bedell Smith had described in a book as including the placement of communists in the Italian government. It took AP two days to find the material and get out a story that McCarthy had not only misquoted, he had given exactly the opposite meaning to the book's reference to the matter, which did not even mention Stevenson.

A fourth ground rule I would suggest the press adopt is that the speaker be required to make himself available for an interview after the speech is delivered so that additions and/or omissions from the prepared text can be discussed. Also, this would allow reporters covering the speech to confront the speaker with denials. It is significant that McCarthy had the habit of being unavailable for comment after his major talks. A man who expects the press to favor him with its attention can return that favor.

If the speaker refuses to comply with these ground rules, the reporter should be permitted to state in his story something to the effect that McCarthy "failed to submit documents substantiating his charge,"

or that McCarthy "refused to discuss his speech with the press."

To some this would be skirting the dangerous land of non-objectivity. Actually however, the press makes this "non-objective" judgment in effect when it determines the location of stories. When the Republican Truth Team stated during the campaign that "Poland and other Eastern European countries were betrayed when Roosevelt, inspired by Alger Hiss . . . agreed to let Soviet Russia take 40 per cent of Eastern Poland," the New York *Times* put this unsubstantiated charge deep in the back of the paper.

It would not be a revolutionary change in journalistic practice if the reporter were permitted to say in his story that the "Truth Team did not offer proof to substantiate its claim of Hiss influence on Roosevelt." After all, the statement was played down precisely for this reason. But the newspaper, whose duty it is to inform its readers directly and simply, has to hope that readers will realize, perhaps intuitively, that because the story was placed next to a brassiere advertisement it has little importance.

From this I do not think it is too great a jump to allow reporters to handle stories in the manner which they think will best get across to the reader the meaning and significance of events. The reporter is the middleman between the event and the reader. Through him the chaos of action is given order and intelligibility. A newsman is trained to seek the heart of the matter and to present it so that it is meaningful to all readers.

If this is the duty of the reporter, then I believe the press should permit its well-trained staff members to cover complex matters, such as McCarthy speeches, with all the tools at their command. Radio and television do a better job of reporting bare facts. Newspapers cannot be satisfied with presenting descriptions. The press must tell the public what the event means, and this must be done in the news columns.

To bring this down to a specific case: After the publication of the Anderson and May book, McCarthy was asked if it were true, as the book claimed, that he had presidential ambitions.

"The authors must have lifted that from the Daily Worker," he said. "I've seen it there."

This reveals McCarthy at his best form. As we saw in his Stevenson speech, McCarthyism, 1952-form, is based on a simple syllogism: Mr. X (believes, thinks, reads, knows) Y; communists (believe, think, read, know) Y; therefore, Mr. X is a communist.

Applied to McCarthy's statements, the syllogism is: authors say McCarthy will run for president; Daily Worker says McCarthy will run for president; therefore, authors must have read Daily Worker. The conclusion in all of McCarthy's logic has the advantage of having unlimited connotations. In this case, the naive newspaper reader could conclude that Anderson and May read the Worker because they are communists; that the communists put Anderson and May up to writing the book as a smear on McCarthy, etc.

I believe that the newswriter should be permitted to state in his *news story* that the use of the word "must" is not justified since the Worker and Anderson and May do not exhaust all the sources which believe that McCarthy has designs on the presidency. Naturally, it would take a capable reporter to handle this type of reporting. But I believe it is the press' job to do so. The fact that for 30 months McCarthy used the press to suit himself indicates that the next demagogue to come down the highway will have the same opportunities unless some changes are made.

Our Reviewers

Robert B. Frazier, Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*; Kenneth E. Wilson, Santa Rosa *Press Democrat*; Melvin Mencher, Albuquerque *Journal*; and John Strohmeyer, Providence *Journal*, are Nieman Fellows this year; John M. Harrison, Toledo *Blade*, was a Nieman Fellow 1951-52; William M. Pinkerton, director of the Harvard News Office, was a Nieman Fellow in 1940-41; Louis M. Lyons is curator of the Nieman Fellowships; Ross Sayers of the Auckland *Star* is an associate Nieman Fellow from New Zealand.

Chicago's Criminal World

by John Strohmeier

BARBARIANS IN OUR MIDST. By Virgil W. Peterson, Atlantic-Little Brown. \$4.50. 395 pp.

Dion O'Bannion was an unusual florist. As a conscientious member of Chicago's Al Capone gang, he not only provided flowers for funerals but also furnished the corpses. One chief of police attributed 25 murders to him but O'Bannion probably could have claimed many more had not two gunmen emptied their revolvers into his skull at the height of his "floral" career. Capone dutifully showed up for his funeral and so did many prominent politicians, including five Chicago judges.

From 1925 to 1946, 638 gang murders were committed in Chicago and Cook County. Only 13 defendants were ever convicted in connection with them. In between killings, Chicago politicians often proclaimed that there was no organized crime in the city.

In 1947, the Chicago Capone mob showed signs of expanding its territory to central and southern Illinois, an area controlled by Carl Shelton and his brothers, Bernie and Earl. A reward of \$20,000 was put up by the Capone mob for the murder of the top men in the Shelton gang. On Oct. 23, 1947, Carl Shelton was ambushed and slain. Eight months later, Bernie, who succeeded Carl, was shot and killed in a parking lot near Peoria. Ted C. Link, crime reporter of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, dug into Peoria crime and came up with a series of articles on vice and corruption. A grand jury investigated and found no vice or corruption but instead indicted Link. He was charged with having kidnaped and intimidated a suspected fingerman in the slaying of Bernie Shelton. The public quickly showed its wrath. The Peoria prosecutor backed down and the indictment was dismissed.

Beginning with the reign of gambling king Mike McDonald in about 1873, the Chicago criminal world has been organized for political action. Peterson's book is largely a history of how the underworld murdered and bribed its way into the social and political structure of Chicago. In 1934, Mayor Anton J. Cermak was murdered and the Chicago City Council

convened to elect a successor. A then significant alderman from the 24th ward named Jacob M. Arvey nominated Edward J. Kelly who was promptly elected. Peterson pictures Arvey today as a behind-the-scenes manipulator of some skill and credits the Cook County boss with considerable influence on local and national levels. Cook County Democratic leaders had their most uncomfortable moments recently when the Kefauver Crime Committee uncovered the mysterious wealth of Chicago Police Captain Dan Gilbert in 1950. Arvey, backer of men like Adlai Stevenson

and Sen. Paul Douglas, nevertheless insisted on backing Gilbert for sheriff in the '50 election. This was his one big slip. Not only was Gilbert defeated but so was Sen. Scott W. Lucas, Democratic majority leader, after a campaign that largely spotlighted Gilbert's huge wealth.

Peterson, an ex-FBI-man, knows his criminals and has a shrewd sense of detecting political underplay. For years, he has served as a friendly adviser and tipster to newsmen all over the country. This book is the first time that he has attempted to document a situation of such wide scope to the general public. He is operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission.

Cedric Adams' Column

by Kenneth E. Wilson

POOR CEDRIC'S ALMANAC. Cedric Adams, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 351 pp. \$3.50.

Here are 9,872 items, 40 cartoons, an introduction by Arthur Godfrey, a postscript by Bob Hope and no plot. You can read it from back to front or both ways from the middle. Or you may want to keep it handy for moments of relaxation—shopping around in pieces on Weather, Health, Recipes, Sex, Animals, Children.

Cedric Adams is a columnist for the Minneapolis *Star* and *Sunday Tribune*. His *Almanac* is a collection of columns over a 20-year tour of duty in Minnesota where, the flap says, he's on at least a hand-shaking basis with practically everyone in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Folksy and breezy in the writing, Mr. Adams' book offers ample evidence why his daily newspaper column is so successful. He has an insatiable interest in people and a knack for identifying himself with the reader and vice versa. In his explorations through the old family home's cellar and attic and a letter to his son who's about to have his tonsils out, he displays a human touch that's tough to beat.

His is the friendly type of column (no crusades, no gossip) that would go just as well in Amarillo or Walla Walla. Editors of newspapers without local columns may decide this is the sort of thing their papers need. Columnists who find it hard

to be clever every day may learn something from the Adams technique.

Mr. Adams is sometimes corny (to his son entering kindergarten: "Good luck to you, Son. Make Pa proud of you, will you?") and is a storehouse of information you may get along just as well without ("Grasshoppers can't leap unless the temperature is at least 62 degrees" and "An ounce of spider's web would extend 350 miles if straightened out"). But his health advice is harmless and entertaining ("If you listen to telephone conversation with your right ear, you're abnormal") and his chapter on S-E-X is refreshingly mild ("In all states the nightgown remains more popular than pajamas").

As many another columnist, Mr. Adams apparently takes a few trips to the library himself when the daily stint becomes hard. But what he learns is good reading the way he says it. Some of his advice on how to keep cool, winter driving, lawn care, how to keep warm and the dangers of the ol' swimming hole is pretty useful stuff.

Some egghead critics have been known to say that in these days when newsprint is so dear, the space occupied by Mr. Adams' quips and tips might well be taken up with more significant news.

This argument won't hold up if, as Frank Luther Mott says, human life is important and the individual personality precious.

Lincoln in One Volume

by John M. Harrison

ABRAHAM LINCOLN. Benjamin P. Thomas. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1952, 548 pp. \$5.75.

The trouble with trying to write a book about Abe Lincoln these days is that unless it's confined to one of the several Lincolns—the man, the politician, the military commander—it will turn out to be not one book but two or three. So extensive has been the Lincoln scholarship, so numerous are the monographs resulting therefrom that a biography traditionally is numbered in volumes rather than pages.

So much more credit, then, to Benjamin P. Thomas, who has produced a single-volume Lincoln life that's as thoroughly informative as it is entertainingly readable. Here is most of the greatness of the man, much of the shrewdness of the politician, and enough of the ingenuity of the military commander. Surely the job could only have been done by a man steeped in Lincoln lore as is Mr. Thomas, who is executive secretary of the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield.

There are many things to be said in praise of this unusual book, which surely will become the best known and most valued of the short biographies of Lincoln. Its most important virtue is the single-mindedness of the biographer. Whatever the temptations, he manages to keep from being drawn off into the many byways of Lincoln's life. He sticks with major themes which give his accounting cohesiveness and consistency.

Thus, he sees and describes Abe Lincoln as a man who—more than commonly—grew up to the responsibilities that ultimately were his. This Lincoln is in no wise the great man whose greatness seemed fated, or even indicated, from his earliest days. Mr. Thomas, although he is no all-out debunker, is inclined to discount the familiar stories of Lincoln's childhood and youth which have made him a paragon of virtues almost from the cradle. He criticizes the crassness of much of Lincoln's early politicking and the cruelty of his young man's wit.

His Lincoln is a man who always is learning and who, most particularly, continues to grow greater in heart. And although he never quite says it in so many words, Mr. Thomas makes it amply evident that it was this latter growth—the deepening and widening of Abraham Lincoln's feeling for his fellows—that swept him up out of obscurity and made him one of the very greatest of Americans.

There is a similar singleness of purpose in Mr. Thomas' handling of that great portion of his book properly devoted to the Civil War and the forces which brought it about. Here he always is at great pains to present Lincoln primarily as Protector of the Union rather than as Emancipator of the Slaves. This is not a new thesis, of course, but it is so very often lost sight of that it needs the kind of indelible underlining it is given here. As President, Abraham Lincoln took such steps as he concluded were necessary to wage the war successfully to its conclusion. One of these steps was to become the freeing of the slaves. But it was to the conclusion, which could be only the re-establishment of the Union, that Lincoln directed his every act.

This book is not without its faults and distractions, but most of these are hard to avoid in a one-volume life of so many-faceted a man. The continuous jumping about from Lincoln's personal life, to the accounting of military action, to the author's estimates of the character and the abilities of his principal subject or those of one of the other men whose thumbnail biographies are necessarily parts of such a book is bound to be confusing. Even here, however, Mr. Thomas is facile enough to reduce the irritation to a minimum. He is a master of the art of bringing minor characters to life with a couple of swift, broad strokes in bright colors. Sometimes he may seem to moralize a bit too much, but he cannot always afford the luxury of enough factual material to give the reader a basis for drawing his own moral.

Not many will read this biography, I

think, without stopping at many points along the way to make comparisons between Abe Lincoln and another man from Illinois who lately has achieved prominence if not victory on the American political scene. There are many, many likenesses and, undoubtedly, many more differences.

It really is only a superficial kind of similarity, no doubt, that Abraham Lincoln said two years before he entered the White House, "I must, in candor, say I do not think I am fit for the Presidency." Yet some surely will speculate how wrong Lincoln was in this estimate.

There are some interesting observations on Lincoln's brushes with the press, which did not hold him in universal regard—a feeling that appears to have been mutual. To the editor of a Missouri newspaper, who suggested at one stage in the war that he make a speech to reassure the people, Lincoln wrote:

"Please pardon me for suggesting that if the papers like yours, which heretofore have persistently garbled, and misrepresented what I have said, will now fully and fairly place it before their readers, there can be no further misunderstanding."

Benjamin Thomas' Abraham Lincoln is an amazingly well-rounded individual for a one-volume national hero. He is warm and human and altogether believable. He has been neither idolized nor debunked. For these qualities, among many others, this biography seems certain to be as popular with real Lincoln enthusiasts and scholars as it is for those who will value it primarily for its conciseness and convenience.

One word, finally, of commendation to the author for a last chapter which is more than a bibliography, being an attempt to tell something meaningful about the other important Lincoln books, including those on which Mr. Thomas has drawn in writing this one. It will bring some order out of abounding chaos in Lincoln literature at least up to this moment, when the Thomas biography is one of nearly a dozen titles just appearing on the book market which deal with some aspect of the life of this great American President.

What Have We Here?

by Robert B. Frazier

THE BIG CHANGE, America Transforms Itself 1900-1950. By Frederick Lewis Allen. Harper, New York, 298 pps. \$3.50.

Frederick Lewis Allen, the *Harper's* Magazine editor whose "contemporary histories" have been widely read for 20 years, this time takes a new approach. In his earlier volumes he described the America he had lived in. Now he looks at the first half of our own century and asks, "What does it mean?" and "How did we get where we are?"

Tough questions, those. To begin with, Allen, like you and me, can't have the perspective of history. He can't stand off and view those years in the clear light of elapsed time. His material must be colored by prejudice, sentiment, and perhaps by interpretations time will change. Only a brave man would have tried to write a book like this. It is good that Allen is a brave man, for he did well.

First he looks at the America of 1900, which, significantly, was the year after Horatio Alger died. He doesn't see the "good old days," because those days didn't really exist. Then he looks at America today. It looks pretty good. Not perfect, but pretty good. Between looks he spins the story of what happened to carry off not one social revolution, but a series of social revolutions, and to make the "American Way of Life" in mid-century something quite different from what it was in 1900.

It is plain that Allen wouldn't trade today's America for that of his father or his grandfather. It is just as plain that he feels his grandchildren will inherit an even better "American way of life." Maybe theirs won't be perfect, he admits, but it will be better.

He suggests that the prospects for improvement are unlimited, if Americans go on combining democratic governmental processes with the new capitalism which he sees as a multi-owner "managementism." Through the years, he recommends, continue to tinker with the American machine if it doesn't run properly. But don't stop the machine; fix it while it's

running. And above all, don't turn it in on a new one.

Worrying about a native socialism or a native communism is wasted worrying, he suggests. America, he finds, is not drifting "toward socialism," but is rushing "past socialism." And "When we battle against Communism, we are battling against the past, not against the future."

He grants that there are hazards ahead, but they don't worry him. "The courageous nation," he points out, "like the courageous man, is not unhappy at the thought of dangers beside the road, but welcomes them as challenges to be faced and overwhelmed along an adventurous course."

Look-Out On Red China

by Ross Sayers

HONGKONG — THE ISLAND BETWEEN. By Christopher Rand. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 244 pp. \$3.00.

Whether you believe United States foreign policy should be "Europe first" or focussed on Asia, the new administration will obviously have to seek a more positive Far Eastern policy.

Newspapermen searching for topical background on the complexities of all-too-little-understood Asian hotspot should not overlook Chris Rand's book. It is far more comprehensive than its title, "Hongkong," suggests. The sub-title, "the island between," is the key to his subject. The island between what? Why, the dangerously broad gulf between western freedom and Communist totalitarian regimentation of its subjects. And when the gulf relates to Red China the complexities are broadened by differences between occidental and oriental thinking processes and psychological traits, which Rand knows more about than most foreign correspondents.

Hongkong is our listening post on Red China. But Rand has a timely warning to editors at home when he points out that not all correspondents find it easy to get

As history perhaps this isn't a great book. A hundred years hence it will be read, if at all, as a curiosity, or as an example of how an intelligent American once felt about his own time. Yet it is a good book, an excellent book for our age, for mid-century Americans to read at mid-century.

If the book has a major weakness (and it is painful to call this a "weakness"), it is that it is too readable, that it contains too much of the delightful prose of "Only Yesterday," too much remembering and not enough questioning. It perhaps gives too many answers to questions the reader didn't get a chance to ask.

However, that criticism is not serious enough to detract from *The Big Change* as a fitting cap to Allen's two "yesterday" books and his two histories of the tycoon. It is a splendid fifth.

reliable "listening post" sources for their news despatches. This he ascribes to the oriental's penchant for vagueness.

Newspaper correspondents trained to observe, to assess opinion, and with sufficient experience of foreign lands to balance their judgments, are usually the best topical historians. But Chris Rand has something more. He loves the East. He considers his profession is not reporting, but reporting Asia.

Nieman Alumni will be pleased that in a sense this book is a Nieman Fellowship achievement. Chris was a Nieman at Harvard in 1948-49 when he acquired a lot of the background for his book by spending the year chiefly learning more about Asia.

"Hongkong" is not all politics. In fact, what I liked most about it was that the extremely incisive political appraisals were sugar-coated for easy reading with personal and historic anecdotes giving it color. Readers seeking purely political background for Far Eastern studies might be disappointed that the book opens more as a travel tale. That approach was pleasantly nostalgic for me because it told of spots I got to know in Hongkong as a correspondent there for a brief spell in the tense

1949 days when Red China troops were occupying the Hongkong-China border zone and clearing out the last of Chiang Kai Shek's corrupt Nationalist regime. At that time no one knew what would be Hongkong's fate. Apparently they still don't know. Rand doesn't try to predict with certainty. In fact, he doesn't try to ram any conclusions down the reader's throat. He knows the situation is too complex for that. He knows—as a less experienced Asia observer may not—that whatever is likely to happen there is qualified by “perhaps—always perhaps” (to use his quaint phrase).

But he gives you a clear picture of the factors involved. Some of these may not be very new to those who have been interested in Far East news, but Chris Rand has defined them more clearly than usual, and he has tried to assess their relative merit in an easy-to-read, clear, entertaining style which abandons the cliché devices of writers less at ease with their subject.

Those of you who have enjoyed his *New Yorker* articles on the East know how well he writes; you will know better than myself, a New Zealander, the reputation of his New York *Herald Tribune* by-line over despatches from the East from 1946 to 1951. But as a Britisher I can endorse his interpretations of some of the mysteries of British colonial government and his fair attempt to present to America the reasons why British policy in the Far East is not the same as that of the United States. One chapter is devoted to clarifying these differences. It is a particularly important chapter, I think, for American newspapermen—and Senators.

Washington Nieman Dinners

The former Nieman Fellows in Washington have been meeting for dinners monthly since last Summer, with attendance of 15 or more. Clark Mollen-

hoff (1950) of the Washington bureau of the Cowles publications, and James Daniel (1943) of the Scripps Howard Washington bureau, made the organizing committee. They report their roster includes at least one Nieman Fellow from every annual group since the beginning (1939), with five members of the 1950 group.

Among the speakers at these dinners have been, John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue (September); Prof. Archibald Cox of Harvard Law School, chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board (October), Senator Hickenlooper of Iowa (November).

Professors Fred Merk and Arthur M. Schlesinger of the Harvard history department and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships, were guests at the December meeting.

Besides Daniel and Mollenhoff, the Washington group includes: Osburn Zuber (1939), Small Defense Plants Administration; Carroll Kilpatrick (1940) Washington *Post* editorial page; Vance Johnson (1941) San Francisco *Chronicle* bureau; Stanley Allen (1942) Senator Benton's office; Oren Stephens (1943) State Department; John Shively (1944) Housing Administration; Herbert Yahraes (1944) science writer; Edward Edstrom (1945) Louisville *Courier-Journal* bureau; Frank Hewlett (1946) Salt Lake *Tribune* bureau; Frank Carey (1947), AP science writer; Walter Waggoner (1948) New York *Times* bureau; Alan Barth (1949) Washington *Post* editorial page; Peter Lisagor (1949) Chicago *Daily News* bureau; Lawrence Weiss (1949) Labor Department; Donald Gonzales (1950) United Press bureau; Max Hall (1950) Mutual Security Administration; Murrey Marder (1950) Washington *Post*; Richard Wallace (1950) Senator Kefauver's office; Simeon Booker (1951) Washington *Post*; Angus Thuermer (1951) State Department; Charles Molony (1952) Federal Reserve Board; John Steele (1952) United Press bureau and Everett Holles (1942), Mutual Broadcasting System.

Letters

Joe Costa's Article

Dear Mr. Lyons:

Permit me to offer my belated thanks and appreciation for the story you used in your *Nieman Reports* regarding news photography and its lack of freedom of operation. Handling legislative matters for the National Press Photographers Association, I have seen how attacks on photographers have been handled.

To my way of thinking, public relations on our part must go further than the public. It must go to the newspaper publisher—the employer, who rarely helps the photographer recover damages other than his equipment, which, in most cases, is owned by the newspaper. Meanwhile the incident is reported in the free press as news and the newsreading public finds that they can get away with assaulting the photographer.

Thus, I appreciate your use of Joe Costa's article because I am hoping it will help open the eyes of the publisher—employer whom . . . if you will pardon the expression . . . we are also trying to educate.

Most sincerely,

Milton Freier
Washington Newspictures Bureau
United Press Assns.

Indispensable

To the Editor:

This is to renew my subscription to *Nieman Reports*. The fact is there is no other publication that gives me, a layman, the basic facts and the truth behind the news.

Nieman Reports sets me straight on many matters and makes me a more intelligent reader of the daily news. To members of your profession, it should prove indispensable.

WILLIAM E. KLINE.

Hudson, N. Y.

[This is typical of many letters, all of them appreciated, which space does not permit printing.—Editor.]

LETTERS (Cont.)

Freedom of Press Photography

Thanks for your letter of October 17th. The reprints did arrive. Believe me, we are sincerely grateful for your making them available. They will be mailed to our entire mailing list which totals nearly 4,000. This is made up of some 1800 news photographers, some 1500 publishers, managing editors, picture editors, etc., and some 600 to 700 members of the Photo Journalism Division of the Photographic Society of America. I know you will agree that the greater the distribution we can give to topics of this sort, the more thinking we will be able to stimulate.

To bring you up to date on my mail, I have a letter from Peter J. Rowe of the *Baltimore News-Post*. You will remember I sent you a copy of the NPPA's letter to Judge Moser presiding at the Grammer trial. Mr. Rowe says in part:

"Judge Moser has not let up in any way, but copies of your letter were used in both papers for the other judges to see.

"Another letter to the Bar Association featuring the no flash-in-court wouldn't do any harm coming from National headquarters. Thanks for your help."

Jack Shipley of the *Baltimore News-Post*, former President of the Baltimore Press Photographers Association, wrote as follows:

"Enclosed find clippings from the Baltimore papers about your letter to Judge Moser. Also several clippings on sketches made in court. We have been barred from the vicinity of the courthouse for years. The photographer summoned in the case, Harold Spicer, has been in the room with the witnesses waiting to be called. In this way he has talked them into posing out on the sidewalk.

"I also understand that one of the courthouse guards insists that a photographer remove the flash gun from his camera before entering the building. Hoping your letter does some good. . ."

I have a letter from Mr. Garrett D. Byrnes, Production Editor of the *Providence, R. I., Journal and Evening Bulletin*, in which he says in part, "Congratulations on that splendid job in Nieman Reports. I am making sure that all of our photographers see it."

You will be interested in two pieces that will be run in the November issue of the National Press Photographer. One is a letter from George Smallsreed, Jr., son of the Editor of the Columbus (Ohio) *Dispatch*, regarding interference with his work during a Stevenson meeting. The other is a story about efforts to photograph the interior of a Civil Defense installation in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Major William J. Lookadoo, Special Assistant to the Director of Public Information, Department of the Air Force, writes in part: "Although having a lot to do, I started the day out by reading the Nieman Reports. Joe, your article 'Does Press Freedom Include Photography,' is wonderful, and full of food for thought. I got much pleasure in finding that you were the newsman who got 'the forelady of the jury shot.' I know of the incident but did not know you were the news photographer. On your able report, I hope all executives (especially governmental) may be able to study it." For your information, Major Lookadoo has been cooperating with us for the past year or more in an effort to put an end to interference with photographers on the part of Air Force.

JOSEPH COSTA

American Way?

To the Editor:

Does Alan Barth in his references to the need of "tolerance of diversity" (*Nieman Reports*, July, 1952) mean we must accept the espionage of Alger Hiss, the proved pro-Communism of Owen Lattimore, the guilt of Remington, as part of the American way?

Apparently, it's okay for my friend, Barth, to have Lattimore accuse everyone (me included) of being "kingpins" in the China Lobby—but it isn't permissible to question the Baltimore Bugle's veracity.

Victor Lasky
155 East 52nd Street
New York City

Protest of Court Ban
On Photographers

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Judge Herman N. Moser, presiding at the Grammer trial in Baltimore, Maryland, in which you might be interested.

JOSEPH COSTA
Chairman of Board

Hon. Herman N. Moser
Judge, Criminal Court
Baltimore, Maryland
Dear Judge Moser,

We, the National Press Photographers Association, representing over 1700 professional news cameramen and their employers, the leading newspapers of America, do most respectfully protest your Honor's sweeping order prohibiting photographic coverage of the current Grammer trial.

Deeply concerned with the untrammelled and free movement of news dissemination in the public interest, we feel that your action in barring photographers, not only in the courtroom, but in the hallways, on the courthouse steps, and in the streets surrounding the courthouse, is a restriction of the constitutional rights of news reporters and photographers. We also respectfully submit that it is contrary to public policy and a definite infringement on the guaranteed rights of a free press—a basic tenet of our democracy.

We sincerely believe that a principle is involved that is as important as the pictures with which we are currently concerned. We cannot stress too strongly the principle of the oneness of news reporting and news photography. Each is linked inseparably with the other. To deny this is to deny the public's demand and right to the unrestricted dissemination of news.

We know that you will not dispute the importance of photographs in giving the American people and the peoples of foreign nations a visual idea of American justice. We believe, too, that you will agree that pictorial coverage helps create a favorable impression of American justice and an appreciation of the due processes of law which are the inalienable right of United States citizens.

We strongly urge you to reconsider and rescind the restrictions you have placed on cameramen. You may be sure that operating within the courtroom with the

LETTERS (Cont.)

natural light available there and without the use of flash bulbs, or operating outside the courtroom, the responsible cameramen assigned by responsible news media, will commit no act which could possibly mar the decorum of your courtroom or detract from the gravity of the proceedings.

In the event that you should still feel that news photographers should not be permitted in the courtroom in this specific instance, we nevertheless feel that you should not prohibit news photographers in the hallways or in the lobby or on the courthouse steps in conformity with the practice that has been universally adopted throughout the 48 states.

JOSEPH COSTA
Chairman of Board

SUPREME BENCH
OF
BALTIMORE CITY
October 21, 1952

Mr. Joseph Costa
National Press Photographers Assn., Inc.
Box 1441
Worcester, Mass.
Dear Mr. Costa:

For your information, the rules governing the conduct of persons in and about and the control of the court house (except for those matters occurring in a particular court room, and immediately adjacent thereto) are under the charge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City.

The rule which I enforced was one passed by the Bench.

Very truly yours,
/s/ HERMAN M. MOSER
Judge
October 22, 1952

Mr. Joseph Costa
National Press Photographers Assn. Inc.
Box 1441,
Worcester, Mass.
Dear Mr. Costa:

Your letter of October 15, to Judge Herman M. Moser, and Judge Moser's reply of October 21, have been referred to me by Judge Moser.

The Supreme Bench of Baltimore City (composed of eleven judges), although it

sits as a Court only to admit and disbar attorneys, and to hear motions for new trial in criminal cases, has the constitutional power to make rules for the trial and disposition of cases in the various Courts of Baltimore City, (law, equity and criminal.)

The rule to which Judge Moser refers, and of which you complain, was adopted by the Bench on April 30, 1928. It is now Rule 3 of the "Rules of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City (1947 Ed.) and reads as follows:

"Rule 3. PHOTOGRAPHING PROHIBITED.

No photographs shall be taken in any court room over which The Supreme Bench of Baltimore City has jurisdiction, or in any court room to which the Chief Judge or any Associate Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City is assigned and over which he presides and has jurisdiction or control, nor so close thereto as to interfere with the proceedings or decorum thereof, while the court is in session, or at any other time when court officials, parties litigant, counsel, jurymen, witnesses or others connected with proceedings pending therein are present. Nor shall any photographic views taken or purporting to have been taken under such circumstances be published. Any violation or seeming violation of the court shall be promptly brought to the attention of the court by any court official or attorney cognizant of the same, and may be heard upon suggestion or charge of contempt."

The Freedom of Speech, and of the Press, to which you refer, and upon which you rely, is qualified by the right and power of the Courts to control the administration of Justice, in the trial of litigated cases. This power to control trials prevails within the courtroom, and extends beyond the confines of the courtroom, or the Courthouse, itself. No precise limits can be set upon it. The necessity for its exercise depends upon circumstances.

In a criminal case, the Court has the duty to afford the State and the accused a public trial; and the duty also to afford a fair trial. A public trial need not become a Roman Holiday, as did the Lindberg case. Both the State and the accused, as well as the witnesses for both sides, are entitled to the protection of the Court from assault and persecutions of any kind, not only in the courtroom, but

going and coming, and wherever they happen to be.

It was to assure that protection that the rule was adopted. Judge Moser has not abused his authority in enforcing it.

Very truly yours,
/s/ W. CONNELL SMITH
Chief Judge

October 31, 1952

Honorable W. Connell Smith
Chief Judge
Supreme Bench of Baltimore
Dear Judge Smith:

Thank you very much for your letter of October 22nd conveying the information about Rule 3 of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City.

Although the National Press Photographers Association has been actively interested in courtroom photo-reporting for the last six years, this is the first time that the rule adopted by the Supreme Bench of Baltimore has been brought to our attention.

Naturally we do not question the right of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore to adopt rules for the preservation of the dignity of the court and the rights of the accused. I note from your letter, however, that this rule was adopted in 1928. Just as archaic laws should be repealed when they no longer serve the purpose for which they were designed, so also we feel, should courtroom rules be adjusted to meet modern needs. We feel that it does not take into account modern technical advances which permit quiet, dignified, unobtrusive photography. We would like to suggest a re-examination of the rule with a view to having it conform with present-day thinking and requirements.

Judges in many parts of the country have permitted courtroom photography in accordance with the manner that has been carefully worked out by the NPPA to help the courts solve this problem. They have all agreed that it in no way interfered with the decorum of the court, nor did it prejudice the rights of the litigants.

We feel that the public's interest, the importance of maintaining proper decorum and preserving the rights of the litigants, are the principal considerations. We believe that none of these considerations will be compromised by the taking of pictures using existing light only with

the modern tools available today. Pictures can be taken with no more interference than that caused by persons such as artists, reporters, court bailiffs, stenographers and others who today carry on their callings in the courtrooms without prohibition by the court.

We believe that it has now been established beyond question that news photography and news reporting are one and inseparable and that one cannot function without the other and still serve the public interest adequately.

We submit that since the judge is the final authority in his own court, it is within his power to remove anyone whose conduct interferes with the trial whether that person be photographer, reporter, artist, spectator or lawyer. For this reason there is no excuse for any judge ever permitting a trial under his jurisdiction to become a "Roman Holiday."

We would welcome and be very grateful for an opportunity to meet with a committee of judges representing the Supreme Bench of Baltimore, with the thought of reviewing the entire issue and presenting you with not only our own thoughts but those of judges in other parts of the country to whom I have referred above.

Respectfully,
JOSEPH COSTA
Chairman of Board

SCRAPBOOK —

Rights of Photography

In a recent issue of *Nieman Reports*, there is an article on the freedom of the press as it relates to news photographs. The question is obviously of prime importance, for the progress of the last few years in both photography and press reproduction has made the news photograph a very influential method of communication. The author of this article, Joseph Costa, is chairman of the board of the National Press Photographers' Association. His position is roughly that anything which can lawfully be seen by the human eye from a public place should be lawfully photographable and publishable provided that it does not violate the laws of libel, treason and sedition.

Since a courtroom is a public place, to which there is a general right of access, he wants photography in the courtroom to be permissible, provided that the process does not interfere with the proceedings

—which with modern mechanism it need not do. He denies absolutely that it "detracts from the dignity of the proceedings."

There is another side to this argument, which we hope will be kept in view in Canada no matter what decision the courts of the United States may come to eventually. This is the fact that the right to be present in the courtroom and thus to see all that goes on in it is not a right which belongs to the individual in virtue of his citizenship or his capacity as a human being; it is a right conferred upon the public for a specific purpose, namely to ensure that the proceedings in the court shall be known, that nothing shall be done which would have to be concealed. It is not for the benefit of the individual spectator that this right exists, it is for the benefit of society. The required benefit

to society is amply assured by the presence of the spectators; indeed it is often assured merely by their right to be there even though there are actually none of them present. Nothing would be added to it by permitting everybody who can buy a newspaper to share the privilege of watching the facial movements of the condemned man as he hears the words which will send him to the gallows.

Our own feeling is that nothing would be added to the dignity of Canadian justice, and nothing valuable to the knowledge of Canadian newspaper readers, if the latter were permitted to see pictures of the proceedings in the courts, and we hope that Mr. Costa's view is not that of the more serious and public-spirited of the newspaper editors of the United States, to say nothing of Canada.

Saturday Night (Toronto) Nov. 22, 1952

The Science Reporter's Job

by Francis E. Carey
AP Science Writer

Every once in a while I get a letter from some young man with ambitions to become a science writer for a newspaper, asking me how to go about it. My first advice is: "Go get yourself a job on a small newspaper and go out and cover a fire." If this sounds like heresy to a scientist, so be it. But, actually, it is not only sound advice for the prospective science writer, but possibly an indirect contribution to the advancement of science itself. The point is that if anyone expects to write science for laymen he must be first and foremost a good all-around reporter of news.

The obvious way of getting reportorial training is to do all the things that work on a small-town newspaper requires. It can mean chasing the fire engines to a big blaze, riding with the cops to the scene of an accident or to a raid on a bookie joint, buttonholing the mayor or the city councilors at City Hall, or interviewing labor leaders on a picket line on a rainy day. It can also mean covering a concert, a ball game, a clambake, a strawberry festival, or the "carrots-peas-and-chicken-a-la-king circuit" of service club luncheons.

And why is all this grist for the mill of the would-be science writer when, of itself, it isn't even remotely connected with

science? First of all, if he has the makings of a reporter, it teaches him what constitutes *news* and also how to get facts straight—often under conditions of rush and other stress. (And if you don't think a science reporter is called upon to work under such conditions at times, watch one trying to interview a gun-shy scientist who, after making a controversial statement at a scientific meeting, insists he has only ten minutes to make a train. Or watch a science reporter break for a telephone after a news conference of the Atomic Energy Commission has produced the makings of a page one story.)

Second, it teaches him that the particular story he's covering on a certain day must compete, for inclusion in the paper, with stories coming in to the newspaper from all over the city, the state, the nation, and the world. Thus, he may learn to marshal his facts and to lay down his story in such an interesting way that even on a day when hot news is breaking everywhere, he'll still make the paper with his yarn. Also, he should learn that, even though his story may wind up on the city editor's desk spike, tomorrow is another day—and he'll keep pitching. As a science reporter, he'd face that situation constantly, particularly if he became a science reporter

for a wire service like the Associated Press. Stories totaling more than 100,000 words a day move on the wires of the AP to newspapers all over the world—and news interest is the prime criterion in the selection of stories that make the wire. The wire is not made of rubber.

If the science reporter comes up with a story about a new and effective treatment for the common cold, he's in the money so far as getting it on the press association wire and into an individual paper is concerned. The same may be true, even on a hot news day, of a science story that reports no new treatments, no new cures, yet has elements of human appeal that allow it to stack up against fast-breaking news.

An AP story on the discovery of "hook-tailed mice" was published in a lot of newspapers recently, even though it was written on a day when political, international, and other news was running a high temperature. And it wasn't just a gag story about an oddity of nature; it was intended to illustrate, in an eye-catching way, some of the unusual aspects of research on heredity.

Sometimes scientists are inclined to shudder at the "hook-tailed mice" type of story, or at least some of them say they do. They don't object to the scientific content, but to the approach a reporter makes to such a story. They maintain reporters go out of their way to emphasize the bizarre. Yet they forgot that, if it weren't for the publication of this type of human-interest story, a lot of people might forget that scientists are working on many fronts to solve still-unanswered questions about heredity and many other things. And scientists, whether they admit it or not, need the interest of the people, because the people, directly or indirectly, foot the bills for much of research.

All right. Let's say the prospective science writer has become somewhat of a hot-shot as an all-around newsman. Does that equip him to write science day in and day out as a regular thing? Far from it. Like any other specialist in the news field—be it labor, politics, diplomacy, or military affairs—the science man must train himself in ALL the fields of activity about which he'll be called upon to write. These fields extend literally from A to Z—from atomic energy to zoology and from astronomy to the physical properties of zircon-

ium. Most scientists have a rather thorough knowledge of their own particular field of activity, whether it be physics, chemistry, biology, or whatever—and a cursory knowledge of most of the other fields. A science reporter must have somewhat more than a cursory knowledge of ALL fields—a large order, true, but the science writer must build it up by his own reading, by interviews with scientists as he goes along, and, if he has the chance, by further formal education.

Some science writers happened to have specialized in science while in college, and that's all velvet. But some of the top men in the science-writing field today didn't have even that much background. They simply had to work all the harder to acquire their skill. A good, all-around reporter—including the man whose regular job is to cover the police station—can cover a science story adequately if he has the persistence to keep hammering away at questions on points that aren't clear to him. In fact, one of the early winners of the AAAS—George Westinghouse Science Writing Award for newspaper science reporting was a reporter who was not a specialist in science.

But the science man can oftentimes catch a story that other reporters would miss—a top story that might develop from a chance phrase at a news conference, or from two or three key words in a rough-reading technical article in a scientific journal. With his background, he can provide fast amplification when a science story breaks in the news.

The science reporter is sensitive to the strange lingo of science, and some of his best stories come from journals that are, perhaps, combed more thoroughly by science writers than by scientists themselves. In fact, some scientists will admit that the first knowledge they had of certain scientific developments came from reading about them in the newspapers.

Sometimes a science reporter does things that the scientific world, for one reason or another, has not tackled itself. Some months ago, this reporter set out on a project designed to explain the issues in the controversy between Sister Elizabeth Kenny and most of the medical profession regarding the nature and treatment of infantile paralysis. He read scientific books and journals totaling many pounds in weight, yet nowhere could he find any

completely clear-cut exposition of the issues by either side of the controversy. So he had to write letters to doctors in various parts of the world and personally interview scores of doctors and technicians before he could nail down a reasonable explanation of what the scrap was all about. Regardless of which side is right in this controversy, it would seem that some impartial scientific group should long ago at least have outlined the issues to the public.

It was indicated earlier in this article that good scientific reporting could help science itself by explaining research projects to a public that ultimately pays many of the bills. Good science reporting can also help the public in a way that goes beyond education for education's sake. Thanks to accurate reporting of medical and public health news in newspapers and magazines during the past few decades, the general public should be fairly well informed on such matters—to the extent that it can ask intelligent questions in talking to doctors and have a good idea of the meaning of his replies.

When you call in a doctor, you imply your faith in him to handle the situation. But you're entitled to ask questions, and no fair-minded doctor should resent them, regardless of how busy he may be. Also, an intelligent understanding of the case by the patient or the patient's relatives should help the doctor in administering effective treatment.

Good science reporting can also alert the public to health hazards and to early symptoms of diseases such as cancer and diabetes. There are science writers who know of instances where a story they wrote about some recently developed drug was the means of calling it to the attention of a patient and his doctor in an out-of-the-way place. Many scientists and medical men cooperate with science reporters in the job of describing the things of science and medicine to the public. But there are still too many rhubarbs on the science beat.

Some scientists still have the impression that science writers think—and write—only in terms of the melodramatic and the bizarre, generously sprinkled with inaccuracies. Rarely, however, can they cite specific instances. Most of their inhibitions are throw-backs to the bygone days when some newspapers kidded science and scien-

tists, or sketched their doings with a lurid pen. Today, the average science reporter plays a science story for what it's worth. He doesn't strain to be cute or melodramatic, but if there is humor or drama inherent in the story, he plays that to the hilt, too. If his facts are straight—and he bends over backward to try to make them so—his one thought is to present them in the most readable fashion from the standpoint of a layman. He hopes the scientists will like his story, too, but he's writing primarily for people who do not necessarily have any background in the subject discussed.

Most of the men and women who report science for newspapers and magazines belong to the National Association of Science Writers (NASW), which was organized in 1934 for the express purpose of promoting accurate, responsible science reporting. The organization has grown from a virtual handful of charter members to close to 150 active and associate members today. The NASW is affiliated with the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE; but, to my knowledge, no member has ever allowed that affiliation to influence his writing toward the over-technical side of the fence.

How does the science writer know what is interesting and readable to a layman? Well, if you'll pardon the obvious, he's a layman himself. Although he associates a lot with scientists and has close personal friends among them, most of his cronies are laymen—and he knows what interests them. Personally, I sometimes try some of my stories "for size" on the fellows around the office or on neighbors who come into my house—and if I detect a faraway look in their eyes, I junk the story.

So far as I know, no definitive public opinion poll has ever been taken to determine *exactly* what *all* readers want in the way of story content and presentation. But a newsman who has read all kinds of papers for years has a fairly good idea of the type of story that is used by most papers. And you can't get away from the conclusion that papers wouldn't be using them if their publishers were not sure that the stories were the kind liked by their readers.

The National Association of Science Writers recently helped conduct a poll of newspaper editors to determine their preferences among different kinds of sci-

ence stories. Medicine and health stories ranked high. Scientific polls like that, conducted on still other questions in the science-writing field, should prove increasingly helpful. The science-writers have every confidence that they have the right slant in presenting their stories, but, like the man in the laboratory, they are continually seeking specific evidence.

It has sometimes been stated by scientists that popular presentation of science should be done by the scientists themselves, *not* by laymen. In fact, when Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, decided years ago that everyday people were interested in science and that science could be handled just like any other news, a scientific friend suggested that Cooper get a scientist and train him to be a reporter. "No," said Cooper, "we'll do it the other way: we'll take a good reporter and train him, in effect, to be a scientist." Cooper was one of the pioneers in introducing straight reporting of science in newspapers and magazines, and the idea has paid off richly.

Although there are brilliant exceptions, most scientists simply cannot write the type of article that makes for good reading by the laity. It's not that they can't handle the English language; it's just that they are accustomed to talking most of the time in scientific jargon. Even some of the down-to-earth men I interview are occasionally inclined to throw in a few "one-to-the-minus-tenths" in the course of our conversation. Fortunately a science reporter can translate that in writing his piece, but it gives you an idea of the fast curves the scientists might throw in writing for popular consumption themselves.

Now and then I get a so-called abstract of a scientific paper from a scientist who tries to be helpful by writing it in what he thinks is good journalese. Invariably, it's not so hot, to put it mildly. Most of the writing done by scientists is for their own scientific journals, and I sometimes think that even within their own lodge they could make some improvements. I speak especially of the writing in journals of scientific organizations whose memberships include scientists in every field. You can't tell me that a physicist always knows what a chemist is talking about; or that a geologist is hep on all the phraseology of zoology.

The technique of the science reporter, who attempts to make his articles understandable to everyone of average intelligence, might well be adopted by the scientists in their own league. In fact, it might step up circulation.

Speaking of "abstracts" supplied by scientists to reporters—and I use the words "abstracts" and "supplied" advisedly—there's another big problem. In covering big scientific meetings, where several hundred different papers may be presented at scores of different sessions, it's obviously a physical impossibility for the best legman in the world to cover everything personally. He should be supplied *in advance of the meeting* with full texts, or at least fairly comprehensive digests, of what the scientists are to discuss. This enables him to pick the best news possibilities from among them. Sometimes he can work directly from the paper or abstract to get his story; often he may have to interview the scientist to get further explanation. But at least his battle plan can be outlined in advance.

Many scientists try to cooperate with the reporters. But some of them are fuss-budgets about minor things. Some of them have sincere fears about being made to appear to be publicity seekers merely because they talk to reporters. They forget that reporters may be just seeking additional information on something the scientist has already reported at a scientific meeting or in a technical journal. If their scientific colleagues condemn them for that, scientific organizations should do something about protecting their men from such criticism.

Some of the top medical and scientific organizations have issued policy statements urging their members to cooperate fully with responsible reporters. That's all to the good; but there ought to be more of it.

All in all, however, the science-writing job is nice going, and it looks like an exciting future. Who knows? Perhaps we'll someday go on a press junket to the moon!—From *Science*, April 18, 1952.

Frank Carey has been covering national assignments for the Associated Press for half a dozen years. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1947, won the Westinghouse award for science writing for 1948.