

# **Nieman Reports**

---

April, 1952

## **THE JAPANESE PRESS— PROBLEM OF FREEDOM**

**Robert P. Martin**

**The Great Untold Story - City Hall**

**Oxie Reichler**

**The Cult of Incredibility**

**David M. White**

**Al Capp Views the Networks**

**Legacy of Scripps**

**Kenneth Stewart and John Tebbel**

**It Is a Bigger Job to Get Out  
A Constructive Newspaper**

**Donovan M. Richardson**

**License Tax and Press Freedom**

**Robert W. Brown**

**When Is a Gift Not a Gift?**

**Richard Neuberger**

**Sensible Newswriting**

**James E. Sellers**

**Reviews — Scrapbook — Letters — Nieman Notes —  
Iowa Doctors' News Code — AP at the Grass Roots**

*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. VI NO. 2

APRIL, 1952

## Down Where the People Live

by William F. Johnston

The opinion has been offered that the AP continuing study committees on the national level have gone about as far as they can go in charting the main courses of improvement. If that is true in broad terms, then we must go down to the roots to accomplish the job we have set for ourselves. The problem is to nourish the roots.

Just a week ago I was making a speech to the dozen or so reporters and desk men on the staff of our little newspaper in northern Idaho.

I told them it is a great honor and a terrible responsibility to be a reporter. It is a very great and very difficult thing to give society the information it must have to make sound decisions. It is a tremendous undertaking to tell the truth to society, for truth is elusive. We are not wise enough; we do not know enough; we do not understand enough to do the job we have to do. We are not good enough and we never will be good enough. For if men and women have any importance—if society has any meaning—then we who provide the information society lives by, must be forever humble. We can be proud, too, for it is a great work we do. But it is easy to be proud. It is hard to be humble.

My own humility is also the humility of the grass roots. The small town newspaper lives close to the people it serves. There are two alternative consequences to living close to people. One is frustration, cynicism and despair and this is unworthy of a newspaper. The other is humility. This is the humility of the grass roots.

There is another thing about the small town. It suffers less than the great city from the fragmentation of society. This, it seems to me, is what has been worrying us chiefly

**William F. Johnston**, managing editor of the Lewiston (Idaho) *Morning Tribune*, made this talk at the 1951 AP Managing Editors Conference at San Francisco.

in our AP discussions. We are profoundly concerned because society is breaking up into fragments with which we have lost personal contact.

The gadgets of civilization have assisted in this fragmentation. The telephone has helped men avoid the necessity of looking people in the eye. The six-lane highways have helped disperse society. The radio, the multiple-edition newspaper, the television screen, have helped train our citizens to see life in little, disconnected, frothy snatches. And we have, of course, become over-organized. Society has divided into ever smaller groups to pursue separately their ever smaller objectives.

So our citizens seek meaning and a thread of unity in life. They look to us, chiefly, because there is no other town hall left except the newspaper where all can meet to learn about each other, to inform and explain and inspire. The citizens gather every morning over their home town newspapers.

They gather only in the privacy of their homes. They may not stay long for the meeting. But if the newspaper is good enough to hold its community together even briefly we have accomplished something important. Where else can all the citizens gather daily to get the information they live by? What other force is there than the newspaper to help them to quit seeing life in snatches and begin to see it steadily and whole? Where else can society gather again *together* as a *unit* to learn what it needs to know?

Down on Main street our readers are not merely the audience to be kept in the house. They also are the neighbors to be understood, instructed, encouraged and argued with. The divisions of society still are there, but they can be seen more plainly. Sometimes they can be patched up more easily.

We on Main Street, if we could learn to do our job, could once again tell people about each other. We could help them get acquainted. We wouldn't need public relations experts with handouts to introduce us to our neighbors. We wouldn't need to fight the censors alone because our neighbors would help us fight. We wouldn't be afraid of entertainment mediums because our neighbors want us to do a bigger job than merely entertain. We could meet with them every morning across the breakfast table and tell them what they did and what their fellows across the nation and across the world had accomplished or failed to accomplish the day before.

We know how to build an honest, interesting, informative newspaper which our citizens will read and believe. We know how it should be done.

And now—if we value our newspapers and value the Associated Press—we can only try day in and day out to do it—down in the grass roots—down where the people live. Let us be forever proud of the job we have to do—and forever humble about our ability to do it.

# THE JAPANESE PRESS (Post-MacArthur)

by Robert P. Martin

***Reformed, democratized and superficially freed, the new newspapers of Japan are three times as many as pre-war. But they have never developed solid advertising support and now face the problem of making their new freedom effective. Robert P. Martin was a correspondent in Japan and China through the war and the occupation. He is now a Nieman Fellow at Harvard.***

Not too many years ago, one of Japan's largest newspapers published what was considered a notable "scoop," a report on the methods of seduction practiced by a highly respected ex-prime minister. It was incomparably superior, in detail and suggestion, to the lurid stories of the sex life of other Japanese leaders then appearing in competing newspapers. The essay, a classic in erotic reporting, has not since been equalled in a press that was almost universally guilty of sensationalism.

Japan's post-war press, superficially freed, reformed and democratized, has been weaned from this sensationalism and its other major characteristic, unreliability. It is, however, still boisterous and, in many respects, delightfully uninhibited. An appalling amount of scarce newsprint is devoted to sex and crime news—to the neglect of important national and international events. But Japanese editorials and commentaries are more widely read, and probably more influential in moulding public opinion, than ever before.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, early in the days of the occupation, said "now that the fetters of feudalism are unloosed, a press which will freely and adequately mirror the aspirations of the people will be created." Tremendous effort and incalculable man-hours were expended by American officials during the process of unfettering, or re-educating, Japanese newspapermen. It is still too early to judge whether the press will remain free and grow stronger, just as it is too early to determine finally the impact of the occupation and an alien way of life on a defeated Eastern people.

National character and the convolutions of history had combined to produce that unlovely phenomenon, Japan's modern press. William J. Coughlin (*Conquered Press*, to be published later this year by *Pacific Books*)\* describes it briefly and tellingly: "An important but irresponsible press which had played a major part in Japan's climb to totalitarian power, a press in the grip of reactionaries who cooperated with tight government control, a press with many features extremely alien to the American concept of a properly functioning press, a press in which years of printing only what the militarists wanted affected the

caliber of Japanese editors and reporters, and yet a press which included some of the world's largest newspapers."

One of the major tasks of the occupation was to destroy this decrepit structure and to build anew. There was trouble almost from the moment when Japanese newsmen interviewed the first American paratroopers disembarking from troop carrier planes at Atsugi airport. A rash of stories reported that American soldiers were looting and raping with wild abandon. The press hinted that the Japanese government was negotiating with MacArthur and advising him on how to conduct a successful but brief occupation. SCAP (Supreme Command Allied Powers) thereupon ordered the Japanese government to "prevent the dissemination of news which fails to adhere to the truth or which disturbs the public tranquillity."

It was soon obvious that the Japanese government had interpreted this as an order to exercise strict control over the content of news and editorial columns. Another SCAP order was issued, forbidding the government to censor, suppress or control any form of public opinion, spoken or written. Reporters Clubs, or "closed shop" organizations, subsidized by various government branches and controlling all news sources within these branches, were dissolved. Subsidies to news agencies were ordered withdrawn.

American censorship, supposedly enlightened and non-political, was substituted for Japanese. The results were not always salutary. Censors deleted discussion of strikes in America, the changing policies of President Truman and the deterioration in Soviet-American relations. Only after MacArthur's personal intervention was the Madison Square Garden speech of the then Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, cleared for publication.

One of the more absurd bans was against the phrase "occupation costs" in reference to the budget. Presumably this was to keep the Japanese from knowing how expensive it was to lose a war. Occupation costs were thereafter lumped with a number of budgetary items under "other items." The camouflage deceived no one. But it did create the false impression among the Japanese that more than half of the government's expenditures was for the "housekeeping" of Allied soldiers.

The ultimate absurdity came direct from the desk of Major General Charles A. Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief. At a moment when MacArthur's prestige was at its highest, American censors approved an editorial urging the people to "stand on their own feet and discard hero-worship." The editorial, distributed by a news agency, was published in most of the Japanese-language press. Several days later, the English-language *Nippon Times* republished the editorial. Willoughby read the editorial and ordered the press run halted. Military police seized copies of an earlier edition from a train already enroute to Osaka. Willoughby's defense: "The editorial was not in good taste."

MacArthur's headquarters subsequently abandoned all censorship while making it generally known that freedom did not mean license to criticize the occupation. But the Japanese government had shown considerable appreciation of the "benefits" of control, and made two major efforts to place limitations on freedom of the press.

The government interpreted the Election Law as prohibiting editorial criticism of or comments on parties or candidates during pre-election campaigning. Editors were instructed to give equal space to competing parties. Bitter opposition by the newspapers and the disapproval of occupation authorities forced the government to withdraw this interpretation. But the law is still on the books.

The second, and more important, attempt to control the press was initiated by Premier Shigeru Yoshida, a long-time foe, as well as target, of Japan's newspapers. Yoshida hoped to enact in full the 1945 occupation press code and to enforce it, once Japan regains her sovereignty. This press code included provisions such as "news must adhere strictly to the truth," that "nothing must be published which might disturb public tranquillity," and "minor details" of news must not be overemphasized as a means of developing any specific propaganda line.

Japanese editors, recalling their country's previous history of "thought control" and government absolutism in the realm of information, insisted that a press code would be turned into an instrument of total control. Yoshida, under pressure from both the press and the occupation, temporarily dropped the proposal.

On two occasions the Japanese government, with the approval of the occupation, adopted measures which certainly did not protect or extend freedom of the press. More than 500 newspapermen lost their jobs during the MacArthur-Yoshida "purge" of Communists and fellow travellers from all vital industries, power, communications, railroads, etc. The end may have justified the means, coming as it did just before and during the Korean war. The purge was designed primarily to remove any threat to the United Nations base in Japan. But the means violated the principles of democratic justice and the Constitution:

no hearings were held and there was no appeal from the purge.

A majority of those fired were probably Communists, but a number of non-Communist editorial writers who had opposed rearmament and a peace treaty excluding both Russia and Communist China also lost their jobs. Japanese editors believed that this precedent could form the basis for a continuing purge of critical newspapermen in the future.

In 1949, the Japanese government used its control of newsprint to hack at the circulation of *Akahata*, the Communist organ. *Akahata* was reclassified as a party newspaper rather than one of general circulation. The government then allocated newsprint to parties, not newspapers, on the basis of the votes the party received at the last general election. Since the Communists had been soundly defeated in that election, the allocation for the Reds was greatly reduced. The other parties were given larger allocations; even parties which had no newspaper at all were given newsprint.

During the war the Japanese government had exercised life-and-death power over the press through the Nippon Newspaper Association's control of newsprint allocation. Many of the provincial newspapers were either closed down or forced to merge simply by denying them newsprint. But no Japanese editor commented on the similarity of the action taken during the war and that of 1949. None publicly stated that an occupation-approved precedent had been established for control of newspapers for political purposes.

One of the major press policies of the occupation was to ensure decentralization by establishing more newspapers, both weekly and daily, in the various prefectures. About 150 of these prefectural papers are being published, triple the war-time number, and more than double the total circulation. There are now nearly 3,000 newspapers of all types with a total circulation of 38 million. Thus Japan is no longer dominated by the Big Three, *Yomiuri* (2,017,000) and *Asahi* and *Mainichi* (each more than 4,000,000).

It is still uncertain, however, whether the prefectural press can survive the long-term competition of the Big Three. Newsprint rationing protected the smaller papers. With the end of rationing, however, the Big Three, with their much larger financial resources, may dominate the newsprint supply and drive the smaller papers into bankruptcy.

This points up one of the major weaknesses of the prefectural press, a weakness that is shared to some extent by the metropolitan press. This is the historical failure to develop newspapers as a recognized advertising medium. *Yomiuri*, for instance, estimates that 55 per cent of its

income is from circulation, 35 per cent from advertising and 10 per cent from job printing.

In the smaller cities, especially, publishers have a congenital dislike of soliciting advertising. To some degree, "face" is the basis of the problem. Many advertising managers feel they lose "face" if they fail to sell a prospective client. On the other hand, Japan has had long experience with "gangster" newspapers, which solicit advertising under threat of blackmail. Many businessmen regard advertising of all types as protection against press attacks rather than a means of selling their products.

Mr. Coughlin, in his admirable and well-documented, although somewhat biased, book, concludes: "One of the strongest watchdogs over the infant democracy General MacArthur has left behind will be the press of Japan." Many Japanese editors would support this conclusion. One, more cynical than most, evaluated the situation to me as follows:

"The government probably will not consider any of the newspapers very dangerous, even when critical," he said. "Essentially, the major papers represent the class (businessmen and conservatives) which is the strongest support of the government. The newspapers will criticize the government, but this is primarily sound business practice. Readers would lose interest and confidence in newspapers if they didn't change their pace occasionally and slam into government. Even the exposes of corruption hit at the bureaucracy rather than the (Yoshida) government. No one demands Yoshida's resignation for condoning the scandals."

To the writer, this viewpoint seems to lack perspective. Probably not more than 15 of the leading newspapers are in a financially strong position. The "Big Three" have purchased or made "satellites" of several smaller newspapers. Rising costs, the result of too large staffs retained because of the deep-rooted paternalism of Japanese employer philosophy, as well as the growing shortage and increased price of newsprint, are bound to drive a number of newspapers into bankruptcy or merger.

Finally, there is no reason to be enthusiastically optimistic about the ability of Japan's press to remain free. A free press functions only in a free society. Six years of foreign military rule, no matter how benevolent, is hardly conducive to an understanding of how to defend freedom. Japanese newspapermen still fear and bow to authority. A show-down between the government and the press may not come soon, simply because the Japanese government will be careful not to antagonize American public opinion. But when the pressure comes, the Japanese press will need all its courage, as well as dramatic support from America, if it is to remain free.

\*Conquered Press, by William J. Coughlin. Pacific Books, Palo Alto, Calif.

## Rx For Rules of Thumb

by Clay Schoenfeld

In city rooms around the country, reporters and copy editors follow certain rules-of-thumb which generally are of value but which occasionally trip newspapermen into presenting a distorted version of events.

One such rule is that every accident occurring on the Fourth of July is to be treated as being a direct result of holiday excesses. Another rule is the unwritten law that every death occurring during a sub-zero cold snap is to be lumped into a roundup story on how "the weather claims *x number* of lives."

The journalistic rule-of-thumb with which this research report is directly concerned is the common city-desk assumption that the big story inevitably to be exploited, come the deer-hunting season each year, is the mounting toll of deer hunters dead from gunshot. This state-of-mind has frequently led journalists—in Wisconsin, at least—to distort the facts regarding deer-season fatalities. All manner of fatalities occurring in or near the deer country have been lumped together by reporters and headline writers in order to build a striking roundup story on the deer season death toll. Headlines and leads have created the impression that "so many" hunters were killed by bullets. Readers who have followed down into the stories have found, however, that the hunter toll was actually 40 per cent heart attack and 20 per cent myth!

The 1949 Wisconsin deer season opened Saturday, Nov. 19. The next day a leading Wisconsin daily reported in a top-front headline that the deer season had already accounted for five lives. Headline scanners undoubtedly got the impression that five hunters had been hit by bullets. But the actual facts were these:

Two elderly deer hunters had died of heart attack.

A mother and her 11-year-old son had been killed in a train-car crash in the deer-hunting territory.

A 15-year-old boy had accidentally shot himself while cleaning his squirrel rifle in town.

In other words, not one of an estimated 283,000 deer hunters in the state of Wisconsin was killed by a bullet while hunting on opening day in 1949. That was news! But that wasn't the angle played up by reporters and headline writers, who were misled by an old rule-of-thumb.

The pattern of deer-season coverage in Wisconsin in 1950 was much the same as in 1949. A representative daily picked up the story Monday morning, Nov. 20, with a head which said: "Six Dead in Opening Days of Deer Season."

---

Clay Schoenfeld is lecturer in journalism at the University of Wisconsin, assistant director of the U.W. News Service, and a frequent contributor to the outdoor magazines.

Readers who got down to paragraph four discovered that *four* of the six were heart-attacks victims, not gunshot hunters.

Outside of the obvious ethical considerations for transmitting facts rather than impressions, there are at least three reasons why it behooves newspapermen to revise their rule-of-thumb on deer-season coverage:

1. Undue emphasis in the press on deer-season fatalities may serve to deter many hunters from venturing into the woods. Yet sound conservation today calls for harvesting more deer, not less. Almost all of the major deer states are plagued with herds which have multiplied beyond the capacity of the range to support them.

2. The preponderance of fatal heart attacks over fatal gunshots in the deer woods suggests that press emphasis might well shift to repeated warnings to hunters to "take it easy." Newspapers could perform a significant public service by pointing out at opportune times that "sudden physical exertion to which the body is not accustomed" is the way doctors describe one of the major causes of heart attack.

3. Sportsmen's organizations are strenuously attempting to teach the rules of outdoor safety to deer-tag holders. The progress they are making deserves coverage, lest they lose heart in the face of stories which create the impression

that the situation is getting worse, when actually it is steadily improving.

The deer hunter who is a victim of a stray bullet will always rate front-page copy in the deer states, but the above data suggest that newspapermen might well re-evaluate their standards of treatment of the annual deer-season story in the interests of accuracy, fairness, and responsibility.

Professor Bruce Westley suggests this solution to the "rule-of-thumb" problem to his copy-desk students in the University of Wisconsin's School of Journalism:

"No solid editor these days wants to tell a story in anything less—or more—than its most meaningful form. Certainly he will not consciously distort facts to make a little bigger story.

"Why not in a news story separate fatalities into *direct* and *indirect* effects of the event in question? Thus the old heart-attack foolishness would not count as a direct result of a snowstorm, for instance, even though the old codgers were shovelling snow at the time. The same would apply to heart attacks during the hunting season.

"Furthermore, why not make comparisons which lend meaning to the current figures? Shooting statistics could easily be accompanied by a 'this time last year' figure. Ditto for holiday fatalities. Some editors advocate that holiday weekend deaths be compared with the previous non-holiday weekend of the same length."

## The Community Weekly—Is It Printshop or Newspaper?

by Walter Wilcox

**WANTED:** A new concept of the community weekly.

In recent issues of *Nieman Reports*, both Charles T. Duncan of the University of Oregon and Evan Hill of Boston University explored the following problem: Is the community newspaper a springboard or a career for the aspiring young newspaperman? That problem, it was agreed, is a challenge to the community press.

Many, but by no means all, journalism educators assume that preparation for the metropolitan field, augmented by sparse survey courses, automatically qualifies the student for work in "lesser" fields. Experience proves the opposite. It's easier for the top-notch weekly man to acclimate himself to the metropolitan paper, than for the successful big city news man to meet the myriad demands of the weekly. Country journalism is a field of itself, not a seedy country cousin of the metropolitan press. Its rewards and satisfactions, its difficulties and heartaches differ widely from those of the metropolitan paper.

Will the country weekly publisher of the next generation visualize himself as a quasi-public official through whom the goals of the community find an ordered voice? Or as a combination small-time advertising salesman, country-comic reporter, and commercial printer?

Perhaps the greatest single need of the country weekly is an infusion of new blood to combat the antiquated system in which the mechanical consideration is dominant. Young Joe Ambition aspires to ownership of his truly own country weekly. From watching the for-sale ads, he knows many fairly sound properties are on the block at prices roughly parallel to good homes, although down payments are considerably higher. But there remains a formidable obstacle. For a sporting crack at success, Joe must be something of a printer. So, he is advised, prepare yourself thoroughly; learn something about the linotype, the casting box, and the flatbed press. Joe thinks the linotype is something that shouldn't happen to Juan Peron, and wonders why civilization still tolerates the flatbed press. But he sets aside his typewriter and camera, and he learns the backshop.

Now where are Joe's cherished plans for his brave new paper? They're dissipating over a box of hot metal, or shunted aside while Joe argues with a linotype squirt. All too much time and energy are sapped through the technological monstrosity.

**WANTED:** By the weekly press, a simple new method of producing newspapers in order to relieve young publisher who has other things to do.

# The Great Untold Story --- City Hall

by Oxie Reichler

How does a city get a reputation—for good or bad? The most effective way I know is by a news item. Just a string of words—largely factual, a little interpretative when necessary—written in words easy to understand and printed in type easy to read.

I say a good news item is the best promoter of any community. So is a good feature story. So is a good picture, and so is a good editorial. And so, also, is a good and attractive advertisement—of the kind we see Rockford, Illinois, place in the New York papers or Dallas, Texas, in the *Wall Street Journal*.

I would say that each paper holds it in its power to give its community a good press—first in its own pages, and then on the wire services and in other media—radio, TV, magazines.

Let me show you what I mean by a few examples. If I draw from my own experience, it is only because a man likes to talk about that which he knows best.

Within the last few days, the city of Yonkers, N. Y., wanted to borrow some extra cash—short-term stuff—some for one year, some for two. It asked for bids on budget notes to cover this little sum—nearly half a million dollars.

How many banks would bid? What interest rate would be offered? Yonkers is very much interested in such things because it was only fifteen years ago that we used to get down on our knees and beg to borrow money at six per cent.

Five banks—including two famous ones in New York—competed for the business. Know what the lowest bid was?

Two-fifths of one per cent a year (.4 per cent).

That's because we have made the long, hard trek from being one of the worst-governed cities in America to a position where we are among the best-governed—and where even Dun & Bradstreet pay us compliments. We have earned a reputation as a good investment, as rating good credit.

The news of that borrowing is a fine promotion for our city. So is our editorial comment. The important thing is that it is the result of a daily stream of news items about the city's housekeeping—news about it when it was bad, news about what was being done to clean up—the civic story that was on Page One every day over a period of years.

In many newspaper offices, editors and reporters seem unwilling to look the civic story squarely in the eye, to

go after it, to get it, to turn it into living and exciting copy.

I found that too often even the Common Council and the School Board are covered with a routine that is deadly and dull—thus failing to inform or stimulate, because the stuff does not even get read—by most readers.

If you doubt that City Hall is often the great untold story of America, thumb through your own paper during the next few days and hunt the civic story. If it's there, did you read it, or skip it? Did your wife read it? How was it written? How was it displayed? How headlined? Did it read at least as entertainingly as the latest boxing match or crime story? If not, why not?

I happen to believe that City Hall news belongs on Page One—and that it rates that position if it's properly presented. I happen to believe that this is an important factor in giving a community its proper promotion.

Where is the story of Philadelphia's current crawl out of its mess? And Boston's? Where is the inspiring story of San Antonio, come to a climax only a day before yesterday? Where are the stimulating stories of Long Beach, N. Y., Des Moines, Iowa, Hartford, Conn., Kansas City, Mo., and so on and on?

Where, moreover, is there even any hint of the vast revolution that is going on all over America at the state government level? What promotion it all would make for these cities and states—and for ours too—and, most of all, for America!

\* \* \*

Community promotion comes from a newspaper—the home town paper—that dedicates itself to tell its *civic* stories with the rest. For proper promotion, we must give that news and comment which will stimulate and inspire citizens of unquestioned ability and integrity to take part, to enter the political parties, to run for office.

That kind of paper examines the competencies of people running for office. It recommends choices. It asks each candidate to prepare a statement of 200 to 300 words to give his own qualifications for office. It lists things that are done and undone, those that ought to be done and why, and it asks candidates to go on record about each item.

It encourages think-pieces by the reporters in City Hall, the County Building and the State Capitol—to surmise, to interpret, to argue, to discuss. Thus it tries to give meaning to the handouts, and to put some flesh on the bare bones of news.

There is something else. If a newspaper is fully aware of the promotional value in the civic story—for the community and for the paper—it may well re-examine its at-

---

Oxie Reichler is editor of the Yonkers (N.Y.) *Herald Statesman*. This is from a talk to the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association, October 5, 1951.

titude toward the people who step forward to help civic improvement.

In all these cities—including my own—independent men and women risk much by the plunge into politics or government. There is the abuse from those who feel they *own* the parties and the government. There is the curious reaction among their own friends and relatives—who still regard meddling in politics as something unsavory for “good people.”

Alas, too many newspaper people adopt this callous—and extremely dangerous—view. Too many of us are altogether too chummy with the politically entrenched. Too many of us look at a high-minded man or woman who is inspired to public service as a freak, a reformer—a nut. Thus Americans who dare to breast entrenched political machines are confronted with an especially cruel attitude from newspaper reporters and executives—among whom they might reasonably expect special understanding and encouragement.

\* \* \*

Once a newspaper steps out with understanding, with sympathy, with helpful aid to those citizens who seek to promote the welfare of their community unselfishly, exciting things begin to happen.

See what the Philadelphia papers have been accomplishing to get their city a much-needed charter improvement. In Connecticut, the Hartford papers have been giving such leadership both for local and state improvement. In Missouri, the Kansas City *Star* has been a mighty force in stripping the Pendergast machine's control and in making Kansas City one of the better-governed places.

The Richmond papers lifted that Virginia city out of a sodden political mess. It had been usual for only 3,000 persons to vote in city elections (interestingly enough, there were 3,000 city employes). Now Richmond has climbed up. Municipal voting brings out more than 35,000. The Denver *Post* has been doing distinguished things for that Colorado metropolis—with promotion that has overflowed far beyond Denver, to include the entire Rocky Mountain Empire.

Dotting the nation are similar newspapers which have chosen to lead readers to improve and promote their community. So it is all over the land, wherever a good newspaper—doing a very good job—is the best publicity agent the community could possibly want.

\* \* \*

Page One can be a bridge between the community—its life and its government and its people—and the mind of the individual citizen.

It is a sacred assignment which can be done best—perhaps alone—by the newspaper that accepts the role of community conscience. It is an assignment that must not be fumbled.

## The Cult of Incredibility

by David Manning White

Thomas Jefferson, in a famous letter to Edward Carrington, wrote his much-quoted line “were it left to me to decide whether we should have government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.” Yet few of the Fourth-of-July orators and self-styled champions of press freedom will recall that Jefferson also wrote another letter some seven years later, this time to James Madison, in which he said: “I have never seen a Philadelphia paper since I left it till those you enclosed me; and I feel myself so thoroughly weaned from the interest I took in the proceedings there, while there, that I have never had a wish to see one, and believe that I shall never take another newspaper of any sort.”

It was regrettable that so truly a believer in the great potentiality of the press in the United States should have been brought to such a conclusion. But the unrelenting calumny of the opposition press soured Mr. Jefferson on the practical workability of the press as a rational tool of democracy.

If Jefferson were to come back to his America today, I think he would find much in the press that would encourage him to regain new high hopes for it. On the other hand, he would find some of the corrosive evils of his own time tied up in a new package, speeded and magnified by the miracle of modern-day communications, but nevertheless evil to the republic and the press alike.

Jefferson would be pleased by what we call “objective” reporting, at least he would be the first few hours of his visit.

But the thing that would disturb Jefferson, I believe, is what I term the *cult of incredibility* which has permeated the American press, exploiting its honest aim of objective reporting, and just as deadly in its effect of character-assassination as the vilest mud-slinging of Jefferson's time.

Here is the way the cult of incredibility operates. A figure of potential national prominence makes a speech or holds a press conference; or utilizing congressional immunity if he is a member of that body, he levels a shotgun blast at his latest target. This figure may be a virtual unknown on the national scene until his first such blast, but it catches the attention of the press in such a way that he is soon a mighty newsworthy figure. The press may unwittingly create a Frankenstein's monster, and has on more than one occasion. But once they have

---

David Manning White is research professor of journalism at Boston University.

built up this figure he is the master of the press and not its servant, because he is a creator of news in himself. And after that, whether the press likes it or not they have to listen and report what he says. Some listen and report because they like what the demagogue says, because in their intense partisanship they welcome the aid of any man who will discredit their "foes." But these are in the minority, and most members of the press soon feel distaste for the demagogue and are intensely dubious of his motives. Yet they must continue to cover his every utterance lest their competitor give the public the coverage. And this large majority of sincere members of the press can always rationalize their continued coverage of the demagogue by the familiar label of "objective" reporting.

The tool of the demagogue is to use language in a way that suggests that the target of his remarks has committed the most perfidious of acts. He knows that the newspapers which will cover his speeches, press-conferences or obiter dicta (and he always calculates when his remarks will get maximum coverage), can write their stories in many different ways. He is aware that credibility and incredibility can be one and the same thing if you can razzle-dazzle enough smear-words, rumors, conjectures into print often enough and in large enough type.

On February 11, 1952, the Associated Press dispatched a story from Washington on its national wire which illustrates the cult of incredibility operating at full power. The lead of the story said that Leon H. Keyserling states that a story by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin is "utter nonsense" and "entirely false." After identifying Leon Keyserling as chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, the story has a paragraph which I quote in full, so well does it illustrate how the "objective" reporter of the Associated Press has presented conjectures, half-facts and innuendos in the same "objective" way that he would report the price of wheat on the Chicago grain exchange.

"At Wheeling, W. Va., Senator McCarthy told a Republican Women's Club that secret and previously undisclosed congressional testimony by an unidentified witness showed Mr. Keyserling had once talked with a Communist Party organizer. Senator McCarthy quoted the witness as saying they discussed Communist philosophy but Mr. Keyserling was not asked to join because he did not agree with all its principles."

Let's break down one part of this paragraph, and let  $x$  equal fact,  $y$  equal irrelevancies and  $z$  equal unsubstantiated, unproved allegations.

The facts would read: Senator McCarthy told that Mr. Keyserling had talked.

With irrelevancies added: Senator McCarthy told a Re-

publican Women's Club (at Wheeling, W. Va.) that Mr. Keyserling had talked.

Had the above statement been written as follows it would have been as *factual* as the AP version: "At Alibozo, N. Da., Senator McCarthy told a Republican Kennel Club that vociferous and unknown ecclesiastical heresy by an egotistical onlooker showed Mr. Keyserling had once talked with an imaginary pink elephant which had Communist printed on its tail."

In fairness to the Associated Press story, 85 per cent of the story is devoted to a rebuttal of Senator McCarthy's speech by Mr. Keyserling. Yet what is there to refute? McCarthy has not called Keyserling a Communist, but merely strung together a series of conjectures which if true would make Keyserling appear a sinister figure. It makes no difference to McCarthy if Keyserling protests with vigor, because each time Keyserling does this, the newspaper with its "objective" reporting will have to recapitulate what McCarthy said originally. Perhaps some people who didn't hear the speech or read about it in the paper the first day will now read it. And if the target of McCarthy's blast has the temerity to protest his innocence and proceeds plausibly to do so, McCarthy has his ace-in-hole rejoinder, which goes along these lines: "Oh yes, my enemies scoffed at me when I pointed out that Alger Hiss was a Communist, too." (The fact that McCarthy had nothing to do with the conviction of Alger Hiss is conveniently forgotten.) Ergo, anybody who doubts what McCarthy says about Keyserling or Phillip Jessup or Dean Acheson or General Marshall should remember that Alger Hiss protested his innocence too.

There is no appeal to logic in stopping the pattern of incredibility, for it is patently and calculatedly an enemy of logic. Jefferson knew at first hand that there was no easy solution to this problem. Goaded beyond even his patient endurance when the Federalist press circulated the libel that he (Jefferson) had paid James Callender for calling Washington a traitor, a robber and a perjurer, Jefferson brought one of the small-fry Federalist editors to trial and saw him convicted. Yet even this conviction of Harry Crosswell brought no practical relief of any consequence to Mr. Jefferson, and what it cost him in peace of mind history does not record. But it is an ironic footnote to the story of freedom of the press in America that its great champion should have been convinced that a trial for seditious libel would correct a campaign of vilification.

Today, with the news function of the press carefully divorced from the editorial page, the demagogue knows that he is safe in pursuing his techniques. He knows that if the American press were to hold a general meeting and decide that they would not give space to any more of his speeches they would be establishing a dangerous prece-

dent. He knows inherently that the American press will not initiate any action to punish his flagrant misuses of "objective" reporting, because the precedent *is* a dangerous one. And yet as Mr. Justice Holmes pointed out in his famous decision in *Schenck vs. United States* "The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent." To which we might amend, or that an aroused American public opinion has a right to prevent.

The facts are clear that the American press in its attempt to report "objectively" Senator McCarthy or any other public figure who makes "news" becomes an unwitting or unwilling accomplice in the cult of incredibility. To prove what I am saying I asked the Minnesota Poll of Public Opinion, which is maintained by the Minneapolis *Tribune* as a public service, to poll the people of that state on the following question:

One of the men on this list is a leading Communist in the United States. Which one is he? John Foster Dulles, William Z. Foster, Phillip C. Jessup, Owen Lattimore, George Sokolsky.

The results of the poll showed that Jessup and Lattimore received more votes as a leading Communist than William Z. Foster, who is actually chairman of the Communist party in the United States and was indicted on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the government. A socio-economic breakdown of the poll showed that respondents with college education named Jessup as often as they did William Z. Foster, so the technique of incredibility works with the well-educated as well as those with less formal training. Less than one in five respondents knew that William Z. Foster was the *only* man on the list who might factually and legitimately be called a Communist. The demagogue might indeed be proud of his work and echoing the words of Marc Antony say, "Now let it work, Mischief thou art afoot, take thou what course thou wilt."

The job of the American press is to inform; not to create an atmosphere in which prejudice, half-truths and misinformation bloom with a noisome stench. The few attempts that have been made by the American press to de-bunk the cult of incredibility, as practiced by Senator McCarthy, have met with strong opposition from him. His appeal to advertisers to boycott *Time* magazine and now the Milwaukee *Journal* in turn has drawn fire in the editorial columns of the leading newspapers and even *Editor & Publisher*. Although I have not read all of these editorials I am sure that one of them must have pointed out the following syllogism:

a. Vishinsky, Malik and Co. have consistently smeared

the "decadent, capitalistic" American press, using as their main argument that it is controlled by advertisers.

- b. Senator McCarthy asks American advertisers to boycott publications which disagree or dare to contradict his point of view.
- c. Therefore, Senator McCarthy is asking the advertisers of America to prove what Vishinsky, Malik and Co. have charged all these years.

That the American press is becoming increasingly aware that there is a calculated pattern utilized by the practitioners of incredibility is a positive sign. Out of the alerted press will come, it is fervently hoped, the method by which this type of communications cancer can be checked.

## May 1 Is Deadline For Nieman Fellowship Applications

Harvard University has appointed three newspapermen to serve with three members of the University on the Selecting Committee for Nieman Fellowships in Journalism for the academic year 1952-1953.

The newspaper members are Wallace Carroll, executive editor, Winston-Salem (N.C.) *Journal and Sentinel*; Eugene S. Duffield, assistant publisher, Cincinnati *Enquirer*; and Victor O. Jones, night editor, Boston *Globe*. Jones is a former Nieman Fellow. The Harvard members of the Selecting Committee are David W. Bailey, secretary to the Harvard governing board; William M. Pinkerton, Director, Harvard News Office; and Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The Committee will select the 15th annual group of Nieman Fellows for one year of study at Harvard. Selections are made from applications which may be made to the Nieman Foundation at Harvard up to May 1. Fellowship awards will be announced in June, for the college year opening in September. About a dozen fellowships are awarded annually to newspapermen who must have at least three years' experience and secure leave of absence from their newspapers.

The Nieman Fellowships for journalism at Harvard were established in 1937 under the will of Agnes Wahl Nieman in honor of her late husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee *Journal*, "to promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the United States." Any field of study at Harvard University is open to a Nieman Fellow during his year on the fellowship. One hundred seventy newspapermen from 41 states and the District of Columbia and Hawaii have held Nieman Fellowships in the past 14 years.

## Al Capp Views the Networks

by Al Capp

The two main ways to communicate ideas in America are by press and radio. I've communicated with America both ways. I've found freedom of speech in the American press. I've found an immovable, frightening Iron Curtain in American radio and TV.

In Communist Russia, you think like the Kremlin thinks, or you'd better stop thinking—out loud, at least. On the American air, you think like your sponsor thinks—or he finds someone else who does.

That is why all the thinking that comes out of TV and radio—both from the frankly commentary and opinion programs—and the concealed “messages” in the entertainment shows represent the thinking of a small group of Americans—the group that sells the whisky and the girdles and the body odor glorifiers—just as all the thinking on Soviet radio represents the thinking of another small group in the Kremlin.

Now I think that minorities should have a voice. I am prepared to fight to the death for the rights of the men who make whisky or girdles or banish unpleasant smells—but I think us majorities have some rights, too.

In radio, the majority of Americans long ago exercised the one right we had left—the right not to listen.

I have every confidence that the unbeatable team of network and sponsor will make TV just as unbearable.

They are mighty proud when they have succeeded in getting five million sets turned into one show, instead of being ashamed that they've succeeded in getting twenty million sets turned off. The great idiocy of air surveys is that they rate only the preferences of the people who are listening. They neglect to find out why more millions, who have invested fortunes in their sets, have re-arranged their living rooms to accommodate 'em, who are desperate for decent entertainment, honest news shows, and yet who have been so bored, sickened and offended by the muck that comes out of their machines, that they turn the damned thing off, and read “Li'l Abner” instead.

After the Democratic primaries in New Hampshire, TV can no longer plead that it is merely an entertainment medium—and therefore has no responsibility to the nation—but only to the whisky distillers or the girdle architects. TV has demonstrated its impact on American thinking by creating a widely popular Presidential candidate out of a heretofore obscure Senator from Tennessee, who, because of a few appearances on TV, was able to beat the

pants off the President of the United States and the regular Democratic political machine.

TV, whether the men who run it like it or not, has become, along with the press, the most powerful means of communication (and therefore influence) in the United States. With power comes responsibility. The American press has by and large shouldered that responsibility. No advertisers can buy the editorial columns of any great American newspaper. Any advertiser can buy the editorial influence of any great American network, by buying time and making sure that the commentator who uses the time is their own obedient baby boy.

In this way, a tiny minority of national advertisers control most of our network time, and can, and do, pull an Iron Curtain down between the public and any views but their own.

It's dangerous—it's un-American. We don't want our thinking dictated to us, shaped for us, by any small group of Commisars, either from the Kremlin, or from the promotion department of a soap factory. It is up to the networks to realize, no matter how uncomfortable the idea is, that in TV they have one of the most powerful media of influence, and that this power must be used for all America, not just their sponsors.

Now the networks have every right to make a buck. It would be, in my opinion, disastrous for us to give control of TV to government. The air should remain, like the press, the property of private enterprise.

But, like the press, the air should be run in an American way—it mustn't, like Russian air, be the property of a small group. It should, like the American press, keep its influence a clean and unpurchasable influence. TV should remain a business—but a business as great in its dignity and honesty as it is in its influence—not a shabby, unprincipled racket that is willing to sell itself—and us—for thirty pieces of silver.

Well, I guess you won't be seeing me on any TV shows after THIS. At any rate, I'll still be seeing you in the funny papers.

---

This provocative statement by Al Capp was heard on March 12 by a Boston audience of several hundred. But the broadcasting and reporting facilities assigned to the meeting failed in their function. *Nieman Reports* thereupon offer Mr. Capp this medium for his views.

# The Legacy of Scripps

by Kenneth Stewart and John Tebbell

The following is a condensation of two chapters from *Makers of Modern Journalism*, a biographical history written by Kenneth Stewart and John Tebbell, on the Spring publication list of Prentice-Hall Inc. (New York).

The history of American Journalism throbs with rich tradition, heart-warming legend, and lofty purpose. Sometimes the glories of the past have been kept glowing; sometimes allowed to languish; sometimes fanned into new life; sometimes dissipated, traduced, and transmuted.

The spirit of Scripps is one of the richest legacies of the lot. Today the Detroit *News* and the Booth Newspapers in Michigan; the Scripps League of Newspapers in the Northwest; the John P. Scripps papers on the Pacific Coast, and, most importantly, the Scripps-Howard cross-country chain, with its allied interests, the United Press and three feature syndicates, all stem from the same family source. The towering genius in the journalistic clan that sparked these widespread enterprises was Edward Wyllis Scripps.

The promising young men he found as editors and business managers of his new papers were each entitled to purchase 10 per cent of the stock, if and when the paper began making reliable profits, and at the incorporating price, which usually was the actual amount of money invested in the property up to that time. Usually they did not have the money to pay for their stock, so the central office of the concern loaned it to them at 6 per cent interest.

These papers were typically rowdy, rambunctious little sheets, published on a shoestring in shabby quarters. Scripps was sad to see that as they grew prosperous they became conventional—perhaps cautious—and less concerned with the problems of working-class readers. He tried to stop this trend but, in most cases, succeeded only in modifying it or slowing it up.

Although he emphasized each paper's autonomy, E.W. did his utmost to train his editors to feel and think as he did. Each new editor went through a rugged period—often a month—as the Old Man's guest at Miramar. Every morning he listened to the Old Man talk. He returned to his paper inspired and stimulated and whether or not his own stamina or the circumstances surrounding his paper enabled him to carry out E.W.'s principles, he never forgot what the Old Man said.

From his retirement, E. W. Scripps wrote to his son, Bob, in 1924:

It is my opinion that the value of the properties over which you exercise control might well in-

crease manifold if your chief aim were merely to cause increase in wealth.

However, I repeat now what I told you when I first launched you in your career: That I would prefer that you should succeed in being in all things a gentleman, according to the real meaning of the word, than that you should vastly increase the money value of my estate. Being a gentleman, you cannot fail to devote your whole mind and energy to the service of the plain people who constitute the vast majority of the people of the United States. . . . You are, and can be, continually, entirely free from any temptation to cater to any class of your fellow citizens for profit. You have not nor should you at any time ever have any ambition to secure political and social eminence.

E.W.'s will left to Robert Paine Scripps, the only surviving son, controlling interest in papers in fifteen states, the United Press Associations, the Newspaper Enterprise Association, Acme Newsphotos, United Features Syndicate, newspaper mechanical and supply properties. With Robert Scripps at the editorial helm, business management had been entrusted to Roy W. Howard.

To an extraordinary degree E. W. Scripps left his heirs free to make what they would of the papers he built; the trust instruments gave great power and discretion to the trustees.

Back in the days when E. W. Scripps was courting Nackie Holtsinger in the Ohio countryside near Cincinnati, a tollgate stretched across the road at Gano between his boarding house and Nackie's home. In his impatience to see her, Ed usually jumped his horse over the gate or the hedge alongside or turned off into the field. He paid little heed to the Scottish family of Wilsons who lived in the cottage there, even though daughter Elizabeth had been Nackie's schoolmate.

Some years later, Scripps learned that Roy Howard, by then a reporter on the Scripps Cincinnati *Post*, was the son of Elizabeth, the tollgate keeper's daughter, and of William Howard, her Irish railroad-brakeman husband. This information, with its sentimental association, aroused in Scripps an interest in the young reporter that, in Scripps' own view, opened opportunities for Howard and greatly influenced his whole career.

All this time Howard's path had not directly crossed that of Scripps. When they finally did meet at Miramar, Scripps found him

. . . a striking individual, very small in stature, a large speaking countenance and eyes that appeared to be windows for a rather unusual intellect. His manner was forceful, and the reverse from modest. Gall was written all over his face. It was in every tone and every word he voiced. There was ambition, self-respect and forcefulness oozing out of every pore of his body. . . However, so completely and exuberantly frank was he that it was impossible for me to feel any resentment on account of his cheek.

That was in February 1908. Two months later, upon the death of the UP's first president, John Vandercook, the directors of the UP appointed Howard to the vacancy on a temporary basis. Having other candidates in mind himself, Scripps was surprised when he found himself being urged to let Howard have the job permanently.

"Certainly at this critical point in his career," Scripps observed, "he owed everything to the fact that he was the tollgate keeper's grandson. My fancy was tickled with the idea."

However, as Scripps took pains to point out, Howard, the upstart, made good. As general manager and president of the United Press, which was rapidly expanding into an important newsgathering and distribution agency, Howard hobnobbed with the world's great, with premiers, foreign secretaries, generals, and leaders in every field.

In making Howard first business director of the Scripps-McRae interests and then chairman of the board in 1920, E. W. Scripps was paving the way for his even bigger plans, as was evidenced when the name of the organization was changed to Scripps-Howard in 1922.

Howard concentrated upon the newspaper chain and particularly upon getting it a foothold in New York, a city that Scripps always shunned and Howard always fancied. Within less than a year after the Old Man's death, Roy Howard gained his metropolitan outlet by buying the New York *Telegram* from William T. Dewart, Frank A. Munsey's executor. Howard imported some of the chain's brightest talent from Cleveland and other Scripps-Howard centers to breathe life into the spineless old sheet, but for complete acceptance it needed the prestige of a local name and reputation.

Howard's eyes were still on the *World* and at a chance shipboard meeting between Howard and Ralph Pulitzer in 1929, Pulitzer agreed that if he ever sold his papers he would talk with Howard first. Thus newspaper history found Howard and the Pulitzers, in February 1931, persuading the Surrogate in New York to let them break old Joseph Pulitzer's will, which had enjoined the sons

to "preserve, perfect, and perpetuate" the Pulitzer papers. Caught off guard, the *World's* staff made a frantic and futile eleventh-hour effort to raise enough money to buy and keep alive the beloved "newspaperman's newspaper" on which they were so proud to work. But the *Morning World* was abandoned, the *Evening World* incorporated into the *World-Telegram*, and Howard's New York venture had its base.

The national depression in which the *World* died had moved the Scripps-Howard papers to criticism of President Hoover, whose election they had favored in 1928. They called for a sweeping redistribution of wealth and aid to the unemployed.

Howard, savoring politics, worked to get Newton D. Baker, Scripps-Howard general counsel, nominated on the Democratic ticket, but that failing, the chain's editors voted at their customary policy conference in French Lick, Indiana, to support the party's nominee, Franklin D. Roosevelt, since the Democratic platform opposed prohibition.

Within a year after Hoover's defeat by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Scripps-Howard papers were acclaiming the "New Deal revolution," flaying "government by money changers," and warning against the "Bourbon diehards" who would attempt to "stigmatize" Roosevelt's program as "socialistic." The Scripps-Howard editors, again in 1936, voted to support Roosevelt against Landon.

The *World-Telegram's* first great crusade, the New York mayoralty election of 1933, routed Tammany and swept the Fusion candidate, Fiorello H. LeGuardia, into office.

It was becoming increasingly apparent, however, that Howard's sympathies and aspirations did not coincide with those of the chain's founder, although he continued to regard himself as a liberal. As New Deal legislation regulating big business hit home to him and his friends, Howard became restive and irritated. In 1935 he wrote to Roosevelt that large-scale industry was harnessed by taxation, which it considered "revengeful," and suggested "a breathing spell and a recess from further experimentation until the country can recover from its losses." The Scripps-Howard papers followed up the letter by attacks on "silly public works," on the Works Project Administration, on the Wagner wages-and-hour act, and other Administration measures.

In 1937 Howard lost the services of his old friend Lowell Mellett, editor of the Scripps-Howard *Washington News*, who saw the New Deal as the expression of the old Scripps progressivism. In the early twenties Mellett had written a series of articles denouncing "government by courts," and the papers had urged limitation of the power of the Supreme Court. Now, however, the Scripps-Howard papers, along with most of the rest of the nation's press, vigorously opposed Roosevelt's plan to reorganize the Court, and Mellett quit the *News* rather

than go along with the attacks upon Roosevelt's "court-packing scheme." Other old Scripps men who felt that Roosevelt was closer to the spirit of Scripps than was Howard—men like Max Stern, Robert Horton, Herbert Little, George West—also left the organization. Some of them, along with Mellett, went into the developing government information service.

In Howard's view the Supreme Court move "signalized the New Deal's abandonment of its original liberalism in favor of modified state socialism, government by bureaucracy and a bastardized brood of political isms."

Roy Howard was as unlike E. W. Scripps, in appearance and in attitude, as Bob Scripps was like his father. Bob, just over six feet tall, had a commanding presence but was quiet and sensitive, allowing executives wide latitude and keeping in the background at Miramar or at his home in Connecticut except for visits to New York to confer with Howard. Forrest Davis's biographical sketch, written for the *Saturday Evening Post* in 1937, described Scripps as "king with final power of yea and veto," Howard as "prime minister, ruling boldly, conspicuously, restlessly, but only with Scripps's consent."

Less and less was heard of Scripps, who had retreated to Miramar. In 1938, stricken with a hemorrhage, he died as his father had, on his yacht at sea, in Magdalena Bay, off Lower California, at the age of forty-two.

The Scripps trust agreement provided that Howard, William W. Hawkins, United Press veteran and vice-chairman of the Scripps-Howard board, and George B. ("Deac") Parker, editor-in-chief of the chain, would succeed Robert Scripps as trustees, each to be succeeded in turn by the sons of Robert Scripps as they reached the age of twenty-five.

None of the founder's grandchildren was yet old enough to take over, and so, in 1938, Roy Howard became the sole ruler of the empire that he had dominated for some time. But he was always careful to point out that neither he nor any other single individual controlled the editorial policies of Scripps-Howard. Those policies, he insisted, were a composite of the opinions of its general editorial board, appointed under the trusteeship.

It was no longer an expanding empire numerically, several of its papers having been abandoned in the thirties, including the one-time hard-hitting crusaders like the papers in Akron and Toledo. Economics had forced papers everywhere by then to contract and concentrate.

The dramatic story of two of Howard's columnists, of their relation to one another and to Roy Howard, throws considerable light upon both the transmutations of Scripps-Howard policies and upon the conflicts and concerns of the turbulent thirties.

Heywood Cox Broun, big of body and of heart, had been a sports writer, dramatic critic, and humorous stylist

for the old *World* until his easy-going nature was stirred to indignant protest against what he saw as the rank injustice of the Sacco-Vanzetti case in Boston. There, he felt, an innocent shoemaker and fish peddler were being railroaded to execution for a payroll robbery merely because they were philosophical anarchists and convenient scapegoats. He hammered so hard on the case in his *World* column that Ralph Pulitzer asked him to desist and when Broun refused, Pulitzer fired him.

Roy Howard promptly got Broun to go over to the *Telegram* on his own terms as to freedom of expression and salary.

Westbrook Pegler, son of a Hearst newspaperman in Chicago who had grown up in the old rough-and-tumble "Front Page" tradition, wrote so sharply and provocatively on the sports page that Howard hired him away from the *Chicago Tribune* to do a general interest column and gave him the same freedom he gave Broun.

The clashing viewpoints and divergent moods of Broun's "It Seems to Me" and Pegler's "Fair Enough," across the page from one another, made exciting reading. Broun, sharp with some capitalists, with enemies of the New Deal and of the Newspaper Guild, was humanitarian and warm in spirit. Pegler was misanthropic and bitter.

When Broun's contract expired it was not renewed and Broun transferred to the *New York Post*. Broun's column in the *Post*, and the last one he ever wrote, was a call to President Roosevelt to accept the nomination for a third term. On December 15, 1939, Broun died of pneumonia.

When time came to renew Pegler's contract in 1944, Howard asked Pegler to agree to certain stipulations. Although Howard shared Pegler's point of view, the criticism of the columnist that impressed him most as a publisher was that Pegler had become "the stuck whistle of American journalism." Howard, reminding Pegler that it was felicity in sports writing and the light touch that won him his first popularity, wanted to specify in the contract that Pegler would confine his attacks on the Roosevelts and labor racketeers to three days a week. Pegler replied that he could not "be funny a la carte" and, ten days before the old contract expired, he reported to Howard that he had signed up with Hearst's King Features Syndicate where he could write as he pleased six days a week (it was abundantly clear by now that what pleased Pegler also pleased Hearst).

In a public statement Howard said: "The impact of Mr. Pegler's writing upon the opinion content of any newspaper is very great—so great in fact that the editorial voice of Scripps-Howard could only continue audible by resort to a stridency which we do not care to employ."

At the end of 1946, Robert Paine Scripps Jr., two years past the stated age of twenty-five but delayed in assuming

his responsibility by war service, replaced Hawkins (who meanwhile had married the widow of the senior Robert Scripps) as trustee of the Scripps-Howard institution. Born in Washington, D. C., young Bob Scripps was educated at home until he attended Webb School at Claremont, California. Then he took some agricultural courses at the University of California at Davis. He worked for a short time in the business office of the trust before entering the Army, where he rose from private to sergeant, finally commanding a regimental reconnaissance platoon for the 161st infantry in the Philippines. After the war he became a farmer, raising alfalfa, sheep and cotton on a substantial property that he co-owned with his uncle in Fort Stockton, Texas. Bob Scripps, a shrewd businessman, conscientiously attended to his duties as a trustee even when it interfered with his farming, but made no secret of the fact that he was completely uninterested in newspapering, either on the editorial or business side.

A month later, the second son, Charles Edward Scripps, reached twenty-five and Deac Parker stepped down. Chairman of the trust and now titular head of Scripps-Howard, Charles had attended Webb, and William and Mary and Pomona Colleges. He worked briefly on the editorial side of the *Cleveland Press* under Louis Seltzer, one of the chain's editors cast most closely in the Scripps mold, and then served in the Coast Guard. Charles displayed more interest, however, in the mechanics of publication than he did in ideas or politics.

In 1949, the year that Deac Parker died, Charles Scripps became chairman of the trust and titular head of Scripps-Howard. Walker Stone succeeded Parker as head of the Washington bureau, which was, in practice, the fountainhead from which the concern's national and international policies emanated, but no successor was named to Parker's more important post as editor-in-chief, to which he had been appointed by Robert Paine Scripps. Old Man Scripps had always warned against the concentration of editorial and business control in the hands of one man.

In January of the following year, the *New York World-Telegram*, bellwether of the flock that now included nineteen newspapers published under the slogan, "Give the people light and they will find the way," bought the sinking *New York Sun* from Thomas Dewart, son of the man from whom Howard had acquired the *Telegram*. The big, bulky *World-Telegram and Sun* that resulted took pride in the fact that it now united under one roof three great traditions of American journalism, combining the ideals of Pulitzer, Scripps, and Dana, but the caustic *New Yorker* gibed that these three great names were now buried in one grave.

Of the deal, the rival and aggressively liberal *New York Post* said:

Thus, in death, New York's intransigent organ of conservative Republicanism is mated with the daily that once drew its inspiration from the fighting liberal tradition of the old *World*. Yet the union is not entirely incongruous. The latterday editorial pages of the *Sun* and *World-Telegram* have been wedded in most causes. Together they hated Roosevelt and together they embraced all the great Old Guard causes. It might be said that the *World-Telegram's* hardening conservatism destroyed the *Sun's* last reason for existence.

Local autonomy still allows wide variation among the other member papers—in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus, Ohio; in Houston, Fort Worth, and El Paso, Texas; in Covington, Kentucky; Evansville, Indiana; in San Francisco, Washington, Indianapolis, Knoxville, Memphis, Birmingham, and Denver—and many of them continue vigorous crusades against municipal corruption along the old Scripps lines.

Samuel H. Scripps is slated to succeed Roy Howard as trustee on his twenty-fifth birthday, October 30, 1952, thus restoring the family to full nominal control of the properties. His interests are in the arts, and if he should decide not to take up his option, as seems likely to some, the succession would fall—either at once or two years later—to the fourth and last son, E. W. Scripps II, a student at the University of Nevada who occasionally worked for the *Reno Daily*, a personable youth with a reporter's approach to life, who will reach twenty-five on November 26, 1954.

Of the two granddaughters of E. W. Scripps, the younger—Nackey Scripps Gallowhur, wife of a New York chemical company executive—has turned more toward horses and painting than toward newspapers, and the other—Margaret Scripps McCabe, wife of the editor of her grandfather's disquisitions—was a good newspaperwoman before her marriage but by now fully occupied with her family. She is as deeply concerned as her husband over the turn the papers have taken.

Will the return of the Scripps family to full control of their properties swing the papers back toward the courageous championship of the common man that gave them their original character? Only time will tell.

As for Howard himself, at sixty-nine he is still strongly in the saddle, and his son, Jack, is firmly established as general editorial manager of Scripps-Howard.

# It Is a Bigger Job to Get Out a Constructive Newspaper

by **Donovan M. Richardson**

Whatever one may think of newsmen as educators we are lumped together in criticism widely heard today. The indictment charges that the colleges and the press are largely responsible for the confusion and cynicism of our times. The complaint alleges that we have failed in two main respects: First, that we are not helping our readers and pupils to obtain a clear grasp of the world they live in. Second, that we are not helping them find a faith to live by, a positive moral impetus.

Startling evidence has lately been produced as to the widespread ignorance of the American people about things on which their future may depend. A Gallup poll recently showed that the average citizen believes the national debt is \$150 billion less than it is and nearly half the people had never even heard of the Hoover Commission's reports. Two-thirds couldn't tell what either the R.F.C. or the Brannan Plan was, and one-third couldn't identify Secretary Acheson or Senator McCarthy. Three-fourths had never heard of the Point Four program. Nearly one-fifth could not place Manchuria or Formosa, Chiang-Kai-shek or Marshal Tito; the 38th Parallel or the Atlantic Pact.

Dr. George Gallup in commenting on the alarming situation said that he had found working newspapermen themselves conceding that the "press today is doing a pretty poor job" in treating news of world events and issues in such a way as to interest the maximum number of readers.

Of course he couldn't have been talking about us! And we need not plead guilty to the charge. But the evidence of ignorance is pretty conclusive and just possibly we should recognize some responsibility—show some interest in doing better than we are. I'm not going to try to tell you how to do your job. I can perhaps give you a little better understanding of newspapers. Such understanding—by you and your students—can help the press do a better teaching job. If also any of the basic approaches we have worked out should prove applicable to your work I should be happy.

In two respects newspapers are very much like politicians: They perform an essential function. They are largely shaped by the public. Don't scorn either of them for that

reason. In both independence is often valuable. But if politicians and newspapers were not in large measure responsive to the public they would not adequately serve the public. There are politicians who don't have to give the people what they want. Most of them are dictators. And there are newspapers which can largely ignore their readers' desires. *Pravda* is a good example—and Peron's captive shadow of the great *La Prensa*. Possibly some politicians with wealth and some endowed newspapers can help. But in the main your standards are going to be raised by the public—including teachers and all their students—showing more appreciation for the best types of politicians and newspapers.

Our press will hold up a truer mirror to life when the public demands it. When you choose a paper for information rather than sensation, for accurate news coverage rather than lurid comics, for fair and incisive editorials rather than scandal headlines, you are using the most effective lever for raising newspaper standards. When you choose a newspaper which feeds your understanding of local, national and world affairs rather than your prejudices or your appetite for sensation, you are helping the press to do a better job.

Observing the number and size of ads in your paper you could easily conclude that advertising calls the turn on the press. It is not so. You are the boss. You could—if you wished to pay for it—have a newspaper without ads. But advertising depends on quantity—and quality—of circulation. And circulation is spelled Y-O-U. I don't mean to dodge the responsibility of publishers and editors. We can help the public improve its taste. We have opportunities for leadership—just as the politician does. But in the main both of us are shaped by the public.

It may be useful to mention some special problems we have whose solution would help us to produce a less confusing effect on readers. One is the pressure for headlines that will sell papers on the newstands.

You can help by asking for fewer startling headlines, more actual information. And you can save yourselves time and worry by discounting a lot of spot news.

Other causes of confusion are volume and variety. How many people can spend two hours submerged in a Sunday paper and emerge with any clear impression? Usually they are put to sleep. There is too much about too many things, many of them unimportant. Smaller papers, organized so the reader could more easily find what he wants would help. A few months ago while in Germany I found the

---

**Donovan M. Richardson** is chief editorial writer of the *Christian Science Monitor*. This is from an address to college teachers at a meeting at the University of New Mexico, December 12, 1951.

Army paper, the little 4-page *Star and Stripes*, more useful than many of our big dailies. Many Europeans have told me they prefer the smaller papers forced on them by war and postwar shortages. But American editors are convinced they must provide variety—readers' interests are varied—and advertising presses for volume. But here again readers could shape papers into less confusing, more rewarding form.

The emphasis on spot news is also partly responsible for another confusion—and a great injustice—when the press is used as the sounding board for character assassinations. The charges smeared across the nation's headlines one day—often without supporting evidence—may be refuted the next. But if new charges or other big news appears at the same time the answer is often blanketed. Most of the blame, I feel, rests on congressional or legislative committees. But the press could do better. If the papers can't refuse to headline hearsay testimony and unproved charges, they can in the very stories reporting them insert a warning that they are not proved. Some papers already are placing added information in brackets in news stories which without such information would give a wrong impression.

The greatest wrong impression is that caused by the man-bites-dog definition of news. Of course we all enjoy reports of strange or exciting events—although they may be of no importance. The account of efforts to rescue a little girl from a well may easily outrank in public interest the ending of the Berlin blockade. Usually half the "big" news stories of the year have little significance but great interest. The space devoted to such stories by newspapers and the time devoted to them by readers add little to our equipment for solving serious problems. But they are relatively harmless compared with cases where the press goes into the business of selling sex, scandal and sensation.

If we want an accurate picture of our telephone system we must count the right numbers as well as the wrong. If we want an accurate picture of our world we must report—and readers must read—the good news—in fair proportion to the bad. The ideas and events which mark progress may seem less titillating at times but often they are absorbingly interesting. For instance the unspectacular but ingenious measures being worked out to achieve harmonious race relations in many a community can be as easy reading as adventure stories—they are adventures—on the frontier of an advancing civilization. Strikes are news—possibly the most poorly reported of all news—but

there is real news also in the far larger number of cases where strikes are prevented by the triumph of reason and conciliation. So also is there news in the long-term development of such good labor relations that differences do not reach the strike stage.

It may take more effort to dig out and attractively present the constructive news but it can be done—if readers demand it. You can have a part in developing readers who won't be satisfied with slime and sordidness. Let me ask you to recognize that papers have to cater to a majority of people who have different tastes from yours and mine. But I am amazed at the number of people who demand the very best of everything else, but buy the cheapest rags on the newsstand. If just one generation of college graduates would learn to read good newspapers—and demand better ones—we would have less reason to complain of the press.

Your good newspaper, like your good history teacher, will tell you not only what happened where to whom, but how it happened and why. It should relate the event to others, place it in perspective and help you get its full meaning. Even with all this you do not have a whole newspaper. For a paper, like a person, without a governing purpose, a faith to live by, is incomplete. That purpose and that faith are expressed most sharply on the editorial page. There you get the paper's opinion about what happened—and what should happen.

I don't think we should be afraid of a moral purpose; I don't think we can meet the challenge of today without it.

I think if the Master were writing our editorials they would voice much less fear and frustration, much more confidence in the triumph of good, knowing that God is good. They would more seldom denounce evil at a safe distance, more often courageously tackle the wrong right at hand. They would show less reliance on military, more reliance on moral might.

They would bring light rather than heat to public debate. They would rely more on convincing than coercing, recognizing that reform comes first in the heart, second in the law books. They would express less suspicion of fellow Americans, more appreciation for friendly allies, less hate for potential enemies, more effective resistance to their propaganda. They would show less interest in partisan conflict, more in fundamental progress.

If you would like a more positive and clarifying moral purpose reflected in your newspapers, why not tell them?

# Is Press Freedom Infringed by License Tax?

## ONE JUDGE DECIDES IT IS

by Robert W. Brown

Is the business license tax that is being levied against newspapers in a large number of cities an unconstitutional abridgment of freedom of the press? Superior Court Judge R. Bruce Findley has ruled in Riverside, Calif. that it is. His ruling was made in a test case whose originators hope for an ultimate decision by the United States Supreme Court to settle once and for all a question over which even newsmen are divided.

Judge Findley found that the City of Corona had "unconstitutionally abridged the freedom of the press" in requiring a \$32-per-year "license tax" of the Corona *Daily Independent*. Publisher J. C. Hammond, cooperating with the California Newspaper Publishers Association had refused to pay the levy to provide the issue. The City of Corona had agreed to participate in the test. If the Association's plan is realized the case will go on up to the high court.

The "license tax," like little Topsy, "just growed," although infinitely faster. It originated in the need for additional revenue in municipalities where the ad valorem levies were at the maximum and other sources already had been taken over by other branches of government. It is levied against all businesses in amounts ranging from a few dollars to hundreds of dollars and usually is tied in with a gross receipts tax. Its adoption has spread literally to thousands of cities. The Corona tax was taken from a pattern set up in 1945 by the League of California Cities for the guidance of numerous municipalities in the Sunshine State interested in tapping this source.

In application the "license tax" is, pure and simple, nothing more than an "open door" business license. It is levied for revenue, not regulatory purposes, and is required of newspapers only incidentally, since it is charged against all commercial enterprises.

For this reason, it has not been vigorously opposed by newspapermen individually or collectively, except in the case of the California Association and in a report by the legislative committee of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association on which I had the pleasure of collaborating. With but few exceptions, I found in a survey of publishers an attitude of, "So what! We are a business and should pay taxes like anyone else."

Still, if there is any substance whatsoever in the conten-

tions of the California and Southern publisher groups and, more important, if Judge Findley's ruling has any validity, the "license tax" at the very least is an indirect abridgment of press freedom, and could prove to be a direct one.

Opponents of the levy will grant that in application it is no more than an "open door" business tax, but they make the point that newspapers and other media properly enjoy special positions and are not to be compared with the butcher and bake shops.

To require payments of a "license" at the beginning of a tax year as a requisite for publishing a newspaper is, the opponents insist, an actual and unconstitutional condition for publication whether in practice a municipality means it to be or not.

Opponents are not concerned with the amount of money involved, it is the principle. The "license" may cost as little as \$10; in the case of my newspaper, \$250 per year. In the California test case, by stipulation of both the city and newspaper attorneys, it was agreed that the \$32-per-year was not an issue.

Like the farmer who is alleged to have exclaimed upon seeing his first elephant, "There ain't no such animal!" opponents insist there's no such thing as a "license tax." A tax is one thing, levied for revenue; a license is something else again, a regulatory or permissive device. If any branch of government can assume the authority to issue a license, it also could revoke or withhold it.

The only instance I ever heard of an attempt to administer a "license tax" in a permissive manner occurred in the small town of Warner Robins, Ga., near Macon, and it was a short-lived and ineffective one. Mr. Foy Evans, a young attorney, had decided to start a weekly newspaper there. Ready for the first issue, he went to the town clerk's office to get his "license" and was informed that the town council had decided not to issue one, according to a clerk, "because Warner Robins already has a weekly newspaper and doesn't need another one." Mr. Evans replied that he would publish without one, and take his case before the public and, if need be, the courts. After the first issue, he was called back to the town hall and given a "license" with the explanation that there had been "some mistake."

This was a rare and exceptional case, granted. Nevertheless it illustrates the theoretical danger. Mr. Evans obtained his "license" and ultimately would have won out even had the town officials been obstinate. But the point is, there never should have been any question about his

---

Robert W. Brown is editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger* and now a Nieman Fellow.

right to publish and he should not have been subjected to any inconvenience. There should be no question whatsoever about freedom of the press.

Another theoretical danger, opponents of the levy point out, is that a given city commission with the authority to require a \$25 or \$32 or \$250 annual "license" from a newspaper also could require one in larger and burdensome amounts, as long as the fee was the same for all newspapers in the community.

In Columbus, the city commission had been charging \$250 yearly for my newspaper, the *Ledger*, and only \$200 per year from our sister publication, the morning *Enquirer*—presumably because the *Ledger* had the greater circulation. We were successful in arguing that this was an apparent attempt to "classify" the press according to circulation—unconstitutional as shown in Louisiana's famous Grosjean case. The result: the *Enquirer's* license fee was raised to equal the *Ledger's*, but it was a moral victory. Presumably, the commission could have set both at \$500 or more.

Another moral victory was won when the Columbus commission added a footnote to the tax ordinance stipulating that the "license tax" against newspapers was not "meant" as an abridgment of press freedom.

Judge Findley referred to several "freedoms" cases decided by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1942-43 in announcing his decision against the City of Corona.

"By practical application of rulings in previous cases," he 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 other rights an individual may have."

Among the "freedoms" cases in 1942 was that of Roscoe Jones vs City of Opelika, and is of interest not only as a precedent but as an example of how decisions on matters of vital importance may pivot around one individual.

The City of Opelika (Alabama) had charged Mr. Jones,

a member of the Jehovah's Witnesses sect, with violating an ordinance requiring a "license tax" of book salesmen. He had been selling religious literature in house-to-house visits. Mr. Jones had appealed his conviction on up to the high court, losing at every stage as the issue ascended. And, on June 8, 1942, he lost in the Supreme Court decision.

"A book agent," the ruling stated, "cannot escape a license requirement by a plea that it is a tax on knowledge."

The decision was written by Justice Reed, with Justices Frankfurter, Jackson, Roberts and Byrnes concurring. Dissenting were Justices Black, Douglas, Murphy and Stone.

But a re-argument was granted and on May 3, 1943, the high court reversed the 1942 ruling, declaring for Mr. Jones and holding the Opelika license requirement unconstitutional. In the meantime, Justice Byrnes had resigned, to be succeeded by Justice Rutledge.

The reversal found the previous dissenters—Justices Black, Douglas, Murphy and Stone—joined by the new Justice Rutledge for a majority; whereas the previous majority group had lost the Justice Byrnes concurrence.

The 1943 decision said, in effect, that Mr. Jones had a constitutionally guaranteed right to spread his doctrine and that the municipality could not impose a license tax on the distribution of his tracts, even though he might sell them.

If the ordinance should be approved, the high court ruled, there would have developed a new device for the suppression of religious minorities. The fact that the "license tax" was non-discriminatory applied to all alike, made no difference. Freedom of press, said the opinion written by Justice Douglas, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion are in a preferred position.

If the Corona case reaches the Supreme Court and if the Opelika decision is found applicable, it would appear that Judge Findley will be affirmed, and that the comparatively few who have recognized inherent evils in the "license tax" against newspapers will not have been splitting hairs as finely as some have thought.

# When Is a Gift Not a Gift?

by Richard L. Neuberger

Gifts have the press and public stirred up these days. These gifts are borne, not by Greeks (except in the case of John Maragon), but by seekers of official favors.

The prevailing attitude toward such gifts has been reduced to very simple terms. Gifts are bad.

Yet, unfortunately, the matter of gifts is a twilight realm where shafts of illumination rarely penetrate. Not only are "bad" politicians involved but also good politicians, purchasing agents for private businesses, all sorts of reputable advertising agencies—yes, and even members of the press.

The difficulty of reaching any hard and fast decision on gifts was demonstrated recently when Senator Wayne L. Morse of Oregon, a liberal Republican, sent back with ostentation and fanfare a Christmas present from an unnamed "head of a business firm." The present consisted of a sterling silver tray and goblet worth \$500. Senator Morse did not want to be thus obligated.

Surely this act was commendable and Morse received many hosannas. Yet would he have returned a \$500 or even a \$5,000 political campaign contribution from the same man? Which would obligate him the more, the \$500 silver set on December 25 or a \$500 check at campaign time? It cost approximately \$65,000 to keep Senator Morse on the job in Washington. His campaign statement on finances revealed numerous contributors of considerably more than \$500.

Now it is obvious that a U. S. Senator should not accept a \$500 goblet. This gift might be said to be sinister *per se*. But is the Senator free of fetters when he takes a \$500 check from the same giver to buy radio time or campaign literature?

As both a journalist and an Oregon State Senator, I have attempted to think through the matter of gifts—not only gifts at Christmas time but the larger gift that is implied when a person or group desires to invest in a race for public office.

The spirit of a gift is important yet not determining. For example, a convivial evening at a night club might be accepted by a journalist and his wife. The spirit would be gay and the atmosphere innocent. Yet a week at the seashore might be proffered in the same gay spirit and innocent atmosphere. I believe the journalist should refuse this. What decides then? I would say it is *value*. Perhaps the night-club foray cost the journalist's host \$50. The week at the shore might cost \$500. That would be placing too great a strain on the journalist's conscience if his host ever should request a well-placed news story or slanted editorial.

The obvious answer is to issue an order and make it

stick: "No gifts of any sort under any circumstances!" This sounds noble, but I am afraid it would be like those house-mother edicts against petting on the campus—honored but not in the observance.

To begin with, the brass has never followed it, either in journalism or in politics. Many Liberty ships and Victory vessels went down the lubricated ways during World War II, gently propelled by a champagne bottle in the gloved hand of the wife of a publisher, editor, Senator, Governor or Supreme Court justice. On more than one occasion the wife was rewarded for her efforts with a brooch, wrist watch, bracelet, or, at least, an engraved silver cigarette box. The shipyard magnate was the ostensible donor although, as the Comptroller-General has complained, the Federal taxpayer ultimately footed the bill under the terms of cost-plus.

If the brass's wife received a jeweled neckpiece for breaking a flask of spirited waters, who was the brass to tell a sports writer or political reporter to send back that package of Bourbon or brace of 24-pound eviscerated turkeys?

Morality, it seems to me, is indivisible. A reporter on a newspaper in the Northwest told me that he was advised to return a package of Scotch whiskey to a local politician, but that the editor of the paper had recently been made a gift of an eight-cylinder sedan.

In my opinion a gift can include a ham, a turkey, a case of canned peaches, a basket of fruits or nuts, a modest set of books, two or three bottles of liquor, perhaps even a mackinaw or woman's dress. But if the liquor is a full case, if the dress becomes a fur coat, if the ham becomes a 15 per cent discount on a \$450 two-oven stove, if the turkey is miraculously transformed into an outboard motor—these things are something else again and start taking on the status of bribery.

I turned down a substantial campaign donation from a chiropractor because I felt I would vote against a prospective measure admitting chiropractors to general hospitals. I told the man the reasons for refusing the check. I said I was unwilling to be obligated for *quid pro quo* that I could not, in conscience, deliver. A friend of mine who is a newspaperman applauded the deed. Yet he confessed, sadly, that he has long accepted free membership in a private athletic club which benefits financially from legalized pari-mutuel greyhound racing. "I hope the picked-up dues tab doesn't influence my attitude on gambling," he said, somewhat tentatively.

Knowing this man as I do, I feel sure no influence moves him other than his own convictions. Yet the free club dues

amount to \$12 each month. Should my friend in journalism expose himself to this amount of pressure?

When the Oregon State Senate is in session, all 30 Senators eat in a lounge in the Capitol Building. Each day the dairies fill the senatorial refrigerator with milk, cream, cottage cheese and other products. The breweries provide stubbies and cans of beer, although the secretarial and custodial help is forbidden even to pay for beer in the basement cafeteria. Each day in the senatorial lounge there is some additional delicacy such as a baked Columbia River salmon, a luscious Oregon turkey, a prime ribs from the open range. The bulletin board tells which lobbyist fed us so delectably that noon.

Our Senate of 21 Republicans and nine Democrats is composed mainly of honorable men and one honorable woman. I believe only an infinitesimal minority ever would succumb to an outright bribe. Is it harmless for us to eat and drink each noon off the lobbyists for special interests? After all, many of the same men allow these same lobbyists to buy them comparatively expensive meals nearly every evening that the legislature is in session.

We are not going to put a halt to gifts and free meals in American politics and American journalism. When a public relations man takes a reporter to lunch, he is going to continue to order highballs and brandy and just what else the newspaperman desires, even if it happens to be a tenderloin steak for which the restaurant paid \$2 a pound at wholesale. The target is not this sort of

hospitality, regardless of how lavish it might become, but rather the benefactions which cease to be gifts and border on bribes because of their high financial value.

All at once the country is excited about such gifts as goblets, coats and deep freezes. That is fine. The country ought to be excited. But I believe the most insidious and ominous "gifts" by far are the heavy financial donations to the men who run for public office. Even so enlightened and responsible a public servant as Senator Morse must accept checks from lumbermen, labor unions, utility executives and bankers to assure his continuance in office.

The disciplined British limit financial expenditures in a parliamentary constituency to £1,180. We have some phantom limitations which don't limit at all. Even the Taft adherents admit that the various Ohio committees working in his behalf spent approximately \$980,000 in the 1950 Senate race. In states of lesser population such as Oregon and Montana a Senate contest is likely to cost \$80,000. Do these sums in campaign "gifts" obligate a Senator? They do, most emphatically, if we accept the earlier assumption that a deep freeze or a mink coat obligates a bureaucrat.

I don't like to see a reporter accept a case of liquor and I'm opposed to bureaucrats who take free airplane rides. But if we are to keep a sense of proportion we should become correspondingly indignant about \$5,000 campaign "gifts" from special interests to the men who shape the policies of our government.

## SENSIBLE NEWSWRITING

by James E. Sellers

American journalism has nearly always had, for the record, a rule that the story must make sense. Since 1946, the readability hunt has moved that rule upward on the list of reporting commandments—past the one that says get it first, and within a stone's throw of the one that says make it fit the news pattern. Sensible newswriting has much in common with the young discipline of readability. Both tell us to prefer the modest, clear-cut sentence, the sharp, plain word, and the street-corner point of view. Yet making sense demands considerably more of a story than readability. Until now, journalism has not greatly proposed to find out what.

The missing knowledge is simply defined. What the newsman needs is a prose test that will give him a tolerance between the kind of story he learned to write and a referential record of the news event. As it is, his yarn may be underdone or overwrought; how much, he rarely knows, and he sometimes doesn't even know which. The risk is that he will fall short of all he needs to say to get his story whole in the reader's mind—or, on the other hand,

that he will tell the whole story and something besides.

The overdone story is usually easy to detect and diagnose. Its trademark is the excessively helpful word, its cause the newsman's divided allegiance. Journalism has never been able to aim straight at the mark in communication, for it is bound to separate tasks. In theory, the reporter is supposed to communicate the event with something like photographic accuracy. Alongside this obligation to the truth is his obligation to the reader, who is only human, after all. To bare communication, the newsman is convinced he must add the perennial build-up. The message must make room for the pitch. The question is how far ought the story to go beyond the unadorned act of transmission?

The reporter's addiction to the pitch is partially to be charged off as a personal transgression. But he is not entirely responsible. Here and there a writer edges toward the reader, and others have to follow for "protection."

On the contrary, underwriting the story—the second de-

parture from centerline—is wrong only when the reporter turns his back on the reader. It is never so much an earmark of the trade as a function of the reporter's judgment apart from his fellows. Perhaps there is an old rule that gives this counsel: never tell the reader anything that he patently knows. Since World War II, no editor has held the rule unbreakable; the responsibility shifts to the writer. It is there for every story. How far short of literal, step-by-step communication can the story be—and make sense?

The build-up has spread over large parts of journalism. A river overflows its banks and a wire service calls it a "villain writing a billion-dollar damage bill" and a little later "the insidious, destroying river." A daily newspaper rewrites a government handout to read "popsicle sticks are in, canned prunes are up, and goats' milk is out." A state news writer delays his real message to point out that "catlemen from all parts of Florida descended on this gaily-decorated 'cow-town' today." A reporter for a small daily begins his piece with the one-word lead, "Rats?" A weekly continues to commit the town dead to "life's terrifying end-station." Fascinating language, yes; sensible reporting, no.

Fortunately, the readability formula has sapped one disagreeable variety of the build-up. Growing in rarity is the 50-word prospectus lead that sets forth the attractions of the story. But the reporter who doesn't want to let go his first hold is still on the land: he has learned to compress the usual assortment of ideas into 20 or 25 words.

By and large, the efforts of the press to be readable have not discouraged the build-up, which grows on competition and mimicry. In the complications and hurry of modern living, the newsman feels, the average man could hardly be expected to stumble into a story of his own accord—or because of the inherent qualities of the bare communication. Somehow, he must be lured from the other stories, if only for a moment. If these tensions of the craft could be eased, the pitch would die. Already, many a skeptic reporter, ordered by his paper in the direction of readability, has at length wished he could drop the pitch, too. A few never had it, and a few others, once forbidden the pleasures of rivalry, have got rid of it.

The alternate fault—underwriting the story—becomes a virtue for the knowing journalist. The ideal news story would be a faultless record of the event put together by a reporter whose ideas call up a one-to-one response in the reader. In practice, the closest the writer can come is to aim to trigger whatever related thought lies at the other end of the chain of communication. In everything he writes, he must rely to some extent on what the semanticist calls a "context" to supply content missing from the story. To write well on any subject, he must know his reader's mind well enough to bet on how much background is already there.

The country editor, for example, is often a master at knowing what to do about a context. "The new police car was delivered this week," announces the village paper. The editor supposes his clientele knows that the town council got up the money a month ago and ordered the car. But the country editor is unusually fortunate; few newsmen have the chance at the intimate knowledge of the news neighborhood that he does.

There is no way to play a context safely, except to know it. On one hand, the reporter fumbles when he assumes a context that is not there. He is not understood by his readers, no matter what his sentence length or syllable count. Again, he fumbles when he ignores a context that *is* there. He bores everybody in the news neighborhood who tries the story, no matter how high its human interest score.

The extent to which the newsman may rely on context is roughly predictable. As the news grows in complexity, the writer must hew closer, within his talents, to an imaginary "perfect" record of the event. Dependence on context becomes riskier. With increasing proximity of the news, liberal use of context becomes increasingly safe—even necessary. The small-town weekly may get away with a reference to "the scrap paper drive" without an explicit who, where, or why. The weekly newsmagazine may speak of "the Churchill mission" without defining it, for its readers are mostly people who have kept up with the headlines during the week. But the newsman moves away from sensible writing when he touches on an event as complex and far-away as "the crisis in the Near East" without saying what it is.

Encouragingly, more and more writing that seems both readable and sensible turns up in the papers. The New Orleans *Times-Picayune* begins a story with eleven words, all messengers, none drummers: "The Algiers ferry landing was destroyed by fire about 7:30 p.m. Tuesday." Terror in the Near East comes out in ten confident words in the *Christian Science Monitor*: "Schools and colleges in Cairo and suburbs are again closed." Quiet notice that "a return to winter was in store for St. Louisans today," shows up in the *Post-Dispatch*. "Troop 37, Blountstown's Boy Scouts of America representative, went to Cypress Monday night," writes a country editor. "Two business places on the highway closed this week," says another. All handle the context well; none uses the pitch.

Some day, the psychologists may produce a formula that will empower any writer to allow for his average reader's background and initiative. By then, perhaps, the reporter will have learned to notice a good thing when it comes along (he took a bit of coaxing when the psychologists tried to muscle in with readability). Turning the formula's crank in that future day may give most of the answers about how trustworthy a context is, and how genuinely

useful a dash of build-up. Now, the newsman can do no better than to try to reconcile his obligations to event and reader. He can make the most of the words that tell the reader about the event, and get rid of the words that stop

James E. Sellers' sensible newswriting won him the first prize for the best news story in the Florida Press Association newspaper competition last year; also for the best personal column. He has been editor of the weekly *Wash-*

ington County News in Chipley, Fla., for four years; is doing communications research at Florida State University, and is preparing a readability handbook.

## Iowa Doctors and Newspapers Codify Relations

*Nieman Reports is indebted to Harold L. Cross and the Maine Journalist for a copy of Iowa's new code of cooperation adopted by news, medical and allied professional groups. The text follows:*

Code of Cooperation to guide the medical profession and hospitals in their relationships with newspapers, radio and television news broadcasters:

These considerations must be fundamental: The primary obligation and responsibility of all doctors and all hospital personnel is the welfare of the patient.

Newspapers and radio news broadcasts exist for the common good, to bring matters of general interest and importance to the public quickly and correctly.

In addition to these general principles, the following rules are suggested for specific instances:

### *Doctors—Hospitals*

The name of the attending doctor shall be made available to the newsman, if requested, but the doctor's name shall not be used in the news without his consent. He shall give information to the press and radio where it does not endanger the doctor-patient relationship, or violate the confidence, privacy, or legal rights of the patient.

Each hospital shall designate spokesmen who shall be competent to give authentic information to the press, radio, and television in emergency cases at any time of the day or night. Information shall be provided as rapidly as possible without interfering with the health of the patient.

Nothing in this paragraph, however, contemplates the providing of any information which shall jeopardize the hospital-patient relationship, or which violates the confidence, privacy, or legal rights of the patient.

The designated spokesman for the hospital may frequently be the nurse in charge. If so, it is her obligation to the patient, doctor and hospital to give authentic information within the limits of this code as follows:

Accident or Emergency Cases: The newsman shall be given the following information: Name, age, address, occupation, and sex of the injured. Nature of the accident—such as automobile, explosion, shooting, etc. Extent of injuries; their degree of seriousness, when ascertained. (IN MOST CASES CONDITION REPORTS LIMIT-

ED TO SUCH WORDS AS GOOD, FAIR, SERIOUS, OR CRITICAL ARE SUFFICIENT.)

Deaths.

Illness of a Personality in whom the Public is Rightfully Interested: The nature of the illness, its gravity, and the current condition, with the consent of the patient or next of kin.

### *Medical Associations*

The executive offices of the Iowa State Medical Society and officers of county medical societies shall be available for newsmen to obtain authentic information as promptly as possible on health and professional subjects. If the information desired is not immediately available, it shall be the duty of the executive office either to obtain the information, or to locate a competent authority from whom newsmen can obtain it directly.

Officers, committee chairmen, or designated spokesmen of the various professional associations may be quoted by name in matters of public interest for purposes of authenticating information given. . . .

### *Newsmen*

Press, radio, and television newsmen, recognizing the first obligation of the doctor and hospital is to safeguard the life, health, and legal rights of the patient, shall cooperate by refraining from any action or demands that might jeopardize the patient's life or health, and rights.

When a doctor or hospital authority authorizes a quotation directly by name, press, radio and television newsmen shall make certain to the best of their ability the quotation is accurate both in content and context.

Press, radio and television newsmen shall exercise editorial judgment to avoid publishing material designed solely to exploit the patient, doctor, or the hospital.

On matters of general health news, the newsman shall make all reasonable effort to obtain authentic information from qualified sources indicated above before proceeding to publication or broadcast.

# Book Reviews

## Lincoln As Strategist

by John M. Harrison

LINCOLN AND HIS GENERALS. By T. Harry Williams. Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 363 pp. \$4.00.

"The Civil War was the first of modern total wars, and the American democracy was almost totally unready to fight it."

That's the opening sentence of T. Harry Williams' book. It's a crackerjack lead by newspaper standards. It tells the story of *Lincoln and His Generals*. Succeeding pages document this contention and relate how the problem finally was overcome.

Mr. Williams has done this by concentrating on a relatively unexplored aspect of the Civil War. His first concern is with Abraham Lincoln's performance as commander-in-chief of the Union armies. Lincoln, the author asserts, is too well known as the Great Emancipator, too little as the Master Strategist. Here Honest Abe emerges as a commander who took a direct interest in the fighting; who, although he made some errors in judgment himself, saw the basic mistakes of his generals long before most of them did; who was an active force in mapping the strategy by which the war was to be won.

This is not military history. It is the story of a nation's halting efforts to face the realities of war and to forge the weapons of strategy to win it. All but a handful of its pages are devoted to that harrowing period from 1861 to 1864 in which mistakes and failures so nearly contrived to rend the American nation in half. Once a modern system of command finally had been achieved—early in 1864—with Ulysses S. Grant as a general-in-chief in whom his commander could put real faith, Mr. Williams' story is largely told. Lincoln continued to review all decisions. He differed with Grant on more than one occasion. But of the campaigns in Tennessee, in Georgia, and in Virginia, which brought the war to an end in 1865, there was relatively little to concern the commander-in-chief.

Most Americans already are familiar with the military history of those early Civil War years, although some historians

have romanticized and misrepresented it. Much less is known of the political intriguing that went on in Washington, of the incompetencies and vanities of the generals in the field who executed policy and, for many months, made their own policy whenever they could get away with it. Democrats and Republicans jockeyed for political advantage. Within the Republican Party itself, two factions fought for control. The politicians were far readier to do battle than the generals—McClellan, Burnside, Hooker, Rosecrans, Banks, Butler, McClernand, and the rest. These were the men on whom Lincoln had to depend to fight a war which he hadn't wanted to fight. It was a task to try his fabled patience.

Mr. Williams has studied carefully this unhappy relationship between a president and his generals. Through official documents and personal letters, he traces the tortuous path the Union trod in sorting out the bunglers, the finaglers, and the Caspar Milquetoasts. He shows how, by a slow and painful selective process, there emerged the combination of Grant, Sherman, Thomas and Sheridan which eventually accomplished in a few months what others had failed to do in more than three years.

Controversy over the author's assessment of individual military men is inevitable. His high regard for Grant, whom he describes as a greater general than Robert E. Lee, surely will come under fire from the Lee enthusiasts. A certain Chicago newspaper publisher, who has erected a pedestal for George Meade as the brilliant tactician of Gettysburg, won't like the picture of Meade which emerges here. From Atlanta to the sea and back again, Mr. Williams will be denounced fervently for daring to assert that Sherman's pillage of the Georgia countryside was a necessary and inevitable result of the emerging realization that total warfare involves destruction of the enemy's economic resources quite as much as the capture of troops and fortifications.

But Abraham Lincoln is the hero of this book and its most compelling figure.

And perhaps we are still too close to the Lincoln myth, to the worship of the Lincoln symbol, to assess the accuracy of all of Mr. Williams' judgments of him. It is enough for now to observe that this study adds a new dimension to the Lincoln symbol and, in the process, makes him even more warmly human than he has seemed as the Great Humanitarian. There will be further examination of Lincoln as commander-in-chief. Even if the final verdict is less glowing than that provided here, he should emerge as a great military strategist.

*Lincoln and His Generals* can't be read today without reference to more recent controversies involving American presidents as commander-in-chief. Shall the civilian in the White House overrule his generals in formulating military strategy? Can a general in the field properly assume both military and political responsibility, quite independent of the command-in-chief? When overruled, can the military man be permitted to carry his case to other political figures? What course shall the civilian commander take when a general defies his authority?

These are questions much discussed in the United States in the last year. Mr. Williams' answer to them—indirect though it may be—is a well-supported assertion that the civilian commander not only must be supreme but that he is more often right than the military officer. He takes his final authority from an unimpeachable source—Clausewitz—who asserts that an acquaintance with military affairs is not the principal qualification for a director of war, but that "a remarkable, superior mind and strength of character" are better qualifications.

T. Harry Williams makes it clear that Lincoln, by comparison with his generals, possessed those better qualifications. Most of those who read his book undoubtedly will speculate on how future historians will assess this aspect of more recent controversies involving presidents and their generals.

### Chance for a Biographer

The letters, manuscripts and other papers of the late Harold L. Ickes are to be made available to any "scholar or responsible writer," but without the right of direct quotation, his will showed this week. The papers were left in the custody of Mrs. Ickes. —*Editor & Publisher*, Mar. 15, 1952.

# Inside Ike

by John O. Davies, Jr.

EISENHOWER. By John Gunther. Harper & Bros., N. Y. 180 pp. WHAT EISENHOWER THINKS. Edited, interpreted by Allan Taylor. Thomas Y. Crowell Co. 186 pp. \$2.75.

Who is Dwight David Eisenhower? What does he think? The questions are of mushrooming importance these days. Wider knowledge of the answers to them may make this General of the Army the President of the United States.

The questions are interdependent. Eisenhower exemplifies the concept that past experience is the forge on which men's opinions are shaped. The "who" of Eisenhower is in Gunther's book, a smooth, reportorial job spiced with recollections of personal contact with the general. Eisenhower's thinking is in Taylor's book, in which the general's own public statements since 1945 are skillfully edited and interpreted. The authors provide up-to-date and penetrating literary tools with which to diagnose one of the most unusual Presidential candidates in American political history.

Both books offer a graphic dissection of Eisenhower which proves that the widespread acclaim for him has been by no means fetishistic. The dissection splits the "man" from the "symbol." This point is stressed in the subtitle of Gunther's book. And Taylor comments that "when a living man becomes a symbol there is always the danger of substituting the reputation for the actuality, of depending on the symbol rather than the person.

The actuality of Eisenhower's liberal, middle-of-the-road conservatism is significantly clarified, biographically and by documentation.

Taylor indicates that "cooperation," one of Eisenhower's favorite words, is the key to a more precise understanding of the man.

"More than perhaps any other word in the language," he writes, "it typifies his instinctive approach to all questions of human relations—personal, political and economic, national and international."

Excerpts from Eisenhower's statements demonstrate how his philosophy of cooperation liberalizes his ingrained distrust of welfare statism, topheavy government and "let George do it" social theory.

Gunther reports that when a delegation of business men once questioned Eisenhower's conservatism, the general countered with the query: "Any of you fellows ever grow up working on a farm?" Gunther quotes a well-known liberal friend of Eisenhower:

"That he is a conservative doesn't bother me. He can't repeal social security or crop subsidies to the farmers. Nobody, not even Eisenhower, can turn the clock back on progress. The only two things that count today are foreign policy and civil liberties, and Ike is absolutely sound on both."

The authors introduce ample evidence that Eisenhower would violently oppose turning the clock back on progress of liberal definition.

Gunther writes an interesting chapter on Eisenhower's future. He reviews the growth of Eisenhower's political appeal since World War II and the pro and con of the general as a Presidential candidate. Oddly, both the negative and positive summaries lead off with the fact that Eisenhower is politically inexperienced. Those who oppose him contend that the ablest Presidents have been professional politicians. Eisenhower's supporters, however, insist that his non-politicalism is an asset at a time when "the country is mortally sick of politicians."

Concerning the dilemma of Eisenhower's prolonged absence from the battleground of Presidential politics, Gunther makes an interesting observation. To campaign actively Eisenhower must quit his European assignment, "a job at which he is as nearly indispensable as a man can be." If he does not relinquish his foreign post, the Presidency might "fall to Bob Taft."

"In other words," says Gunther, "Eisenhower may have to give up SHAPE in order to save it."

Taylor's collection of Eisenhower's thoughts, as phrased by the general himself, is the best depiction of the type of President he would be.

Stressing middle-way, humanistic cooperation, Eisenhower would oppose concentration and misuse of power by government, business or labor. His spiritual and ethical makeup would bar government corruption. An opponent of prejudice, he would be a powerful advocate of civil rights. His military career has taught

him that war is to be avoided if at all possible; hence, he would be a champion of world peace. He is acutely conscious of the foreign totalitarian threat to American security and would insist on military preparedness. An internationalist, his foreign policy would not differ fundamentally from Truman's.

Here is Taylor's concluding interpretation of Eisenhower:

"Greater than his many competencies, and central to his ideas of freedom, initiative and self-reliance, is the kind of faith and moral character which are so badly needed by the confused Western world. There are signs that many Americans are beginning to revolt against the negativity of a materialistic outlook that has stressed comfort-seeking and the acquisition of material things at a cost to spiritual satisfaction and real happiness.

"Thus it might be argued that Dwight Eisenhower's amazing hold on the imagination of millions is as much a response to his affirmative attitude on the true values of life as to his personal charm and great achievements.

## The "Why" of It

by Joseph Givando

UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC OPINION, by Curtis D. MacDougall. The Macmillan Co., New York. 698 pp. \$5.

In 1948 a major feature syndicate serviced its clients with "preparedness" material for use in covering the presidential election. Included among the features was a banner headline mat which with simple brevity read: "Dewey Elected." It was a pretty mat with a flashback filigree of Dewey's life depicted around the bold immensity of the type. The mat, of course, went into the wastebasket before dawn on November 5.

The syndicate editors had not felt it essential to go to the expense of creating a similar mat reading "Truman Elected." They demonstrated they did not understand public opinion. The pollsters demonstrated the same lack of understanding. But worse: the editors who received the "Dewey Elected" mat did not fire back collect telegrams demanding a mat for a candidate called Truman. Of all the hundreds of clients to this syndicate not one editor complained BEFORE Truman's victory about the Dewey-sided na-

ture of the mat as well as the other "preparedness" material.

Curtis D. MacDougall's new book, *Understanding Public Opinion*, can serve as a beacon to newspapermen who don't want to be caught with the wrong mat cast and the stereotypers comfortably asleep in bed. In his attempt to steer newspapermen down a less rigid path of interpreting public opinion than the counting of noses—whether they be quantitative noses or the qualitative noses presently in fashion with the pollsters—Professor MacDougall has written the most comprehensive, one-volume treatment of public opinion specifically formulated for the fourth estate. His major success and partial failure in solidly nailing down the "why" of public opinion indicates how much is known, how little is understood.

Understanding public opinion is not just taking a poll nor merely a matter of getting off the campaign train and talking to "the people". Understanding public opinion is really a matter of understanding man, understanding how he behaves and why he behaves as he does. This takes a wide horizon of knowledge and stipulates as its first principle that journalists must intellectually deserve the encomium of "fourth estate."

James Reston of the *New York Times* has said that in 1948 "we overestimated the tangibles, underestimated the intangibles. We relied too much on the techniques of reporting which are no longer foolproof. We were too impressed by the tidy statistics of the polls." Despite this warning, voiced by many others in the years since Truman's whistle-stop conquest, the recent New Hampshire primary demonstrated again that the techniques are not "foolproof," the polls not invincible. Senator Estes Kefauver, to the confusion of the predictors, coon-skinned in all the delegates and an unexpectedly high popular vote. Why this continuing failure at prediction?

Professor MacDougall's answer is that the "attitudes" of the public are not understood. These attitudes—a key concept in his discussion—are formed by the conditioning of the individual. Human behaviour, he points out, can be predicted because similar causes are followed by similar effects. From this not unusual hypothesis Professor MacDougall mines down to the bedrock of social science and then constructs his book. He offers no

easy, "how-to-do-it" panacea to solve the "why" of man's attitudes. Public opinion, elections keep demonstrating, cannot be catalogued with certainty. Despite the Gallups, the Ropers, the Crossleys, editors and reporters must still observe and think for themselves. The journalists, Professor MacDougall insists, must set their sights at an elevated target: they must know human behavior if they are to know their jobs because not to know the "why" of opinion is not to know whether opinion is being correctly assayed.

"Learn early and never forget that explanations do exist," he admonishes. Public opinion hypotheses can be tested and the sociologist, anthropologist, psychologist and historian are leading the way to understanding.

Some specifics can be cited: All too frequently minority opinion becomes public opinion in the minds of journalists. Minority opinion, in an analysis made by Floyd H. Allport, promotes "an illusion of universality." The Allport derision of the use newspapermen make of this fake "universality" is perhaps just—"the journalistic fallacy."

Distrust the stereotype answers, counsels Professor MacDougall. Social behavior, contrary to the poll-taking fetish, can't be added like two and two. Man is more complex than two and two. The journalist should know that social phenomena "just don't happen," and that "rightness or wrongness" of an idea is no criterion by which to evaluate its popularity. Beware of the danger of getting on the bandwagon of statistics. Public opinion can't be separated from the broader aspects of why men behave as human beings.

*Understanding Public Opinion* doesn't tarry more than necessary over the theory of the subject. The nature of man, society and propaganda is considered. The general characteristics of American culture cover more than two-hundred pages. And the media of public opinion, the leaders, the language, the arts, religion and churches, education and schools, public relations and journalism, come in for full survey.

It will be unfortunate if *Understanding Public Opinion* becomes primarily a text for the class room student. The problems facing today's world demand that Professor MacDougall's volume on public opinion be given a prominent place in the journalist's fifty foot bookshelf.

## The AP Report

THE APME RED BOOK, 1951. The Associated Press, New York. 267 pp.

This is the annual report of the discussions of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.

The discussions concern the "continuing studies" undertaken by editors' committees for five years now to try to improve the AP news report. This 1951 book seeks to add up the five year's effort. So it is a sort of landmark. General agreement is expressed that the results are evident in better writing, more interpretive reporting, more creative news work, and generally a more flexible and more readable news report on the AP wires.

All this is certainly true, and demonstrable to the casual news reader. How much of it stems from the continuing studies and how much from the change in top management of the AP, which coincided in time, is perhaps not important. But evidently the management of the AP was pulling more than it was pushed in all the directions urged by the continuing studies.

The problem of the AP, as seen by the more aggressive and responsible managing editors among the membership, were put in sharper focus in the earlier reports of their five years. This is more of a recapitulation and progress report. Indeed the committees are, if anything, a little too satisfied. It would seem to be time to get some new committees who would start a new round of creative discontents, now that the old ones have been pretty well met.

About half this book is taken up with the miscellaneous and technical matters of news photos, news features, typesetting and the state studies. The other half deals with the news problems of more general interest—foreign and domestic coverage, writing, news barriers, creative reporting, handouts, sports.

In foreign news, it is clear that the AP is providing all that most papers demand and much more than most use. Some criticism mentions the meagerness of news from "neglected areas," such as Morocco and Pakistan. On South America the trouble is lack of public interest. The recommendation is made that the AP campaign to get real news of South Amer-

ica used in U.S. papers. From the Far East the AP report is called the most adequate available. But it has "too much trivia and too few solid stories of real significance." South Africa is described as a potential trouble spot on which the news is not covered with enough continuity to keep readers informed.

Since the arrest of William Oatis in Czechoslovakia the AP is not being pressed very hard to greater exertion to meet the extraordinary difficulties of getting news out of the Iron Curtain countries. Russell Wiggins of the *Washington Post* wants more background news. Turner Catledge of the *New York Times* says news coverage behind the Iron Curtain is "a story of frustration." But in the face of all the difficulties, he felt "newspapers should expect more." But it is clear that most don't, and that is the reason the AP is not under greater pressure to supply it.

Of news barriers, which have been the subject of ardent campaigns in previous reports, the observation is made that part of the problem is "the lethargy of editors toward news censorship." In Korea (post-MacArthur) "the correspondent is beset by military ineptitude in public relations."

On news production "we need tighter writing, better roundups, more and better interpretive."

One of the 1951 feats of the AP was its 126,000 word file for the 42 days of the MacArthur hearings. The AP supplied the *New York Times* its 127½ pages of text, averaging three pages a day. Fifteen AP staffers handled the hearings. The *Chicago Daily News* preferred the shorter UP version. The *Hutchinson, Kansas, News Herald* thought it mostly "wasted energy." But David Patten of the *Providence Journal* was grateful to the AP for doing "a massive job extremely competently."

Criticism came to the AP for "casual and uncritical writing" in several instances. One was a story of its science editor on a cure for baldness. Some clients thought the AP's science editor over credulous. The AP enterprise in breaking the news to a mother that her son had lost all four limbs in Korea brought protests and the recommendation that: "The AP is not in the business of telling tragic news to survivors except in extraordinary circumstances."

A handout early in the year by Senator Joseph McCarthy was carried by the AP without checking. The *Milwaukee Journal* checked and found "half truths and even untruths. But the danger had been done and the AP aided McCarthy in spreading an unbalanced story."

The AP comment on that criticism was: "Previously disclosed facts should have been incorporated to give perspective."

As to writing: "The major fault of the press is that the writing is not good enough."

Applauded most was the suggestion to encourage "more originality, freshness and departure from formula."

Sports writing was found improving, but was criticized for "cliches, cuteness, confusion and failure to explain technical terms."

Writing faults were found commonly due to one of three causes: inexperienced reporting; hurrying to beat the opposition; and striving too hard.

More interpretive writing was asked: "more explanatory facts, not opinions."

Good marks were given for creative reporting wherever found, and not found often enough. "There's no limit to the chance for it." An example cited was by the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, which kept digging into the cause of a railroad wreck until the railroad admitted it was a bad signal system.

The subject of handouts was covered without the usual cliches. J. M. Rob-

erts, Jr., AP news analyst, found them "valuable." James Marlow found them invaluable. "If it weren't for handouts we couldn't cover Washington unless we could get a lot more men, and even then I think we couldn't do it."

Marlow added, "I don't see any conspiracy in Washington to frustrate the public."

The content studies reported "reader interest in public affairs is growing," but found that education, science and farming are at the bottom in volume of news carried.

The performance report took note of a special incident. Pat Morin, touring the Mid-West early last year, found everyone was talking about Eisenhower. It was outside his assignment. But he wrote a story of the talk going on at the crossroads. The squawks came into New York. "Since when was the AP on Ike's bandwagon?" "It was not objective." But the committee reported, "If they spiked the story it was they and not AP who were not objective."

This committee concluded:

"The overwhelming majority wants an AP freed from every choking and frustrating definition of the past, an AP always flexible and ingenious, its character to be judged by the extent to which it refuses to be content with just reporting the routine news."

—LOUIS M. LYONS

## Trygve Lie and His Job

by Shane MacKay

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS: HIS POWERS AND PRACTICE. By Stephen M. Schwebel. Harvard University Press. 299 pp. \$4.75.

This is a remarkably thorough and well-written examination of the political functions of the United Nations Secretary-General. Based on a Government Honors thesis for Harvard College, it was expanded into book form after two years' study of U.N. materials and interviews with Trygve Lie and a rather impressive list of 60-odd other persons associated in one way or another with the subject.

Mr. Schwebel's thesis, supported in part by statements from Mr. Lie, is that the au-

thority of the Secretary-General will eventually have to be spelled out more clearly in some future amendment to the U.N. charter. Specifically, Mr. Lie would like his right to state an opinion before the Security Council set down in statutory form. At present, the Secretary-General relies on two articles, neither of which explicitly permits him to make the type of statement made, for example, on the issue of representation for the Chinese Peoples' Government.

Article 98 outlines his purely administrative duties as director of U.N.'s domestic affairs. Article 99, a cornerstone of U.N.'s principles, says he "may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten

the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Secretary-General has kept within the bounds of these two articles. He has managed, in Mr. Schwebel's words, to leap in and out of debate without ever being a constant element in it. Between the San Francisco conference and June, 1950, Mr. Lie intervened on only four occasions: the Iranian agenda question, 1946; the powers of the Security Council and the Trieste statute, 1947; the Palestine partition, 1948; and Chinese representation, 1950. His most important weapon, Article 99, was not openly invoked until Korea and on this occasion only after the Council had been summoned into emergency session by a member government.

Part of the League of Nations' failure has been attributed to the fact its Secretaries-General were neither equipped with the authority nor inclined personally to strong public intervention. Unlike his predecessors, Mr. Lie has been provided

with Article 99 and has wisely interpreted it to include his right to make independent inquiries, findings of which may be placed before the Security Council and the world community.

Clearly this is the direction in which his authority must be extended if the position of Secretary-General is to have meaning. Mr. Schwebel cites the experience of the International Labor Office, whose first Director, Albert Thomas, exercised roughly the same powers in his sphere as the U.N. has provided. With his spectacular sense of constructive personal leadership, Mr. Thomas made the I.L.O. a vastly more influential and indestructible instrument than the League of Nations.

Some of Mr. Schwebel's most interesting material is on the experience of the League's first two Secretaries-General, Sir Eric Drummond and Joseph Avenol, both of whom provided him with memoranda not previously published.

the Adam Smith stuff, tied to the great exponent of the freest sort of enterprise.

The notion is just pure theory, but it works this way:

In the model world of Adam Smith's followers, all competing sellers would be so numerous, small and equally matched that none could control his prices. Each would have to take the market price for his goods, but every seller could always dispose of all his goods at that price.

Therefore, the theory continues, there would be no point in advertising: a seller wouldn't need to advertise to sell all his goods at the market price, and he couldn't get any better price by advertising.

(Theorists like to point to the wheat or cotton farmer in illustration of their thesis: none of these growers is big enough to affect the market price; none advertises, either, because he can always sell all he produces at the price the market provides—or to the U. S. government sometimes at a better price.)

What's wrong with this economic picture? Galbraith says it's all very pretty, but just a dream—as far from the real thing as the current wearer of a Confederate soldier's cap, and even more impractical.

The typical American industry today, though there are important exceptions, does not fit the theoretical model, he says, backing up the assertion with evidence that the typical set-up, especially in manufacturing, is a small group of large firms which *do* control their selling prices.

These large firms, Galbraith observes, have determined from experience that unrelenting price competition can ruin them all: in a price-cutting war, the cutters kill themselves off by selling at a loss; non-cutters die on the vine from lack of sales.

So price competition tends to fade out and be supplanted, says Galbraith, by competition of another kind: energetic efforts by each firm to develop new or improved products and to capture a greater share of the common market through advertising and other sales effort.

The Harvard economist says that the system can't be so bad, for it has thrived in recent years while violating all the old economic rules, and the fact is that it has important advantages over the "model" system.

For one thing, only with large firms can you get the cost-saving, price-lowering benefits of mass production—and the ad-

## Spiced Ham or Plain Sidemeat

by Charles Molony

AMERICAN CAPITALISM: The Concept of Countervailing Power, by J. K. Galbraith. Houghton Mifflin. \$3.

Advertising gets a new treatment in a major work on economics: "American Capitalism," by a leading American economist, Harvard's John Kenneth Galbraith.

The news, this time, is that advertising is not the whipping boy.

Instead, economists themselves get a knuckle rapping: Galbraith says they're wasting their time and energy when they worry about the "economic wastefulness" of advertising in this country.

That's man-bites-dog stuff of bulletin caliber, good enough for reopening the somewhat foggy topic of advertising and economics—although Galbraith himself covers far more ground, providing a whole new interpretation of the American economy's success, and doing so with great clarity, originality and wit.

Of course it's simple home economics to all members of the press that most newspapers get at least two-thirds of their revenue from ads, and papers minus that money would die in droves—assuming they didn't exchange their independence for subsidies from propaganda groups.

But the advertising-is-wasteful econo-

mists don't concern themselves on that score, or with the point that adless (and unsubsidized) papers would cost so much there would be many fewer readers, and a much less informed public.

What's their angle, then? For the benefit of newspapermen who have shied away from formal economic texts for livelier reading, and been otherwise engaged when advertising's economist-critics were speaking their piece, here's a brief fill-in:

The critics say advertising not only adds nothing to the economy's wealth, it even decreases it by drawing workers away from productive employment and thus holding down the output potential; otherwise, all that advertising does is transfer already existing wealth from one group to another.

At the base of this critical position is the stock notion of an "ideal" world of pristine pure competition in which advertising wouldn't exist—not because some dictatorial power banned it, but because advertising would be purposeless.

Unlimited competition without advertising? Yes, say these critics. Is this the Karl Marx brand of economics? No, though the Marx brand, too, would exclude advertising. This is, on the contrary,

vertising industry has claimed all along that advertising *made* mass production, and so made this country what it is today.

For another, American prosperity depends on continuous development of new or improved products; only big firms can afford the costs of the complicated research now required, and only firms able to set price margins so as to recoup these costs would risk the research outlays.

Galbraith suggests that too many of his fellow economists pay too little attention to advantages of this sort, and occupy themselves too much in worrying over "waste" in an economy better able to afford "waste" than stagnation from lack of new development.

Don't get the idea he urges that advertising be *acquitted* of wastefulness, Galbraith, deputy chief of the wartime OPA and a 1943-48 editor of *Fortune* magazine, suggests merely a *pardon*—and that economists turn their talents to more pressing problems.

Advertising, he says, wouldn't be any problem to economists if the country were really poor, for it wouldn't exist—and in fact does not exist in the poor countries of this world:

"A hungry man could never be persuaded that bread that is softened, sliced, wrapped and enriched is worth more than a cheaper and larger loaf that will fill his stomach.

"A southern cropper will not, as the result of advertising, develop a preference for one brand of cooked, spiced and canned ham over another. He will buy plain sidemeat."

The U. S., says Galbraith, is rich, but economists still apply "the mentality of 19th century poverty to the analysis of 20th century opulence" when they insist that anything that denies America "additional goods and services, however casual their significance, is the greatest of sins."

"The result," he declares, "is an inefficient deployment of the economist's own resources. He is excessively preoccupied with goods qua goods; in his preoccupation with goods he has not paused to reflect on the relative unimportance of the goods with which he is preoccupied.

"He worries far too much about partially monopolized prices or excessive advertising and selling costs for tobacco, liquor, chocolates, automobiles and soap in a land which is already suffering from nicotine poisoning and alcoholism, which is nutritionally gorged with sugar, which is filling its hospitals and cemeteries with those who have been maimed or murdered on highways and which is dangerously neurotic about normal body odors."

Find that easy reading? If so, and if you're interested in economic theory in general, you'll find Galbraith's book a choice example of economics-without-tears.

## Watterson of the Courier-Journal

by Paul J. Hughes

"MARSE HENRY"—A BIOGRAPHY OF HENRY WATTERSON. By Isaac Marcossou, with a foreword by Arthur Krock. Dodd, Mead & Co. New York, 269 pp. \$4.

Henry Watterson was 18 when he decided to go into journalism. But he was already immersed in American politics and history. He was born in Washington where his father was a Congressman from Tennessee. At the age of eight, Henry was a page in the House where one of his friends was the sixth President of the United States, the indomitable old John Quincy Adams, who used to put his arm around the small boy and walk across the Rotunda to select books for him from the Library on Congress. On the dramatic day that Mr. Adams fell dying in his place on the floor of the House, little Henry Watterson was one of the first to run to the stricken statesman.

Watterson's father had been editor of the *Washington Union*. But the son characteristically determined to make his start on his own. So he hied to New York where he knew Henry J. Raymond,

the editor of the *Times*. The *Times* regular music critic was on leave, so Raymond put Henry Watterson to work on music. One of his early assignments was to cover the operatic debut of Adelina Patti, who had been a childhood companion.

The next year Watterson was on *The States*, covering the State Department. Here he proved his sharp reportorial instinct in his first scoop.

At the time, an Isthmian canal already was under consideration and the government was going to send a diplomatic mission to discuss it, among other things, with the Central American States. Several important names had been mentioned; speculation was rife—who would it be?

One day, perched on a ladder hunting a book in the departmental library, Watterson overheard a messenger say to the librarian, "The President is in the Secretary's office and asks that Mr. Dimity come there at once." The youth had a flash of inspiration: Dimity, as official translator in the State Department, spoke Spanish fluently and otherwise was well-qualified—he was to be the President's choice, Watterson was sure about his

hunch, because all angles added up so well, to him.

Off the ladder in a hurry, he rushed to *The States'* office, breathlessly told the editors his story—a hole was found in the editorial page and a two-column double-leaded announcement was made that Dimity was the President's choice. It was a sensation and it was at first denied. The other papers refused to pick it up, but two days later Dimity's appointment was duly announced.

When State Department officials demanded his source, Henry calmly, but with a confident smile, replied: "Out of my inner consciousness—didn't you know that I have what they call 'second sight?'"

Years later, as editor of the *Courier-Journal* in Louisville, Watterson tanned the hide of an assistant to the Postmaster General because he implied a doubt of editorial honesty. This factotum merely wrote a routine letter inquiring whether, as charged by a reader, the *Courier-Journal* had accepted pay to print an advertisement as an editorial. Watterson testily wrote: "Sir.—I return you these enclosures with the scorn and contempt they

fully merit. An official who could transmit to the *Courier-Journal* an anonymous accusation that it printed a paid advertisement as an editorial is unfit for public station, or service, and be he the Third Assistant Postmaster General, or another, who gives expression to such a charge, is a scoundrel and a liar."

Such stories as this, plus Watterson's well-nigh unreadable hen-scratching penmanship, constitute virtually all that most newspapermen of this day and time know about the great editor of the personal-journalism era. Unfortunately, the lore has begun to discredit the glorious name and fame of Watterson. He was a boozing, crochety, high-tempered, roistering old crank who'd best be given what he wanted and the quicker the better: that's what all too many in this generation have as their picture of Watterson, who actually was kind, considerate and gentle—until his principles were challenged.

It is refreshing, therefore, to have Ike Marcossion, who worked for and with Watterson, tell the story of Marse Henry as the able, generous, friendly man he really was; a forthright soul with a gifted pen and an inbred dogged determination to fight unflinchingly dishonesty and discrimination wherever he encountered them.

Watterson, who had had some excellent experience in newspapering and had followed the fortune of the Confederacy as a soldier in gray, himself gave this picture of the national problem as he saw it in 1868 when, handsome and 28, he became a partner in, and editor of, the newly-constituted *Courier-Journal* after a consolidation:

"Never did newspaper enterprise set out under gloomier auspices.

"There was a party of reaction in Kentucky claiming to be Democrats, playing to the lead of the party of repression in the North. It refused to admit that the head of the South was in the lion's mouth and that the first essential was to get it out. The *Courier-Journal* proposed to stroke the mane, not twist the tail of the lion. Thus it stood between two fires. There arose a not unnatural distrust of the journalistic monopoly created by the consolidation of three dailies into a single newspaper, carrying an unfamiliar hyphenated head-line. Touching its policy of sectional conciliation it picked its way

perilously through the cross-currents of public opinion. There was scarcely a sinister purpose that was not alleged against it by its enemies; scarcely a hostile device that was not undertaken to put it down and drive it out.

"Its constituency represented an unknown quantity. In any event it had to be created. Meanwhile it must rely on its own resources, sustained by the courage of the venture, by the integrity of its convictions and aims, and by faith in the future of the city, the State, and the country."

Thus Watterson steered a course toward conciliation by an intelligent appeal to business interests and the conservative elements of Northern society for a policy of justice alike to black and white. He battled for a closer understanding between the sections, for an appreciation in the South of the true greatness of Lincoln and a fuller comprehension of the misery wrought by his assassination. Naturally, this policy was resented by extremists and so it was that the *Courier-Journal* had to go it alone often without party or organized following.

Watterson crusaded not alone with the pen: Even though he ever avowed he was not an office-seeker and would not accept such preferment, he worked in the trenches and in the high councils of his party.

Watterson's life and professional career had its high-level contacts—he knew every President from Fillmore to Harding, he knew bootblacks, pugilists, actors and singers, and among his publisher friends and contemporaries were the giants of the times. He was a gifted speaker, and so honored as one both at home and abroad. His editorial writing—from the time of "Grantism" to Wilson and the League of Nations—was taken as Democratic gospel all over the South; under him the *Courier-Journal* gained deserved prominence, and circulation.

But not for circulation alone, nor for any compromise with his policy, would he yield a jot—the *C-J* nearly lost its shirt when Watterson broke with Bryan over the free silver issue. Democrats all over his territory left him cold; papers were burned by the unopened bundles at dozens of rural railroad stations; hatred was intense. Watterson, in Switzerland at the time Bryan was nominated, cabled

William B. Haldeman, son of Watterson's partner, Walter N. Haldeman, and a member of the Democratic National Committee: "Another ticket our only hope. No compromise with dishonor. Stand firm."

Another ticket was put in the field, the Gold Democratic Ticket, which so divided the vote that McKinley was victor and the Republicans actually carried Kentucky. That was when the fury broke. But Watterson and Haldeman by new alignments and new interests gradually regained their paper's prestige and following.

When the late Judge Robert W. Bingham bought out the Haldemans in 1918, Henry Watterson, at his own request, was made Editor *Emeritus*, writing occasionally but with no specific duties. When in 1919 he wrote in opposition to the League, and the views of the new owner, an amicable separation was arranged and he retired altogether. He was then in his 80th year. He died two years later.

The magic of his versatile and forthright pen, his humor, his companionship, his high courage, are dealt with most interestingly by Isaac Marcossion, who has recaptured enough of the personality—without telling all he knows about Marse Henry or his great paper—to make the giant of personal journalism still live and breathe.

---

## Our Reviewers

**Paul J. Hughes, feature writer, Louisville Courier-Journal, and the following Nieman Fellows:**

**John M. Harrison, Toledo Blade.**

**John O. Davies Jr., Newark News.**

**Joseph Givando, Denver Post.**

**Shane MacKay, Winnipeg Free Press.**

**Charles Molony, Associated Press, Washington.**

---

# Nieman Scrapbook

*Realpolitik in Kentucky —  
Or, Maybe, Any Place*

## Sure, 'Interests' Run the Assembly, But . . .

by Allan M. Trout

Frankfort, Ky., Feb. 29—Yes, as you've often heard, the General Assembly is dominated by "interests."

But the cloak-and-dagger stuff you hear about is pure baloney. The Legislature is not divided into one troupe of Honest Harolds, opposed by another troupe of Black Rufes.

The average legislator can, and does, play Black Rufe about as often as he plays Honest Harold. It all depends upon whether the act calls for his ox to be gored, or the other man's ox.

All major enterprises organized for profit in Kentucky have performing friends among the senators and representatives as well as definable lobbies in the corridors.

### **Farm Bloc Unstoppable**

Farming predominates. When the farm vote unites and the Farm Bureau applies political pressure, nothing can stop a bill.

Star performers for the farm element are Senator Stanley Hoffman, a professionalized farmer in Henderson County, and Representative William L. Jones, a dirt farmer in Caldwell County.

The lobby from the Farm Bureau can be R. H. Proctor, its secretary, or, if the need arises, hundreds of leaders from all parts of the state.

Capital and labor fight it out to a draw most of the time, with capital winning the rest of the time. Lobbying ramrod of capital is the Associated Industries of Kentucky. Labor is represented in the corridor by all Kentucky units of C.I.O., U.M.W., A.F.L. and the railroad brotherhoods.

Despite the weight of federal force behind labor, it has never been able to pull away for a straight-ahead course in Kentucky. The reason is not hard to see. The conservative instincts of rural legislators in this state always side with capital when the cards are down on a tight bill.

The handful of men that labor keeps on guard in the corridors is not the real lobby. These fellows merely call for help when needed.

### **'Only The Watchman'**

Similarly, Louis J. Bosse, Louisville, is only the watchman for Associated Industries. But the pressure he controls can be centralized upon Frankfort from just about every town in Kentucky.

Leaving now the three broad fields—agriculture, capital and labor—let us examine the subdivisions that qualify as special interests.

Here we find coal, whiskey, beer, utilities, railroads and trucking.

These interests are subject to special laws of regulations or protection; hence, their name, "special interests."

Tobacco becomes a special interest only when a new tax threatens. And from the Frankfort viewpoint, the special interest of racetracks is a mere shadow of its old self.

Coal presents two viewpoints. One is the enlightened self-interest of the operators. The other is the enlightened self-interest of the United Mine Workers.

Since Former Senator Ray B. Moss, Pineville, did not stand for re-election last fall, the operators have no visible pivot point inside the Legislature. But they have considerable strength "under the table." As Senator Moss used to say in his reminiscent moods: "It is no accident that this state has never passed a production tax on coal."

Political expediency requires legislators from the coal districts to sway with the wind, more or less. It is hard to get elected without union support. Similarly, it is hard to get elected in face of opposition by the operators.

The prevailing style, then, is to be for the miners some and for the operators some.

Spearhead of the operators' visible lobby in Frankfort is the experienced team of Democrat Robert B. Hensley and Republican Ralph A. Homan, both of Louisville. Homan was secretary to Governor Simeon Willis, and Hensley succeeded him as secretary to Governor Earle C. Clements. Their combined knowledge of the legis-

lative arm of government is quiet but sure.

The U.M.W. lobby in the corridors, however, is manned by Sam Caddy, Lexington, and a seasoned crew who do not yield to Hensley and Homan one whit of superior assurance that the proper study of mankind is man.

Conflicting lobbies also cross in the electric division of utilities.

While this conflict has been lying quietly since the 1948 session, the traditional antagonists have been the privately owned group, led by Kentucky Utilities Company, and the public-owned group of rural electric co-operatives.

Senator Louis Cox, Frankfort, is the acknowledged mentor of legislative thought on the subject of utilities in general. His law firm, Hazelrigg and Cox, represents most utilities in cases before the Public Service Commission, and a few with cases before the Department of Motor Transportation.

### **Drys Fare Forth**

Still another dual lobby operates in the field of whisky. But this is the first session the drys have fared forth in opposition to the wets with no holds barred.

The dry lobby is headed by the Rev. Walter C. House, Louisville, secretary of the Temperance League of Kentucky. The wet lobby is spearheaded by Harry Davis, Frankfort, secretary of the Wholesale Liquor Dealers Association.

Star performer for the wets inside the Legislature is Senator Leon J. Shaikun, Louisville, who in private life is attorney for the Louisville Retail Package Dealers Association. At the House end, the wets find a steady man in Representative Fred H. Morgan, Paducah, former secretary of the McCracken County Liquor Dealers Association.

The drys have a lot of strength inside the Legislature, especially in the House. On the whole however, it is not organized to bore in like a gimlet. The drys have yet to learn the basic lesson that political pressure is of no account unless it hurts when applied.

## What More Can a College Do?

by Nat R. Howard

The railroad and trucking lobbies have not crossed purposes in Frankfort since the truck-weight limit was lifted from 18,000 to 42,000 pounds at the 1946 session. That defeat wrote finis to the traditional backroom power wielded by railroads in their golden era of ascendancy.

With no big stuff on either side, then, we find George Lewis, Lexington, pacing the corridors for the railroads, and Lew Ullrich, Louisville, warming a seat in the balcony for the truckers.

In the vernacular, what those boys want is "not to get hurt." That means they do not want higher taxes aimed at their particular interest. Nor do they want more restrictive law than is now on the books.

When danger arises, therefore, the boys simply pool their votes into a compact pledged one for all and all for one. This is known as log-rolling. In other words: "You help me and I'll help you."

A simplified example may be cited.

At the 1950 session, a flood of single-shot tax bills made their appearance in the House.

### One Bill Started It

It started out harmlessly enough. Somebody dropped in a bill to tax coal production 5 cents a ton. The coal boys got busy. Ere long another bill proposed to raise the cigarette tax 1 cent a pack.

Then the tobacco boys got busy. Next, somebody dropped in a bill to double the tax on pari-mutuel betting. Then the track boys got busy. Bills soon turned up to raise the tax on whisky, beer and wine.

By then, everybody was busy. Single-shot taxes also were proposed against standing timber, clay deposits, fluorspar, oil, natural gas and rock quarries.

So the boys simply got together for mutual protection. Their compact left not a corporal's guard of legislators with untied hands. Not one of the bills passed, and nobody "got hurt."

The practice of lobbying moves to still another field after it leaves the specialized area of the special interests.

Watchdog for the druggists is E. M. Josey, Frankfort, secretary of the Kentucky Pharmaceutical Association. Ralph Fontaine, Louisville, watches for the Kentucky Bankers Association.

In the field of insurance, most bills are introduced by Senator Strother Melton, Paducah, or Senator Ernest M. Ford, Owensboro. In private life, both are insur-

Harvard College still occupies a niche in the U. S. civilization. It retains a reputation that has caused people to laugh at, distrust, or look up to its 300 years of importance.

When I was a boy, Harvard has a "sissy" connotation among us Ohioans. When I was college age at Oberlin, Harvard was famous for bizarre but great teachers of highest flights of intellectual fancy. Twenty years ago, Harvard began gaining a fresh reputation for turning out radicals bound for our State Department and other New Deal berth. The wonderful thing is, Harvard has always had these fragrant public suspicions, and since 1636 has gone on being the intellectual center of the American collegiate universe.

Yet I know about a Harvard that belies its lifelong tradition of impersonal and obscure boredom with all save the eternal truth. The Harvard where a Cleveland boy, who had made a good record for two years as a scholarship winner, was suddenly involved in a serious traffic injury and taken to a hospital where first his life was despaired of and then his senses—while his agonized mother, from Cleveland's West Side, hurried to his bedside.

This Harvard—this cold and intellectual community—gave her a college apartment and invited her nightly to dinner with her son's classmates; put the brain surgeons of the Harvard medical faculty onto the critical case; furnished its law-

ance agents.

Senator Sylvester J. Wagner, Covington, is a grocer in private life. Thus we find him introducing bills relating to fair-trade practices, retail-credit requirements, and whether liability for the printed label rests with the retailer or the manufacturer.

Senator C. W. A. McCann, Louisville, in private life is a dealer in insecticides, janitor supplies, disinfectants and the like. So we find him introducing bills designed to promote the use of these products.

But, you may ask, who represents the public? The question can be answered only by posing another: Who is the public?

The legislative process does not begin to make sense until you realize the public is a composite of the dog lover and the

yers to get her the insurance settlement money. This Harvard's student newspaper, on which the boy was an editor, produced a car and chauffeur for her transport; this Harvard's President and Dean asked her to lean on them for every help, telling her that they were glad this Cleveland boy had chosen Harvard at which to win a scholarship, and that they proposed to take care of him when care was what he needed.

He is on the mend now, it is pleasant to report, and has lost neither life nor senses nor his particular winsomeness of personality. And if there is any person in the land who believes Harvard to be a warmly beneficent institution, whatever else you may say for it, it is this Cleveland mother.

It has been interesting to see what four Harvard years have done for this nephew-namesake, bright, easy-going Cleveland kid when he went there. Periodically, as a kind of duty, he has filled me in on his life at Harvard, so I who never got there could enjoy a faint synthetic experience of it. It has wonderfully sharpened his good manners. It opened books and ideas for him which many colleges would not. It has made him feel he was somebody, but not too much of a body. Above all, it convinced him that the world was a most interesting place. What more can a college do for a young man?

Cleveland News, June 21, 1951

sheep raiser, the coal operator and the miner, the druggist who sells a home permanent and the beautician who loses another customer.

The public is all that and more. It is the railroad engineer and the truck driver, the dry and the wet, the stockholder in K. U. and the customer of R.E.A. It is the schoolteacher and the taxpayer, the dealer with soap to sell and the man with dirty hands who needs it.

Roll all these into one, and you have the public. Slice off a thin layer, and you have a faithful reproduction of the General Assembly.

The 138 members at Frankfort are no better and no worse than the people back home.

Louisville Courier-Journal, March 2, 1952

# A Negro Reporter Looks at "The Negro Problem"

*To see how the Negro is making out in America, the Toledo Blade sent William Brower, staff reporter, a Negro himself, on a 3-month tour through 27 states. His report ran in 16 articles. Two are reprinted here. Brower, 35, was born in South Carolina, went to high school at High Point, North Carolina, attended Wilberforce University (for Negroes) in Xenia, Ohio and worked on several papers before going to the Blade in 1947. He covers general assignments, not at all limited to Negro news.*

## ***Southern colleges are opening their doors to Negro students***

One of the most important changes that has taken place in the South since the end of World War II has been the opening of doors to Negro students in hitherto all-white college and universities.

In at least 11 southern and border states, Negroes have surmounted the barriers of segregation and discrimination in professional and graduate schools in colleges and universities.

What has happened at the University of Oklahoma is one of the best exhibits of how brittle segregation really is, once it is cracked. In three short years, Negro enrollment has jumped from a retired teacher, separated from the rest of his classmates by a railing, to more than 250 students. And the symbols of segregation that once pock-marked the campus have long vanished.

I had hoped that some of this liberal spirit had radiated beyond the confines of the campus. But I found that Negro students had to find their way to the rear of busses that took them from Oklahoma City and other communities to Norman.

From Oklahoma City I took a Jim Crow bus for the 45-minute ride to Norman, seat of the University of Oklahoma.

My companion, Malcolm Whitby, one of the first Negro graduates from the University of Oklahoma, reminded me to take a back seat in the bus.

In Norman, I found a town that bars Negroes as residents. Jim Crow practices are as apparent to a visitor as they are in most southern towns. It was once said of Norman that any Negro who stayed overnight there was crazy—literally. The state mental institution for Negroes was

located in Norman. It since has been moved to Taft, a Negro Community.

So it can be safely said now that any Negro who stays overnight in Norman definitely is not crazy; he (or she) is a student at the University of Oklahoma.

Discrimination against Negroes at the institution began to crumble Oct. 13, 1948. On that date the university board of regents voted to admit George W. McLaurin, the retired teacher, to the graduate school.

This was a milestone in southern education. But it was marred by a decree of strict segregation for Mr. McLaurin—and many Negroes who followed several months later. The Negro sat in a anteroom off from the regular classroom. A railing kept him apart from classmates. He was given a special table in the cafeteria. He studied at a designated place in the library. He was compelled to use Jim Crow rest facilities.

Soon, however, Jim Crow signs were mutilated or destroyed by white students. Mrs. Ada Lois Sipuel Fisher had become the first Negro student to enroll in the university campus law school. (A law school of Langston University, a Negro institution, had been closed in Oklahoma City.) Football Coach Charles (Bud) Wilkinson had said: "Any time a Negro is good enough to make our team, he's welcome."

Then came the crushing blow in June, 1950. The U. S. Supreme Court knocked the legal props from under segregation at the University of Oklahoma. (In a companion case of Herman Marion Sweatt, a former Houston post office worker, the Supreme Court ruled out segregation and discrimination at the University of Texas law school. The decisions were widely interpreted as banning segregation on the graduate and professional school levels in

the South.) Referring to the segregation of Mr. McLaurin, Chief Justice Fred Vinson remarked:

"Such restrictions impair and inhibit his ability to study, to engage in discussions, and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession."

I walked about the University of Oklahoma campus during the summer sessions. I had breakfast in the cafeteria. Negro students, I observed, sat where they pleased, intermingling with white students. There was not the faintest sign of friction, no discernible distinction on the campus or in the classroom. In Sooner City, a campus housing development for married students I found many Negro couples who had set up housekeeping.

"School administrators the faculty and the majority of the student body were ready for integration long before it came about" Carl M. Franklin, executive vice president of the university told me.

Mr. Franklin recalls that, early in 1948, several hundred students participated in a bonfire. Copies of the 14th Amendment were burned in protest against the refusal of the university to admit Negro students.

Well over 1,000 Negroes matriculated last year at hitherto all-white institutions. Many were enrolled in undergraduate courses. Several received degrees.

Some farsighted officials did not wait for the inevitable. Negroes were admitted to state-supported institutions in several states, notably Arkansas and Kentucky. Private colleges and universities have admitted Negroes in Kentucky, Texas and Missouri.

But in many states, acceptance came only after the choice was forced upon them. Such states as North Carolina, Virginia and Maryland yielded only after the courts said they must.

In Atlanta I met Dr. John B. Eubanks, young president of Jarvis College, Hawkins, Tex., a Negro institution of 200 selected students. I asked him what effect this ferment over Negro students entering previously white schools has on Negro institutions.

Negro schools, he said, would simply have to improve their standards or face the threat of going out of business.

Dr. Eubanks has been doing some advanced thinking on this matter. He told me that he had applications for five whites seeking to join his faculty. He added that he had been approached by two different white citizens in Hawkins about enrolling their children in Jarvis College.

"I may let them register and tell the trustees they can vote later," Dr. Eubanks said.

## *Negro remains victim of discrimination in the matter of housing*

Any Negro can buy the highest priced automobile—if he has good credit or the cash to lay on the line. The same goes for the food he eats and the clothes he wears. Usually he gets a dollar's worth for a dollar spent.

But a house in which to live is another matter. A house is one thing that Negroes cannot yet purchase on equal terms with their fellow citizens. Negroes are forced to accept more hand-me-downs and left-overs in housing than any thing else.

In Philadelphia, Negroes occupy by far the greater share of 110,000 substandard houses, including 70,000 without bath and 61,000 with unsafe walls, leaky roofs and other dangerous defects. But Negroes have moved into fewer than 1,000 of the more than 30,000 new dwelling units constructed in the Pennsylvania metropolis since the end of World War II.

Housing is the key-point of segregation. It leads to discrimination in schools, employment, churches and recreation. It is one of the most provocative irritants of racial tensions.

Some Negro businessmen, politicians and even clergymen have a vested interest in segregated housing. They have found racial barriers profitable. Frequently many tacitly oppose the movement of Negroes into new neighborhoods.

Curiously, as a residential pattern, housing is a more acute problem in many northern cities than in the South. The most squalid black belts are on Chicago's South Side, in New York's Harlem, in Cincinnati's Basin and on Dayton's West Side.

In New England cities—Boston, Hartford, Providence—I found Negro leadership, allied with other groups, striving to undo racial segregation in public housing. Even in San Francisco on the comparatively cosmopolitan West Coast, I found Jim Crow public housing projects.

Residential patterns in the South are often a paradox. To be sure, the railroad tracks or some other symbol usually marks the beginning of Negro neighborhoods in many small towns. In the larger cities, Negroes generally are excluded from the most select residential areas.

Yet in Louisville, Ky., Raleigh, N. C., and New Orleans, I saw neighbors of both races living side by side. Even in Dallas, Tex., scene of recent bombings of Negro homes and businesses, Negroes and whites live in the same block.

In New Orleans I asked a Negro woman about her white neighbor. The two families live under the same roof, their homes divided by partition.

"We have lived on the very best of terms for a number of years," said the woman. "I could not wish for more friendly neighbors. Our children play together in the yard, even exchange toys, but there is where the friendship ends.

"One day we were taking the same bus downtown and the children could not understand why they could play together but could not sit on the bus together—and I could not explain it to their satisfaction."

The forces that have kept Negroes hemmed-in residentially are obvious. One is a combination of real estate and financial interests. Few realtors will sell to Negroes in all-white residential areas because of fear of a general depression in values. In trying to break into all-white blocks and neighborhoods, Negroes meet burdensome obstacles in obtaining loans from banks and other lending institutions.

Even the Federal Government is involved. The Federal Housing Administration has refused, in many instances, to approve loans for Negroes who desire to move into areas in which they are not

wanted. The Public Housing Administration has bowed to existing community patterns in determining the racial occupancy of many public housing projects. In fact, racial segregation has been introduced through Government housing projects in many communities where no such clear-cut pattern existed before.

In recent years legal pressure has been constantly exerted on segregation in public housing. At least four states—New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Jersey—have laws banning Jim Crow public housing units. Many cities have imposed similar bans.

In cities like New York and Seattle, integration in public housing has been rule for years. Many other cities—Los Angeles, Chicago, Cleveland and Newark, N. Y.—have followed the same trend in the last few years.

Surprisingly, segregation in public housing still prevails in San Francisco and, to some extent, in Boston, Hartford and Providence, Minneapolis and Denver. In Providence, I was told that a suit was contemplated by whites to permit them to stay in a new public housing project that had been designated for Negroes.

Despite the fact that Negroes remain at a competitive disadvantage in the private housing market, I found hope and progress in many cities. When the U. S. Supreme Court, in 1948, held that restrictive covenants had no legal effect on the signers, residential bottlenecks were broken in many cities. Negroes began a process of emigration from ghettos.

I found striking evidence of this is Los Angeles. It is a civic boast in Los Angeles that Negroes have more residential freedom than in any other city in the country. I covered much of the vast acreage of this West Coast metropolis—embracing 453.42 square miles—by taxicab and private automobile. I saw Negro residential salients reaching into the north and east and the west and southwest. A few years ago the majority of the city's Negro population was concentrated in the southeast section of the city along Central Ave.

In Los Angeles I found less panic among white families when Negroes move into an all-white block. I saw Negro and white children playing in what two or three years ago were solidly white blocks. I met the Negro landlord of a triplex dwelling. One of his tenants was white, the other a Ne-

gro. I was assured that this was not an uncommon situation.

An instinct of whites to stampede from new Negro neighbors has given rise to a vicious and greedy real estate exploitation. Crafty real estate speculators tell whites a neighborhood is going Negro and promise them fancy prices for their homes. They promptly inflate the price and sell to the first Negro taker. In buying old property, Negroes not only pay higher prices but have to accept more stringent terms than they would for new dwellings. Negro manipulators are just as guilty of this practice as anyone else.

One of the bromides in real estate circles is that Negroes will lower property values. All over the country I saw evidence to the contrary. In many cases, like the Glenville section in Cleveland, Negroes have acquired run down property and improved it above the level of most white homes in the same areas.

Negro ownership of non-farm homes is steadily climbing. Today they own nearly 40 per cent of the non-farm homes in which they dwell. In many cities—Atlanta, Nashville, Tenn.; Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Calif., and Phoenix, Ariz.—I found thousands of new units for rent and sale to Negroes—the first new construction available to them in years.

In Oklahoma City, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Edwards have built more than 600 homes under the FHA since 1937. They range in price from \$7,200 to \$19,000.

"Not one home has been lost for failure to keep up payment and a large number are now paid for," the Negro couple proudly told me.

### Good Ideas Are Wealth

The strongholds of dynamic personal liberty in the nation's widely debated private enterprise system traditionally have included the publishing of weekly newspapers in rural and suburban communities.

One of the great and distinguishing features of the typical country newspaper is that you know who owns it and you know where to go to complain when you take issue with the editor.

Unlike the big city dailies, isolated in anonymous and distant ownership, the country and suburban papers are owned by a neighbor, a friend, a community

leader, a person you can approach and with whom you may reason.

Country journalism, measured in dollar volume, may not be classed as big business in America but it surely is important business, significant business—and definitely concerned with the common welfare.

Journalism is akin to statesmanship and is charged with the maintenance of ethical standards. By its nature, country journalism may be said to be the closest of all such efforts to the people themselves.

It is a truism that the cold war engulfing the world today is a harsh battle for men's minds.

In this battle of ideas, the country and suburban editor, close to the people and their problems, is in a position to measure the community's heartbeat and feel its pulse with knowing accuracy.

When and if confidence is restored in newspapers generally across the nation, and it seems likely that television's approaching spot news coverage may force needed reformation from within, it will be mostly the individual owner-editors taking a daily interest in the paper who will lead the reform.

It's in the battle of ideas, thru selectivity of news and its proper emphasis, that editors can best serve the common good and help save the Republic.

*Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal*  
Volume 3, Number 21

### Obits

*From the obituary page of the New York Times, March 11, 1952*

#### 37 PAPERS QUIT IN 1951

#### Ayer Reports Drop in Sunday and Morning Publications

PHILADELPHIA, March 10 (UP)—Although daily newspaper circulation in the United States remained high, thirty-seven morning and Sunday newspapers went out of existence during 1951, according to the eighty-fourth annual Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals published today.

The N. W. Ayer & Sons directory showed circulation totaled 53,593,000, compared with the all-time record of 53,618,000 set in 1950.

Evening newspapers, including foreign language dailies, totaled 1,507, an increase of ten over 1950; but twenty-seven morning newspapers went out of existence, lowering the total to 363 in 1951, while Sunday newspapers dropped ten to 564.

The directory showed morning newspapers had a combined circulation of 20,457,000 and evening newspapers a combined circulation of 32,225,000, the highest ever registered. Sunday newspapers had a combined circulation of 45,970,000.

The directory showed that since the end of World War II, evening newspapers added 12 per cent to their circulations, morning newspapers 15 per cent and Sunday papers 19 per cent.

### The Voice of Yale

Most of the misunderstanding about what is taught in American colleges would evaporate if everyone would grasp a single sentence in a report made by an advisory committee to Pres. Griswold of Yale. The report says:

"The business of a university is to educate, not to indoctrinate, its students."

The advisory committee is headed by a former president of the Union Theological Seminary, and includes the board chairman of United Steel and a Federal judge. It has examined charges that Yale is indoctrinating students with subversive ideas and promoting irreligion.

The university, the report finds, is doing the exact opposite of trying to indoctrinate anyone with anything. It seeks to present "all sides of an issue . . .; all sides not just those that may be currently popular with trustees and alumni." The committee finds, incidentally, that "religious life at Yale is deeper . . . than . . . for many years."

To the university's critics the committee answers that it seeks to teach the young to think for themselves. That is education. Alumni, legislators and the public would do well to note that it is quite a different thing from indoctrination, which means the overpowering of the student's mind with a ready-made line of thought.

—Boston *Globe*, Feb. 19, 1952

San Francisco Chronicle,  
February 17, 1952

## South S. F. Area Votes to Exclude a Chinese Family

*'I Didn't Know About Prejudice'*

by Bernard Taper

Residents of the Southwood district of South San Francisco were triumphant yesterday in their efforts to keep their neighborhood 100 percent Caucasian.

They achieved this object by the use of one of democracy's most fundamental instruments—the secret ballot.

By a vote of 174 to 28 they told Sing Sheng, a former Chinese Nationalist intelligence officer, that they did not want him, his pretty wife and small son as neighbors.

They did not want the Shengs as neighbors for a lot of reasons which added up to one big reason: the Shengs are Chinese.

The ballots were counted in a garage in the neighborhood. The long narrow building was crowded with some 100 home owners and spectators.

### Sheng There

Sheng, a young man of 25, dressed in a double-breasted blue suit, sat at the balloting table. His Chinese-American wife sat in the front row. She is pregnant. Her baby is due to be born on February 22—Washington's birthday.

The suggestion of putting the matter to a ballot came from Sheng himself, after he received numerous objections to his purchase of a house on West Orange Avenue last week. Most of the objections asserted his presence would depress property values.

"I didn't know about any race prejudice at all until I came to Southwood. I was sure everybody really believed in democracy, so I thought up this vote as a test," he said at that time.

Before the counting of the ballots began, Edward Howden, executive director of the San Francisco Council for Civic Unity, told the assembled home owners he had learned of a scientific study recently made in the Bay Area analyzing the actual effect of non-Caucasian residents on property values.

He asked if the group wanted to postpone counting the ballots until they had a chance to consider and discuss this study.

## The Sheng Story

Everybody knows the housing problem of the Sing Sheng family who were excluded from a "restricted" development in Southwood, California, by a vote of the residents. The reason everybody knows the Sheng story is the extraordinary coverage given it by the *San Francisco Chronicle*, beginning with the threats and pressure on Sheng after his purchase, going through his decision to test democracy by putting the issue to a secret ballot by his neighbors, and continuing through the explosion of public opinion that followed. On several days the entire editorial page of the *Chronicle* was devoted to editorial, column and letters on the Sheng case. Six days later the *Chronicle* announced it had received 266 letters for Sheng, 16 against. It printed a whole page of them that day, cluding all 16 opposed. The same day it gave half a page to the real estate man's explanation of why Sheng would be bad for business in Southwood.

Gov. Earl Warren of California was one of the first letter writers. In a letter direct to Sheng, the governor said:

"I am not at all proud of the action of people in the neighborhood of your new home. It is not in keeping with the fairness of the people of the San Francisco Bay Area or of Californians generally, and, of course, it has no legal effect.

"I am sure it is a disappointment to you and I agree with you that it is just such things that the Communists make much

of in their effort to discredit our system.

"It is my hope that you will find a home where the real hospitality of our people will be demonstrated and that you and your little family will find real happiness in our State."

Scores of homes were offered to the Shengs by people who agreed with the governor. A week later a "For Sale" sign went up in front of the most imposing house in Southwood, owned by Roger Roussille, one of the dozen original residents who had lived there 11 years. "I do not want to continue living with a bunch of bigots," Roussille said. Somebody telephoned him to threaten a lawsuit should the house be sold to a non-Caucasian. "I told him to go right ahead and sue. I'd love to have somebody do something like that," Roussille said. "I am fortunate enough to be in a position to defend myself and at the same time defend my principles."

Following the *Chronicle's* lead, public opinion had taken a sharp turn around on the Southwood prejudices. One of the early threats to the Shengs had been that little children might throw rocks and dump garbage on the house. But a week later the South San Francisco school superintendent found he needed to address the school children, saying, "Lay off the Southwood kids." And looking down at his own son in the audience: "And that goes for you too."

Voices from the back of the garage shouted this down:

"Let's get on with it. Let's not fool around any more.

Each ballot was tallied aloud, read by South San Francisco City Manager Emmons McClung.

### "I Object"

The ballots were phrased so that the home owners were asked whether they

objected to the purchase of a home in the neighborhood by this Chinese family.

The Shengs heard McClung read the phrase, "I object," 174 times as he tallied the ballots. By the end of the balloting they looked crushed.

A silence followed the final tally. Then Sheng stood up and let it be known he would abide by the vote.

"We'll have to sell the furniture we

bought and go somewhere else to live. I hope you people will be happy in your community and that your property values will increase every day."

The meeting broke up. The home owners exchanged jubilant remarks as they drifted out of the hall.

Many of them were articulate to this reporter about their reasons for not wanting the Shengs in their district, but not one would permit his name to be quoted in connection with these explanations.

"What do you want to do, put me on the spot?" one of them demanded.

The home owners were indignant at the *Chronicle* for reporting the story in the first place.

"We have a quiet, respectable neighborhood here and we don't care for publicity," one said.

If Sheng had wished, he could have ignored the vote and insisted on his legal right to move into the house. The U. S. Supreme Court has ruled "restrictive covenant" agreements unconstitutional.

Despite this ruling, the American Homes Development Company of Burlington—describing themselves as "developers of this representative American residential area"—sent a letter to all home owners in Southwood last week urging

them to hold fast to the principle of restrictive covenants in all their housing transactions.

"These covenants set forth salutary and beneficial restrictions on the land for those purchasers desiring ownership in a community where they could welcome their neighbor and live in equality."

The letter was signed by Frank B. Perkins for the company.

#### A Letter

The Shengs also wrote a letter to the Southwood home owners before the balloting. It read:

"We wish to express our gratification for the interest you showed in the welfare of our purchasing the house at 726 W. Orange avenue.

"Before you reach any decision as to how you will vote in the ballot, allow us to tell you our opinion. The present world conflict is not between individual nations, but between Communism and Democracy. We think so highly of Democracy because it offers freedom and equality. America's fore-fathers fought for these principles and won the Independence of 1776.

"We have forsaken all our beloved in China and have come to this country seeking the same basic rights. Do not

make us the victims of false Democracy. Please vote in favor of us."

Southwood's homes are in the \$10,000 to \$12,000 price range. Of the 253 owners eligible to vote, 31 did not return ballots and 14 expressed themselves as having no opinion on the matter. Six ballots were void.

"If Not Satisfied . . ."

The owner of the house, Jack Denson, said after the meeting he would return Sheng's \$2950 down payment.

The Densons said they had been subject to "considerable pressure" ever since the sale to the Shengs was announced.

"We were given to understand that if the sale went through people would see to it that we had a hard time buying another piece of property anywhere on the Peninsula," Mrs. Denson said.

Sheng came to the United States in 1947, intending to study for the diplomatic service. When the Communists took over China, he decided to stay in this country. He is employed as an air line mechanic. He and his family live in an apartment in colorful—but congested—Chinatown, at 47 Eagle avenue.

This week the Shengs will resume their efforts to find a home. They hope to meet with better success, because this is Brotherhood Week.

## A Good Mule Out of Work Through No Fault of His Own

Special to the Journal

RALEIGH.—Eleven years of plodding service to the State of North Carolina will come to an unhappy end March 20 when John, a mule for the Woman's Prison, will be sold at auction.

Sealed bids for John are now being accepted. They will be opened next Thursday, and John goes to the highest bidder.

The announcement of John's retirement from prison service was made earlier this week, and Louis Smith, farm superintendent, feared that two injustices had been done.

The first was an impression that John was being fired because he has grown slow and lazy.

Nothing could be farther from the truth, Mr. Smith said. In fact, John has always pulled his share of the load at the 200-acre farm.

He said John has an excellent personality, and added that women prisoners are very attached to him.

As for intelligence, John is being given excellent references. He is considered very smart since he can unlatch a door and turn on a spigot to get his water.

The second mistaken impression left by the announcement of John's retirement, Mr. Smith said, was that women prisoners have plowed the retiring mule.

Yesterday, to clear up all confusion over John's return to civilian life, Mr. Smith said "He is being offered for sale only because the prison's re-vamped farm program can be carried on with one mule less than previously."

Some mule had to go.

And John was elected.

—Winston-Salem *Journal*, Mar. 13

Winston-Salem Journal

## Columbus Klan Fears New Blows

More Arrests Due in N. C. Floggings

(This is the first of four articles by Marjorie Hunter, Journal reporter, describing the developments in connection with the arrest of former Klansmen in Columbus County.)

By Marjorie Hunter  
Journal Reporter

WHITEVILLE.—The day after 10 former Ku Klux Klansmen were arrested last week, a local editor took a look around this tobacco-rich county that has been called the KKK's North Carolina guinea pig.

"A few weeks ago, you didn't know where the Klan was going to strike next. Now, the shoe is on the other foot. The Klan doesn't know where the forces of law and order will strike next."

Editor Willard Cole of the Whiteville News Reporter appeared to be right.

Klan members, many of them who joined the Columbus County KKK Klaverns with no idea of violence to come, are wallowing in mud that the Klan furnished its Tar Heel guinea pig.

Officers, working both day and night in an attempt to solve a dozen other flogging incidents that brought a reign of terror to this rich farming county nestling next to the South Carolina line, have promised more arrests.

Those arrests, the officers say, will cut deeply into the ranks of the county's estimated 1,700 Klansmen.

### Fear Spreads in Klan

Fear began spreading through the Klan after FBI agents rounded up the 10 former members of the Fair Bluff Klavern last week on charges of kidnaping and violating of civil rights.

For many of the Klansmen, that fear isn't a fear of arrest. It is a fear that their short-lived link with the Klan will be exposed.

Of the estimated 1,700 Klan members in this county, officers believe that not more than 150 have taken part in the night rides that left bloody victims by the roadsides and frightened many of Columbus County's 50,285 citizens into purchasing guns with which to greet night callers.

And what of the Klansmen who did not take part in terrorizing night rides?

"Some of them are upstanding citizens who got into the Klan, thinking it was just going to be a social organization," Editor Cole said.

Many of them attended one meeting, sensed the type of organization it was, and never went back again, a local police officer said.

But by that time, they were enrolled in the Klan. Somewhere, there is a record of membership dues received from them. They are Klansmen who turned anti-Klan but are afraid—or ashamed—to speak.

Few have gone directly to officers and explained the situation into which they got themselves. Some have approached officers through third persons. Most are keeping quiet.

When the Klan first moved into North Carolina in the early Spring of 1950, crossing over from South Carolina's Klannish Horry County (home of popular Myrtle Beach), few residents of this county realized what was happening.

Quietly, a Klavern was organized in Whiteville and chose a headquarters a semi-public building. Three other Klaverns—including the one at Fair Bluff that was disbanded early this year on orders of Grand Dragon Thomas L. Hamilton of Leesville, S. C.—were organized in the months that followed.

The Klavern were already strong by the time the Klan staged a giant cross-burning rally that attracted 5,000 persons to a farm seven miles south of Whiteville in the early summer of 1950.

Just as quietly as the Klan had edged into this county, H. Hugh Nance began investigating reports of night-ride floggings when he took office as Columbus sheriff in January, 1951.

"We're going to break this," Sheriff Nance promised one day last week as he sat in his office in the red brick courthouse.

Local observers say that Klansmen, both the active and passive ones, are afraid the sheriff was right.

(suggested by Hoke Norris)

## McCarthy Threatens the Press Shop Talk at Thirty

by Robert U. Brown

Following an E & P editorial Feb. 2, condemning Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin for attempting to apply pressure on *Time* magazine's advertisers to withdraw their patronage because that publication had criticized him, we have been reminded that this is not exactly a new technique with him.

In fact, it is getting to be a habit. Any publication that disapproves of Joe McCarthy may expect him to appeal to its advertisers to unite in a boycott. We expect E & P to get the same treatment any day now. But we don't expect our advertisers to be intimidated by him any more than we would be, or that *Time*, its advertisers, and the other publications which he has threatened, have been.

Actually, the Senator may not know it, but if he should be successful in organizing an advertiser boycott against any publication he would be guilty of violating the Sherman anti-trust law. Several New York City department stores tried to boycott the *New York Times* back in 1943, were found guilty of conspiracy (acting in concert in an attempt to regulate the retail advertising rates), and were fined heavily. It may be that the Senator is guilty of such violation by even trying to promote such a conspiracy.

In the Feb. 2 editorial E & P noted McCarthy's letter to *Time's* publisher: "As you, of course, know, I am preparing material on *Time* magazine to furnish all of your advertisers so they may be fully aware of the type of publication they are supporting."

We recalled that "this is the second time" he had tried to intimidate critics by attacking their pocketbooks and noted his demand in 1950 that the Adam Hat Company withdraw its sponsorship of Drew Pearson's radio program.

Actually this was the fifth time Senator McCarthy has tried to use this club. Two newspapers and a radio station in his own state of Wisconsin are contenders for the honor of being the guinea pigs in the Senator's "muzzle-the-press" campaign.

We are indebted to Lindsay Hoben, chief editorial writer of the Milwaukee

*Journal*, for bringing us up to date.

Number one on McCarthy's "hit parade" was the Madison (Wis) *Capital Times*. In a mimeographed newspaper release, dated Nov. 7, 1949, and sent from Senator McCarthy's office in the U. S. Senate to all newspaper editors of Wisconsin, he said:

"It is for the people of Madison and vicinity to decide whether they will continue by advertisements and subscriptions to support this paper in view of the above facts—especially in view of the fact that the man who is editor publicly proclaimed that the man hired as city editor was an active and leading member of the Communist Party."

Mr. Hoben reports that "this statement was quoted in many Wisconsin papers and was quoted in full in several of them. In a speech at Madison before the Madison Shrine Club on Nov. 9, 1949, McCarthy used this statement as the basis of his address and urged the boycott by advertisers and subscribers against the *Capital Times*."

On August 7, 1950, in his speech to the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association in Milwaukee, Senator McCarthy attacked the *Capital Times* and the

Milwaukee *Journal*, saying in part: "Keep in mind that when you send your checks over to the *Journal* for advertising or pay a nickel for it, you yourselves are contributing to bring the party line into the homes of Wisconsin."

He made another boycott attack on the Milwaukee *Journal*, Sept. 14, 1950, in a speech before the Wauwatosa (Milwaukee suburb) Republican Club. McCarthy proposed a boycott of businesses which advertise in the *Journal*. He repeated this attack several times. His words in the Sept. 14 speech were:

"Now if every housewife advises the advertisers in that paper that she will not buy a cent's worth of goods advertised in papers that are smearing good, loyal Americans, that will have an effect. That's what you can do. And the same thing goes on the radio."

Mr. Hoben says this latter reference was to the Milwaukee *Journal's* radio station WTMJ and its television station WTMJ-TV.

Citing the effectiveness of the Senator's attempts at intimidation, Mr. Hoben observes: "It was a matter of particular satisfaction to us that the *Journal* made new high records in circulation and in ad-

vertising despite the Senator's boycott attack's.

Many newspapers and magazines have raised their editorial voices against McCarthy's attempt to intimidate *Time* and other publications. Some of those who have spoken out on this issue have been friendly to him in the past.

Senator William Benton of Connecticut, who led the movement in Congress to expel McCarthy (which has bogged down because of the coming elections), this week in New York charged McCarthy with attempting to "blackmail" publications. Speaking to the alumni association of the City College of New York, Senator Benton said:

"First we see McCarthy violating the great Anglo-Saxon doctrine that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty. Now we see him attempting to overthrow by intimidation an equally great Anglo-Saxon doctrine, freedom of speech and press.

"These are the ways of the dictator. I predict he will not find the press as soft a touch as the State Department."

We agree. He hasn't and he won't.

—Editor & Publisher,  
February 16, 1952

## New Orleans Item

### The Item Reports to Its Readers

This is the *Item's* report for 1951.

It is addressed to you, our readers.

In it we initiate a policy of reviewing our record of the 12 months just past—a policy of accounting for our stewardship, so to speak, to you in the *Item* family.

For the *Item*, which will shortly begin its 75th year, is more than a business. It is more than a medium of news, opinion and entertainment.

We feel—and hope—that it is a public servant, an instrument of democracy.

We feel that freedom of the press is a freedom that belongs to you, rather than to us. It is less the freedom to *print* than the freedom to *read*.

We reported daily the crises and controversies of 1951. We tried to evaluate events as they happened, and to take a clear stand on vital issues.

We also accepted another duty of a living, vital newspaper:

To battle vigorously and unceasingly for the public causes we believe are important.

News is not only something that *has* happened. It is also something that *can* or probably *will* happen.

If a rotted firetrap housing the mentally ill should burst into death-dealing flame, that obviously is news. But isn't it news also that such a *possibility* of disaster exists?

The *Item* doesn't believe in sitting back and waiting for news. We believe in going out and getting it. And 1951, as much as any year in our time, defined

the *Item* as a hard-hitting, campaigning newspaper.

Last year we waged 11 public service campaigns. Each one of them was aimed against a condition or situation of vital import to the welfare of our city and our state.

Each campaign began with a series of articles presenting the facts. These we followed up with plain-spoken editorials.

We presented opposing points of view. We tried to steer clear of self-righteousness.

In most cases, the *Item* got action—though not always conclusive action.

In every case the public was acquainted with the facts.

(There followed a full-page report under 16 headings of the *Item's* campaigns and causes in 1951.)

---

### Headline of the Times (N.Y.) Mar. 12, 1952

## 'Clues' to Schuster Murderer Fail; Police Seek Aid of Psychiatrists

**Christian Science Monitor,  
March 20, 1952**

## Let's Look at the Evidence

by **Richard L. Strout**

Washington

On the television show of Edward Murrow, March 16, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy participated. He was asked to comment on the subject of "congressional immunity." Mr. McCarthy referred to Senator William Benton (D) of Connecticut who has brought a motion to oust him from the Senate. Mr. Benton charges that Mr. McCarthy, among other things, made false accusations free from libel suits under the cloak of congressional immunity.

Mr. McCarthy in turn told the big TV audience that Mr. Benton had been hypocritically employing congressional immunity himself even while he was making his own charges. Referring to the 30,000-word statement which Mr. Benton read to the Senate subcommittee, Mr. McCarthy told the TV audience:

"This was handed to the press and we find the following: 'No part of this must be used by the press until it becomes immune as I testified.' So you find the senator shouting and screaming to high heaven, 'McCarthy shouldn't use congressional immunity to expose Communists.' But he is using congressional immunity to smear McCarthy."

This reporter listened to the Benton testimony. I have before me a copy of the 30,000-word Benton text as I write this. Mr. McCarthy's charge is not correct. The phrase which he ascribes to Mr. Benton has been doctored for his own purposes. The key phrase in the release notice at the top of the Benton document as it actually appears is as follows: "The attached testimony . . . must be held in strict confidence for release as it becomes a part of the record of the subcommittee." The phrase is an everyday one in newspaper offices. Mr. McCarthy has altered this statement and spread it out to the wide winds of television inaccurately to suit his argument. He got a momentary triumph on the television at the cost of certain exposure a few days later. Every reporter who heard Mr. McCarthy's rendition of this phrase knew that it was wrong. Mr. Benton, himself, took the Senate floor Tuesday to point out

that it was wrong. He went further and publicly renounced any senatorial immunity he may have under the circumstances.

Mr. McCarthy was offering evidence to suit his own purpose and it was false evidence, as a comparison of the two statements shows.

The problem of Mr. McCarthy has been growing more acute. Mr. Benton brought in his ouster motion seven months ago. He offered 10 items of alleged fraud and deceit. One of these was the \$10,000 sum Mr. McCarthy received from the Lustron Corporation while as a senator investigating housing; others were the conflicting McCarthy claims of sensational evidence.

Many people would be glad to have the Senate investigate the Benton charges. But Mr. McCarthy has now attacked the subcommittee making the inquiry. The angry subcommittee voted 4 to 1 to ask the Senate for a vote of confidence, and this was followed by a similar demand from the full committee, 8 to 3.

The Senate has given Mr. McCarthy

one full month to take action on this matter and repeat his accusations to the Senate although Mr. McCarthy has already told the press that he did not intend to raise the issue. It is hard not to believe that some members of the Senate are afraid of Mr. McCarthy, or are purposely holding back for political motives in Mr. McCarthy's reelection campaign.

Mr. McCarthy has meanwhile started a maneuver against publications which attack him. He has urged the retail food dealers of Milwaukee to boycott one of his Wisconsin critics, the Milwaukee *Journal*. He is widely credited with having lost columnist Drew Pearson his radio sponsor. He has recently written to Henry Luce, the publisher of *Time* and *Life* magazines, warning him that he is preparing to organize a boycott of his advertisers.

The tactics have caused the New York *Daily News* (no enemy of Mr. McCarthy in the past) to dub him "Low Blow Joe." *Editor and Publisher* comments, "The whole thing reeks of totalitarianism." Chairman Guy Gillette (D) of Iowa, in his official report to the Senate, calls the McCarthy charges against his Rules Committee "intemperate and outrageous." Now comes the presentation of twisted evidence to the unsuspecting American television public on a reputable TV show.

**Columbus, Ga. Ledger, March 7, 1952**

## Papers Distribute 'Most Realistic' Ad

The four-page Flowers Bros. clothing advertisement in today's *Ledger* is probably the most realistic display ever carried in the *Ledger-Enquirer* newspapers.

Not only is it possible to read about Flowers' suits and see a full-color picture of one—you can actually feel the material! Three cloth swatches were pasted by hand to a page of every newspaper.

Several *Ledger-Enquirer* firsts were chalked up by the ad. It is the first time full color has been used for a full-page ad; the first time four pages have been devoted to a single item, and the first time actual cloth has appeared in the paper.

The ad ran in the *Enquirer* yesterday. **400 Hours Used**

Four-hundred man hours of work were consumed merely in pasting the cloth swatches to the paper. The job required

420 yards of cloth, or enough to make about 125 suits of clothes.

Flowers Bros., which has planned the sale for several months, obtained special delivery of 2,000 suits from Burlington mills and Sewell Mfg. Company. The store at 1026-1028 Broadway was redecorated especially for the occasion.

"This is the biggest thing we have ever undertaken," says Harry Thompson, store manager, "and we believe it to be the biggest thing of its kind in Columbus."

"We felt that we had merchandise that could best be shown in color, and by letting the public see the quality of the cloth. With the help of the *Ledger-Enquirer*, we accomplished both of these objectives in our special section."

## FIRST TOWN FOR IKE

Boston Globe, February 26, 1952

*"We folks seem to forget that we ain't just electing a President. We're choosing a feller to run the whole world."*

# The Town That Always Votes First

by Edwards Park

### Harts Location:

Eisenhower . . . . . 3  
Truman . . . . . 1  
Undecided . . . . . 4

HARTS LOCATION, N. H., Feb. 25—This 180-year-old township, stretching like a long finger through Crawford Notch in the White Mountains, has the reputation of beating the nation at counting votes. Every election year the reporters gather up at Willey House Station, on the lofty trestle of the Maine Central Railroad and watch the tabulation of eight, or 10, or 12 votes.

This year there are only eight on the checklist. Two people are moving down to Maine and have asked Town Clerk Joe Burke to remove their names. The others are getting their minds made up for the primaries on March 11.

Choosing their candidates is a serious business for the Harts Location residents. They are not farm people with a tradition of Republicanism. They are nearly all railroad folks—"working people" as they call themselves, with a subtle dig at the farming communities. And as working people they are often partial to the Democratic party.

The town has gone Democrat in more than one election. It has two citizens who are registered Democrats.

One is John B. McCann, 68, section foreman of the Sawyers River section of the railroad. He has lived in Harts Location since 1911, when he moved there from nearby Carroll. He is big and ruddy, has the reputation for telling tall stories, smokes nothing but a pipe and was wearing an Alaskan parka, with the snow dusting the fur trim, when he appeared, trudging down the line to where his section hands were throwing rock salt on the grade crossing.

"I've been a Democrat all my life," he says, with a belligerent thrust of his jaw. "I voted for Truman last time and Roosevelt before that. If they find me a candidate I like this year, I'll be for him."

But who that candidate might be he doesn't know yet.

"Harry's all right, if he'll run," he says. "Jobs have been good, with plenty of money coming in under him. I never knowed it so good. Don't know much about this feller Kefauver."

The other Democrat is Dot King, Peter King's wife, up at Willey House Postoffice. She, too, voted a straight Democratic ticket in 1948 and 1950. This year she says she may not vote at all.

Her husband, Peter, is usually Republican. He was the last few times, anyway. This year he's undecided between Taft and Eisenhower.

Half a mile up the railroad from the Postoffice is the Willey House Station, named after the famous Willey House, which was wiped out by a landslide in 1826. Here live the Burkes, Joe and his wife. Their son, Harold, was trying to open the road with a bulldozer, clattering into the eight-foot drifts and heaving them back and up until they buried the stubby mountain spruces.

Harold was the first to answer questions. He is a barrel-chested man with hands like slabs of New Hampshire granite. He spends his long Winter evenings tying trout flies. Sometimes he takes a rifle and goes out to look for a bear. He says there are plenty of them.

"I'm for Ike," he says, "I think he'll pull the country together. Someone's got to. We're in a hell of a mess now, ain't we?"

Harold's father, the town clerk, agrees. "I think Ike may be a man that'll do something for the workin' man," he tells

you. "We're for him, anyway. All three of us." His wife nods approval.

They voted for Dewey in 1948 and split their tickets in 1950. They liked Powell for Senator, but went Democrat for the gubernatorial candidate.

"This is my last year here," Joe Burke says, a little nostalgically. "I'm due to retire next year and we'll move down to Bartlett."

Mrs. Burke looks around the warm, comfortable living room in the station house.

"How would you like living here?" she asks. And then, not waiting for an answer, she says, "You know, it's kind of pretty and nice . . .!"

About the only Harts Location people in no way connected with the railroad are the Moreys. Mrs. Morey, owner of a roadside inn, has served as town clerk and held other district political positions. Her son George is a farmer—which in this district means he works on ski runs and as handy man for the big Summer establishments.

Both are strong Republicans. Neither is sure of whom to back in the coming primary.

"Ike seems good," George Morey says, "but he ain't around to tell us a lot of things we'd ought to know."

"I'd likely vote for MacArthur if he were younger and I thought he stood a chance," he continues. "There's a man put in 16 years as Governor of the Philippines or some damn place. He knows the business."

George hunches his shoulders and squints off down the gleaming white road. In profile, he is not unlike the Old Man of the Mountains.

"We folks seem to forget that we ain't just electing a President. We're choosing a feller to run the whole world," he rumi-

nates. "What's more, we'd ought to take a lot more care about the Vice President we put in. These candidates are all a healthy lot, but these days they seem to go out sudden—like the King."

The Moreys, mother and son were for Tobey in 1950 for "private reasons."

The snow is falling lightly along Harts Location. It falls some just about every day, powdering the great six to seven foot blanket that lies over Crawford

## Story of a Scoop

### Leg Work Gives Times TB Drug Beat

Hard and persistent digging by Arthur Gelb of the local news staff resulted in the exclusive story in the *Times* on Feb. 21, announcing development of a new drug that may eventually eradicate tuberculosis. It was one of the most important medical beats in years.

Gelb covers the State Building. At lunch there one day early in February a doctor friend told him about amazing results obtained from a series of experiments on "hopeless" TB patients with a new drug at Sea View Hospital at Staten Island. The doctor didn't know the details since he was not employed by the city, and was not connected with the project. He had heard, though, that men and women in the final stages of the disease were up and about after taking the new drug. The experiments, the doctor understood, had been going on for about seven months.

Gelb listened skeptically. How was it possible, he wondered, that he had heard nothing about such an extraordinary development from the Hospitals and Health Departments which were a part of his beat?

The secret, his friend explained, had been zealously guarded. The doctor felt, though, that it was too important to be kept from the public. He advised Gelb to dig into it, but warned him against seeing the commissioners. He thought they would try to steer Gelb off. They wanted to sit on it for another month or two, and let it appear first in official medical publications.

Gelb was still dubious, but tried to check the information during the next few days, while covering routine health and hospital assignments. All doctors to

Notch.

You half run, half slide down the steep path to your car. Out on the highway, a New York car sings past, its ski racks loaded. A mile down the road it will pass a town line sign marking the boundary between Harts Location and Bartlett. But the sign is buried in the plow drift. The visitors will never realize that they've just passed through the town that always votes first.

whom he talked professed ignorance of the TB project. Then, just to make sure in his own mind that he was not on a wild goose chase, he called a friend at Sea View and asked if he knew anything about the drug.

"Get off the line," the friend told him, nervously. "My wire is probably being tapped. I'd be fired if it was learned I was talking to a reporter."

Gelb knew that he was on to something. He drew up a list of about two dozen doctors whom he knew fairly well, both in and outside of the Health and Hospitals Departments. He began to canvass them, one by one. The first few acknowledged that experiments were going on, but told Gelb they were forbidden to talk. One glanced nervously up and down the corridor outside his office, then pleaded with Gelb to keep away from him. Nobody, though, offered what seemed to Gelb a logical reason for keeping the news from the public.

Frustrated, but determined to find out the reason for secrecy, Gelb tried to reach the Hospitals Commissioner, Dr. Marcus D. Kogel. The Commissioner was out of town but his aides reacted with horror when asked about the Sea View experiment. "Lay off," they told Gelb, and fell silent.

\* \* \*

At this point Gelb was against a cold stone wall. He reported the drug tip to city editor Robert E. Garst, and Mr. Garst suggested that he check it with William L. Laurence, *Times* science reporter.

On Friday, Feb. 15, a line appeared in Earl Wilson's column in the *New York Post*. This merely said that Sea View was experimenting with a TB miracle drug, and let it go at that. On the following

Monday, Gelb heard that a squad of *Post* reporters had been assigned to dig up information on the drug.

He raced through the rest of his list of doctors. Toward the bottom he found one who knew some of the facts and who felt it was wrong to keep them secret. Though the doctor was not attached to the project, his data came from sources that were. He steered Gelb to someone else who had additional information. From these two men, Gelb got the main facts for his story.

At the office on Tuesday evening, Feb. 19, he sought out Bill Laurence. Bill, meanwhile, had checked his own sources and had satisfied himself that the story stood up. Together, he and Gelb reported to the city desk. Laurence suggested that the story be used quickly, before it broke elsewhere.

Next morning Gelb found that one of his two sources was out of town. The other suddenly refused to talk, or even to look at the piece. He hastily bundled Gelb out of his office. A few minutes later Gelb learned that *Post* reporters were hot on his trail, feverishly sniffing for facts. They had been to Sea View and to the TB associations, and Gelb learned from a friend that the *Post* was set to run the story. He heard, too, that other newspapers were making inquiries and that patients, overwhelmed by the results of the drug, were spreading the news to relatives and friends.

Gelb knew he had to act fast. Desperately, he sought—and finally found—someone who was willing—and qualified—to read his story and to verify the facts. Gelb called Frank Adams, assistant city editor, to urge the need for speed if the story was to be a *Times* exclusive. Adams wired Laurence in Boston, asking him to call Gelb at the *Times* that afternoon to check the final story draft over the phone. The call came through; Laurence suggested a few changes.

Mr. Garst told the news department editorial conference that evening that Laurence had checked the story and had found it sound, that Bill was convinced there was no valid reason for withholding it. Manager Editor Turner Catledge gave the "go ahead."

The story ran on page 1 on Thursday morning, Feb. 21—and reaction came in journalistic tidal wave.

—*Times Talk*, March, 1952.

## Denver Post Turns Spotlight On News of Lobby Activities

by Roscoe Fleming

*Special Correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor*

Denver

The Denver Post has regularly assigned an experienced reporter to this state's so-called "third House"—the lobbies that try to influence legislation.

"Of course, news of the lobby got into newspapers now and then, but usually as a by-product of reporting what went on in the legislative chambers," said Palmer Hoyt, publisher, explaining the Post's new coverage. "The secrecy was unhealthy. We're the first newspaper I know of to make a regular news 'beat' of the activities of those who try to influence legislation, either directly or indirectly. . . .

"The intent is not punitive, nor to muckrake, but simply to report what we believe to be important news that the public is entitled to, about the way its business is run.

"The lobbyists didn't like it at first, not being used to publicity, but I think some of them are coming around to see that we concede, and even at times find praiseworthy, the importance of their role in supplying background information for legislation."

For example, Robert H. Hansen, the newspaper's "third House" reporter, closely followed efforts of veterans' organizations to bring about passage of a bill to legalize use of slot machine by charitable, religious, and fraternal organizations.

### Slot-Machine Bill

The Post disclosed that the representative who sponsored this bill is the father of the commander of the state Veterans of Foreign Wars, who is lobbying for the bill.

It quoted Gordon H. Rowe, Jr., first-year Republican representative, as denouncing the type of pressure being brought for the bill. He said members of veterans' posts all over the state were buttonholing legislators in behalf of it, were snowing them under with telegrams, and that, as for himself, the "heat" was so great at home that he didn't expect to come back.

He added that veterans' groups "seem to think they are a favored few who should be able to run slots when no one else can."

Pointing out that sponsors promised to donate to charity from the profits, he declared that if "charity has to be financed by an illegal measure, I'm against it." The bill was defeated.

### 25 P.C. Tax Limit

Mr. Hansen also reported and analyzed the support for the so-called 25 per cent income-tax amendment, which memorializes Congress to call a constitutional convention to limit federal corporate and personal income taxes, inheritance and gift-taxes, to that figure in time of peace.

He reported it as sponsored by three organizations—the Committee for Constitutional Government, American Taxpayers Association, and Western Tax Council—all allegedly supported by various major business groups.

The memorial was introduced in the Senate by GOP Senator Frank L. Gill, Majority Leader.

It provoked a blazing debate in both houses, winning by one vote in the House, but being badly beaten in the Senate. Without this public attention, it might have passed, as it has in other states where the public barely heard of it.

### Reins on Lobby

Mr Hansen's stories have also led to tighter reins on the lobby itself. As a result of wide publicity for its activities, the Senate has passed a strict lobbyist-registration rule, under which lobbyists must register, name their employees, give the amount of their lobbying compensation, and signify what legislation they are interested in.

The number of registrants quickly reached 125, as compared with 100 legislators. However, some vice-presidents and other important officials of large Colorado corporations, whose duties keep them at the State House virtually throughout each session, are holding out against registration as lobbyists.

"We feel that the results have been very good," said Mr. Hoyt. "Bringing hidden pressures into the light has resulted in a healthier atmosphere around the State House. We think it should result in better legislation and better government."

### To Stassen Let's Fasten

Though Rome may burn, let others fiddle! Harold Stassen's solved the riddle! He'll rush, his country's wounds to salve, from Pennsy U. to Pennsy av.

Relax, Robert, bow to Karma. Stick you, Ike, to NATO armor. Duff and Dirksen, Lodge and Warren, think you not that you can bore in. Hairbreath Harold will take over! In full sight, the cliffs of Dover to the tired and weary swimmer bring of hope their welcome shimmer.

Harold runs!—and has a platform ranking high as modern art form. "Where I Stand"—his former volumn—stands up still as freedom's column!

Strikes he blows for home and Mother; says each man should be a brother. Graft and war and wild inflation—these, he vows, will harm the nation. "I love America," states Stassen. 'Tis plain, on him all hopes should fasten. "For its farms" his "deep affection" counsels clearly his election. Help the great work of the churches! Let learning leap in splendid lurches; schools and colleges be aided; sloth and ignorance upbraided.

Though to some these may be platitudes, Stassen has some concrete attitudes. Much to selfishness we've pandered. Cure it with a new gold standard! Steep taxation has proved wearing. Replace it now with profit-sharing. To all classes Harold's justest; no more mostest to the fustest.

For sage advice, he'll lean on Hoover. (If point needs proving, Hoover'd prove 'er.) Also Ike and Doug MacArthur (Europe first? Or Asia farther?)

Another counsellor: Ralph Bunche. (Suggested by vote-getting hunch?) Advice will come from hither, thither. Beneath these guns, watch rivals wither.

To Baruch, for sapient steering, he will go—and, mantraps fearing, when he don't know where he's at, he will turn to Dixiecrat. Harry Byrd and James A. Farley (shade of Scrooge and ghost of Marley)—these will tide him safely over. (Nix on Douglas and Kefauver!)

With plan diffuse and many a mentor, he parts his hair straight down the center. (In past, aspirants in such toggery have been accused of demagoguery.)

(This editorial jingle of F. P. Locke, a Nieman Fellow of 1947, on his editorial page in the Dayton News, is published for its rhyme rather than its politics.)

## Why Are Crusades Necessary?

### Are They Confessions of Papers' Failures?

Since The Denver *Post* on Oct. 25 printed its blockbuster editorial, "The Governor Defaults—Now It's Up to the People," the silence of public and press has been almost deafening. Only a few letters to the editors, only a few editorials in weekly and daily newspapers, have been printed.

This is not a belated gallop to support the *Post* in its concern over "the lack of moral responsibility among public officials." This article does not deal with charges made, the issues defined or divined. At this time the writer is not complimentary or critical of the manner or the matter of The *Post's* crusade.

There is an issue of more importance to the public and to the press, than the current controversy. This issue was stated well by James S. Pope, managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*:

What worries me about crusades is: Why are they necessary? Is it not possible that the contrived fury which a crusade turns upon open public enemies is usually in itself a confession of the newspaper's deeper failure?

"The crusade is the Big Bertha of American journalism, a powerful weapon for a mighty target. But how did the target get so big?

"If we can startle the public into action with news of law-abiding democracy at bay, does this not imply that we left unreported news that led up to that crisis?"

And then Pope prescribed for editors: "I am convinced that the good editor—and perhaps any good and useful leader—has to wake up angry every morning. Not at the people who disagree with him on the numberless controversial topics of the day; in that arena he must maintain a tolerant calm.

"But he is not amused at all by the charming chicanery that surrounds him. He does not wait for the moment to crusade on a spectacular scale. He does not await an epidemic.

"He spots and cauterizes civic germs, regardless of the enemies gained, before the infection takes root."

Have too few newspapers fought the local enemies of democracy, the next-door

neighbors in city and state, with the fervor used on enemies in Washington and abroad? Have newspapers overlooked their daily and weekly responsibility—and then faced a much more difficult fight against enemies of democracy that are entrenched in power? Have newspapers chosen the best time to fight? That is the question.

I'm thinking of that great managing editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, O. K. Bovard, who "had nothing of the crusader, nothing of the zealot, in his temperament. He was a surgeon of facts, using a scalpel rather than a bludgeon. His persistence was what made malefactors shake with fear when once Bovard set out on their trail."

I recall another St. Louis editor, Robert J. Blakely of the late St. Louis *Star-Times*, who declared that "the free press reaches its zenith in a good newspaper looking for a fight in a good cause in its own avenues and alleys."

Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland *Press*, speaking Nov. 17 to the national convention of Sigma Delta Chi, called for "the Pulitzer prize-winning type of investigative reporting." He told delegates to the professional fraternity meeting

that "the challenge to American journalism is not only to protect democracy but to protect a free press by being vigorous, active and courageous."

Why, he asked, should newspapers abdicate to congressional committees, magazines and books the type of investigation for which the American press is famous?

When investigative reporting is lacking for a period of years, crusades, though they be a confession of the deeper failure of the press, are necessary. These crusades may have to be immune to argument and invincible to attack, for a time. But, gradually, crusades arouse conscience and make citizens articulate.

They deprive unworthy authority, wherever it may be, of the support of the intelligence of city and state and nation.

If the target is a mighty one, grown large because of public and press neglect, then the Big Bertha crusade needs to be used. But how much better for newspaper and citizen and government if the editor and reporter have, by daily investigative reporting, spotted and cauterized civic germs before the infection took root? This is the significant issue to which public and press should devote attention.

—Denver *Post*, Dec. 9, 1951

*Boston Globe*, Nov. 10, 1951

## Pope Offers Tips to Sports Writers

### Urges "Sober Discretion" in Writing, Avoidance of Technical Terms

Vatican City, Nov. 10 (Reuters)—Pope Pius XII today called on sports reporters to write with "sober discretion, which is a thousand times more eloquent and more powerful than lyrical dithyrambs."

(Note: A dithyramb is an enthusiastic composition, originally a wild hymn of praise to Bacchus, the Greek God of wine and joy.)

He told sports writers from 14 nations they should not be "mere reporters," recounting the superficiality of sports events and making their effect by "a strikingly colored style, by picturesque vivacity of narration and by a technical vocabulary,

intelligible only to initiates."

Instead sports writers should be conscious of the influence they wield and should use this influence to form public opinion.

This could be done by means of "a brief reflection" at the beginning of a story or at its end—or "better still, by a simple word which seizes a fleeting incident, a gesture, an attitude."

The Pope made these comments in a prepared speech in French to an audience of delegates to the 20th plenary assembly of the International Sporting Press Association, now meeting in Rome.

# Letters

## On 'Resignation of An Editor'

To the Editor:

I have read Louis M. Lyons' piece "Resignation of an Editor" in the January *Nieman Reports*. There are a couple of errors in it which I would like to correct. These are facts that were readily available to him before he wrote the piece.

Lyons: "His publisher, Robert Choate, telephoned Sunday night to say the review wouldn't be run."

Fact: Choate telephoned Sunday night to say he didn't think it ought to be run, that it was ill-timed and ill-advised. Crider said, "Okay, okay."

Lyons: "Crider simmered . . . called the publisher back."

Fact: Crider called the *New York Times* and told them of his resignation "and then called the publisher back."

Lyons: "Crider gave the message that he had called to resign. To make sure he wouldn't sleep on the decision, he telephoned the *New York Times* the news of his resignation."

Fact: This is not true. He called the *Times* first, gave them a statement on his resignation, and then called Choate's house. He was told that he would do better to resign personally to Choate at his office in the morning.

Lyons: "This was front page news in Washington", etc.

Fact: Choate had no word from Crider personally until Tuesday morning, when Crider came to the *Herald* at Choate's invitation.

Lyons: "Publisher Choate . . . announced that the *Herald* was not supporting anybody until after the Republican convention."

Fact: Choate made no such announcement.

Lyons: "Editor Crider had not known the *Herald* was running Taft's book."

Fact: Of course no decision had been made to run or not to run the book until Crider made a great issue of it and said "Senator Taft's book should be widely read, but it should be read discerningly. It is full of booby traps."

Lyons: "How uncomfortable this had made his (Crider's) editorship . . . is not a matter of record."

Fact: Crider never expressed any disagreement with Choate on the *Herald's* editorial policy.

So far as the Taft incident is concerned, Crider on October 17th wrote about Senator Taft as follows:

"The Senator from Ohio is a fighter as he proved so well in Ohio two years ago. Win or lose the nomination, no one can but respect the rugged Americanism of this distinguished son of a kindly remembered Republican President."

The name is spelled "Mullins."

Sincerely yours,

Robert Choate

(*Nieman Reports* regrets the misspelling of the name of William Mullins and presents the views of the publisher of the *Boston Herald* on other points on which the facts are not readily reconciled.)

## At the Nerve Center in the War of Nerves

Vienna

To the Editor:

Here I have been since returning from Washington a year ago, in one of the most interesting places on the Continent, and sometimes one of the tensest. Soviet-American relations still endure here, on a formal basis, but the propaganda on both sides has reached such a fever point that not even the simplest bit of mutual business, as occupying powers, can now be accomplished without an exchange of insults. Luckily for them, the Austrians have developed very deaf ears. People in the business of psychological warfare tell me that all the Communist shouting derives from the fact that they are on the defensive. Maybe so. Certainly our psychological position here has changed considerably in the past year. Instead of just sitting here, waiting for refugees from the Communist states to come running to us, we have turned central Europe, especially Vienna and Munich, into a living textbook of psychological warfare. Free Europe, Free Russia, Free Poland and all other sorts of "free" committees, all equipped with powerful radio transmitters, much money, crusading zeal and the best intentions in the world—but without much coordination or in fact, much idea of what they are really trying to achieve—are all over the map. They plot graphs showing how much jamming is being

## Tattered and Torn

To the Editor:

We made such extensive use of the 1949-50-51 issue of *Nieman Reports* that our copies in the library are tattered and torn. For this reason, I recently had our Purchasing Department write to you requesting that you send us three years back issues . . .

I would like you to know that I make extensive use of *Nieman Reports* for a course in Principles of Journalism. We find the material in the *Reports* perfectly suited to discussion of journalistic ethics, principles, and newsroom problems and policies.

Raymond Simon, Instructor in  
Public Relations

Utica College of Syracuse University

done to their programs. They buy any story, from anybody, for any amount. I often wonder where it will all end.

I get my fresh air by trips to Yugoslavia. Tito has made skilful use of his opportunities and of our needs, and at the moment is busy proving that he will not give up Communism for dollars, although we think that eventually he will, by what we call dynamics of the situation. But it's the land and the people of Yugoslavia that cheers me up, the lack of fear and inhibitions, the confidence in themselves and what they are doing. It's rare in Europe these days.

Last time I was in Belgrade, so were three other Niemanians—Bob Shaplen, Ernie Hill, Stan Allen. A notable reunion!

Alexander Kendrick  
C.B.S. correspondent

## One Beat That Was Not Stark's

To the Editor:

In the *Nieman* report of my speech at the dinner arranged by my colleagues there was included an error by me concerning a "beat" on the NRA in 1933. I have since learned that the first story on the NRA was Arthur Krock's and of course he should be credited with this beat.

I hope you may find room for the above, in your next issue.

Lou Stark

## Correspondents and Intelligence Officers

To the Editor:

I'm trying to clean things up so I can get away for a winter vacation and so I lack sufficient time to do the necessary research for a comprehensive discussion of the Monitor's article on the "Yalu Disaster: Inside Story of UN Commanders in the Dark." However, a few ideas struck me as I read it (and I'm throwing rocks in the general direction of nobody in particular.)

1—War Correspondents may be excellent reporters but very few of them possess sufficient technical military knowledge to understand procedure in higher headquarters. Few of those who do understand it are presumptuous enough to attempt to criticize it in the absence of complete data. Few of those thus presumptuous are in any position to secure such data.

2—It would pay some War Correspondents to take time out for a course at the Command and General Staff College,

where they might get some inkling of the work that goes into an intelligence mosaic. Too many of them seem to confuse "military information" with "military intelligence," which is an equine quadruped of a totally different hue.)

3—The refusal of "division intelligence officers" to tell a War Correspondent, even a "close friend from Pacific War days," what they know about enemy dispositions is no conclusive proof that they know nothing. (Some Intelligence Officers have enough intelligence to reserve that information for the one man who is entitled to share it.)

4—Some War Correspondents might learn a few things if they would peruse a few military manuals, for instance one on "Operations." They might then try to figure out the difference between the standard formations to be used in exploitation or pursuit and those for the launching of new offensives.

I repeat I'm not throwing bricks at anybody in particular—but I keep remembering Robert E. Lee's plaint that the Confederate newspapermen all seemed to know so much more about running his army than he did. I sympathize with War Correspondents. I've been one. I've also spent about half a lifetime trying to acquire a smattering of a military education, and that may cause me to regard some of their complaints with a jaundiced eye.

I therefore declare in all humility that I, myself, would regard it as impertinent presumption on my part to attempt to sit in judgment on the professional activities of any great soldier—at least until all the official evidence was available, and even then I might hesitate. (I don't pay much attention to earnest young medical students who flay great surgeons for their professional techniques, either.)

Yours for more humility,  
Lowell M. Limpus,  
Chief, UN Bureau,  
N. Y. *Daily News*

## Nieman Notes

1939

In an article, "Goodby to the Solid South," in *This Week*, March 14th, **Hodding Carter** sees the 1952 Presidential contest in these terms:

Today, the direction of history, the force of a changing economy and even emotional conflicts are jointly writing good-by to the Solid South. The multiple cleavages are evident in every internal aspect of Southern life today. Given the proper set of circumstances, they will be evident in the presidential election next November.

In short, Southerners are beginning to react much as do their fellow Americans elsewhere.

The Republican party is still a long way from being an organized political force in the South. This is due in great part to the disinterest of the Old Guard wing of the party, which seems interested only in controlling the South's convention delegates. Most of these delegates are scandalously hand-picked, and a majority of them are deep in Senator Taft's pockets.

Yet the South today is fertile ground

for Republican proselyting. If General Eisenhower were to win the GOP nomination, all signs indicate that the South would split wide open. If Truman is the Democratic nominee, the rift would be of even greater proportions. Four Southern states walked out on him in 1948. More than that number may well walk out next time.

It is almost impossible to overestimate the deadly, emotional animosity of most of the South's political leaders toward President Truman. Much of it stems from his insistence upon federal civil rights legislation.

The South will fight at the party convention for an acceptable platform and candidate. If it loses, the rebelling states probably will not pick a Southern ticket of their own.

Instead, those states in rebellion would elect electoral college delegates who would be uninstructed. That could throw the election into the House of Representatives, as they hoped would happen in 1948.

An important alternative could be the nomination of Eisenhower, with a South-

ern running mate, on a States' Right Democratic ticket, provided he is also the Republican nominee.

However, if Taft and Truman are the nominees, Sotuherners are apt to walk away for both major parties in a bolt that will dwarf 1948's four-state walkout.

1940

**Carroll Kilpatrick** joined the editorial staff of the *Washington Post* in March. He has had a decade of experience as a Washington correspondent, successively for the *Birmingham News*, *Chicago Sun* and *San Francisco Chronicle*, which he left about a year ago to handle press relations for the State Department.

1941

**Vance Johnson**, Washington correspondent of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, went to New Hampshire for the primary campaign and paid a visit to Cambridge on his return.

1942

*Makers of Modern Journalism* by **Kenneth Stewart** and **John Tebbel** is scheduled for early publication by Prentice-Hall. Stewart, now professor of journalism at New York University, has accepted ap-

pointment as professor in the University of Michigan Department of Journalism to begin in June.

1942

The *Arkansas Gazette*, of which Harry Ashmore is executive editor, eliminated Jack Lait as a columnist after the publication of *U. S. A. Confidential*, by Lait and Mortimer. As reported in *Editor & Publisher* for March 15:

Ten days before the March 13 release date on the book, Karr Shannon, *Arkansas Democrat* columnist, reviewed an advance copy.

Of Arkansas, the book said:

"Principal income: entertaining visiting hoods.

"Chief industry: moonshining.

"Citizens' hobbies: shooting revenueurs and raping their own daughters."

After the Shannon column, Gov. Sid McMath attacked *U.S.A. Confidential* as "libelous, obscene and a new low in journalism." Arkansas Attorney General Ike Murry and Secretary of State C. G. Hall agreed that some action should be taken.

Next day, the *Arkansas Gazette* in a blistering editorial announced that Mr. Lait, standing in for Walter Winchell, had "stood in for the last time in the *Arkansas Gazette* yesterday."

The editor described the book as the "most outrageous and libelous collection of garbage we have ever seen in print."

The editorial stated:

"The *Mirror* editor was apparently only a passive partner in this particular crime, but in lending his name to it he has renounced any conceivable claim to journalistic respectability. We apologize to our readers for giving him house-room in the past."

1943

Fred Warner Neal was married February 14 to Irena Burrous at Boulder, Colorado, where he is associate professor of political science at the University of Colorado.

Edward J. Donohoe, city editor of the *Scranton Times*, served as one of the judges of the 1951 Broun Award, along with Erwin D. Canham, editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, and John C. Manning, editor of the *Detroit Times*. Mr. Donohoe, now on a Reid Fellowship, is studying some labor problems in the

coal mining areas of Britain, France, Belgium and Germany.

1946

Arthur Hepner joined the staff of *Newsweek* the first of the year to write business articles, after a period of free-lance magazine writing.

Robert Manning became an associate editor of *Time*, Inc. last December.

Richard Stockwell, editor of *Aviation Age*, reports that this is now "the most widely quoted aviation journal in the world." The name was changed in 1950 from *Aviation Operations*, to bring the title in line with the magazine's larger scope.

1947

On February 11, Henry Hornsby became city editor of the *Lexington (Ky.) Leader*, succeeding William Stucky (1950), who joined the staff of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* after ten years on the *Leader*. Hornsby had been serving as farm editor of the morning *Herald* since July, 1950.

Fletcher Martin, city editor of the *Louisville Defender*, joins the news staff of the *Chicago Sun-Times* April 20. He has served the *Defender* for 10 years, as feature writer, war correspondent, and since 1945 as city editor.

1948

Rebecca F. Gross, editor of the *Lock Haven Express*, took off March 1 on a tour of Central Europe and the Middle East, in a group of 40 newspaper and radio editors. They began their air trip with a briefing by the State Department.

As she left Lock Haven, the *Express* marked its 70th anniversary by starting work on an expansion of the plant to permit installation of a 20-page press and give more editorial office room.

1950

Clark Mollenhoff of the Washington bureau of the *Des Moines Register*, writes a newsy letter:

"I see nearly all the Washington *Niemans* every week because I do a lot of circulating. I've worked with Eddie Laley and Ed Edstron on a couple of assignments where a little doubling up helped.

"The Don Gonzales', Max Halls, Murrey Marders and Dick Wallaces were out for a party a few weeks ago, and we're all scheduled to go out to Gonzales' tonight. There was a possibility of Max Hall leaving O.P.S. when DiSalle pulled out, but it appears he is going to stay. He likes Arnall and has been doing an excellent job. I wish there were a few more public information chiefs around this city who were as interested in getting out all the information possible.

"I have lunch with Dick Wallace periodically. He is able to maintain a calm outlook on life despite the fact that Ke-fauver's office is a madhouse.

"I see Murrey Marder at the Lattimore hearings. I've been dividing my time between that hearing and the crime corruption variety.

"Vance Johnson has moved his office down on the eighth floor of the National Press Building—next to us."

"I wish I'd had this time in Washington before doing the article for our special edition of *Nieman Reports*. I would have been a lot stronger in some of my arguments on the attitude of the reporter and the general subject of the weaknesses of the press.

"I'm having a simply wonderful time—in between my periods of great fury about information I can't get or have to fight to get. My bureau chief is an ideal boss, and we have a nice agreeable bunch in the office. There are no restrictions on what we cover, and no censorship (except our own common sense) in how we handle it. In addition there is practically no messing with our copy in Des Moines and Minneapolis."

1951

A son, Simeon Saunders Booker III, was born to Thelma and Simeon Booker at Cleveland, January 30. Two days earlier Simeon had joined the news staff of the *Washington Post*. His earlier newspaper work was with the *Cleveland Call-Post* and as correspondent of *Afro-American*. His work on these papers won him a Willkie Award in 1947 and a Cleveland Guild Award in 1948.

Wellington Wales, editor of the *Auburn (N. Y.) Citizen-Advertiser*, started moderating a TV show "Starring the Editors" on WMBF-TV March 4. It is put on Tuesday evenings by a panel of New York State editors.

David Norman Meyer, II, was born Feb. 2, to Mr. and Mrs. Sylvan Meyer at Gainesville, Ga., their second child but first son, weight, six pounds, five ounces. Sylvan Meyer is editor of the Gainesville *Daily Times*.

A daughter, Christina Isabelle, was born to Alice and Angus MacLean Thuermer in November, in Washington, D. C., where her father serves the Associated Press.

Edwin O. Guthman, whose investigation of a loyalty case won him a Pulitzer Prize in 1950, has been digging into corruption in the Washington State Land Office. One official has been convicted and another trial is due in April.

## Stucky Play May Be On Broadway in Fall

New York Producer Irving L. Jacobs has bought "Preacher Boy," a play by William M. Stucky, formerly of Lexington, and plans to produce it on Broadway next fall.

Stucky, former city editor of the Lexington *Leader*, is now a reporter for the Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

Jacobs is negotiating with Raymond Massey to play the lead in "Preacher Boy." The play will be directed by David Alexander, who is now directing the revival of "Pal Joey." It will be produced first in summer theatres before it goes to New York.

The "preacher boy" of the play is a 13-year-old Negro houseboy in the household of a liberal Southern landowner "somewhere in the horse country of the Upper South." The boy's primitive religious convictions, together with his excessive concern about "the painin' and the hurtin'" in the world, set off a chain of events that result in tragedy for the entire household.

Stucky began the play while he was at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow during 1949-50. Much of the writing was done under the guidance of Theodore Morrison, English lecturer and director of the Bread Loaf (Vt.) Writers Conference, while Stucky was at Harvard. The play was finished last year in Lexington.

"Preacher Boy" is Stucky's second full-length play. The first, "Then Came June," was produced by the Guignol Theatre in 1941.

—Lexington (Ky.) *Leader*

### Press Note

## Newsmen Gather for Midwinter Institute

The traditional newspaperman of a past era, of, say, seventy-five years ago, was a shabbily dressed, down-at-the heels figure, hovering on the edge (if not tumbling over the edge) of bankruptcy; more than apt to be smelling of whiskey; altogether, a sort of vagabond, whom respectable members of the community looked upon with a pitying disapproval. There were some exceptions, of course, but that was the typical figure.

If such a character had waked from a Rip van Winkle sleep and had found himself in the lobby of the Carolina Inn last night, and if somebody had told him that the men he saw aroundabout belonged to his newspaper brotherhood, he would have said to his informant: "Are you trying to play a joke on me? Why, this crowd can't be newspapermen. They look like bankers."

And so they do, publishers, editors, and reporters who have come here from all over North Carolina for the annual Newspaper Institute. You never saw anywhere a more sleek and well-fed and prosperous-

looking company than this one.

They are having a big time. They have a few speeches on their program, and some confabs on business matters, but what they are really here for, what they get the most fun out of, is to loaf around with one another, and tell each other their experiences, and swap stories, and engage in chatter and laughter.

It's sure there won't be any reduction in their waist measures while they are here. Besides eating the ordinary meals they are to be the University of North Carolina's guests at an even more sumptuous dinner tonight.

No doubt there is some highball tossing among them, behind closed doors, as always at these gatherings, but mostly it is a sober company. You don't run across anybody who has a tottering gait or, when he talks, gets his syllables jumbled.

Chapel Hill *Weekly*, Jan. 25, 1952

Chapel Hill *Weekly* is edited by Louis Graves, former journalism dean of the University of North Carolina.)

## Nieman Reports Subscription

*Nieman Reports* is published quarterly by the Nieman Alumni Council, representing former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University.

*Nieman Reports* aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession. Nine out of ten subscribers to *Nieman Reports* are not themselves former Nieman Fellows but they share a belief in the purpose of the Nieman Foundation, "to promote and elevate standards of journalism."

For the convenience of new subscribers, a subscription blank is printed below:

NIEMAN REPORTS

44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Please enter my subscription to *Nieman Reports*, for which I enclose \$2.00 for one year.

.....

..... Street

City ..... Postal Zone

..... State