

Nieman Reports

April, 1953

Report on the German Press

Wayne Jordan

Where We Stand on Freedom

Arthur Hays Sulzberger

The Heat of the Headlines

Alan Barth

Reporting the Schools

Wilma Morrison

To Compete with TV

John W. Bloomer

Civic Victories—and Defeats

Calvin W. Mayne

Nieman Scrapbook — Letters — Nieman Notes — Reviews. J. B. Conant on the Public High School; Native Cranks; Postscript on the Investigation of Sen. McCarthy; Local Tax Problems in New York

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 M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; 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, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, Washington, D. C.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. VII NO. 2

APRIL, 1953

Standards for Ownership of a Newspaper or Radio Enterprise

Following is the text of Nelson Poynter's Aug. 6, 1947 "Standards for Ownership of a Newspaper and Radio Enterprise" as carried by the Associated Press Nov. 12 in a story on WTSP'S TV hearing in Washington:

This is a guide for my heirs, trustees, executors, courts or their advisors who have any responsibilities in disposing of any of my newspaper or broadcasting properties and equities. These standards shall be used as a yardstick in choosing the purchaser of the St. Petersburg *Times*, WTSP or other properties which I own. A fair and equitable price must be realized from my properties but my executors shall be under no obligation to sell my interests to the highest bidder, but they may accept any offer from any bidder for any amount deemed by them to be fair and reasonable, and upon any terms deemed by them to be acceptable in view of the following:

1. Ownership or participation in ownership of a publication or broadcasting property is a sacred trust, and a great privilege.

2. Any publication or broadcasting property has unusual obligations to the community in which it operates, and any new owner must be sensitive to this.

3. The owners of a publication or broadcasting station can not compromise with the integrity of the news and information that is sold or given to the public.

4. A publication or broadcasting station must be aggressive in its service to the community and not wait to be prodded into rendering that service. A publisher or broadcaster must share the zeal and enthusiasm for what is new each day. He does not belong as an owner unless he has such enthusiasm.

5. Adequate and modern equipment is vital for successful publishing or broadcasting, but it is secondary to staff.

6. A "chain" owner cannot do justice to local publications or radio stations. His devotion and loyalty to any one area is bound to be diluted or divided if he has other ownerships and interests.

7. I expect every member of any staff to be above average in his respective job. I expect my successor to demand standards of his staff as high or higher than mine. A concern that expects its staff to be above average must be willing to pay staffers above average.

8. Any modern capitalistic institution must expect to provide pensions that promise honest and dignified retirement to members of the staff who have devoted their lives to the institution.

9. Mere ownership in a paper or broadcasting station does not entitle an individual to a salary. All salaries should be commensurate with the services rendered.

10. A publication or broadcasting station cannot best serve its community if it is encumbered with outside interests. Its editorial policy should not be tainted with ownership in enterprises not related to newspapering or broadcasting.

11. To maintain a strong editorial policy, a newspaper or broadcasting concern must be in a strong financial position.

12. To qualify as an owner of a newspaper or broadcasting station, a prospect should have a well-rounded appreciation of the contribution that is made by all departments—and above all, the creative or editorial departments.

13. A payment of not more than six per cent dividends on the present capitalization should be considered fair until debts are discharged, reserves built and technical equipment brought up to a position of second to none on the West coast of Florida.

14. Dividends beyond six per cent should be equalized with bonuses to employes on a formula which I expect to perfect in the coming several years, a formula that recognizes length of service and contribution to the enterprise.

15. A publication is so individualistic in nature that complete control should be concentrated in an individual. Voting stock should never be permitted to scatter.

* * *

As examples of how the newspaper and radio station have lived up to the specifics of his standards, Poynter said they have divested themselves of real estate and other holdings not connected with the newspaper or radio broadcasting business and that wage levels have gone up faster than the average in the city and a pension plan has put been into effect since the standards were written.

In referring to Point No. 5 he said the *Times* is now the best equipped newspaper on the Florida west coast as a result of improvements since the standards were written.

St. Petersburg *Times*
Nov. 13, 1952

Where We Stand On Freedom

by Arthur Hays Sulzberger

"Discussion Is Being Restricted" says the publisher of the New York Times. "A smoke screen of intimidation dims essential thought." "It isn't the super-zealots who bother me so much as the lack of plain old fashioned guts in those who capitulate to them."

As you have gathered, I'm in the newspaper business, and as such I have found much of interest in Alexander Hamilton's thinking on the subject of freedom of the press. There was, as you may recall, considerable debate as to whether or not the Constitution should contain an affirmative statement for a free press. One viewpoint was expressed in the report of Charles Pinckney to the Legislature of South Carolina; he urged that, since the new government was intended to have no powers other than those specifically conferred upon it, the inclusion of an affirmation of press freedom might furnish an excuse for the "general government to exercise powers not expressly delegated to it."

Alexander Hamilton shared these views. He wrote in *The Federalist*:

"What signifies a declaration, that 'the liberty of the press shall be inviolably preserved.' What is the liberty of the press? Who can give it any definition which would not leave the utmost latitude for evasion? I hold it to be impracticable; and from this I infer that its security, whatever fine declaration may be inserted in any constitution respecting it, must altogether depend on public opinion, and on the general spirit of the people and of the government. 'Here, after all,' said Mr. Hamilton, 'must we seek for the only solid basis of our rights.'"

As we all know, an explicit constitutional declaration for press freedom, promoted largely by Thomas Jefferson, eventually prevailed. This does not lessen, however, the value of and the essential truth in the words written by our distinguished alumnus, whose name and profile grace the medal I have received from you this evening. Those words have great significance as we make plans for the celebration in 1954 of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of King's College.

One year from now Columbia starts its third century of growth. That is really more important than the completion of its first two hundred years. But whether it is more important or less so is immaterial. Throughout our history at Columbia we have been blessed with guides and leaders who have been forward looking persons, forward looking in education, of course, but forward looking also in all things which concern national and international welfare. Where is there to be found a broader cross-section of the minds of free men of every race than in our faculties and student body? It is from that cross-section of world thinking that there has emerged the plan to make our birthday

year one of constant and worldwide stress upon "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." While the Bicentennial Committee can claim to have performed the function of midwife to this theme, its lineage is deeply rooted in the ancient and respected traditions of the institution.

Some few years ago a mantle of responsibility and leadership was dropped upon the unprepared shoulders of our United States; in the pockets of that mantle was the vast wealth created by our industry and initiative. We have learned rapidly. We have squared our shoulders and now carry the mantle less awkwardly than we did. But we have come to know that responsibility and strength are not each inclusive of the other and that American might is not alone sufficient if we are to play our role well. We have lavishly expended our wealth for the purpose of strengthening our allies but we have come to know that even their might added to ours is unequal to our task. Not only, however, is it important that we make strong the good right arm of the free world but we must also fire its spirit,—we must influence its mind and heart and soul.

Columbia has given effectively to the strength of our Nation. Its greatest contribution, however, must be in the creation of lasting leadership based on high ideals. We hold the belief that the theme of our Bicentennial is far more than nine words strung together. In it you will find the soul which can unify free men and transform what might be a Frankenstein of power into a sentient force capable of guarding man's right to be a man.

My reverence for Thomas Jefferson, and the men who with him insisted on spelling out our Bill of Rights, is second to none. Legislation is possible in a free country whose citizens are willing to codify their laws. But this "free world" we talk about is a nebulous one—as nebulous as a bit of white dust visible at night in the high heavens. Yet each—the free world and the speck of starry dust—has something that holds it together.

The nebulous yet potent something was indicated by Hamilton in the passage which I have quoted. Whatever freedom of access to knowledge any man has, whatever freedom of the use of knowledge, depends on "public opinion and the general spirit of the people and of the government." Here, and here alone, as he insisted, is "the only solid basis of our rights." This is the essential stuff that unites the free world. The words of a statute or of a UNESCO declaration

provide a helpful frame, but there will be neither flesh nor muscle nor beauty upon that frame unless public opinion supplies them.

Dr. Kirk made a trip to Europe recently, and I made a similar one to parts of Asia last June. Our missions were to persuade educators to join in our Bicentennial celebration; our argument was the validity of our theme—"Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof."

But I can well imagine some of those we have approached raising their eyebrows just a trifle in an expression of wonder as to whether or not we actually think of ourselves as free and, if we do, whether in fact we are. Are we as free to speak our minds today as twenty years ago? Is thinking and giving expression to thought as unrestricted as in the past? Most of you here, I believe, will join me in saying "No," and we base our judgments on the record.

Before examining this record, permit me first very briefly to give you my thinking and plainly fix the bench mark from which my reasoning starts. I believe that Russia presents us with a "clear and present danger" and that the luxury of being an intellectual Communist or fellow traveller in this country is no longer sufferable. I believe with the late President Neilson of Smith that it's wise to "keep an open mind, but not so open that your brains fall out." So long as the rulers of the Kremlin insist upon conducting their affairs in the dark, behind an iron curtain, so long as they continue their aggressive acts, we are—in my judgment—fools if we credit them with aught but evil and their sympathizers with anything but "fifth column" purposes.

This is not a new philosophy with me, nor did it change when Russia was an ally. On my return from Moscow in 1943 I said before a group of teachers gathered at the Brooklyn High School that an accord with Russia could and must be reached . . . "But this understanding cannot be had if we delude ourselves or becloud our thinking. No admiration for Russian bravery should cause us to overlook the fact that in that land,—and before the war imposed its restrictions,—there was no freedom of speech as we know it, no freedom of religion as we know it, no freedom of the press or freedom of assembly upon which we know our very existence depends. . . I know of no task ahead of us more important than to get along with Soviet Russia, but I propose that we get along with our eyes open."

Freedom cannot be trifled with—you cannot surrender it for security unless in a state of war and then you must guard carefully the methods of so doing. Thomas Jefferson said it perfectly: "I have sworn upon the Altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." He seemed to have the habit of perfect statement.

Totalitarianism from the left has never been more attractive to me than totalitarianism from the right, and "never" includes those years when Moscow was fighting with us against a common enemy.

In line with that view, I would not knowingly employ a Communist on the news or editorial staff of the *New York Times*. On the other hand, I would not institute a witch hunt to determine if one such existed and thereby throw questioning and fear into an organization which can perform its function only if its milieu is one of calm and honest reflection and judgment. Truth is a sensitive companion, difficult to catch up with and likely to flee if suspicion appears. Even if we found a Communist or two—granted we had the power of subpoena and could conduct such a search—in doing so we would run the risk of destroying the atmosphere needed for the production of the kind of newspaper we are publishing.

I remember years ago when some inadequate story appeared in the *Times* and a friend of mine called to criticize it. I told him that I, too, had noted it and checked to determine who was the author. I found that it was the work of a man who was wearing out and that it should not have appeared. I added, however, that it reflected a condition which helped to make the rest of the paper better. Men worked in an atmosphere of trust and knew that they would not be cast out the instant they had passed the peak of their professional skill. Thereafter the man's work was undoubtedly watched or he was moved, and I mention this only to emphasize that one has to take certain risks to achieve an end if the end is worthwhile.

There very briefly, as I promised, you have the statement of my prejudices, which brings me to the question of where generally *we* stand today on this subject of freedom.

My thesis is that we cannot have a good public opinion, which Hamilton rightly held to be essential, unless there is freedom of expression—freedom of expression in our schools, in our government, in our assemblies, in our press, in all our walks and ways of life.

I wish there were time tonight to do more than sketch the problems in each of these areas but obviously there is not, nor am I the proper person to deal with most of them. The fact that it has been done before would probably not deter me, but there are experts here who may already be repeating the words of that undertaker!

No more than they, however, do I find satisfaction as an American citizen when I read that a brochure entitled "The E in UNESCO" was permanently removed from the schools of Los Angeles after it had been acclaimed by the teaching profession.

I do not hold my head any higher when I note that the Board of Education of Houston, Texas, voted not to permit the students under their jurisdiction to participate in an annual high school contest conducted by the American Association for the United Nations. The UN has been attacked and the Houston Board of Education surrendered to the implications of that assault.

In Pawtucket, Rhode Island,—the traditional home of

free thought,—the principal of a high school suspended a club called “The UNESCO Thinkers” because he feels that UNESCO is atheistic and communistic. The action, according to my information, was upheld by the School Committee and endorsed by those presumed custodians of our freedom—the Pawtucket branch of the Daughters of the American Revolution. As a Son of the American Revolution, I cannot feel too fraternally toward these particular sisters of mine.

Let’s go up to the university level. Thirty-five years ago, Frank Magruder wrote a book entitled *American Government*. Recently a critical review of it appeared in “The Educational Reviewer” which is published by the Committee on Education of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations. The critic said the book had socialistic and communistic overtones. That review was then picked up by a well-known radio commentator.

Academic reaction came fast: The State of Georgia dropped the book, but, ironically, agreed to sell to the highest bidder the 30,000 copies it had on its hands.

Houston, Texas, banned the book.

Little Rock, Arkansas, dropped it as a text but retained it for reference.

Attacks were made in other communities—New Haven, Connecticut; Council Bluffs, Iowa; Washington, D. C.; Jackson, Michigan; Trumbull County, Ohio,—to name just a few.

Did any of these critics read the book? It is doubtful that one out of a hundred of those attacking this or other books for “subversive” contents actually reads the books he—or she—attacks.

I didn’t read it either, but wherever *American Government* was examined by impartial committees of educators or responsible citizens, it was given a clean bill of health.

The case of the attacks made on the book, *Basic Economics*, provide another distressing example. This book was written by four Rutgers professors, was approved by the Phoenix, Arizona, Board of Education, by the President of Phoenix College and the School Superintendent.

Then, from the blue, an anonymous Army Corporal in a letter to the *Phoenix Gazette* charged that *Basic Economics* was subversive and should be dropped by the College. The local American Legion Post examined the book and called it “socialistically and communistically inclined,” and urged that it be dropped.

In the course of the subsequent public hearing, it developed that the Corporal had said that he had not read the book but merely “glanced through” the 500 pages. The four Rutgers professors properly asked: “Are we to be discredited by the rash complaint of an anonymous person who had ‘glanced’ at the pages that required years of training and experience, and months of composition on our part?”

One poison pen letter was enough to smear the book.

The President, Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education capitulated and the book was removed from Phoenix College. The American Legion committee then announced a campaign to remove it from the forty universities and colleges where it then was in use.

The effect of all this is summed up by the principals of four schools in Scarsdale, New York, who said: “We see suspicion, fear and distrust spreading among our neighbors and friends. We see our teachers being affected by the feeling that their loyalty and patriotism are being impugned. . . . Unless the forces that are undermining confidence can be met and resolved there can be no future for the good name of our schools.”

The Board of Education at Scarsdale strenuously resisted all attacks and, in my judgment, deserves the thanks of our community.

Let us consider briefly some other areas of restriction on free—and therefore fruitful—thought; in government, for example. The most conspicuous aspects of that problem are found in the State Department. Now I am not defending all that has happened in “Foggy Bottom” in recent years. Far from it. I think that too often there have been temporizing and timidity when sternness and strength were required. But when members of the Department are attacked now for honest advocacy of policies generally accepted some years ago but presently unpopular, when their assailants say in effect: “The test is not whether you were honest in your opinion, but only whether, in our view, you were right,”—then I say that this is doctrine right out of the maw of the Kremlin.

The results of such tactics are shockingly apparent. These broad-scale attacks on the loyalty of State Department employes have endangered the integrity of the reporting done by our foreign service officers and, more than that, threaten to affect high-level decisions in Washington. Because of the momentous nature of our foreign policy judgments in the coming years, this is perhaps the most dangerous sphere in which thought control has begun to show itself in this country.

Consider then another area—what might be called the Area of Assembly and Debate. No one will deny that it is vital that the great issues confronting us be argued out fully and freely. Yet there is mounting evidence that such discussion is being restricted and in many instances prevented—in public meetings, on radio and television and other forums—because of the pressures that result from black-lists and irresponsible accusation.

The stringent provisions of the new immigration law have added to this kind of restriction. Many visitors, including scientists who might have contributed to our sum of knowledge, have been kept out. The damage to American prestige abroad is undeniable; the measure of security attained is surely debatable.

Then we come to the area of the press, the area of the printed word, in which of course I include magazines and books and all other printed matter as well as the newspaper.

The effects of these attacks are increasingly apparent. Authors are now required, in effect, to pass loyalty tests; otherwise their publishing houses may find themselves in the midst of blind boycotts. And as for newspapers, the pressures there, too, are great. On the whole they have been admirably resisted, although there are some which have joined, with great hoop-la, in the witch-hunts, whether for circulation or ideological reasons I have no means of knowing.

Our book reviewers have had a particularly difficult time, because of the too general assumption that any anti-Communist book is automatically a good book. I should think the fact that Hitler and Mussolini were authors foremost among the foes of communism would be sufficient refutation of that theory.

And so it goes. One begins to wonder whether this is still the "Land of the free and the home of the brave" about which we sing so whole-heartedly. There has been dropped upon utterance and thought a smoke screen of intimidation that dims essential thought and essential talk and begets a fog through which we wander uncertainly. Nor is it the super-zealots who bother me so much in all of this—it is the lack of plain, old-fashioned guts on the part of those who capitulate to them. Surely, such actions must be of great aid and comfort to the Kremlin; these capitulators are, in effect, a *sixth* column which does not even require payment.

Well, what is to be done? In the first place, I do not believe that the picture is either as black or as red as it has been painted. I do not believe, for example that Messrs. McCarthy and McCarran represent the real feeling of the American people. I have great faith in the basic common sense and the fundamental fairness of the nation.

But there is more fear in the country than the facts warrant. Beset by doubt, the nation listens to those who seem

to offer a cure, even though the medicine be more harmful than the disease.

Once more we are met upon a great battlefield testing whether this nation or any nation similarly "dedicated can long endure." I have the utmost confidence that it can and will. Five days from now, General Eisenhower retires as President of Columbia University to take on his greater responsibilities. It was his letter to the institutions of learning throughout the world that first voiced our theme of "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." It was under his guiding hand that NATO was first brought into being. In my judgment, he has demonstrated his understanding and his ability to curb our extremists and harness the spiritual and physical strength needed to draw us toward a brighter future.

There are times when all of us are oppressed by the magnitude of the problems surrounding us, when we wonder what we as individuals can do to alleviate the situation. I offer you four suggestions: First, let us keep strong; let us never lower our guard. Second, in the justifiable concern about our own loss of equilibrium, let us keep alert to all aspects of aggressive Communist imperialism. Third, let us remember that we need spiritual unity in our land. We must not lock our minds with the key of prejudice. We cannot afford senseless fights—they are a luxury based on a security we do not possess. And finally, I suggest that you take our Bicentennial theme home with you and, in the words of the Old Testament, "write it upon the door posts of your house and upon your gates" and "bind it as a frontlet between your eyes." Let us dedicate ourselves anew to "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." Let us thus help to restore a courage of old to our beloved country. That, as Alexander Hamilton said, "... must altogether depend on public opinion and on the general spirit of the people ..." And that, my friends, means you and me.

This is from Mr. Sulzberger's talk at the Alexander Hamilton dinner, January 14, upon receiving the Columbia College award for distinguished service in 1952.

Nieman Fellowship Applications

Deadline for applications for Nieman Fellowships for the next college year is May 1. Awards are announced in June and fellowships start with Harvard College opening in September. About a dozen fellowships are awarded annually. They are awarded only on the basis of applications. A letter to the Nieman Foundation, 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass., will secure an application form and information about the fellowships.

The Harvard Corporation appointed the following as the Selecting Committee for Nieman Fellowships for 1953: Ralph E. McGill, editor Atlanta *Constitution*; Paul Miller,

executive vice president of The Gannet Newspapers; William A. Townes, editor, Los Angeles *News*; David W. Bailey, secretary to the Harvard governing boards; William M. Pinkerton, director, Harvard News Office; and Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Any newspaperman of three years' experience and under 40 is eligible to apply for a Nieman Fellowship. He will need to secure leave of absence from his paper for the academic year, September to June, which will be covered by his fellowship stipend.

The Heat of the Headlines

In the Campaign and After

by Alan Barth

There are, I think, two outstanding influences which have contributed fresh strength and vitality to the American press during the past quarter of a century. One of these influences—perhaps the most important in raising the standards of American journalism—has been the growth of the American Newspaper Guild. The Guild may have been less eloquent than some of the associations of philosophers and editors in adopting resolutions and formulating canons of conduct for newspapers. But in its own mundane, bread-and-butter way, it has managed to lift the wages and working conditions of newspapermen, so that newspapering has become a respectable, if not yet a highly remunerative, livelihood.

In the good old days before Heywood Broun propounded his radical notion of a decent wage scale, the newspaper game (as we all loved to call it then) employed a distressingly high proportion of beaten down hacks or juvenile romantics. The movies gave currency to a not altogether unwarranted caricature of the American journalist as a happy-go-lucky, carefree dare-devil, boozily indifferent to the deficiencies of his weekly pay-check.

Well, the American Newspaper Guild, by virtue of some pretty stern and stubborn effort, has managed to improve that weekly pay-check to a point at which men could begin to think of newspaper work as a career rather than as an escape from reality. Hollywood's loss was, I think, journalism's gain. By making journalism a calling in which men of competence and conscience could hope to support themselves and even to raise families—could hope indeed to take a responsible place in the life of their communities—the Guild made it possible for men of first-rate capacities to enter the calling and to stay in it beyond their salad days. I can think of nothing that has done so much to improve the caliber of the American press as this improvement in the caliber of the men serving it.

Now, the second major influence upon the contemporary American press, it seems to me, has been wrought by the schools of journalism.

The press has responsibilities which go beyond that of any other private enterprise. And it is with the discharge of these responsibilities that the schools of journalism must

Alan Barth, editorial writer on the *Washington Post*, delivered the Guild Memorial Lecture at the University of Minnesota Dec. 5, 1952, from which this article is taken. Author of "The Loyalty of Free Men," he was a Nieman Fellow in 1948.

be primarily concerned. They set standards of performance for the working press. They are the keepers of the conscience of our calling.

A great deal can be said, and said honestly, about the virtues of American newspapers. Perhaps it can fairly be said, that with all their faults, they remain the best that men have yet developed. I have a strong feeling, however, that it would be well to let others, outside the craft, give us such applause as they may think that we deserve; and that for us who are members of the Fourth Estate, the need at present is to concentrate on our shortcomings and to look at them unflinchingly and realistically.

American newspapers have just won an election. They have won the election after a number of unsuccessful tries, and they have won it, I think, at a very considerable cost to their own prestige and independence.

The president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Charles F. McCahill, said a great deal more than he meant to say, I suspect, when he told the board of the Bureau of Advertising of the ANPA at a recent meeting that the press exerted great influence in the election of General Eisenhower. "When the merchandise is good," he said, "the press can sell it. I think the newspapers exerted great influence in this election. They had a great product to sell. They presented it factually and forcefully to the American people, and the people accepted it."

I intend no partisanship, and certainly I intend no disparagement of a great American when I say that General Eisenhower, as a political figure, was to a large extent the creation of the American press. Newspaper publishers had a good deal to do with initiating and promoting his "draft" for the Republican nomination. They took part in a common if not concerted publicity campaign to transform the general from a military hero into a civilian leader. An extraordinary number of them pledged him their support and endorsed him without qualification before he became a candidate—and before they knew anything at all about his political outlook. They packaged the product which Mr. McCahill says they sold.

Now, it goes without saying that they had every right to do this. And perhaps their preference for General Eisenhower over Governor Stevenson stemmed from the perspective of their professional position, reflecting only their disinterested, objective, unprejudiced appraisal of the two men and the two major political parties. I am inclined to think, however, that it was more reflective of a natural pro-

pensity on the part of newspaper publishers to behave like newspaper publishers—which is to say like conservative businessmen.

Let me offer you a couple of inconclusive but not altogether insignificant considerations which lead me to put more stock in the latter explanation than in the former. The first of these is the striking divergence between the views of the publishers and their professional employees. Eric Sevareid observed in a mid-October broadcast that “a most bizarre situation has developed in this campaign, worthy of attention at least as a footnote to history. Never before has such a high percentage of American publishers come out personally for a candidate; and what *makes* it bizarre is that the working journalists appear just as overwhelmingly for Stevenson as their publishers are for Eisenhower. In political sentiment, at least, publishers are drawing closer to other publishers, and farther away from their own staffs.”

The second consideration which I think deserves to be taken into account may be a mere coincidence—although it does not seem to me and, I fancy, does not seem so to most Americans—the fact that General Eisenhower happened to be the candidate of the Republican party, and that the Republican party is the party of the conservatives and of the businessmen.

Editor & Publisher reported in its issue of November 1, just prior to the election, that the general had the editorial support of 67 per cent of the daily newspapers published in the United States and that these newspapers represented 80 per cent of the total daily circulation in the country. The governor, on the other hand, was endorsed editorially by only 14 per cent of the dailies; and these comprised only 11 per cent of the total circulation. The rest of the press was not formally committed. While Eisenhower had the backing of at least one newspaper in every state of the Union, there were nine states in which Stevenson had no editorial support whatever.

In Governor Stevenson's home state of Illinois, according to the *Editor & Publisher* survey, 52 newspapers backed the general while only 4 backed the governor. And it seems worth noting that the combined circulation of the Eisenhower backers was 3,488,969, while the combined circulation of the Stevenson backers was 35,420—a ratio of almost precisely 100 to 1.

In Michigan, a key state, the newspaper line-up was 35 to one, the circulation line-up two million as compared with 3300. In Pennsylvania, it was 83 to 5, or three and one-third million against a combined circulation slightly under one hundred thousand.

It seems to me that the most newsworthy aspect of this striking disparity is—that there was no news in it. It contained no element of novelty whatever. The division in 1948 was 65 per cent of the dailies against 15 per cent. In

1944, it was 60 against 22. In 1940, 66 against 20. In 1936, 60 against 20. In 1936, 60 against 35. Need I say that in each of these divisions the preponderance was on the Republican side?

“In my new role in life,” Governor Stevenson observed in a talk to newspaper editors at the very beginning of the campaign, “I can't help noticing from time to time—I want to put it as delicately as I can—that the overwhelming majority of the newspapers of the country are supporting the opposition candidate. This is something, I find, that even my best friends will tell me! And I certainly don't take it personally.”

He was quite right not to take it personally. It had nothing whatever to do with him or with the merits of his candidacy. It would have remained just about the same in all probability, no matter what he said or how he conducted his campaign. “It would seem,” he said philosophically, “that the overwhelming majority of the press is just against Democrats. And it is against Democrats, so far as I can see, not after a sober and considered review of the alternatives, but automatically, as dogs are against cats. As soon as a newspaper—I speak of the great majority, not of the enlightened 10 per cent—sees a Democratic candidate, it is filled with an unconquerable yen to chase him up an alley.”

It was in this sense that Governor Stevenson expressed concern over the extent to which we are developing a one-party press in a two-party country. All of us who are members of the press need, I think, to share in his concern.

It has been possible in the past to gloss over the bias of the press on the ground that it has not seemed to be very influential. In five successive national elections, this is to say, the American public managed to ignore the editorial importunities of the newspapers. But those who disparage the influence of the press sometimes tend to confuse the influence of the editorial page with the influence of the news pages.

Any generalization about the 1700-odd daily newspapers in the United States—even, perhaps, the generalization I am now indulging in—has very doubtful validity. And a generalization drawn from isolated, random incidents—especially those selected to show the worst instead of the best aspects of an institution—is bound to be misleading and unjust. For my own part, however, I find extremely disquieting some of the “atrocious stories” which have come out of the campaign.

Let me quote once more Eric Sevareid, a sober and balanced analyst. “Nearly all the great weekly publications, such as *Time* and *Life*,” he said, “are not only for Eisenhower in their editorials but some are unabashedly using their news and picture space as well to help his cause, by giving him the predominant play, week after week. But they are fairness itself, compared to some big mid-west and

western dailies where Stevenson is reported as if he were a candidate for county clerk. Little wonder that Stevenson is concentrating on radio and television to get his arguments across."

Another experienced and thoroughly dependable witness on the campaign performance of the press is Roscoe Drummond of the *Christian Science Monitor*. "The Democratic nominee," Mr. Drummond said, "is getting considerably less than an even break in the news columns of the daily newspapers across the country. . . My own daily observations on this matter lead me to the conclusion that much of the daily press is committing a serious offense against its readers—and against the canons of responsible journalism—in showing marked one-sidedness in covering the news of this campaign and in slanting much of the news it does cover."

Add to such estimates as these the isolated instances of unfair play which seem to have been pretty widespread and you have a very disagreeable picture of what might be called, in the editorial jargon so popular a few weeks ago, "a captive press." There are the numerous stories—to suggest only a single example—of newspapers which chronicled the general's arrival to make a speech with banner headlines but seemed to regard a visit from the governor as a military secret.

But such stories, whether or not they are typical and true, do not go to the heart of the influence which the press has exerted, and will continue to exert, on American opinion. It may be doubted whether the outcome of the election could have been determined by any amount of distortion in the reporting of the campaign. There is no room for doubt, however, that the thinking of the American people—the attitude with which they approach an election—is shaped and conditioned to a major degree by what they read in their newspapers.

The values by which people appraise individuals and issues are immeasurably affected by the values which their newspapers set before them—in news pages even more than in editorial pages, in advertising, in comics and in the boilerplate that is more and more reducing the diversity and individuality of the American press. The public's emotional temperature may be governed by the heat of the headlines, much as the temperature of a living room may be governed by a thermostat.

For some time past the press has been conveying to the American people some fantastically misshapen pictures of their country and their fellow-citizens. It has allowed itself to be used by demagogues as a vehicle for the exploitation of anxiety. Day after day it has reported—with an "objectivity" that treats with perfect even-handedness the character assassin and his victim—allegations that the Government of the United States is overrun with Communists and subversives. Week after week it has conveyed from congress-

sional committees and from supposedly sober Senators an impression that the Communist Party is a powerful octopus extending its tentacles into every aspect of American life—our homes, our churches, our schools, our labor unions, our arts and our professions. Month after month it has made the public flesh creep with hints of saboteurs and spies who have penetrated into every sanctum of security. Quadrennially, these accusations have grown increasingly shrill and insistent. They reached a crescendo a couple of years ago and have maintained that pitch, like a stuck whistle, ever since.

It is not easy in such an atmosphere to make rational judgments. An atmosphere in which the newspapers report straight-facedly the assertions of a United States Senator that the Secretary of State is a Soviet agent, that the chief of staff who guided the United States Army to victory in the greatest of world wars is the leader of a treasonable conspiracy, that one of the country's principal spokesmen at the United Nations is not to be trusted—this is an atmosphere more conducive to lynching than to the operation of the democratic process.

The constant repetition of such charges, the incessant sowing of suspicion and distrust, could not fail to affect men's minds in a time of tightening international tension—and in a world waiting apprehensively for atomic extinction. I am not saying, you understand, that the newspapers originated these charges or that they are responsible for them. But they have been the carriers of hysteria in much the same way that the mosquito has been the carrier of malaria. When men have been led long enough to believe that they are teetering on the edge of an abyss, it is small wonder if they lose their balance. When the news pages have created a panic, the editorial pages are likely to be powerless to quell it.

It is upon this larger problem, rather than upon coverage of the campaign itself that I would urge the focusing of the post-election inquest into the performance of the press which has already been suggested by a number of thoughtful commentators. The inquest will not serve much useful purpose if it is conducted by counting the lineage devoted to the Democrats and the lineage devoted to the Republicans in the brief period between Labor Day and Election Day. More subtle matters of content will have to be weighed; and the weighing, if it is to have much meaning, will have to deal with the larger question whether the press is, in fact, conveying to its readers a focused picture of the world around them.

The study ought to be a tough and searching one. And it ought not to be cavalierly dismissed by the press—as the study made by the Commission On Freedom of the Press, a group of distinguished scholars under the chairmanship of Robert Hutchins, was dismissed five years ago. The warning expressed by that commission is worth remember-

ing today. "The press must know," it declared, "that its faults and errors have ceased to be private vagaries and have become public dangers. Its inadequacies menace the balance of public opinion. It has lost the common and ancient human liberty to be deficient in its function or to offer half-truth for the whole."

The press must make itself, and keep itself, genuinely independent if it is to retain its freedom. The two go inescapably hand in hand. If the press becomes the captive—or equally, if it becomes the captor—of any political party, it will eventually arouse in the opposition a demand that it be brought under some sort of governmental regulation. And if that demand should ever prevail, the indispensable condition of press freedom will be destroyed. A free press must be an independent press.

A one-party press is dangerous enough, as I have tried to suggest, when its party is out of office. It becomes intolerable when its party is in power.

For the paramount function of the press in the American social system is censorship of the government. It was primarily in order to enable it to fulfill this function that the founders of the Republic insisted upon adding to the Constitution as its first amendment—and as the first article in its Bill of Rights—a flat, absolute prohibition against any governmental regulation of the press.

The men who wrote the Bill of Rights were not sentimentalists. They valued freedom of the press not as an abstract ideal but for utilitarian purposes. They granted to newspapers—despite the fact that these were private enterprises operated for private profit—a uniquely privileged position because they looked upon them as one of the essential elements in the elaborate system of checks and balances they had contrived to keep governmental authority within appropriate bounds. So far from conceiving of the press as subject to censorship by the government—as it had been in the England from which they declared their independence—they aimed to establish censorship of the government by the press.

This view of the fourth estate as distinct from, and as an offset to, all the other estates of the realm was an axiom among the libertarian political thinkers of the late 18th century. The First Continental Congress sent a memorial to the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec in 1774, referring to liberty of the press as a means "whereby oppressive officers are shamed or intimidated into more honorable or just modes of conducting affairs."

The idea that the press ought to serve as a censor of the government was explicitly stated by Thomas Jefferson. He wrote to President Washington in 1792: "No government ought to be without censors, and while the press is free, no one will."

It was precisely in order to enable the press to discharge this indispensable censorial function that the American peo-

ple have tolerated a great deal of newspaper irresponsibility. For it is a central principle of the American political faith that total divorcement of the press from the government is a condition of freedom. And, indeed, nothing more sharply differentiates the Russian system from the American system—or any totalitarian from any free society—than the contrasting relationships they maintain between the government and the press.

Now, it happens that the bias of the press has been on the side of its censorial function during the past two decades when the political party it predominantly supported was out of office. And it must certainly be admitted that the press has been vigorous enough in exposing venality in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Federal agencies.

I am convinced, however, that the government has been engaged in something much worse and much more dangerous than venality; and the press, I think, has almost entirely ignored it. There has been taking place, I believe, an expansion of governmental power and an encroachment of that power upon traditional civil liberties of a sort that the authors of the Bill of Rights would have considered intolerable—and which they relied upon a free press to prevent.

Think, for example, of the prevalence of the political test oath today. Our forefathers considered it an abomination. But now almost everyone who accepts any kind of public employment, and many who are engaged in private industry, are required to go through the mumbo-jumbo of disclaiming disloyalty—as though, somehow, the safety of the nation could be assured by this ritual of expurgation.

Think of the extent to which we have whittled down the great safeguards of individual rights which we customarily refer to as due process of law. Men are condemned and punished in these times for the undefined offense of disloyalty—on the basis of information from anonymous sources—information the source of which is often unknown even to the judges in these strange, un-American proceedings.

Think, if you will, of the ways in which congressional committees, in the guise of investigation, have usurped the functions of courts of law, placing men on trial as it were—although without any of the protections which a court of law would provide—probing into their private political beliefs (and sometimes even into their religious faith), forcing them to profess their patriotism and punishing them by publicity for conduct which the Constitution forbids Congress to make punishable by law.

Think of the extent to which we have permitted petty officials to make arbitrary decisions affecting the rights of American citizens—the right to travel abroad, for instance—and this in a country whose citizens have always proudly asserted that they lived under a government of laws, not a government of men.

Think how far we have allowed the Federal police to invade our vaunted rights of privacy. Wiretapping, for example, has become an accepted practice, despite the fact that a Federal statute expressly prohibits it.

Think how flagrantly members of the United States Senate have abused the immunity from suits for slander which their office confers upon them—to vilify and destroy innocent men for personal or political purposes.

All this extension of governmental power—all of these violations of the individual rights traditionally claimed by Americans—are justified in the name of national security. Yet I am convinced that they operate, in fact, to impair the security they are supposed to protect—that by diminishing the freedom of American citizens, they diminish the real sources of American strength. They are aimed, like the Japanese thought-control system which we used to make so much fun of during the war, at the elimination of “dangerous thoughts” and the enforcement of a rigid and sterile conformity.

The worse and the most frightening aspect of this invasion of individual rights is that the newspapers, with few exceptions, have not cried out against it. Many, indeed, have applauded it and have let themselves be used, for the most part unwittingly, as instruments for the execution of sentences arbitrarily imposed by congressional committees or by senatorial demagogues.

It does not matter that the extension of government authority and the invasion of what were once deemed inalienable rights have taken place in the name of national security. It does not matter that the men responsible for this corruption of basic American principles were patriotic and well-intentioned. Dictatorship always has its origin in the assumption that men supposed to be benevolent may be entrusted with arbitrary authority. The American Republic was born in rebellion against such authority; it was nurtured on the doctrine that governmental power must be jealously circumscribed and kept, in particular, from interference with individual freedom of expression and association.

The press was meant to serve as a sentinel of this freedom. It ought always to remember the warning uttered by Mr. Justice Brandeis. “Experience should teach us to be

most on our guard to protect liberty,” he said, “when the government’s purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding.”

The American press began to face a crucial test when the party it has so long supported assumed office in January. It will have to prove that it deserves its freedom by reaffirming its independence. It will have to resume its ancient role as a censor of the government.

Its commitment must be, not to any party, but to the public. Freedom of the press, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter has pointed out, “is not an end in itself but a means to the end of a free society.” A free press can exist only in a society that is free. If the press fails in its championship of freedom for the society as a whole, it will lose its own freedom. If it fails in its censorship of the government, it will succumb in the end to censorship by the government.

Americans look to their armed forces to protect their liberties from totalitarian assault from abroad. They look to their newspapers to protect their liberties from the assault of demagogues at home. This is the first function of a free press.

In the long, bitter and titanic struggle now in progress between totalitarianism and democracy, the real superiority of the democratic system lies fundamentally not in the number and power of its machines, not in its capacity to produce steel or to manufacture weapons, not even in its supremacy in the field of atomic energy—important as these assets may be; it lies, rather, in the techniques and the resources of freedom—in the loyalty and unity and spirit which can be forged only among free men.

Freedom has been, from the beginning of our history, the real secret of America’s growth to greatness and the most vital source of American security. Freedom is the special symbol of America. In the harbor of our greatest city stands a heroic statue of Liberty, holding aloft a blazing torch. We must never allow that torch to be extinguished, either by dictators abroad or by demagogues at home. It has always given us the light to see our way.

Reporting the Schools

by Wilma Morrison

Reporting the schools is like doing chemical experiments in which there is always an "unknown" and that "unknown" is always a high explosive. You never know when a side reaction is going to blow up the laboratory.

Those traditional standards of the press—objectivity and accuracy—won't cover the job of the education editor. His is a task of translation. The fact that it is necessary to translate, and by translate I mean explain, sometimes to the point of the ridiculously elementary, the most American of American institutions, the public schools, is a sad and exasperating commentary on these frightened times.

As a friend said after seeing a school board meeting derailed for hours by a shotgun blast of accusations—a blast that permitted no answers—"Maybe the critics have something. Maybe the schools are no good. Many of their products have grown up to mistrust the system that produced them."

Consolation lies in the thought that there is no knowing how much more suspicious these people would be if they had not gone through the public schools. And much more consolation in the fact that, for all their noise and costly nuisance effect, the number of persons who are sharpshooting at public education for the sake of shooting is few.

For every one of these extremists, there are hundreds who support the system that made our democratic government possible—hundreds whose criticisms are constructive and who need only facts in order to think through to right conclusions.

How, then, to get them the facts?

The newspaper is the only means of giving the entire public a knowledge of what the schools are trying to do and what they contend with in doing it. I am not talking about sporadic, look-how-wonderful articles on new educational tricks or periodic spates of stories that precede tax elections.

I mean continuous reporting that airs every problem that comes before the board, together with the opinions and discussion that led to each decision. All the action, including the times the board trips over its own policies or lack of policies. Week-in, week-out reporting that lays out the damned-if-you-do and damned-if-you-don't dilemmas that go with each of the hundreds of school pressures that boards and administrators deal with year in and year out.

Magazine articles can't do this, nor professional journals. Only through the newspapers with their continuous coverage can this background picture of the complicated thing

that is a democratic school system reach the people. And only this knowledge of all that is behind Johnny's classroom can insulate the public against rumor and generalized propaganda so that it won't go tearing off on a hate hunt, entirely forgetting the children, when a controversy shows.

Schools and concerned parents are right when they emphasize a "responsible" press. Accuracy, competency, objectivity, do not cover the school reporter's job. Nor does the conception of some school men—that responsibility means responsibility to themselves, exhibited in articles written to their specifications and greater glory.

Responsibility applied to the press means exactly what it should mean when applied to every citizen and every school administration and teacher—a first focus on children. The newspaper should apply all its rules of news coverage of any public agency, and add to that, the consciousness that the welfare of thousands of children is involved.

Adding 60,000 kids (in Portland) as background characters, innocent bystanders, in every school story, does not subvert the news and does not lessen the coverage—quite the contrary. It does alter the treatment.

How do you get a responsible press, one that is so conscious of its responsibility to those 60,000 youngsters that it will throw out an inflammatory headline and run a factual—and less saleable—one?

This is one of those circular, chicken-or-the-egg, questions. To get a responsible press you have to have a responsible and, above all, an open school administration. Which comes first is academic. If the school administration is not open, the newspaper won't have the background knowledge with which to be responsible even if it wants to. Besides, the schools have no alternative except to cooperate with the press. Putting it baldly, the press can hurt the schools but the schools have no effective club over the press.

Your only safeguard against a bad press is knowledge of school operations and problems by the reporter and his editor. And the only way for them to get that knowledge is to sit in on the schools, day by day, pressure by pressure, deficit by deficit, personnel controversy by personnel controversy.

Yes, even on personnel matters. When a dismissal case gets to the point of a tenure trial or public hearing and an aroused group brings in a petition and charges the administration with discrimination and false accusations, the reporter is not likely to overplay its sensational charges IF he has listened in, over a period of years, to instances in which the person in question has had to be rescued from his own errors and weak performance.

Wilma Morrison has been for nine years education editor of the Portland *Oregonian*.

A reporter who has sat in, year after year, on the parent and teacher struggle toward a satisfactory report card and who knows all the unanswerables involved in translating the development of a human being onto a piece of cardboard, would not lead off a story like this one from New York.

"Foreign families at the United Nations and even some old-fashioned Americans are moving this summer to get away from the world's screwiest school system."

The story continues, "New York schools are now in their fifth year of an experiment which is variously called, '100 per cent promotion' or 'compulsory promotion' or 'continuous progress.' It means simply that everybody gets promoted regardless of how dumb, indolent, backward, lazy or moronic he may be. . ."

The reporter who knows the dilemma of the schools under compulsory attendance laws—to fail dull children and have 16-year-olds in the primary grades or pass them along and have some 9th graders who can't read—would have told the story differently. He would have noted the criticism of the foreign families and then gone into the age-old problems of inventorying junior for his parents. And if he had known enough about report cards, he would have had just as interesting—and an even more amusing—story than this one that went out over the country from a syndicated daily news service.

First step toward that "responsible" school press is a school board and administration truly open to the press—not just paying lip service to an "open policy." Second, is to convince the editor that he should keep one person on the education beat and permit him really to cover the schools, not just catch up with them when a crisis occurs. Chief objection of school men to open their meetings to newspaper coverage is that editors send an assortment of uninformed reporters and they frequently go off half-cocked and headline falsehoods or half-truths that do grievous harm.

After nine years of reporting education in Oregon I can lay out one simple, mechanical rule for a good school press. Give more space to a school story than would be given to a story of comparable importance about another public agency. A lot of misinterpretations and falsifications that raise holy hob with public schools come not from intent to deceive but from excessive brevity.

If the highway commission closes a stretch of road and its action is reported without explanation in a two-paragraph story, nothing much is going to happen. A comparatively few persons living on the road will be outraged and will come to the commission for an explanation.

If the school board decides to shut down a high school or drop cooking from the 8th grade curriculum and these are reported without explanation, thousands react. All the alumni of the high school for 60 years back come up howling. All the mammas who believe that calory charts and

white sauce can't come too early in life, beat a trail to the board meeting. As do all the persons who make it their business to find a subversive educational plot back of every school change.

But if these actions are reported with full explanation of why they were taken, the public will either accept the reasons as sensible or, if the reasons aren't adequate, come to the board with arguments based on fact. They won't come in slugging at what their imaginations have whipped up as reasons—and convinced before discussion starts that the board tried to put something over on them.

A two-paragraph announcement of a school shut-down will create an uproar. Half a column of explanation and figures on population growth and shifts that have made the closure necessary, will result in sensible argument or no argument at all.

As simple as that. More space in newspapers to lay out school problems in partial insurance, at least, of community cooperation rather than community conflict in solving the increasingly involved problems of public schools.

Now, assuming that your editor has included the 60,000 children as background characters in his paper's school stories, and has put one responsible reporter on the school beat, and has recognized that school news requires more than average space—and merits it from the reader interest standpoint—how open should schools and school board meetings be?

All meetings with exception of those dealing with personnel and land purchase should be open to the public. And all meetings including personnel and land purchase should be open to the press—the latter with understanding that the individual's right of privacy in his job shall not be violated. Nor will advance publicity be given to financial negotiations that would jeopardize the district's land purchasing.

(Off-the-record pledges by a reporter, which are anathema, and rightly so, to editors, will not be necessary if you have a newspaper staff with the kind of responsibility described above.)

This I believe—on the evidence that it has worked successfully in Portland many years.

My belief in the entirely open board and administration will not be widely supported by school heads. And I am aware that press performance in various localities is governed by all kinds of outside influences. Newspapers whose competition for street sales is bitter, play news more sensationally than do those where the big circulation is residential as in Portland. The problem of school coverage in small communities where the paper keeps no local staff is something else again. Lack of a press is part explanation for the fact that often the school board and administration blackout is blackest in the small community and the county system where, it would seem, the public should be closest to its schools.

In spite of these differences in the newspaper field, it has surprised me that so few larger districts are entirely open. When one of the Portland directors appeared on a public information panel at the western conference of school administrators in Los Angeles last year, he brought back the report that his contribution to the discussion was fruitless.

Directors and educators at the meeting, he said, just didn't believe him when he told them the board here does not meet at all without press notification—not in rump session, not in luncheon huddles, not at all.

In an effort to find out what the general practice is, I sent a questionnaire to each of the 48 school districts of over 200,000 population and got 42 answers.

With due allowance for the inadequacies of the questionnaire (and this project verified my long-time doubts of the questionnaire method in general) the answers showed these things fairly conclusively.

Thirteen out of the 42 said all meetings are open either to public and press or to the press. However, answers of six of the 13 leave doubts as to whether the writer's concept of open was as open as the one I had tried to define in the questionnaire. Another thing that throws the questionnaire evaluation off is the fact that I failed to allow for the many boards which unlike Portland's distribute their business among committees—finance, curriculum, personnel, etc. In these cases, the discussions and problems that give rise to final decisions are in committee meetings. Even if the board meetings are covered by the press, if these committee meetings are not, then the performance is not truly open.

Twenty-nine of the 42 could be called semi-open according to my definition. That is, executive meetings and committee-of-the-whole meetings are closed.

Sixteen said the papers are notified of all meetings; 19 said, notified of official meetings only, and one said papers are never notified. Five did not answer.

A morning or late afternoon hour for meeting can have the effect of closing an officially open meeting. Twenty-six said meetings are held in afternoons or mornings, most in afternoon. Fifteen reported night meetings, one did not specify.

There are, no doubt, good reasons for holding school board meetings in the morning or, what is more common, in the late afternoon. There is also the reason, admitted by some,

that at these daytime hours the public is unlikely to attend and business can be transacted with more speed and less argument.

Indication that papers are being responsible and are recognizing reader interest in education is seen in the fact that 32 of the school heads said their newspapers have special reporters assigned to the schools on a continuous basis.

Seventeen said there is a trend toward more open public and press relations. Ten said there has been a definite opening of policy in their districts in the past 10 years and two said the trend is toward less open meetings. Twenty-three did not answer.

Given the open school administration, the cooperative editor, the extra newsprint—given all this, the education editor still does not quite have heaven too. There is still the little matter of dressing up school stories into something the public will read.

I have about decided there is nothing to be done about the "pedagogue" of the teaching profession. Like medical and engineering language, it seems to be a necessary shortcut in professional conversation. I don't run a blood pressure anymore, or at least not much of one, when school people ask me to lure the public away from the comics with reports of wonderful projects "aimed at enriching the resources and widening the area of experience" or "on-going programs of in-service training."

But, please, please, don't dish it out to mama that way. Don't tell Mrs. Jones about the "whole child." It doesn't mean anything to her when she sees it in print even though she has a houseful of aggressively whole children. It will mean something to her if she is told that the good school is responsible for helping her Johnny get over stuttering, learn to swat a baseball, tell the truth on the playground as well as off.

Don't try to sell her "enriched learning experiences" for the enriched tax dollar you want from her. It is Sanskrit to her and she is right. It doesn't mean anything except that the writer is lazy, or dull, or both. Tell her what the kids are doing and why.

Schools expect the press to bring their educational methods and goals to life on paper. Let them practice extracting the specific from the general themselves for awhile.

Un-Afghanism Exposed

by E. L. Holland, Jr.

It was with understandable surprise that I discovered, while doing research in Pushtu, that Nullah Habib, his father Habib Habib, and his grandfather, Habib Nullah, all had been seriously guilty of Americanism. During the course of my reading the usually hard-to-find writings in Pushtu, it being hardly the language of Afghanistan literature, which is Persian, I happened across the first issues of the *Kabul Blade*. It had been started in 1849, ten years after the British entered the capital, but it had grown out of a small, one-page, handwritten sheet which had sprung up with the onslaught of the imperial British.

Some copies of the early paper, beautifully handwritten, I must say, also came into my hands. It was readily evident that fire ran through the veins of that first old Durani editor, Habib Nullah. At least, fire had run through his veins at first. For he struck out boldly at the British. He warned of the eternal dangers represented almost by the very existence of the Khyber Pass. One could almost read an ominous forecast of the day Gary Cooper and his colleagues might become menaces to the north, innocent enough when at their game of lancing pegs from the ground, but not so when on official orders.

But time, I am compelled to say, played its not unusual tricks. Although the British were thrust back north in 1841, leaving behind a trail of blood drawn from them by angered Afghanistan patriots, the Crown was adamant and a year later Whitehall had reason to boast that things were in hand in old Afghanistan.

It was under this rule, then, that prosperity did, in fact, come to Habib Nullah and the *Kabul Blade*. This journal became the leading paper of Kabul, and although many good folk of Afghanistan could not read or write, they all were gifted with their ears and whereas Western folk have trouble listening, the Durani, the Tajiks, the Ghilzais and the Kaffirs had no such trouble. The professional newspaper reader achieved something of a semi-professional status.

With some stability, always an asset in the orderly accumulation of wealth, Afghanistan industry waxed. The Greater Kabul Silk Mills prospered; the Wool Combine grew lush; also there expanded the Sheeps' Tail Grease Sandwich Spread factory, the National Herat Carpet Co-operative and the great farms of the Castor Bean, Madder and Asafetida Farmers' Association.

When unengaged from his Pushtu researches, E. L. Holland, Jr. does editorials for the *Birmingham News*. When both these preoccupations disengaged him temporarily in 1949 he was a Nieman Fellow.

Now all of this meant an active trans-frontier trade with India. The caravans were many and laden richly. In Habib Nullah's house, there was always plenty of rose-water and lapis lazuli imported from the provinces hung about the necks of Habib's womenfolk. He had become quite prosperous.

The Habib family wealth—which became ever greater, of course, however slowly fortune at first began to be accumulated—grew out of the advertising carried by the *Kabul Blade*. In time Habib died, to be succeeded as editor and publisher by his rather fat and, frankly, apparently obnoxious son, Habib Habib. Habib held to the fortune, though he did not much increase it. He reigned at the *Blade* offices from 1903 until 1917, when he died of complications following a sprained wrist, incurred during a tragic dice game. Nullah Habib took over then, though only nineteen. Today, a man in fine health and with a close eye on his bookkeeper, he is the epitome of Asian success. though Russia to the north has him worried.

What is of interest to us is that Habib and his descendants were so little concerned with the national aspirations. How they maneuvered to remain unaffected doubtless never will be known, unless some employe one day writes the *Blade* history in intimate detail.

But we do know that rarely did the paper say anything against the British. Reading the editorial columns, one can find instead detailed discussions of the growth of the Mississippi Valley, the issue of slavery as it was being debated after the Missouri Compromise, the effect of Whitney's cotton gin on the Southern economy.

In the years of the great war, 1914-1918, the *Blade* was principally involved with Wilson's stewardship and the rapid development of the West Coast, particularly in the San Francisco area. Through the early years of the Twentieth Century, there was a persistent move to enlarge the gates between the separate, walled sections of Kabul. This was obviously, for the old city, a municipal problem of heat-generating propensities, yet the *Blade*, as far as I have been able to determine, only once commented on the matter. And that was only to say that, "There is considerable discussion as to the gates of the City. Our view is that these should not be too narrow; neither, on the other hand, should they be so wide as to imply to the sight that contiguity is not a factor in the adhesiveness of the metropolitan area, which is called Greater Kabul."

One would have thought, perhaps, that in 1929 when King Amanullah endeavored to force upon the people of Afghanistan the customs of the West, the *Blade* would

have taken some position, pro or con. Instead, most of the editorial discussion involved the increasing likelihood, in the paper's view, that Herbert Hoover would be America's greatest president, possibly even breaking the so-called two-term tradition.

When the question soon thereafter arose, whether a particular water carrier who had assumed rebel leadership against the king was truly of throne caliber, the *Blade* was much taken with the probability that prohibition in the U. S. was the most important factor in the rise of the bootlegger.

As most persons know all too well, in 1921 complete independence was granted Afghanistan by the British. But in the hours of exuberant celebration, the *Blade* was discussing automotive advances in the United States, with particular emphasis on the achievement of Milton Frontenac in winning the Indianapolis classic with an average speed of 89.62 m.p.h.

Today, the *Blade* under Nullah Habib and Afghanistan enjoy relative prosperity, though much remains to be done to insure the people a rising standard of living and adequate transportation. Yet these problems are hardly attacked by *Blade* writers. From the north there shines most ominously a Red Russian glow. But *Blade* editors are seemingly preoccupied with political developments. Long essays fill the columns, discussing Dwight D. Eisenhower's possible future as a portrait painter and golfer.

It perhaps behooves an historian not to essay an opinion as to his hosts, and in Afghanistan mine have been incomparably helpful to a struggling researcher. But in the interests of brighter, fresher, more positive journalism—and, after all, the whole world sorely needs an active, vibrant, free press—one may in all humbleness, and with much of sympathetic interest, suggest that the editors of Kabul's great *Blade*, down through the years, have been guilty of Americanism.

To Arthur M. Schlesinger on His 65th Birthday

Hail, Clio's son, incline thine ear this way
To old friends' wishes, sung to thee this day:
Dan Webster and his foes, Calhoun and Clay,
Send birthday greetings, also Asa Gray.

From pillar'd Monticello, Jefferson
Calls "Ave, Arthur, life has just begun—
Your sixty-five is others' twenty-one."
Agreed, for once, is Alex Hamilton.

Good cheer from Greeley, Dana, Phineas T.,
Fred Olmsted, Garrison and Harriet B.
Joe Smith and Brigham and their wives, Ann Lee,
Bill Channing, Beecher—even Fox (Maggie)—

Thank God there's meat still in thy lectures yet,
And in thy brain a book or two (they'll bet)
Once more to guarantee reformers get
The merit due from us still in their debt.

Lucretia Mott, Miss Stone and Fanny Wright
Lend fe-male tones, though pitch'd with all their might,
To praise from Harvard's Sparks and Yale's Tim Dwight,
From Edison, who gave us day in night.

The Hudson River School and Charley Peale
Send painted paeans honoring thy zeal
In limning hist'ry's pages brightly real
On canvas ever true to commonweal.

Goodyear, McCormick, Deere and Whitney, too,
Invent new birthday greetings, for 'tis true
That Youth still has in thee the upper view;
In thee, no fear of anything that's new.

From Horace Mann, Barnard and Calvin Wiley,
Miss Lyon, Emma Willard, Peter Parley,
Philosophers Tom Paine and Mister Dooley
Come thanks for making students' brains less woolly.

Not from dim past alone hear three times three:
The glorious Roosevelts—Ted and Franklin D.,
Brave, spirited but luckless Harry T.,
And Harry's protegee, sad Adlai E.,

Together raise their hearts and voices, one
With nature-loving J. J. Audubon
And Freedom's architect, rever'd Lincoln,
To sing, with thanks, the chair Lee Higginson.

Endow'd, with foresight, that thou might inspire
Young Lib'ral's, yet endure Reaction's ire
By teaching Truth with all thy spirit's fire—
This makes us loath to let thee now retire.

O, Arthur, Happy Birthday (two days late),
Friend, teacher, critic of the Fourth Estate,
Reporters join with giants on this date
Thine ever ageless youth to celebrate.

The Nieman Fellows, 3/1/53

A Report on the German Press at the Beginning of 1953

by Wayne Jordan

By American standards, the present-day German press is pretty feeble. Its weaknesses spring from such sources as these:

(1) Resurgence of the old official caste in numerous key positions at all government levels. That caste is now rather obviously trying to rearrogate to itself as many of its old powers and privileges as it can. Many public officials, finding themselves in a new relationship with the press, have tried to frustrate editors and publishers in every way they could. Toward that end, they have used court actions, administrative rulings, and new laws or threats of new laws.

(2) Revival of an unfortunately efficient "press officer" system that was evolved under former government regimes. German press officers almost invariably explain that theirs is a two-way function—keeping the press informed while at the same time keeping the government informed of what the press is saying. Much, of course, depends upon the personality and outlook of the individual press officer. In numerous instances, the present relationships between press officers and press appear to be mutually happy. (Even in some of these cases, however, it may be wondered whether the newspapermen are too easily satisfied.) Many press officers are quick to say that they do not interfere with reporters who wish to deal directly with official sources. It seems clear, however, that the system tends to discourage rather than encourage such individual enterprise. Efficient though the German press officer set-up may be as a means of disseminating information, it is also a ready-made, efficient machine for suppressing information whenever and wherever the will and the strength to use it that way may exist. In that respect, it would seem to be particularly dangerous in a country where press freedom has no deep roots in either law or custom.

(3) Indifference toward press freedom on the part of the German people (a "public" in the sense in which we use the term can hardly be said to exist in Germany at this time). Discussions with Amerika Haus audiences, professional journalists, university professors and teachers, and other Germans in various walks of life reveal a singular (though not historically surprising) unawareness of

Wayne Jordan, who has run both a news desk and a journalism school, was sent to report on the German press and journalism teaching last fall by the State Department. This is an excerpt from his report to the Office of Public Affairs of the High Commissioner for Germany, which was accompanied by recommendations for assisting in the development of a stronger press in Germany.

any such thing as "the people's right to know." As yet, apparently, no substantial segment of the German people can be counted on to identify its interests with those of the press in any kind of showdown fight between press and government. A German journalist-lawyer recently said, "Do not forget that most Germans still wish first of all to be obedient subjects. In any conflict between a newspaper and a government official, they tend naturally to side with the official."

(4) An unfortunate educational system that, generally speaking, produces neither good newspaper readers nor good editors. Our commonplace view that the free flow of news is closely related to good citizenship would still be regarded as a strange new doctrine by most Germans. Another shortcoming of Germans as newspaper readers is a peculiar mass inability to assess and face facts—a reluctance to accept demonstrable truth as the final arbiter.

Example: A German newspaper received 22 cancellations of subscriptions because it reported truthfully that a test had proved that a fire company's pump would not lift water to the top of a certain hill.

Curiously coupled with this tendency to resent unpleasant fact is an inordinate intolerance of inaccuracy, a trait amounting almost to a demand that the newspaper be infallible. Americans who have given any thought to the matter at all have long since come to realize that an editor's "right to be wrong" is one of the fundamental bases of our press freedom. Link that freedom with imperative rectitude and the freedom disappears. The fact that honest men might produce in good faith conflicting reports on the same set of happenings apparently is not conceded by many German newspaper readers. The result is extremely unfortunate from the standpoint of press freedom, for such thinking leads people to say, in effect, "It's O.K. to suppress that paper, because it's a *bad* paper."

The demand that the printed word be authoritative is the more remarkable because, by our standards, so much German reporting is so extraordinarily careless and inaccurate.

(5) Ineptitude of many editors, publishers and reporters, who seem to understand neither their own strength nor the part that the press must play in a democracy. The gap left in German journalistic ranks by the Nazi period is obvious enough. We need also to remember (in taking the full measure of present difficulties) that the press in Germany has never had a role comparable to the press in our own country.

To one used to working with American newspaper files

in historical libraries, the contrast with German files of the last century and a half is startling. Era for era, the German press has lagged far behind. It even appears probable that the biggest and best newspapers (with the accent on *news*) ever published in the German language were those published in the United States, when places like New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Milwaukee had a highly developed German press.

The tendency to return to outmoded editorial, business, and mechanical methods because they represented "the German way" has been one of the disappointments of our effort to westernize the German press.

(6) Failure of the press to interest itself to any great extent in the everyday life of the people. Local news, as we know it, is for the most part neglected by the German press. Small papers ape larger ones in their emphasis on national subjects and in space given to *feuilleton* that an American editor would regard as mere "optional" or "filler" copy.

The limited amount of local news that can be found in the German press tends largely to neglect the human equation. Except in cases involving rank or prominence, individuals figuring in the news are commonly not even identified by name. ("A small boy" is killed by an auto driven by a "shopkeeper," who is arrested by "a policeman.") Such anonymity, doubtless readily explainable in the light of Germany's non-democratic past, brings home to an American observer the important part that our own press plays in establishing and maintaining the status and dignity of the individual citizen.

Whatever explanations and apologies may be offered, the fact remains that widespread disinterest in the common people and their personal and neighborhood problems deprives the German press of a strong source of support. There is a lack of that fellow feeling which so many Americans have for the local newspaper that concerns itself so largely with their own doings and with events that bear directly upon their own health, safety, and economic well-being.

(7) Lack of a small press of the kind that, while figuring so importantly in our democratic process, gives our journalism such a broad popular base. I refer, of course, to weeklies and other community papers like those that are represented in our National Editorial Association.

Germany's deficiency in this respect is closely related, of course, to the relative disinterest in people and their local affairs that has just been mentioned. As already noted, Germany's small papers are generally preoccupied with non-local matters.

The result is that the German press, viewed as a national institution, is without "grass roots." That means, among other things, that there is no vigorous press check-up on government in the smaller communities. It also means

that no vigorous outcry will come from the villages and hamlets when attempts are made to whittle away press freedom.

(8) Economic limitations imposed upon newspapers by German custom, tradition and precedent. Because of these limitations, most German newspapers seem to lack the individual strength that breeds confidence and sustains resistance to governmental and other pressures.

One of the most obvious limitations results from the tendency of German newspapers to be narrowly partisan. In being political, they are often not content with being broadly "conservative," "middle-of-the-road," or "liberal." Instead, they adhere so narrowly to a party position (or a position within the party) that they automatically curtail their potential circulation sphere.

This self-limitation of circulation is made all the more effective, of course, by the traditional German predilection for partisan comment rather than straight news in the news columns.

Another economic weakness of the German press stems from business habits that differ markedly from our own. Advertising, apparently, is still a relatively underdeveloped field, misunderstood in many instances by both newspaper managers and the business community. Few papers, it seems to me, are making a real effort to tap their local advertising potential. Rather, they accept complacently the fact that most of their local businessmen have never learned, or been instructed in, the value of advertising.

Too often the placing of an advertisement is regarded by both parties to the transaction as largess rather than the sale of something that has economic utility for the buyer.

With respect to the economic position of the German papers, one notes a disturbing complacency. Most newspaper managers appear quite content to operate a "German-type" paper, which means an institution modeled after the papers of a prewar generation. In most interviews on the subject, one senses a lack of boldness, a reluctance to experiment, a disinterest in the possibility that a little research might reduce operational costs and reveal ways of increasing revenues.

No claim is made that all of the weaknesses of the German press are listed here. The purpose of such a listing is to show that the problem is a very difficult one that requires our serious, continued attention.

Signs of Progress

Despite the many adverse factors that have been noted in this report, one who had opportunities for firsthand observation of the German press in 1947 and 1948 cannot help being impressed by certain unmistakable signs of progress.

The greatest triumph of all has come from the American and British efforts to establish a new press in Germany through a temporary licensing system. In general, the

performance of the licensed papers, which have so successfully survived the end of licensing, is cause for great satisfaction.

The result has been an infusion of new blood and new ideas into German journalism. Besides being unmatched in German history, this accomplishment seems likely to stand as one of the most conspicuous successes ever obtained anywhere through missionary work in the cultural field.

In 1947 this writer observed that many of the German newspaper licensees of the U. S. Zone were illy prepared for the responsibilities they had been called upon to assume. Finding qualified German newspapermen who were also believers in democracy was a difficult task at the end of the war. Understandably, many of the licensees were men who were politically friendly to the West rather than men who knew much about newspapers.

It is now gratifying to see how many of the licensees were able to measure up to the challenge that confronted them. For the most part, they have established themselves well enough to hold their own against their present competitors. At the same time, many are effectively perpetuating American influence after years of close association with American representatives.

One of the best indications of United States influence upon the German press is to be found in increased awareness of the difference between fact and opinion. The idea that a newspaper's primary function was to provide accurate information for its readers was a new one to Germany. Although many German newspapermen have not yet accepted that view, the progress toward factual reporting has been marked.

In Western Germany, with licensing ended, the papers that stress separation of news and comment are doubtless a minority. The fact remains, however, that a considerable number of German newspapers do try to present news with a degree of objectivity never before known in Germany. Besides, surveys show that some German readers have actually come to prefer straight reporting.

Apparently many German editors of the pre-Hitler school are willing to concede that the American and British efforts to introduce straight reporting have made a permanent impress.

It should also be noted that there has been considerable progress in journalistic competence. Many of the young people who received their training on licensed newspapers (often benefitting by the guidance given by American information officers) have developed into capable craftsmen. Young people who have had schooling or practical newspaper work in the United States under the Exchanges Program also constitute a promising new element. Likewise, many publishers and senior editors are willing to acknowledge benefits derived from tours of observation in the United States.

In the matter of competence, German reporters' professional performance at press conferences is a case in point. Americans who observed Germans at such conferences a few years ago invariably noted that few of them seemed able to ask simple, direct questions. What purported to be a question more often resembled a lengthy declamation. This time I noted a considerable improvement in that respect, an observation that was confirmed by a highly competent American correspondent who had served in Germany continuously through the postwar period.

Unfortunately, the economic incentives for German journalists are not what they should be. Editorial pay is far too low by comparison with that of the mechanical employee.

Unfortunately, too, journalism as a craft does not yet command in Germany the public respect that it merits in a democratic society. The fact that the German journalists of today have an adverse historical legacy to overcome should heighten our respect for what they have accomplished in such a short time.

Over all, I feel that continuance of our efforts to help, improve, and protect the German press is amply justified by the results obtained to date.

New Forms for New Times

by John W. Bloomer

If there were any remaining in the newspaper world who had doubts as to the fact that something unusual is going on in the business of news dissemination these days, they must have been convinced by the story out of, I believe, West Virginia, recently. It related how a reporter, unable to attend a function on which his newspaper desired coverage, sat down in front of a television set, took notes on the event as transmitted by that medium, and turned in a story satisfactory to the copy desk.

Richard Harding Davis must have whirled in his grave at that one, and I admit to a few twirls myself.

The rapid development of television as a medium of news dissemination has created a disturbing question within the newspaper industry as to how readership will be affected as further progress is registered in expansion of TV broadcasting facilities and a better use of the medium. Also a matter of speculation is the effect which television, with its high cost of production and transmission, will have upon the division of the advertising dollar.

It doesn't require a seer to predict that television will have a strong impact on news gathering and news presentation practices now current in newspaperdom. Even should we entertain strong doubts that the loss in newspaper circulation in 1952—the first such retrogression since the late thirties—was the result of television competition for readers' time—and the metropolitan papers hardest hit in the circulation loss attribute it to that factor—we can look forward to a vigorous reaction from the press. Even should we try to ignore the enterprise as a rival dispenser of news, we most assuredly are not going to be able to ignore the evolutionary effect it will have upon society, since our prime mission is reflecting the transitions created by pressures upon the people.

Those who discount the impact of television are doing the American press no favor. They frequently attempt to bolster their argument by exclaiming, "Look at radio. Advertising revenue and newspaper circulation have both increased drastically since the advent of radio." True. But it wasn't done by ignoring radio or discounting its influence upon the American society.

The first great challenge to the printed word came about 30 year ago, when radio entered the commercial phase. The newspaper not only held its own, but after a temporary setback in circulation, started a climb in readership that

reached its peak in 1951 with a circulation of over 51 million, one-third the population of the nation. It did not achieve that mark by resting on its prestige and tradition. It styled itself to meet the changing times.

In a vigorous drive to maintain and increase its readers' interest, the press turned to the unexploited opportunities offered by pictures. Over a comparatively few years amazing progress was registered in photographic and engraving processes. Wire and radio photo made available pictures of events to points hundreds of miles away within minutes after their occurrence. Advancements have made possible to smaller and smaller newspaper operations the advantages of their own photographic and engraving plants, until today we find even the so-called country weeklies equipped to reflect the news of their communities in pictures.

In our striving to overcome the competition for attention we expanded our news coverage. We added a variety of features and attractions designed to entice readers on every age, social and economic level. Comic sections blossomed into 16-column departments; views of columnists and writers on every topic imaginable were presented in increasing numbers; we became aware that womankind was a most valuable source of readers, as well as a strong economic force, and we designed our papers to appeal more and more strongly to them. That trend remains particularly vigorous. To contrast with the surface reporting provided by radio, which we could not match in speed of transmission, we started digging deeper into the new picture, providing some perspective for the reader with background information, speedily transmitted interpretives, maps, graphs, and other explanatory material. Humor became a valuable news commodity and we demanded more and more of it from our news services. The human interest story became eagerly sought to stimulate the attention of the reader.

Typographically, the changes in newspapers since the advent of radio are specially notable. We became highly conscious of readability and eye appeal, with the result that they have increased manifold. Upper and lower case heads have almost entirely superceded the upper case heads. Lengthy and complicated decks have been abandoned by most newspapers, partly in the interest of faster production and news print economy, but largely in the interest of simplicity and readability. New types have been designed to achieve that advantage.

As the influence of radio was extended we became highly conscious of our writing and reporting techniques. Studies were authorized to ascertain readability of our copy. Simplicity in sentence and thought structure received unequal-

This is a talk by Mr. Bloomer, managing editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*, at the Georgia Press Institute, Athens, Ga., February 19, 1953.

led emphasis as we strove to keep the newsboys busy acquiring character and business acumen. Insistence became greater for better informed, more capable staffs, a demand answered by the universities with rapid expansion of schools of journalism.

Another development of this period was organization. We wound up organizing every level of newspaper endeavor, on both the state and national scale, from the publishers down to the, well—almost to the copy boys. In organization not only was found greater economic strength but an incentive to higher standards of journalism.

We have seen that this vigorous program of self-improvement on the part of the press in no way deterred radio. That institution continued to grow and expand its influence economically and socially. But we did discover that the program paid off in both circulation and prestige for newspapers. The two great media of information prospered side by side, and their combined advertising impact was a strong contributor to the amazing growth which the American economic structure has experienced in the past 15 years.

We can discern no reason why newspapers, radio and television, through their combined economic impact, cannot contribute to creation of a still more vigorous American economic structure large enough to accommodate all three in a healthy condition of competition.

But that era will not be unmarked by terrific new pressures on the newspaper industry. Forces equal to or greater than the radio and the automobile are even now beginning to play upon the living habits and attitudes of the people of the nation, and the changes in the next 30 years in this fast moving society are almost beyond contemplation.

The role that the newspaper will play in such a society is by and large up to us of the press. The past 30 years have demonstrated the skill of newspapers in meeting challenges for readership. Changes which we cannot visualize may be awaiting us, but already we are in a transition period that is demanding new concepts, and new approaches, in discharging the responsibilities which our free society has placed upon us, responsibilities that become more and more demanding as the affairs of the community, the state, the nation and the world become increasingly complex.

Never before has there existed the interest in public affairs that we find today. The most convincing recent demonstration of that was the fever heat generated through every class and age level during the political campaign just past and the record outpouring at the polls on election day. Interest is being continually expanded through emphasis on citizenship training in our public schools. Grade school youngsters are keener students of public affairs than were high school and even college students of a few decades ago, when memorizing a pledge to the flag was con-

sidered the limit to public school citizenship training. Maybe they aren't learning to spell, but they surely can ask us adults some embarrassing questions concerning our government and its ideologies. And their parents to a great extent as a result of enlightenment gained through the newspaper, are becoming more and more familiar with questions with which only leaders of statecraft concerned themselves in times past.

Nor is this broadening interest in life confined to public affairs. Science in all its phases—medical, mechanical, chemical—has come within the ken of a large percentage of our people and they are keenly interested in the laboratory developments which are affecting our daily lives to a constantly increasing degree.

The science of education itself has become a matter of public domain, so to speak, a subject of topical interest to our readers. A higher percentage of college graduates in our population, PTA activities and other such endeavors are fostering widespread interest in the mechanics of education. We must be prepared to report on the subject intelligently and with a grasp of its basic principles.

No longer is an interest in the arts—painting, music, drama, literature—concentrated in the great centers of wealth. Today it is found in the smallest villages. Merely providing space for syndicated columns out of New York has ceased to be sufficient. We face the need of being prepared, on the local level, for intelligently reporting on the arts for an increasingly sophisticated society.

A greater understanding of the economic forces that have a basic influence on our lives has been generated by a decade of government controls. Assumption of broad economic powers by the federal government has awakened every level of readership to the pressures that are exerted on their pocketbooks. No longer do Americans blindly accept an economic situation as inevitable. They want to know why and they demand action and answers.

So it is through the entire pattern of daily life in America. The partial glimpse which radio and television afford whets the appetite of the public for the full story. Complete coverage of events and developments will be required by an enlightened public. Already many non-metropolitan newspapers have adopted the practice of publishing in full texts of important speeches and statements by our national leaders. The practice needs to be extended down through the state and local levels and expanded to include the important papers, reports, and actions on all levels of government.

We spend much time and effort finding fault with our national news gathering agencies, but it seems to me that they are doing a much better job on the national and international level than we are doing on our local level. The average American today is better informed on national and international questions than he is on those of his own community.

I suggest that we spend more effort in intelligently and diligently reporting on the varied interests and activities of our own communities. On the local level we have mastered reportorially the police blotter. We have demonstrated skill in political and governmental reporting. We have proved that we can copy long lists of names and publish them with a minimum amount of errors, and we have shown we can handle a human interest story with a fair amount of finesse. Beyond that I would hesitate to carry a brief for the non-metropolitan press today. In the past that has been adequate. But not in the future.

It is doubtful if the press is equipped today for keeping pace with the broadening interests of a more enlightened and a better informed public. We are going to find an increasing need for reportorial and editorial specialists. Reporters with legal training, with experience in accountancy, with education in the traditions of the arts. Political science

majors will be encouraged to spend less time writing grass fires and more time exploiting the knowledge they gained in university classes. Engineering graduates may be found to be better reporters on many phases of our community endeavors than English majors. Mere ability to recite the five W's and change a typewriter ribbon is not likely to be enough in this advancing stage of journalism.

Inspiring challenges lie before us of the newspaper profession. They must be met, for the newspaper, in contrast to other information media, remains the hope of a free American society for free, uncensored, unbiased dissemination of news.

Richard Wagner, the German composer, found the prescription for masterful and inspiring creation of music in a conclusion that we of the newspaper business today can understand—"One must belong to one's own day, find new forms suited to new times."

New Answers for Old Questions

State-Local Tax Relations in New York

by Calvin W. Mayne

The pattern of state aid to municipalities in New York State is of interest both to students of local government and to students of the administrative process. In the new concepts of the fiscal relationship of the mother state and the child city developed by the Moore Commission of 1945-46 is an attempt to find new answers to the continuing vexing problem of the financial plight of our urban centers. In the executive budget presented annually to the Legislature is a refreshing new treatment of aid to localities from an administrative point of view.

This paper is an attempt to treat these matters, in a general way. An examination of the effect of the measures adopted by New York State following World War II demonstrates, however, that the old problems are still far from being solved. Although the material and graphs presented here are limited almost entirely to New York State, persons familiar with aid to municipalities in other states will be able to apply the Empire State's experience to the difficulties in their own regions.

The Nature of Aid

It is generally agreed that the relationship of state to city is far different from the relationship of the federal government to the states. Although the states are beginning more and more to become mere administrative units for all-pervading central government, the states are still theoretically independent political entities possessing certain areas of power over the lives of their citizens without in-

terference by the central government. The cities are, however, created by legislatures which have long retained great powers over the affairs of their children, in spite of the home-rule concept in many states. With this state control is a responsibility for the fiscal health of the communities, subject to the will of local city councils and taxpayers in purely local matters.

Thus state aid was established, at least in New York State, "(1) to stimulate and guide certain locally administered activities, (2) to guarantee a minimum standard of certain services in even the poorest communities, and (3) to relieve the poorer communities of crushing tax rates they would have to impose to support even a minimum level of government services if left to their own resources."

New York State Municipalities and Their Revenue

Local government in New York State is big government and is getting bigger. In 1946, spending by local governments totaled \$1,250,000,000 annually. More than this amount is currently spent every year by New York City alone.

Frank Moore cited the complexity of New York State's local governmental units in a 1946 speech. There are in the state, he pointed out, 62 counties, 62 cities, 932 towns, 548 villages, 5,300 school districts, 200 town improvements districts and 600 fire districts. With expanding suburbs, this number is growing.

New York State municipalities (and other American local government units as well) have used property tax-

tion as their largest single source of revenue. One hundred years ago, property taxes gave the cities almost all of their revenue. Today, property taxes still account for 42 per cent of New York City's budget, with a far greater proportion found in other cities, towns and villages.

The power of the cities to tax property has been restricted by the Legislature in New York State, however, since the 1880's. This restriction, amounting in recent years to a strait-jacket, has played an increasingly important role in the cities' financial difficulties.

Property tax limits and debt limits were fixed in the state constitution in 1938. Briefly, the restriction provides that real estate taxation for a city's current expenses in any given year (including education in larger cities) is limited to two per cent of a five-year average of assessed valuations. All revenue from real estate taxation in excess of that limit may be used only for debt service and major capital improvements ("an object or purpose for which a period of probable usefulness has been determined by law").

New York State cities are free, of course, to set tax rates at whatever figure they choose. Only the *total amount* raised by taxes on real estate is restricted.

New York State Legislatures have always severely limited other forms of revenue available to cities. This policy is changing, however, under the impact of inflation. This will be discussed at greater length below.

The state government has extended aid for certain municipal services for more than a half century. Principal types of state aid are grants for education, welfare and highways. Since 1920, state aid to municipalities has totaled at least 40 per cent of the state executive budget and often more.

Included in the general category of state aid were "shared taxes." These were taxes collected by the state and returned under various formulas and percentages fixed by the Legislature to the municipalities. It was this system of shared revenue that was abolished by the Moore Commission for the "per capita" system. Principal shared taxes were the personal income tax, corporation tax, mortgage tax, motor vehicle and motor fuel taxes and various taxes on alcoholic beverages.

The Moore Commission

The Moore Commission was established in March, 1944, under an Act of the Legislature "creating a temporary state commission to study the fiscal relationships between the state and local units of government therein, the finances of such local units and the relief of real estate taxation." The official name of the group, composed of experts on city finance in and out of public office, was The Commission on Municipal Revenues and Reduction of Real Estate Taxes. It was headed by Frank C. Moore, then state comptroller and now lieutenant governor of New York and one

of the nation's leading authorities on local government finance.

More than two dozen commissions had studied one or more phases of the Moore Commission's work in New York State since 1916. The success, if any, of each effort was short-lived. With greater attention being paid during World War II to the future problems of cities, some 20 other states appointed similar groups, the Moore Commission reported.

The chief aim of the Moore Commission was to bring about stability of local government finances. Another implied goal was to increase the volume of state aid to local governments. The announced goal of reducing real estate taxes was, it subsequently appeared, more political than real.

The problem was that under the system of shared taxes, revenue available to the cities fell off just at the time the cities needed it most. This occurred most markedly during the depression of the '30s. Assessed valuation in the state dropped from \$29.5 billion in 1931 to \$25.6 billion in 1936, with a resultant decrease in real estate tax revenue, coupled with large percentages of uncollected taxes.

While this was happening, the total of shared taxes returned to municipalities plunged from \$84 million in 1930 to \$37 million in 1933. Municipal debts increased sharply. Welfare costs skyrocketed, with the state being forced to issue \$214 million in bonds for unemployment relief from 1931 to 1937. The cities never regained their financial health until the war, and even this recovery was regarded as only temporary.

As the Moore Commission said: "With declining assessed valuations and sharply curtailed income from shared taxes, the municipalities found themselves confronted with the necessity of raising the moneys required not only to meet their normal costs of government but also to pay the debt service upon the huge borrowings accumulated in the '20s and to provide vastly increased relief and welfare services to their citizens."

Governor Dewey later put it this way: "The present system of shared tax distribution is a patternless maze justified only by accidental circumstances and historical but now obsolete motivations. The amount of shared taxes received by municipalities is presently measured neither by their needs, the nature and quantity of services provided nor the population served. Some localities derive from such tax-sharing more income than other localities with equal or greater needs."

At the same time, city officials seeking revenue were hemmed in by the real estate tax limitations and a debt limitation of nine per cent (ten per cent in New York City) of the five-year average of assessed valuations. This, however, turned out to be a more severe problem after the war than before.

New Answers to Old Questions

The Moore Commission began its proposals for the future with a lecture:

"The state cannot and must not accept exclusive responsibility for the solution of local fiscal problems. Nor should it even undertake at the expense of the rest of the state to indemnify the citizens of any community against the unwise fiscal practices of the local officials they have selected. Increasing reliance upon the state for financial assistance may lead to greater state supervision of local government, with consequent impairment of home rule and the destruction of local responsibility.

"Permanent stability in local finance and the reduction of real property taxes can be achieved only by the whole-hearted and united efforts of the state and its subdivisions. Each must do its part."

The Moore Commission then recognized a larger responsibility, of a new type, by the state toward local government:

"The state should continue to assist the localities not only by grants for special services but also by annual contributions of money available for their general governmental purposes. The present system of shared taxes should be abolished and a more stable and equitable method of state assistance to its subdivisions adopted. The new plan should be better adjusted to the needs of the localities and it should provide certainty of income in good times and bad."

These were the major specific proposals, recommended in the Commission's final report in 1946 and adopted in toto by a cooperative Republican governor, Thomas E. Dewey, and a Republican Legislature:

(1) The state share of welfare expenses—for home relief, old age assistance, aid to dependent children, some types of administrative expenses and aid to the blind—was increased from about 40% to 80%, or more accurately, the difference between 80% of the welfare cost and the amount of federal welfare aid distributed by Congress through the state to the municipalities. Thus the care of the aged, the destitute and dependent children, said the Moore Commission, became "the concern of all people of the state, borne by all forms of wealth, with standardization of service and promotion of sound municipal fiscal planning through an end to large fluctuations in cost."

(2) The State was urged by the commission to put an end to the mandating of new expenses on municipalities by the Legislature.

(3) The formula for aid to education was revised for larger grants to schools, with an emphasis on equalization of standards throughout the state.

(4) For the former system of shared taxes, the state adopted per capita grants, similar to the "block grant" system in effect in England since 1929. After thousands

of computations, the Commission arrived at a figure generally representing an increase over the amount already received under the shared-tax plan. According to the formula, municipalities receive for each inhabitant annually a grant which can be used in whatever manner the local authorities deem advisable. The per capita allocations were fixed at \$6.75 per person for cities, \$3.55 for towns and \$3.00 for villages. A "taper" system was set up to minimize the immediate effect of any gain or loss from previous shared-tax revenues. The per capita allocations are set each year by the Legislature, but have not been changed since first established.

(5) The state executive budget, submitted annually to the Legislature by the governor, was divided in two major parts in a procedure still followed today. One part provides for ordinary expenses of the state government. The other budget section provides for municipalities and is called the "local assistance budget." Each budget is set up separately and is considered and adopted separately by the Legislature.

The purpose of the new budget form, the Commission said, is to assist in understanding the destination of each tax dollar paid to the state. Although both the state purposes and local assistance budget are presented at the same time, in the same volume and in the same budget message, there is now a definite schism between the two. Instead of the former method of talking in one budget section about shared taxes and in another section about state assistance to local governments, the total picture of state assistance to localities is presented in cohesive, isolated form.

As one authority observed, "this practice makes clear the relative weights in the total financial picture of grants to local units and direct state expenses." The new budgeting practice is a significant contribution of the Moore Commission to American governmental processes.

In order to finance the two budgets, the state's general fund is divided into two sub-funds: the local assistance fund and the state purposes fund, each of which is backed by a tax stabilization (reserve) fund. To each fund is allocated a percentage of state revenues, fixed annually and appropriated for each. Revenues which exceed the amount needed to meet the cost of each fund are placed in the reserve funds to be drawn on in times of emergency and diminished revenue.

In the 1952 state budget, the state's purposes fund total was about \$483 million. The local assistance fund was about \$610 million for a total of \$1093 million, the first billion-dollar budget in New York's history. As of January, 1952, the balance in the local assistance reserve fund was about \$74 million and the balance in the local assistance reserve fund was about \$43 million.

Principal types of local assistance in 1952 were: education, \$285 million; welfare, \$135 million; per capita aid, \$115 mil-

lion; public health, \$25 million, and other aid and fund transfers, \$50 million. More than half of this aid went to New York City. The 1952 total is more than twice the 1945 total, with most of the increase accounted for by vast increases in education and welfare grants.

"As New and Useful as Radar"

The Moore Commission regarded its plan with great optimism. During the first year of operation (1946), the added cost to the state of the new plan was set at about \$51½ million. This was regarded, however, as within the means of the state treasury, then bursting with high war-time tax returns.

Frank Moore added in 1946: "Never before have the local officials of the State of New York had an opportunity comparable with their of today to serve the people of our state and, particularly, the folks in their own home towns . . . At long last, the uncertainties and inequities of state assistance have been eliminated and now, for the first time, every municipality can anticipate with certainty its full and just share of revenues from that source . . . Upon a sound fiscal foundation we can build municipalities as new and useful as radar."

It will be recalled that one of the purposes of the Moore Commission was to reduce real estate taxes. The Commission said it expected this reduction to occur but was rather vague about how this was to be accomplished. The Commission banked on stabilization of finances and decreased welfare expenses as a means of cutting municipal budgets and reducing tax rates.

Inflation and State Aid

The Moore Commission's recommendations were adopted by the Legislature and the new era of municipal fiscal health was hailed. But the new plan proved neither a panacea for all local fiscal ills, nor even a means of greatly altering the existing rate of state aid. Some good results were obtained, however:

(1) In the new budgeting process, definite advantages were obtained in the clarity and simplicity of the state executive budgets.

(2) The block grant (per capita) system *did* provide a means for making it clear to municipal officials how much they were going to get from the state from year to year, at least in one important portion of state aid. This gives assurance that if depression comes again, municipalities will not be left almost bankrupt by diminishing state aid at a time of skyrocketing expenses. Municipalities also have been relieved of the welfare expenses that contributed largely to depression fluctuations in city budgets. And in the block grant system, the state gives its support without ticketing each dollar for certain purposes, thus affording municipal officials flexibility and freedom in planning their

budgets. The block grant system has succeeded well in England, and it has succeeded, as far as it has gone, in New York State. If faults are still present in New York, a precedent is at least established for expansion of the system in the future.

Those are the good results—some stability, a backstop against depression and better budget processes and fiscal planning. But there have been events which show that the fiscal problems of the cities, especially in relation to the role of the parent state, are as acute today as ever before.

Despite the work of the Moore Commission, state aid plays no greater role in the finances of New York State cities than 12 years ago, before the Commission was formed. In New York City, state aid accounted for 20 per cent of the 1940 budget, 24 per cent of the 1948 budget and 20 per cent of the 1952 budget. In Rochester, a more or less typical Upstate city, state aid supplied 26 per cent of the 1940 budget; 30 per cent of the 1948 budget, but only 16 per cent of the 1952 budget. With state aid and collections from real estate taxes in these cities stable or declining, other sources of revenue became vitally necessary as inflation struck after the war.

Thus, the New York Legislature has finally been forced to break down its bars against other forms of taxation permitted the cities in an effort not only to assist the municipalities to meet increased expenses but also finally to call a halt to the increasing burden of state aid. As Governor Dewey said in a message to the 1947 Legislature:

"The state government has in recent years gone far—perhaps too far—in its expansion of local assistance. Apart from effects on state finances and state government in the future, there is the progressively degenerative effect that excessive grants-in-aid produce upon aided units of government."

There is some question whether in a state the problem of aid to municipalities, the "children" of the state, should be regarded in quite the same moral light as federal aid to state and cities, aid which often stifles local initiative and independence. Be that as it may, the New York Legislature followed Governor Dewey's advice and, curbing as much as possible new types of state aid to cities, granted permission for local authorities to impose business, sales and other forms of new taxes. The opportunity presented was quickly seized by the hard-pressed cities.

But the cities of New York State, having become accustomed to the benevolent handouts of the state government, are crying annually for more state aid and shying away from new local taxes. The procession to the wailing wall at Albany is led annually by the mayor of New York City, and all local officials appear to have been satisfied only temporarily by the Moore Commission's work.

The principal difficulty seems to be that the block grant system, being rigid in the formula adopted for distribu-

tion in 1946 and retained since by succeeding Legislatures, is designed for depression and not for inflation. As costs of government go up in the cities, the state per capita assistance—and often the education grants—stay put. Thus local governments must find other ways of raising money, politically and otherwise an increasingly difficult proposition.

It will be recalled that the per capita grants will stand as a bulwark against bankruptcy in time of depression. Since they are relieved of diminishing state aid and the great burden of welfare costs, New York State cities should be able to withstand any recession or depression well, although the state itself may find itself in some financial difficulty. The state, however, is better able with its greater financial resources to undergo this burden and strain. The tax stabilization funds, in addition, can form a reservoir of money collected in good times for the emergency of any depression.

The problems of a depression, however, are somewhat remote at present from the minds of New York's local officials. Thus there is no sign of an end of pressures for more state aid, for relief of real estate taxation restrictions

and legislative permission for new types of taxes, including payroll taxes.

Perhaps it is still too early to form a conclusive judgment on the Moore Commission's work. But if, as some authorities predict, the American economy is to level off at a high plateau of prices and wages, a sort of permanent semi-inflation, the role of state aid to cities will need thorough review and revision in New York and most states.

One of the great benefits of New York's examination of and action on local finances is the fact that the state's officials have actually made a strong and well-reasoned attempt to do something constructive about an old problem. This, they believe, is better than doing nothing, limping along from year to year on improvised emergency measures or wasting time in endless arguments and recriminations on the conduct of state and local government. With the character of the American scene now thoroughly transformed from rural to urban, this sort of action is a first order of business in every state capitol.

Calvin W. Mayne covers city hall and municipal affairs for the Rochester, N. Y. *Times-Union*. He did this paper in a course on local government, as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, this year.

McCarthy Postscript

The Investigator Investigated

by Melvin Mencher

At the opening of the 83rd session of Congress a 400 page paper bound government document was distributed to Congress, the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of its "investigation to determine whether expulsion proceedings should be instituted against Senator Joseph R. McCarthy."

The subcommittee made no recommendations. It came as no surprise that the report contained only the material turned up in the investigation and questions that the committee deemed proper to ask. McCarthy had draped red banners about the members of the committee from its inception in August, 1951. The Senators on the committee, he declared, were out to get him. The hearings were designed to expel him for "having exposed the communists in government." Also: "The committee is guilty of stealing." And: The investigation is "an attempt to further smear McCarthy." (The senator frequently refers to himself in the third person.)

McCarthy's contempt for the committee, his refusal to testify before it, the resignation of two senators early in the investigation, and less tangible forces, such as McCarthy's

reputation for taking care of senators he dislikes, background the committee's decision to leave it to the senate as a whole to sit in judgment on their colleague from Wisconsin.

Much of the material the committee included in the report is not new—McCarthy's \$10,000 book for Lustron Corp., his relations with the sugar lobby, and his strange financial transactions. But for the first time the record was tied together and buttressed with evidence obtained by an exhaustive check of the senator's finances.

The questions the committee asked appear pointed enough to have demanded consideration by the senate. Several newspapers, notably the New York *Times* and Washington *Post*, thought so. But the report was issued at the time the Republicans were reorganizing the senate, and the clanking of their political machinery drowned out the report, which the committee stated "should speak for itself."

Although the committee concluded that the report was serious enough to "transcend partisan politics," the Republicans were not interested in challenging McCarthy's seat as this might have deprived them of senate leadership. (The

senate stood at 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats and Independent Wayne Morse.)

The task of doing something about the report clearly fell upon the Democrats. But political considerations bothered the Democrats also. A Democrat revealed his party's troubles:

In the Democratic caucus in January an attempt was made to determine whether there would be any challenge of McCarthy's seat. At that time, the report was not yet released. An attempt was made to have Senators Thomas Hennings and Carl Hayden, Democratic members of the McCarthy investigatory committee, inform the caucus as to the contents of their report. But the senators felt that any disclosure before the 4 p.m. release time might cause the Republican committee member, Robert Hendrickson, to pull out and thus make the report a partisan document. The meeting adjourned upon Senator Lyndon Johnson, the new Democratic leader in the senate, agreeing to talk over the report with Hennings and Hayden after its release, to determine whether a new caucus should be called the next morning.

No caucus was called.

The Republicans had a powerful counterweapon in this maneuvering—the threat of refusing to seat Senator Dennis Chavez, whose election was being contested by his opponent, Pat Hurley. If the Democrats challenged McCarthy, the Republicans would follow through on Chavez and the GOP would retain its right to organize the senate. Also, the Republicans argued, many of the committee's revelations were known to Wisconsin voters during the campaign and they still sent him back to Washington.

There is no possibility that the senate will take further action on the report. A Washington correspondent of the *New York Times* recently reported that only eight senators could be counted on to act against McCarthy. In fact, there is a possibility that there may be no adverse report for the senate to act on. McCarthy has asked for a revision of the report. An editorial in the *Washington Post* pictures what may occur:

"Once the report gets into the hands of the reconstituted Republican Elections Subcommittee, which is under the chairmanship of Senator Jenner—you can be confident that it will be doused in rosewater, sprinkled with stardust and primped and crinolined until you won't be able to tell Senator McCarthy from Abou Ben Adhem."

McCarthy is not, however, entirely free from concern. The subcommittee stated that its report and its files were made available to the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue for any action "deemed appropriate by such agencies." An administration exasperated by McCarthy's intrusion on executive matters could conceivably give the agencies the nod. But this is highly speculative.

The senate was asked to deal with McCarthy as a matter of conscience. It did not do so for pressing political reasons. It chose to ignore the committee's warning that the matter is beyond politics and "goes to the very core of the senate body's authority, integrity and the respect in which it is held by the people of this country."

Melvin Mencher, state political writer on the *Albuquerque (N.M.) Journal*, is now on a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard.

"J. B. Conant Speaking"

EDUCATION AND LIBERTY. James Bryant Conant. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, \$3. 168 pp.

This is an apt title for the last book of the last president of Harvard whose final report warns the universities that they must be prepared to defend their liberty against such demagogic attack as is now rampant.

Conant had discerned "the rising tide of reaction" some seasons ago. He alerted the schools to their danger from irresponsible smears even while he was organizing The Committee on the Present Danger to warn the nation against Soviet aggression. The people who were sabotaging the schools as subversive were the same people—in and out of the U. S. Senate—who were resisting any steps to stop the Red Army from overrunning Europe.

As he took his post in Germany on the edge of the Iron Curtain, Conant fired the last salvo from his academic arsenal at the enemies of the freedoms which universities are the strong points to defend.

History teaches, he wrote in his last report, that "to the degree that what professors teach is regarded as important, the universities must be prepared to battle for their independence."

Indeed, throughout his 20 years as head of Harvard, he saw the proponents of free scholarly inquiry "fighting a rear guard action." In those terms, all of Conant's presidency of Harvard was a struggle for freedom in education.

His book is chiefly a statement that the public high school is the most strategic institution for the continued vitality of democracy in America. He deals also with the history of the four-year liberal arts college, a unique American institution, which brought the public high school into being. Conant traces its evolution from the British "public school" and explores the different directions that public education took in Australia and New Zealand. But it is the American high school that makes the core of his book. This is the institution, he says, that has shaped our society, given a continuity and cement to our common faith in the democratic process.

It seems to some more than a little paradoxical that the high school finds its

greatest exponent in the head of our most ancient university—that the head of Harvard, so long caricatured as the haven of rich private school boys, should prove the educational leader to see most clearly that only the public high school can preserve the common touch of practical democracy.

He takes special pride that "the idea of a comprehensive high school is a product of the special history of this nation." He affirms the value of general education "for all American youth." He deplors the tendency in larger cities to separate students into different high schools depending on whether they are preparing for college or jobs. "It fails to provide a basis for the growth of mutual understanding between different cultural, religious and occupational groups."

He grows eloquent over the high school: "Without this unifying influence of the public school, I doubt if the American nation could have developed its remarkable coherence. If the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, it may well be that the ideological struggle with Communism in the next 50 years will be won on the playing fields of the high schools of the United States." Many had forgotten that his first act as president of Harvard was to launch a scholarship program to bring in the cream of the crop of the high schools of the country. His sharpest disappointment on retiring from Harvard was that this had not brought with it, as he had hoped, a larger number of the just average high school boys.

This former chemist, now diplomat, was through his 20 years as president of Harvard the most persistent voice for enlarging, expanding, enriching educational opportunity "for all American youth." To cut the cost to them he would set up regional colleges, annexed to the largest local high school, and cut the time to two years, which he thinks enough for most purposes. To make these two year colleges acceptable and respected, he would give degrees. This horrified his academic colleagues. But he was in good Harvard precedent. His predecessor, Lowell, had little reverence for the Ph.D. and set up an alternative to it at Harvard in the Junior

Book Reviews

Fellowships which have turned out a generation of top scholars in all fields. The more he talked of the two-year terminal college, to provide general education for all, the more Conant seemed to say that the only need for the four-year college was a channel for those going on to professional schools. Like his predecessor, he grudged the years that youth spent in preparation and believed it could be shortened for most. As half the cost of college was in going to college away from home, the regional college would be the great economizer.

Conant blazed his own trails also in adult education. The Nieman Fellowships for newspapermen were his invention. And these, as he liked to chronicle, have proved the pattern for other fellowship plans—for trade union officers, agricultural extension workers, public school administrators—to give them a year or a term for a free-wheeling roving assignment in a university, to make what individual use they could of its resources. These, with the Littauer Fellowships for government officers on leave, and the advanced management courses in the Business School, for junior executives have made a considerable development at Harvard of what David W. Bailey, secretary of the Harvard governing boards, has named "life as a preparation for education."

These are pilot plant jobs, every one of them, and very little copied yet in American education. Indeed they still open unrealized vistas of opportunity for professional refresher courses in our universities. It took the Ford Foundation to begin to catch up with Conant's trail blazing in these lines.

He is a tough-minded Yankee scientist. He got his job as president of Harvard by impressing the hard-money men of the board as the man who sounded most as though he could ride out a depression without deflating Harvard. He nearly had an academic revolt on his hands from his first quixotic attempt to balance the academic personnel against the depreciated budgets of the 30's. But the resulting reform strengthened the status of the Harvard staff. He wrote of it in his last report:

"From an academic storm of no small magnitude there emerged a strong fair wind that enabled us to sail a new and far better course."

A good case could be made for university administration as training for diplomacy. Conant must have had his rough times when he was first taken from the laboratory to head an institution with so many entrenched positions as Harvard's and so complicated and decentralized a system. The president presided over two governing boards and eleven faculties and sometimes had to persuade nearly all of them separately to a change. One of the boards is self-perpetuating. The other is elected by alumni. The faculty (all but the junior grades) have permanent tenure and run their own show. With this framework it took some doing to change the basis of the curriculum; to merge Radcliffe (women) with Harvard (men) classes; to graft German Bauhaus design onto a traditional school of architecture and let Gropius apply his Bauhaus architecture to Harvard's latest group of buildings; to let football find its level while pressing alumni for ever mounting demands for scholarships for A students from high schools in the far reaches; to bring women into the Medical School and humanism into the Business School; to revolutionize the training of dentists against the boycott of organized dentistry; to create fellowships for working newspapermen against the cynical counsel of publishers; to keep Harvard departments from inbreeding without infringing on their unique autonomous authority; to denounce totalitarianism while protecting the fullest freedom to the wooliest-headed professors; to have to meet inflation by doubling the rate of endowment but still keeping to a safe minimum the easy money from government contracts. This developed whatever diplomacy was not native. But his statesmanship in education lay in his own choices of where to throw the considerable weight of the Harvard presidency—and most often he chose to throw it into the support of the public school. He chose the dismaying incident at Pasadena to do an article that both warned of the dangers of demagogic sabotage and of the inadequacy of the public relations of the schools. He undertook himself to correct this by years of public speaking and writing to emphasize always our *unique* school system, which he identified as the living thread of our democratic institutions—indeed the dynamism of our democracy. He instigated his friends (Roy Larsen

and the rest) to organize the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. Harvard under him came to have a full half public school students—and a large leaven of mid-western scholars from the great state universities on its faculty. He himself led the planning committee for enlarging the facilities of the University of Massachusetts, seizing the veterans' pressure as the occasion for this.

Withal, what colors and vitalizes the Conant career is a bred-in-the-bone democracy and consequent liberalism that he brought with him to the presidency of an ancient university. The scientist in him toughened this to realistic understanding of the essential elements of our society. Fluidity, mobility were his fondest words. They spelled the ways to keep open the door of opportunity—and this led through the public school. "Through" is the word. He was no sentimental people's man. His interest was in ability. The educational process must be kept open to the talented from anywhere—to let ability reach the top where it could fulfill its capacity. That was his realism—the nub of his philosophy about our educational system.

Harvard boys picketed Conant in 1940 when he was pressing for intervention in the war. Soon he was building atom bombs and mobilizing science for winning the war. But he was one of the first to talk of the divided world and the Iron Curtain. He had soon articulated a philosophy to live for maybe a lifetime in a divided world, which, to his native optimism, need not burst into war. After running Harvard as a commuter from Washington for several years, he set up a system by which the University ran itself—that is, with a provost and vice-president and corps of deans as the active administration. With the war over, he used his war-won spare time to speak to Harvard alumni and others in 300 cities in the space of a few seasons; to visit England, Russia, New Zealand, Australia, to invent a new course (which he had to teach himself) on the Strategy of Science, so that Harvard students would know how scientists work and what are the problems and processes of science; to write several books on education and on the Russians—usually combining these as in *Education in a Divided World*—and always applying his New England thrift to make the same theme do for speech, lecture series and

book before he tapped his reserves for a new topic. One would do him about a year, and he was always miserly about his publicity so as not to get his resources used up prematurely.

His thrift in respect to texts was so successful that the speech which was the final controversy of his academic career and the core of this book, was actually delivered as a lecture at the University of Virginia months before it ever leaked into the press at all. He'd planned it that way and counted on it. He wanted to spring it on a later educational meeting in Boston, and he did. Then when all the dead cats had come in, he gathered them all up and made such modifications in the speech as seemed good to him and put it in this book. It also is in the record of his hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was given as the reason for making that session secret. Anybody reading Chapter 3 of *Education and Liberty* can now see what it takes to scare Senator Wiley into a secret session.

Conant in his final presidential report shrewdly gives his estimate of why the colleges prove so vulnerable to demagogic attacks:

"The proponents of the ridiculous charge that our colleges are subversive receive a wider hearing today than at any time in recent history. Among the reasons is the failure of the colleges to demonstrate the nature of their primary task. The public entertainment business in which almost all of us are engaged has become so competitive as to generate public scandals. Another reason for public suspicion of the colleges is the special position they have occupied under the Selective Service Act."

This is not the kind of statement that gets a fellow's back slapped with alumni heartiness at the Harvard Club of New York. Conant's earliest critics were the old-school-tie boys who worried about his scientist's concern for the higher reaches of education—beyond the college in the graduate schools. And this final controversy, which was over the third chapter in this book, found the old-school-tie boys joined against him in the company of those who had been frustrated in their efforts to get Conant to support the use of public funds for parochial schools.

In this book he deplores the tendency

of well-to-do families to take their boys out of public high schools, and wishes the religious would be content to limit their patronage of parochial schools to the lower grades. This would give their children a chance for the common experience of rubbing shoulders with the neighbors in public school.

He has no quarrel with the parochial school, and of course recognizes anyone's right to prefer religious to secular schooling. But, he says, to use taxpayers' money to assist private schools is to suggest that the American society use its own hands to destroy itself. For the greater the proportion of youth who fail to attend public schools, the greater the cleavage in our society.

Criticism of the public schools should be welcome, he says, and he urges the public school authorities to be alert to the special educational needs of their communities. But he demands that the critics of the public schools be honest, and it is not honest, he asserts, to attack the public schools as lacking concern for moral and spiritual values just because they are necessarily non-denominational.

The fact that the majority of young Americans are today enjoying the advantages of studying and playing together in public high schools, Conant says, "is the principal reason that I for one have confidence in the future of this nation."

In his espousal of the public school, the word "unique" always turns up. Our unique system of public education. This touches a pride that, except for the recent offensiveness of the word we would call nationalist. Indeed a decade ago he would describe himself as politically an internationalist and culturally nationalist. He had rather a dim view of most things foreign. Canada and Australia interested him more than England; whether because they were newer, more dynamic countries or closer to us, one couldn't be sure. A publisher once sought his assurance about a plan for fellowships for study in South America. The best he could get from Conant was that there was probably no harm in it as a limited project. Some might conceivably want to study Mexican art. But if it was chemistry or engineering or most other things, it would be a waste of time to go to South America or, one gathered, to go anywhere much south of Boston.

The vigor of the views in this book makes one wonder how much stouter a democrat Conant would have been had he never been restrained by the presidency of Harvard. He must have been a more radical thinker before his Harvard presidency. Yet even the famous essay that a John T. Flynn brought up against him a decade later,—“Wanted, an American Radical,”—was an argument that alien issues can find no root in American soil; therefore he lectures the young left wingers who are flirting with communism that what America needs is a native radicalism, honest product of America's unique heritage and the shield of that heritage. He spells out the reforms they might well apply their energies to, rather than chase the mirages of Marx.

Even this worried his associates who governed Harvard. Implicit in it was the radical use of the taxing power to bring off the American dream of a land for the people in it. Indeed his Harvard friends kept so conspicuously busy explaining that essay away to the jittery millionaires who hadn't yet made their wills, that Conant never again articulated a full-dimensional political philosophy. He confined himself to his specialties—education, later the atom, always science, and in and out of foreign policy when the crisis was great enough so that the balance of safety seemed to him precarious. Then he would sweep away academic chores and throw himself into a minute-man round of speeches and organizations, such as the Committee on the Present Danger, induced by the fright he got at realizing that our defense program was limited by the mind of Louis Johnson as Secretary of War.

Conant became conservative in his manner of communicating more than in his ideas. This was partly a scientist's bias against publicity. He'd say of a speech: the thing is to avoid headlines. He meant, of course, to avoid the chance of distorting his meaning by dragging some sentence out for a headline. But the expression symbolized his caution about the press. This idiosyncrasy gave his inherent democracy much the same outward aspect as the brahminism of his predecessor. Indeed Conant never really changed Lowell's rule against the president of Harvard being interviewed. Any press conference for him was away from Cambridge and under other auspices. He never let his

public relations advisors shape his course and they soon learned not to try. It took their utmost to keep him from putting everything off the record. This was a limitation of his nature, enhanced by the conservative tradition of Harvard and of the scientist, and deepened by the unreliability of press performance in Boston. He might well have envied the presidents of Columbia, Princeton or Yale whose programs had their first presentation through the perspective of the *New York Times* and *Herald Tribune*. The public picture of Harvard was constantly warped through the queer channels of too much of the Boston press.

Neither did Conant ever appreciate the force of radio, either in education or publicity. This was a sharp limitation not only on any radiations of Harvard but on the fulfillment of the educational potential of radio and television in the community of which Harvard is the greatest cultural factor. This was partly from a negative view of the great new engine of publicity and popularization, soured naturally by a distaste for the commercial; partly from another trait. “Don't complicate it” was a familiar admonition. Conant believed in success. When a project was successful, he resisted anything that might change it. The only directive he ever gave me in 15 years of running the Nieman Foundation, which was his invention, was “Don't complicate it.” This always meant, “No.” He had a crystal ball, a treasured gift, with “No” enamelled on the bottom of it. He kept it behind his desk and often followed the whimsy of consulting it when a dean came in with a proposal that looked dubious to him. Most proposals did, that were not his own. That of course is a part of the genius of an administrator, not to let himself or the resources at his command, be diverted from his central purposes. Because his purposes were large, bold, vital and sound, Harvard flourished under him. My own view is that his capacity for the negative, which long irked me, is a core of his strength and now the essence of his effectiveness as a diplomat—that he can follow the straight line of his assignment, with no temptation to digress. He never would have taken the job had not the administration line, as he sees it, been the one he has been advocating all along.

—Louis M. Lyons

Native Cranks

by John M. Harrison

RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY, A History of Modern American Reform. By Eric F. Goldman. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 503 pp. \$5.00

Those footnotes to American history about the political "nuts" and "cranks," the movements and parties they founded and nourished, are beginning to come to life. A group of young historians has been examining these men and movements with infinite care and trying to integrate them in the mainstream of American affairs. These are students of what they variously term liberalism, the progressive tradition and modern American reform.

Eric F. Goldman, professor of history at Princeton, is the first of these men to get down on paper a comprehensive survey of this movement, which dates by common consent from the end of the Civil War to the present moment. Some may argue that it came to an end, at least temporarily, on January 20, 1953. That depends on several factors, particularly the terms in which the movement under discussion is defined.

In an engaging preface, Mr. Goldman acknowledges the oneness of the reform movement with liberalism and progressivism, but never quite gets around to defining any of these terms. In the absence of a definition by the author, the reviewer supplies one devised by another of these young historians—Prof. William Leuchtenburg of Columbia—who suggests that the progressive tradition is "a moral response to the social and political effects of industrialization, particularly political attempts to modify its effect on individuals."

If this is not necessarily an all-inclusive definition, still it draws some of the boundaries of the area under consideration which are necessary to its success. For the most important and useful function of such a study is to compel liberals—call them progressives, reformers or "goddam radicals" if you will—to think through all the implications of their political, eco-

nomical and social beliefs. This process must extend even beyond the point where it begins to get uncomfortable and where, too often, refuge has been sought among the myths and folk heroes of the reform movement or in the doctrine that the end always justifies the means. These young historians are an irreverent lot where myth, folk hero, and doctrine are concerned. Although most of them are closely identified with the reform movement, they reject this escapism. They refuse to swallow placebos so many liberals use to effect magic cures that fail to cure when honest and intelligent liberals probe the reform movement and find it in symptoms of weakness and decay.

Rendezvous With Destiny is, in some of its aspects, a disappointing book. But it never is dull, uninteresting, or lacking in provocative ideas. Mr. Goldman is a master of incisive and descriptive writing. His book is studded with anecdotes and apt quotations—some of them fabulously funny, some poignantly tragic.

Because of these qualities, Mr. Goldman's history of modern American reform should achieve a wide audience, which will enjoy his breezy anecdotal style. What he has to say should compel some fresh thinking about the United States, its relatively immediate past, and its indefinitely immediate future. There will be some hot arguments, for example, over the assertion that the real meaning of the Truman victory in 1948 is that reform has become respectable; that, in Mr. Goldman's words, "most Americans now accepted the basic domestic doctrines that generations of reformers since the depression of 1873) had agreed upon and the heart of the foreign policy that they had made their own." Careful consideration of this thesis may even cause both liberals and conservatives to examine more closely the real implications of 1952 and to attempt more than a superficial reconciliation of Dwight Eisenhower's possible alignments and coalitions are more extensive than most political writers seem to comprehend. Was 1952, after all, a Waterloo for liberalism?

Of Mr. Goldman's basic conclusions, perhaps the most important is his emphasis on the essentially American character of the reform movement in this country.

With the marks of Charles A. Beard and Frederick Jackson Turner so clearly on him, his arrival at any other interpretation would be surprising. But, leaving Beard and Turner to one side for the moment, surely just about all hands are agreed that the imposing evidence now being compiled by this school of young historians of the reform movement thoroughly destroys the notion that foreign "isms" have played an important part in American reform. This basic tenet is properly underlined.

The most impressive portions of the book, however, deal with the intellectual struggle to break what Mr. Goldman calls the "steel chain" of ideas protecting the status quo. In emphasizing the role of teachers, writers and thinkers—men like James, Dewey, Ross, Ely, Veblen, Partridge, Smith, Turner, Beard, and many others—the author makes it clear that these men strode far ahead of the politicians in the reform movement.

Especially commendable is the exposition of the part played in the history of reform by Herbert Croly, who gave the whole era from 1900 to 1952 the nearest thing it had to a systematized progressive philosophy. In *The Promise of American Life* and the doctrine of New Nationalism which emerged from it, he provided much of the thinking which political leaders—especially the two Roosevelts—tried to implement. When this whole era is assessed from a greater distance—say a hundred years from now—it is altogether possible that Croly's name will stand higher than any of the others. Mr. Goldman gives Herbert Croly his due.

Since there is so much to commend in *Rendezvous With Destiny*, why is it disappointing? Basically, for two reasons.

First, in the process of condensing, simplifying and popularizing, Mr. Goldman has been guilty of omissions and distortions that sometimes defeat his purpose—at least what I take to be his purpose—of integrating reformers and reform movements into the mainstream of American history. When he races past the Granger and Greenback-Labor movements, for example, to plunge with a splash right into the middle of the Omaha convention of the Populist Party in 1892, the whole business takes on those

footnote aspects of the other history books. His account of that convention is brilliant and colorful, but he makes it an oddity, a freakish, monstrous kind of thing instead of an expression of mounting agrarian unrest. He makes Mary Ellen Lease, and Sockless Jerry" Simpson, and James Baird Weaver, and all the rest as bizarre and outlandish as a McMaster or a Muzzey ever made them, instead of the very human beings they were. Obviously, this was not the author's purpose. But that Omaha convention is outlandish except when seen in the full perspective of 20 years of mounting discontent.

Likewise, when he dismisses the whole municipal reform movement with a few paragraphs about Tom Johnson, Mr. Goldman omits a big and vital chunk of the history of the progressive tradition. He bypasses a more colorful figure—"Golden Rule" Jones—and an infinitely more articulate and meaningful one—Brand Whitlock. He loses the whole contribution of an era when American reformers believed with all their hearts that the city was the agent through which they could best achieve their ends. And although he discusses the muckraking journalists at some length, they never quite come into perspective without the essential corollary of municipal reform in which they got their inspiration.

Again, John Reed gets only a lick and a promise and there is almost no discussion of the growth of the American Communist Party or, more important, of the Popular Front. Did Mr. Goldman reason that there was no need to follow considerable elements of the liberal movement in what proved to be a disastrous turning aside, ending in a dead-end street?

If he so reasoned, the author made a mistake, for he has missed much of the drama of the movement he is considering. He has done the liberal cause no favor in failing to analyze that strange combination of the most commendable idealism and the most deplorable wrongheadedness which took so many men of good will into the Communist Party and so many more into that uneasy alliance known as the Popular Front. It was here, in this cul-de-sac, that the men who followed the Communist lead finally learned the folly of expecting that unlimited power in the state can achieve the liberal's goals. Other liberals had warned of the dangers

—Brand Whitlock, George W. Norris, the senior Bob LaFollette, and many others—but it took this experience to teach the final, bitter lesson that there is no such thing as a liberal totalitarianism. Because he fails to examine this misadventure, Mr. Goldman misses an important element in the area he is studying.

There are other such faults in *Rendezvous With Destiny*, some or all of which might be dismissed as differences in stress and interpretation. Its other basic shortcoming is more serious. For Mr. Goldman, having undertaken to interpret the meaning of the reform movement and to indicate its future direction, only achieves a kind of monumental wavering which shies away from the hard task of analysis at most of the crucial points.

He recognizes that liberalism has got itself in trouble by its allegiance to Reform Darwinism and the principles of pragmatism. He cites the dangers of relativism, the tendency of splinter pressure groups developing in the electorate, the failure to guard against the threat which an increasingly centralized government poses to the individual, who is the acknowledged object and beneficiary of progressive reform. But where does Mr. Goldman think the reform movement should go to avoid these dangers?

He points vaguely in the direction of something akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority principle, which has a magnetic attraction for liberals in its combination of centralized planning and local or regional administration. But he does not spell out how this principle can operate to remove the conflicts and contradictions within the ranks of the reform movement.

Never does he come to grips with the major disenchantment among liberals, which so easily could lead the whole movement off into another dead-end street—this one charted by the neo-Calvinists who actually despair of the individual and his ability to plan or execute any action on his own behalf. If Mr. Goldman never embraces these dangerous notions, neither does he disown them as the serious threat to liberalism they are. These ideas, based on the doctrines of original sin and the fallibility of the common man, are all the more threatening since so many common men deserted the liberal theoreticians in November to cast their votes for a military hero.

All this, of course, is in no sense history. But when historians set out to tie the past to the future—and surely much of the fun is in this process—it is disappointing when they fail to meet its implications with the same candor Mr. Goldman had displayed in analyzing the past. One can only regret that he fails to attack the liberal stereotypes of the present with the vigor which characterized his exposing the myths and folk heroes of other days.

Rendezvous With Destiny is lively, interesting, and thoroughly readable. As a first major work of its kind—unless John Chamberlain's *Farewell To Reform* is accepted as a serious historical study—it is remarkably competent. It will stir talk and analysis among Americans who never have thought about—much less studied—liberalism, progressivism, reform. For all these reasons it is a major contribution to the writing of American history, however much more satisfactory it might have been with a few changes and amplifications.

Wire Fuses Threatened

by Kenneth E. Wilson

THE WIRE GOD. By Jack Willard. Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, N. Y. 348 pp. \$3.95

At the age of 25, George T. McCord had never kissed a girl and was about as dull as French Point, Texas, where he lived and learned the only thing he knew: Morse code. In a matter of 17 years he makes up for an awful lot of lost time in the sex department, becomes a double-fisted drinker, a two-handed handshaker and the double-dealing president of World Press Service. By this time his name is G. Truett McCord.

How he does it is told in this sexy, alcoholic and improbable novel which, the publishers say, "PROMISES TO BLOW TELETYPE FUSES IN WIRE-SERVICE BUREAUS COAST TO COAST STOP." The author is a compound personality writing under the pseudonym of Jack Willard. The name combines those of Jack Guinn and Willard Haselbush, assistant city editor and city editor of the *Denver Post*, who collaborated

on the book. Chances are that the teletype fuses will remain intact and that *The Wire God* will wind up on drug store book stands with a sex-in-the-newsroom cover picture.

Willard obviously is venting spleen about the news business and individuals in it. For that reason the book probably will get passed around a lot of wire service bureaus and city rooms for laughs. (Sample: "I can spot an AP man in the john by the slow, dignified manner in which he addresses the urinal.")

McCord embarks on his career as a wire service executive with the mythical (thank God!) World Press Service by proving conclusively he's not a reporter and doesn't know a news story from third base. He gets fired, but through deceit wins his job back and drives the man who fired him to kill himself. With this solid background and a briefcase full of bourbon, McCord moves onward and upward through the WPS to New York.

In the end he's having some trouble with the FBI about Eva, a little number he picked up while junketing in Hungary. McCord uses his influence to get Eva admitted to the U. S. and installs her as his office receptionist, a handy arrangement. ("It was like walking into a furnace, or falling into a cold river, or riding a chugging train off a cliff, or maybe all those things put together.") When Eva turns out to be a Russian spy, as the WPS correspondent in Hungary had told McCord, it seems as though the string may have run out.

But no. McCord stalls the FBI long enough to get over to the Roosevelt Hotel to accept the "first annual International Freedom Award" presented by President Truman on behalf of the United Nations. This apparently is supposed to take care of the Feds and prove that no-good heads of wire services are here to stay.

Willard dedicates the book to "The Freedom of the Press, Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny." This is a pretty good tip-off of what it is trying to say—that freedom of the press is as much a myth as Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny.

Be that as it may, Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny are more convincing than *The Wire God*.

History in New Clothes

by Watson S. Sims

THE COURSE OF EMPIRE. By Bernard DeVoto. Houghton Mifflin, Boston. 647 pp. \$6.00

In the National Book Awards choice as the best non-fiction work of 1952, Bernard DeVoto spreads his colorful net over three centuries to catch almost every explorer who helped to unveil the physical face of North America.

The Course of Empire completes a trilogy of North American expansion written backward into history. *Year of Decision*, which won a Pulitzer award in 1944, dealt with the critical events of 1846. DeVoto stepped back another decade in time to write of the Rocky Mountain fur trade in *Across the Wide Missouri*. In the final book he begins with Columbus and finishes with the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804-5.

This is a searching new history of discovery, concerned entirely with the disasters and triumphs which went into the charting of a great continent. Many of the characters would be familiar to any schoolboy, but some of the most fascinating pages deal with lesser characters and legends which have long been stranded in the byways of history. More, however, it is an examination of the problems these characters faced and the methods through which they arrived at solutions. DeVoto is never satisfied, for example, to state that Indians traveled by birch canoe; he explains how the canoes were made, how fast they traveled, how many pounds each man carried on freight portages, and every

other detail incidental to traveling by canoe.

Another feature of this book is the pungency of the author's pen and his readiness to add commentary to history. Spanish conquistadors strut more proudly, frontiersmen torture in greater detail, and legends are exploded with a louder bang than in most texts. That Spanish explorers "turned to dogheaded men themselves and went rabid in packs" is hardly the way most historians would put it. Nor would they add, after stating that Henry Kelsey was the first poet of the fur trade, "it can never have had a worse one."

Such asides leave no place for the colorless monotone which history so often adopts, but even the stimulus of this needle cannot turn so much factual matter into a living tory. Any effort to treat with three centuries of exploration in a single volume will have little space for the character sketch, and besides, DeVoto is much more concerned with what his characters are about than what they are like. It is the picture of what these men fought against and the conditions under which they struggled that DeVoto has painted with great knowledge and skill.

Few professional historians will read this book without meeting new characters and gaining a better understanding of the problems which they faced. The "spectrum of knowledge," widening with each assault on the wilderness, is admirably illustrated by the generous use of color maps.

Censor Uncensored

by Beverley Britton

KOREAN TALES. By Melvin B. Voorhees, Lt. Col., USA. 209 pp. New York: Simon & Schuster. \$3.

Far more than its normal share of headlines have been written about this short, compact book by the former chief censor with the Eighth Army in Korea. The reason is an ironic one: the censor has himself run afoul of Army clearance procedures. The result has been his court-martial, and a sentence to dismissal from the service.

Technically, Lieutenant Colonel Mel-

vin B. Voorhees was charged with failure to submit his manuscript for review by the Army as prescribed, and with refusal to withdraw it from publication when so ordered by his commanding officer. No question was raised as to security violations. Rather, Army objections apparently were aimed at his occasional slurring comment on general officers, and most especially at his bitter criticisms of press representatives covering the war.

Colonel Voorhees was well aware that his book might arouse controversy; this

he acknowledges in his foreword. But he writes from strong convictions which, he says, "stem from an honest heart and a balanced mind." He is concerned primarily with what he considers the irresponsibility of the war correspondents: their acceptance of privileges without regard for attendant obligations; their filing of stories which endangered men's lives or threatened the success of an operation; their general indifference to "the consequences of their dispatches," which in his view were widespread defeatism and doubts within the public mind as to the nation's military leadership.

These are serious charges, and Voorhees, himself a newspaperman for eighteen years, feels that they reflect seriously on the newspaper profession. His is not a blanket indictment, for there were many who did outstanding jobs in writing about the Korean war; he feels, however, that the "pros" were in the minority, at least in the early days.

Voorhees offers many specific examples to support his charges. In the tragic first six months of the war, he says, when "voluntary" censorship was in effect, the enemy knew our order-of-battle (deployment and designation of troop units) and war plans as soon as we did. Arrivals of new fighting contingents were published to the world (and to the enemy) as soon as they set foot on Korean soil. Even our amphibious landing at Inchon, he says, was revealed ten hours before it actually happened.

Military censorship was imposed in December 1950, with the backing of 90 per cent of the correspondents. In the highly competitive news business, this was the only system that had a chance of success. With editors and publishers at home constantly pressuring correspondents for new and sensational stories, continued minor violations were inevitable, and various dodges were used in efforts to evade censorship. But the situation was largely corrected, and the enemy was kept guessing.

Censorship is a horrid word to Americans, and with reason. It is fully as abhorrent to the military man who must administer it, as it is to the reporter. But in wartime the stakes are high for carelessness in the release of news; the life of a man, a unit, perhaps a whole nation may depend on the proper safeguarding of information. The Eighth Army censor pro-

ceeded in the belief that "the folks at home would rather get news a few hours late of a son who is living, than news of a battle before it begins and then of a son who is dead."

Voorhees does not exempt the generals from criticism on this count. He cites two instances in which, he states, General MacArthur announced impending offensives before they were actually under way. For the most part, however, he has little but praise for the efforts of Generals Walker, Ridgway, Almond and Van Fleet.

It is perhaps misleading to discuss the controversial aspects of *Korean Tales* at this length—for by far the greater part of the book is simple, straightforward, effective reporting. Seven of the twenty chapters are highly realistic short stories based on actual incidents, and they deal with little people rather than the big brass. Three especially memorable ones recount the lonely death of an American corporal; the anguish of the guilt-haunted sergeant who turned a machine gun on prisoners he had come to regard as human beings; and of the incredible fortitude of three Korean women, turned into wandering refugees by the fortunes of war. In these, Voorhees is a master of ironic understatement.

The thirteen "fact pieces" include the controversial material, presented in vigorous and forthright style. There is also the dramatic story of three old Pershing tanks and their heroic crews, who saved the Pusan bridgehead in the war's early days. There is a fascinating run-down on the complications of supplying an army made up of eighteen nationalities, all with different requirements in food, clothing and living habits. There is a brief profile of President Syngman Rhee, and a condensed version of his country's long and complex history. All these reveal solid writing which achieves dramatic effect without heroics.

This is a well-written, informative and interesting book. As the personal reactions of one man, it is little more than a collection of impressions. But if it has cost its author his military career, it may well have launched him on another as a literary man. Voorhees has been city editor of papers in Portland and Seattle, and editor of one in Tacoma. This is his first book, but certainly it will not be his last.

How Reds Are Made

by William Steif

REPORT ON THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST. Morris L. Ernst and David Loth. Henry Holt & Co., N.Y. 240 pp. \$3.

Morris Ernst, lawyer, and David Loth, journalist, have dug up some 300 ex-Communists and on the basis of interviews, answers to detailed questionnaires and perusal of congressional committee records have tried to show how American reds are made—and unmade.

The authors carefully disclaim "an attempt at amateur psychoanalysis" and say they are confining themselves to reporting. This method is satisfactory for a while; that is, when Mr. Ernst and Mr. Loth are spinning out the answers to such questions as the average age at which Americans are most likely to join the C.P. (18-23), Communists' educational level (very high) and the kind of jobs Communists hold (white-collar, definitely non-manual).

But when Mr. Ernst and Mr. Loth put such questions as these—do they join the party for gain, power, an ideal, emotional satisfaction? Or, are certain personality traits common to all or most Communists?—the little black couch heaves into sight.

This psychological approach may be all right, but it tends to drive the authors into vague generalizations which professional psychologists or sociologists might have avoided.

Thus, at one point:

"The average Communist seems to be distinguished from non-Communist believers of the same ideals by an absence of individual grace and humor. Lacking in whimsy, in the magic of human relations, they go at even their recreations in a mood of anxious solemnity."

Such verbalizations, ill-defined, hint that Messrs. Ernst and Loth started their interviews and studies for this book with a set of assumptions they were trying to prove.

For instance, they come to the conclusions that "the average member enjoys subordination," that he relies "upon dogma, upon the importance of faith," that he was "insecure" and either openly or inwardly rebellious during childhood, that

"the desire for affection" was much more important in making him a Communist than "dissatisfaction with minority status."

There are lots of other reasons given, too, for the making of Communists—"rejection by or hostility to parents, the influence of a sexual partner, the frustrations arising from a physical or emotional handicap, or even the mistaken ardors of youth"—and they are all sound in a slick, shallow way.

But most of these reasons, this reviewer suspects, could be dredged up at a fashionable New York cocktail party of so-called liberals without the trouble of interviewing 300 anonymous ex-party members.

Nevertheless, this book does have a certain value.

It suggests, first of all, that a thorough, professional psychological study of Communists, rather than Communist doctrine, ought to be made in the U. S. as a primary step toward dealing with American reds.

It suggests, secondly, that the U. S. make it a lot easier for present Communists to slip out of the party by giving up the excesses of congressional witch-hunts and trial-by-headlines and by getting such organizations as the American Legion, the N.A.M., chambers of commerce and labor unions to co-operate in finding jobs for ex-reds.

It suggests, thirdly, that anti-Communist police work be left to the FBI, that loyalty programs be abandoned except for "sensitive" jobs and that the U. S. stop trying to drive the C.P. underground because the party is much easier (for the FBI) to watch in the open and because Communist ideas exposed to free trade in the marketplace of thought will wither before the truths of our democracy.

These suggestions, which presumably were the assumptions on which the book was started, are fairly commonplace but can stand repetition in today's rather rigorous intellectual climate.

The book's quoted interviews are interesting if not overly instructive and the Ernst-Loth interpretations are simply frosting on a cake which was quite sweet enough.

No Revolt in Russia

by Arthur C. Barschdorf

SOVIET OPPOSITION TO STALIN, A Case Study of World War II, by George Fischer, 230 pp. Harvard University Press. \$4.

Most Americans, with characteristic optimism, feel that the Russian peoples themselves will one day smash the terror and tyranny of Stalinist Communism. This optimism feeds on a reaction to the fear of Russia's power and on an eagerness to believe reports of signs of internal Soviet strife as seen in purge trials, rumors of small-scale revolts and claims of effective free world propaganda.

Not living in an atmosphere of terror and authoritarian control, these Americans see the great mass of Soviet peoples building up the resentments, the deep hate that can and will be crystallized into revolution.

For these Americans, George Fischer's book will make unpleasant reading. His scholarly look behind the iron curtain, through the window of a weighty study of Soviet opposition to Stalin in World War II, finds no revolution building up. Instead, he finds little or no opposition now and little or no opposition likely.

Oppression and terror are not kindling fires of revolt, but are reducing individual initiative to a minimum, according to Fischer. Inertness is the concept the author uses in describing the state of mind and emotions of the Russian people.

His contention is that terror, the constant barrage of Stalinist propaganda, and the totalitarian domination over every political act, and over the spiritual, social and work life of the individual combine to create an apathetic and passive citizen.

This impact of Stalin's totalitarian regime forestalls any serious internal opposition, Fischer believes. The seeds of revolt that may be present among the people cannot be germinated in the sterile soil of inertness.

Any revolution, he feels, will originate externally and under conditions that only war can bring.

This Fischer theory will be challenged and will be unpopular since it leaves war as the only instrument of accomplishing the defeat of Stalinist Communism with-

out outright conquest of the USSR by the free nations.

The author builds his case well in his study of the anti-Stalin movement headed by Lt. Gen. Andrei Vlasov and sponsored by the Germans in World War II. He adds further support with his conclusions from interviews with Soviet emigres and refugees.

Although the Vlasov movement never amounted to much more than a propaganda effort, the 500,000 to 1,000,000 USSR soldiers and civilians who actually fought under German commanders reflect a tremendous opposition to Stalin.

Fischer rejects the "revolt" idea that these Russians were largely deserters and traitors. He attributes their initial willingness to serve Hitler as the only alternative to a life of starvation and brutality as war prisoners. He credits their easy capture to the chaos that followed the swift German victories after invasion of Russia, and the apparent defeat of the USSR in the early stages of the war.

It is true that the Ukrainians first welcomed the conquering Nazi hordes and were willing to fight against Stalin. The conflict between Great Russia and the Ukraine was an old one. But the cruel treatment given Ukrainians by the Nazis made them more anti-Hitler than anti-Stalin.

This same policy of distrust for anyone except Germans marked the official Nazi feeling toward the efforts to create an army of Russian liberation among the captured USSR soldiers.

It was Hitler himself, Fischer reports, who said in a June, 1943 meeting with his top military planners: "We will never build up a Russian Army. That is a phantom of the first order."

And until the last weeks of the war, the Russian Army of Liberation remained a phantom force. Between 500,000 and 1,000,000 Russians, however, were scattered in units from division size down among the German armies.

The Vlasov movement, created by what Fischer calls the "Other Germans"—who were anti-Nazi—and tolerated by the Utilitarians of Nazi officialdom—who wanted

to use the project for its propaganda value and freeing of German forces for more urgent duty—moved through a succession of discouraging attempts to fashion an army of Russians under Gen. Vlasov.

It was poetic irony that the climax of the Vlasov story came near Prague when a division of Russians under Gen. Buniachenko turned and fought the Germans instead of the Red Army.

As Fischer records it: "This, then, was the dramatic finale of the military arm of the wartime Soviet opposition movement. Founded as an act of collaboration with Hitler, denied all but an insignificant eleventh hour part in combat, in its last moment turned on its erstwhile patrons . . ."

The story of the Vlasov movement is

fascinating and provocative. It contains a wealth of material from sources of unpublished documents, from personal interviews with Germans and Russians connected with the movement as well as more current Soviet defectors, and from published information.

In analyzing the motives which led nearly 1,000,000 Soviet subjects to side with Hitler Germans against their own government, Fischer leaves the conclusion that much anti-Stalin enthusiasm can be created in a situation (war) where opposition can breed and the shell of inertness is broken.

But at the same time he warns the free world not to be optimistic about a revolution in the USSR.

substitute action for words, and determination for timidity."

In the kit bag of every diplomat, Howley suggests, should be a big stick, and when necessary the stick should be used. He isn't talking about bluff, which he (and the Russians) deplore. Says he:

"This making of a bold front and then backing off when confronted by possible retaliation, is the worst possible way to deal with the Russians and the Communists. It was always my policy never to threaten anything I didn't intend to carry through, and never to start anything I didn't finish. The Russians knew this, so that even a quiet word was sufficient to prevent trouble, if they didn't want trouble."

The principle worked in Berlin and Howley doesn't see why it isn't a good rule of thumb for dealing with the Russians and Communists everywhere else too.

Germany, he grants, is still the same Germany, "like Beethoven and Hitler—like 'Lili Marlene' and Ruhr steel." But it is also "the center of Europe's defense, the basis of its sound economy. It is the most important country in Europe to the United States of America, and probably the least understood by us."

German economic recovery he found excellent when he visited Germany again recently. Morale is not so good. In Berlin, especially, he says, the Germans are discouraged and resigned to endless strangulation by the Russians.

Germans want unity, he warns, and they'll get it "the same as we wanted unity at the time of the Civil War and we got it."

Admitting that there may be some resurgence of the Nazi spirit in Germany, he refuses to worry about it, comparing it to an embarrassing situation in America where "we probably always will have a certain number of people who believe in the Ku Klux Klan."

In his opinion the chief value of America's Berlin experience was that it showed the true nature of the Russians. Without it, he thinks, there would be no NATO, no Marshall Plan, no allied solidarity. Furthermore, he says, it showed what the West could have expected from the Russians "if we had gone along with their numerous conditions for a united Germany."

He writes with sympathy of the French

Frank Howley's Way Out

by Robert B. Frazier

YOUR WAR FOR PEACE. By Frank L. Howley, Henry Holt & Co., \$2.75, 166 pp.

America's problem in Germany isn't a "German problem" at all. It's a Russian problem. Today everybody knows that. But back in 1945 the American policy was to be nice to the Russians because then maybe they'd be nice to us. The "experts" were distressed over Col. Frank L. Howley, American military commander of Berlin, and a man who was violating the "nice" policy every day. Howley just wouldn't take any guff off the Russians.

Howley, now a retired brigadier general and a vice-chancellor of New York University, is thus one of the few top-level Americans of the 1945 era who can crow, "I told you so."

Howley stayed in Berlin through the "honeymoon period" when the western powers tried to "understand" the Russians, and eventually, with General Lucius Clay, was responsible for the great Berlin airlift. "Unser Howley" became a hero to the Germans who in 1945 were hating and fearing him. He became a prophet to Americans who in 1945 were cringing over his strange insistence that even Russians should live up to their agreements.

Howley's new book is a brief assessment of America's world position. More valuable than his recommendations for getting America out of her predicament, however, are his estimates of the strength and intentions of Germany and Russia.

Howley traces America's post-war Russian policy through the three stages he labels appeasement, co-existence and containment, and he doesn't like any of them. His policy, which he doesn't spell out in specifics, runs like this:

Attack Stalin on his philosophy "where he is most vulnerable." Meanwhile, "Withdraw respectability of recognition which the present criminal organization in the Kremlin enjoys. We should put an end to the farce of joyously bowing to them at social functions while they stimulate warfare which is killing our people. We should close up our consulates and our embassies where we are not welcome, and kick theirs out of the United States where they are simply serving espionage purposes and where they are gaining a respectability which the present government of Russia does not deserve. We should accept no insult, no imprisonment of American citizens on flimsy charges. When such acts and insults take place, the retaliation should be prompt and severe. We should stir the satellites and encourage them in their fight against the Communist imposed governments which maintain their position by force and murder. But above all, we should use psychological warfare to its utmost. Plans can be worked out beyond balloons such as those flown into Czechoslovakia, beyond the 'Voice of America' with its handicaps of neutrality, beyond even the aggressive voice of 'Radio Free Europe' . . . We must

whom he knew first as a student and later as a civil affairs officer in liberated Paris. That country, he says, is being bled to death in Indo-China, and plagued by problems in North Africa, some of which have been helped along by American busy-bodies.

Indo-China and North Africa, he says, are the No. 1 and No. 2 problems to the French. Germany is third and Russia fourth. Howley thinks the Frenchman is likely to be blind about Russia with "some-what the same attitude that he had in 1934 when he was so busy with internal problems that he refused to recognize the German threat."

French Communism is losing ground, he says, and explains that many Frenchmen who support the Communist Party are not really Communists themselves. "To the Frenchman," he points out, "anything bad can be blamed upon the government, and the strongest party against the government being the Communist Party, it therefore gains many a member who hasn't the slightest idea of what Communism is."

Often, he recalls, he's been asked if there's any real difference between socialism and communism. He says yes, comparing the difference to the difference in men and women—small but terribly important.

Throughout the book the American State Department takes a beating. Howley is critical of pussy-footing and cookie-pushing. He wants America to get tough. Warning that Russia will continue to be tough, he doubts that the situation can be handled adequately by men "who could be put to better use if they were working in a bookkeeper's office, discussing tremblingly an absence of 12 or 13 cents from the petty cash."

That's not the only crack at the department, but it's typical.

His view of the non-European world makes fine reading, but it is not likely to become the core of a new American foreign policy. He's at least half a century late. Some of his pronouncements sound facetious. But Howley is serious. Among his more colorful observations on foreign affairs are these Howleyisms:

On the Egyptians: "And now they are fit mostly to be houseboys, market-place wranglers, and small-time opportunists. They were for years aptly led by a great

tub of lard who preferred the flesh-pots of Europe to taking care of his people."

On Iran: "The simple fact is that Mossadegh and his radicals seized property which did not belong to them. . . . The oil has been under Iran for centuries, just as it was under the land of Texas. The Texans got busy, sank wells, and developed that natural resource. The Iranians pre-

ferred to sit on their blankets and scratch their toes."

Fortunately such pronouncements are not the meat of the book. Howley at his most worthwhile is Howley the expert on dealing with the Russians, the old Berlin hand, and the former Paris art student who learned to love and understand the French.

The Copy Editor's Job

by Donald Janson

NEWS EDITING AND DISPLAY.

Charles H. Brown. Harper & Bros. N. Y. \$5. 443 pp.

This book is crammed with pertinent information for the trainee in desk work. It ably introduces him not only to the fundamentals of copy reading, but also to many important fringes of editing he'll be concerned about—typography, make-up, press law, ethics, art and how the press associations function.

The author shows a clear realization that the copy reader's work covers a considerably greater scope than writing headlines and editing for style, errors and length. The desk man exercises news judgment on every sentence, paragraph and story he considers, whether he edits it or files it in the wastebasket. He often is the final check against the "fifth estate" of concealed propaganda. He is likely to be the last authority on objectivity—for example, has it been applied only to one side in a controversial story and thereby become unobjective? His responsibility always extends to backgrounding, to qualifying, to guarding against libel. Usually it will be up to him alone whether a headline tells a story fairly or sensationalizes it to any degree.

Textbooks on editing, like this one, often are written by teachers who are not in close contact with day to day newspaper operation. Brown's is no exception.

He states that stories should be edited to permit trimming from the bottom exclusively, that editors must be free to lop off the last paragraph when necessary for fits. He instructs the tyro that newspapers use slugs as long as "hotel fire" and "hotel fire . . . eyewitness." He says an efficient paper

permits no overset, comes out even every time. He says editing wire copy is simpler than handling local copy (though later he points out how frequently press association stories bury real leads under any later angle, a practice sometimes demanding a major rewrite job on the part of the copy reader).

As generalizations, these statements won't work. They won't apply on many papers. I assume, however, that Brown's emphasis in these cases is on procedures on small papers.

He also makes the flat assertion that the first duty of desk men is to process news "into a product shaped and colored by the desires of the owner." Despite a kernel of truth in this, I would be surprised to find many papers where the policy is as bald as the author's context seems to make it. Most copy readers I have known have been made to feel no compulsion to "shape" the news into anything except a full, factual report to the readers on what happened. But much of my desk experience has been on the Milwaukee *Journal*.

Whether or not the reader of Brown's book joins me in quarreling with what seem to me to be flaws, it will profit him to pass on to the considerably greater number of excellent points given accurate and careful coverage. While mainly for students, *News Editing and Display* has chapters of considerable value to the practicing copy editor on every desk in the office, both metropolitan and small daily. Brown has pegged many of their chronic shortcomings and many pitfalls that even the experienced need to be reminded about from time to time. I found it a useful reminder.

Lincoln and Greeley

by Robert E. Lee

LINCOLN AND GREELEY. By Harlan Hoyt Horner, University of Illinois Press. 432 pp. \$6.

When the Republican Party slowly emerged from the ashes of the Whigs in 1854, Horace Greeley gave it the powerful editorial support of the New York *Tribune*. Abraham Lincoln busily mended political fences of Illinois and studiously avoided premature identification with the radical new organization.

Two years later Greeley already was trying to establish himself as a party king-maker when Lincoln joined up and permitted his name to be offered briefly for the vice presidential nomination. Although elected a delegate, the first Republican president apparently didn't bother to attend the first Republican national convention.

In weaving together the threads of their lives, Mr. Horner amply shows that Greeley "was prompter to get into action, more voluble and aggressive, but less astute than Lincoln." The thesis proves itself in a play-by-play account of Greeley's editorials, Lincoln's speeches and an impressive assortment of both men's correspondence.

But the book is pretty heavy going. It moves slowly and is riddled with quaint banalities: Lincoln, in a speech, "even descended into pure billingsgate and left on the record a political harangue which sheds no luster on his career."

Morrison's Novel

THE STONES OF THE HOUSE by Theodore Morrison. Viking. 375 Pages. \$3.50.

By the time the stones of the house settle comfortably and confidently into place, Rowley University has finally decided on its choice of a new president, an even score of characters has handed individual crises in one way or another, and an introspective hero has made considerable headway in his search to know "What good does it do to do good?"

Mr. Morrison, a noted critic, poet, teacher of creative writing at Harvard and director of the Bread Loaf Writers' Conferences, has waited until he was 50 to write this, his first novel. Despite his wide range of experience for blue-pencil literary pieces, Morrison still falls

Not intended to be a history of the period or a biography of either man, neither is the book a very moving description of what Mr. Horner calls their "common experience."

Some of the speeches, writings and letters are presented interestingly enough—many in full text and some arranged in double columns to show what both men were thinking about the same issue at the same time. But the deadpan chronology of events is unrelieved by much of the great human qualities of these two giants of the mid-century.

Nevertheless, Mr. Horner has compiled some rich source material about the crucial years of the Republic and the parts played by the astute statesman-politician and the strident editor-propagandist—who usually went in the same direction but almost never on the same road.

If his tone is occasionally too reverent, it is probably explained by the author's confession in a foreword that his "affection for Greeley has grown through the years" and "so far as I permit myself hero-worship, it is bestowed on Lincoln."

The book is thoroughly documented (footnotes on all but 32 pages) with the standard citations—Nicolay and Hay, the New York *Tribune*, *Congressional Globe* and *Senate and House Journals*, for the most part.

back to a college setting for his first fictional work.

Andrew Aiken, as acting president of Rowley, is hero of the book. Promptly, the question is posed whether the Board of Trustees will drop the first word from Aiken's title or drop him. Under the pressure, Aiken nevertheless concerns himself with the value of doing good. He is not trying to choose a moral way for himself—his own nature ordains that he act the good man—but he wonders what blessing goodness, per se, can bring.

Surrounding him and helping him arrive at something of an answer are an assortment of souls common to a medium-sized university. Like most examples of human nature, they are well-intentioned but their attempts at goodness have not al-

Stones of the House

Novels as technically skillful as this one, as wise and gently humorous, as fresh with the breath of life, are almost as rare as men like its hero, Andrew Aiken, acting president of Rowley University. . .

The Stones of the House is a novel about basic human emotions and fundamental ethical issues, a novel rich with ideas and food for thought, but one written with a light touch and engaging humor. It is very good, certainly the best American novel with an academic scene which I have ever read.

Orville Prescott
N.Y. *Times*, March 3.

ways paid off. This troubles Aiken. What good, for example, did it do his spinster secretary to idolize and cherish her Petrov? Soon he deserted her. What good did it do to Chaplain Holmes to live his days according to his Christian principles? Eventually he would be eased out for someone more aggressive, more ingenious.

To add to Aiken's dilemma is his uncertainty over whether he really wants to be president. Meanwhile he must deal with others who have no doubts about what they want and who expect Aiken to help them in their efforts. Badger Bratten, a powerful alumnus, seeks a new Pi Alpha house on the proposed site of the new library which Aiken fights to build. Young Badger Bratten III, a student, is lost and confused and wants to know where he fits into life. Professor Holsberg wants to be accepted as a Jew in a gentile society. Connie, Aiken's efficient wife, wants her husband to be Rowley's president.

Mr. Morrison deftly fills each episode and each character to the brim with vital details, though the mischiefs do at times seem to come a little too thick and too fast even for the life of a university administrator. But while he covers Aiken with a mass of tribulation, philosophical inquiries and even some calamities, he does not smother him.

It is to Mr. Morrison's credit as an expert craftsman that he pilots his novel through these intricate channels without bumping shore. Moreover, he does it with such pleasant charm that the reader thoroughly enjoys the trip.

—John Strohmeier

Civic Victories --- and Defeats

by Calvin Mayne

CIVIC VICTORIES: The Story of an Unfinished Revolution. By Richard S. Childs, with an introduction by Thomas Harrison Reed. Harper & Brothers. New York, 350 pp. \$3.50.

"Politics," Mr. Dooley once remarked, "ain't bean-bag. 'Tis a man's game; an' women, childher, and prohybitionists'd do well to keep out iv it."

A man who has plunged his hands deep into the mire of municipal politics to beat the politicians at their own game and make local government safer for women and children and even prohibitionists is Richard S. Childs. A dedicated and tireless reformer, he reviews in *Civic Victories* the accomplishments of a half-century of attacks on the prevailing political system of American states and cities, a system he calls "the stupidest and most unworkable on earth."

Long left untended, the garden of American city government has been choked and corrupted by the weeds of wholesale speculation and bossism. Bryce in 1894 called municipal government "the one conspicuous failure of the American democracy." That this oft-quoted assessment still applies too often is shown by Curley and Crump and others of their ilk.

Yet the American people have not always stood idly by while political gangsters made off with City Hall. Time and again, the voters have risen to throw out the rascals, even if these rascals are soon replaced by a similar crew.

To cement the occasional gains, reformers and political scientists have continually tinkered with the system of state and local government and have often succeeded in at least building a better facade of democratic control. Secret ballot, initiative and referendum, civil service, commission plan, proportional representation, unicameral legislature—these are some of the mechanical improvements.

Two of the most important of these reforms, and perhaps the keys to the rest, are the short ballot and the city manager form of government. Both are the brainchildren of the author of *Civic Victories*, and to them he devotes the core of his book.

Yale graduate, advertising man and business executive (Bon Ami Company and Lederle Laboratories), Childs is also a former president of the National Municipal League and a member of a host of political science and public administration organizations. He is still active in the unfinished fight for better government. His book is an essential primer for amateur reformers, a valuable reference for professionals, and a bible for the city hall beat.

Childs says the root of our civic evils is the half-million elective offices in the 112,420 (at last count) units of government in the United States. Ignored by the voters, the holders of these offices are largely prisoners and/or rulers of political machines, machines which are frequently insensitive to the needs of the people, too often corrupt and primarily concerned with keeping the opposition out of office or ousting the incumbents.

The American addiction to electing people to everything traces to the rough-hewn democracy of Andrew Jackson. Systems of government based on "popular control" for every state treasurer, county clerk, drain commissioner, judge or coroner are as outmoded today as the horsecar and gas lamp. But the multiplicity of elective officers lingers on, and politicians raise Fourth-of-July ghosts of George Washington to stave off attempts to undermine their entrenched power.

Childs dismisses the argument that apathy and laziness are the causes of voters' inattention to minor elected officials. He defies any but the most diligent voter to cope intelligently with the minor offices on an Ohio ballot studded with as many as 100 candidates for some 50 offices on four levels of government. But when attention is concentrated on a few candidates, each citing clear-cut issues and competing for important posts, Childs declares, the people will act intelligently and in great number. Anyone who is familiar with the mechanics and heartbreaks of political campaigns for these minor officials will testify to the truth of his assertion.

Childs demands slashing the ballot to

a reasonable number of elective officials (five is enough, he says) and appointment of the rest. This has the great advantage of providing integrated, effective administration; and, meeting the argument of those who protest against the people "losing touch" with their officials, he says:

"When the ballot is long, a prime function of the politicians is to make up tickets of candidates, tying together complete sets of candidates like asparagus so that the ordinary voters can vote them by the bunch. A couple of good stalks on the outside of the bundle will help, but the voters can be relied upon to look no further into the bunch to detect rotten stalks. Hence the voter who eagerly supports a dramatic and fearless reformer for governor may in the same election unknowingly or helplessly send to the legislature representatives who will thwart every project the governor advances."

Childs adds to his two rules of short ballots and integrated governments a third rule, that the constituency must be wieldy. He holds it self-evident that the task of reaching hundreds of thousands, even millions, of voters in city and state campaigns discourages good men from running for office and cements the power of parties at the expense of worthwhile "independents."

This is certainly true; but Child's proposals for a short ballot would tend to increase the constituencies of city councilmen or state legislators. He proposes this inconsistency be corrected by proportional representation ("it has no fault but its unfamiliarity") in the cities, but he leaves the question scarcely examined in the states.

Honesty in municipal government, Childs declares, is becoming the rule rather than the exception largely because of the spread of the 40-year-old city manager system to 658 of the 2,525 American cities of 5,000 or more population. This form of government, patterned after the administration of business corporations and working best with nonpartisan elections, he predicts will soon become the dominant form of American local government.

Childs examines the administrative record of city managers, in violation of the initially-declared limitation of his book to voting processes, and finds it good. City managers form a highly-skilled little group of able administrators, and they have, with

but a few exceptions, promoted the cause of good government.

Childs maintains the city manager system is best for even the biggest cities, but other authorities disagree. The duties of political leadership and administration in a metropolis are too intertwined to permit effective operation of a city manager, the opposition argues. A compromise is currently being tried in Los Angeles and Philadelphia with an administrative officer controlling most, but not all, of the "business" functions of government.

The author reviews all his proposals' progress and finds it somewhat wanting, despite his book's optimistic title. Rural politicians still spit tobacco at the interests of city-dwellers in most state legislatures—despite frequent and unavailing reapportionment efforts. County government in the United States is still largely a morass of unessential offices filled by indolent incompetents, marking time in a governmental structure unresponsive to the demands of swollen suburbs and modern living. Only in the cities has a more efficient and more democratic framework of government been accomplished, and there is still far to go here.

Childs admits that "we cannot devise a system of government that will automatically produce good administration" but adds that voters can install systems "which will almost inevitably be democratic."

"And if we achieve a practical working of the democratic process, the self-interest of the voters can be appealed to for correction of lapses in performance, and sensitive responsiveness of the mechanism will facilitate the ability of such self-interest to prevail."

This is perhaps too superficial an assessment. Men, not mechanics, make good government. Even the most archaic system can produce honest, efficient leadership, while a streamlined city charter can mask the graft and inaction of dishonest, lazy officials.

But Childs is correct when he says that good government is easier to obtain in a more responsive, simpler political framework, and his reforms are certainly the only long-range solution to the persistent problems of grass-roots government.

Perhaps recalling too many snubs by busy or apathetic editors, Childs pays

scant heed to the role of the press in reform. Yet it is true that most major municipal improvements have come only on the heels of sustained, fact-digging, fearless crusades by American newspapers or magazines. If the public had not been aroused by Lincoln Steffens and his fellow muckrakers, Childs would never have had a receptive milieu in which first to present his schemes. Cooperation among newspapers, civic leaders, voters and theorists still provides the only sure means of permanently removing corruption from the American governmental scene; conversely, where editors encourage or ignore political self-seekers and corruption, the cause of good government will inevitably suffer despite the efforts of reformers.

But Childs still presents in his book an effective and comprehensive program of sound and basic reform, and his claim that "there is no competing school of thought, no contrary program" is justified. His book is superbly documented and well-written, despite an excess of exclamation marks and the coining of such unnecessary words as "democratics" and "scatteration." The writing seldom bogs down in the dull, statistic-mired prose of most political scientists.

It is always easier to sneer at local government than to remedy it, and the reformer's lot is not a happy one. Childs has done democracy a service by recording the sum total of his remarkable career in behalf of our free institutions.

Nieman Scrapbook

Few Will Talk About It

Eight years ago we spent a winter at Harvard on a fellowship. Scores of the world's great thinkers debated, in our presence, many of the pressing problems of our society—among them the condition of the Negro in America.

In these discussions we would invariably point out that the plight of the Spanish-speaking peoples of the Southwest was as bad as the Negro in the East and South. But nobody listened.

Influential forces have been set in action in behalf of the Negro, and for that we are glad. Lynchings have practically disappeared. Segregation is on the decline.

The poll tax is becoming obsolete. Employment opportunities are somewhat improved.

But still no strong voices are raised in behalf of the Spanish-speaking peoples—143,000 of whom are in Colorado. Yet these Spanish families have incomes far below the Negroes of this state.

Harvard is 2,000 miles from Colorado, and it is perhaps too much to expect social scientists there to be concerned about our problem. But is it too much to expect the "Anglo" citizens of the state to solve their own?

The average Coloradoan is vaguely aware of his underprivileged neighbors. He finds their names in the Korean casualty lists—ignorant of the fact that many have been forced into uniform to attain status and a little equality. He reads about them in the juvenile crime news—not realizing this to be the result of social discrimination and lack of recreational programs. He discovers an-above-average number of them listed in the traffic casualties—for what reason we are not sure.

It is all overwhelming. No quick solution presents itself to the citizen's mind. So he turns on his TV set.

But this does not train more Spanish students in our universities for leadership. It does not break the tradition that only menial jobs should be assigned to this group. It does not recognize, what psychologists proved in World War II, that all races are possessed of equal innate intellectual capacities. And it does not bring justice to the Spanish-speaking defendants when they are thrown into jail and hailed before the lower courts.

The Negro situation is on the way to solution. Now, all we need are a few eminent crusaders to start a march on this problem in Colorado and the Southwest.

When our defense effort slows down, Americans will begin thinking about public works. Unless the pattern is changed, this thinking will be done about physical objects. Officials will advocate the building of highways and hospitals and police stations. Is it not time for us to have programs for the building of people?

Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*
Jan. 16, 1953

Home of Pulitzer's World Echoes Steps of Those Bidding It Good-By

by Meyer Berger

Ghosts thronged the World Building at 63 Park Row yesterday from its darkened sub-basement to its verdigreed dome as the structure awaited a death sentence from the city.

The tallest office building in New York when it went up in 1890, it huddles miserably now among other time-blackened structures that also must come down for a new Brooklyn Bridge approach. It may stand until late spring, possibly into midsummer, but it will not see the end of the year.

When Joseph Pulitzer erected it his prayer was:

"God grant that this structure be the enduring home of a newspaper . . . forever fighting every form of Wrong."

It endured only four decades; died as a crusading newspaper in March, 1931, and its distinguished staff scattered everywhere.

Melancholy maintenance men who have worked in the World Building for thirty years or more took visitors on tour of the doomed plant last week. They talked nostalgically of the *World's* gloried past, bitterly of their own uncertain future.

In the sub-basement twenty feet under Park Row two naked light bulbs cast grotesque shadows ahead of the men on a sentimental journey. Plaster grit crackled under their shoes, and ancient boilers hissed and panted in the emptiness.

The old *World* printing press beds embraced blocks of brooding shadow. Cold drafts whistled down long unused iron stairways. Mountains of rubble from upstairs walls, dumped in the pressroom, resembled mounds of bomb debris.

Cryptic Markings Stir Memories

The stereotype room was as cold and dark as an ancient wine vault. Dusty racks that had held press gears hunched in a gloomy corridor, but cryptic chalked markings left by departed fingers still showed through—"Hoe folder gear 869P."

Bronze memorial tablets that had been on the lobby walls for years were gone—the plaque to Gregory Humes, who telephoned details of a railroad wreck to the *World* before he died of wreck wounds;

the tablet to men of the *World* who fought and died in World War I.

The old city room on the twelfth floor, where generations of *World* men wrote history day by day, is now a workroom for City Housing Authority engineers, but the spot where a little iron stairway led to the composing room was easily discovered.

The west windows in the city room looked out on pretty much the same skyline that turned into a golden curtain after twilight on the night the paper died. The windows facing east still gave sight of blackened rooftops and of the old bridge gracefully arching the river to Brooklyn's shore. Reporters, editors and rewrite men had that view burned into their memories.

Ascent to the old World dome, once bright gold, now weathered green, was by darkened spiral iron stairway all covered with dust. The first landing looked down on where the World restaurant had been. It is a plant for adding machine repair now.

Franklin P. Adams, Frank Sullivan, Heywood Broun, Charlie Somerville, Albert Payson Terhune, Joseph Jefferson O'Neill and others of the old staff took their coffee, sandwiches and beer there. An old office boy remembered that.

Names of Famous Editors

At the fifteenth-floor landing, half-way up in the melancholy dome, some of the frosted panes still showed the names of editorial writers who had worked behind them—Charles Merz, James M. Cain, John Langdon Heaton—and in the darkest corner, the name of Rollin Kirby barely came through the dust.

The others were all but obliterated—Frank Cobb, Walter Lippmann. Lock peepholes offered a glimpse of assorted building equipment in the long-deserted editorial chambers, a litter of odds and ends covered with powdery dust.

At the seventeenth level, in almost utter blackness, yellowed oblongs of paper lay underfoot, in the dust. They were printer's pay vouchers of 1921. Ninety dollars to W. E. Boselly, composing room superintendent \$58 to Norman Moir, both long since dead.

Down on the eighth floor old Joseph Pulitzer's black throne stood just inside the door. Beside it was the companion couch from his office. His portrait, done before his blindness, looked down from the wall.

Down in the white marble elevator corridor Ray Diller, thirty years on the elevators, looked troubled. His spirit was crushed when the *World* died and he knew the city's condemnation order would condemn him, too. He stared at the great stained-glass *World* symbol over the stair-to winter-blackened William Street—someone beside him said a collector had offered \$3,000 for it. He remembered Lindsay Denison, Martin Green, Charlie Hand, Don Seitz, crusty old Mr. Brownes, the Scottish auditor. And he remembered Herbert Bayard Swope "roaring in here on election nights in top hat."

Another old elevator man cut in on the reminiscence. He seemed bitter.

"You got your story," he said. "You'll tell all about what a hell of a place this was in the old days, That's fine for people to read and get sentimental about—but how about us old *World* guys? Where do we go when the place comes down?"

Diller turned away and stared through the stained glass Liberty over the William Street doorway, and was silent. The starter's castanets clicked. Diller got into the shabby old elevator.

"Going up," he called gloomily, and the door slid closed.

N. Y. Times, Jan. 12

Our Reviewers

Kenneth E. Wilson, Santa Rosa (Calif.) *Press Democrat*; **Watson S. Sims**, AP, Chattanooga, Tenn.; **William Steif**, San Francisco *News*; **Arthur C. Barschdorf**, Hammond (Ind.) *Times*; **Robert B. Frazier**, Eugene (Ore.) *Register-Guard*; **Donald Janson**, Milwaukee *Journal*; **Robert E. Lee**, UP, Washington, D. C., **John Strohmeyer**, Providence *Journal*; and **Calvin W. Mayne**, Rochester *Times*, are Nieman Fellows this year; **John M. Harrison**, Toledo *Blade*, was a Nieman Fellow 1951-52; **Beverly Britton** is a Special Student, on leave of absence from the Navy; **Louis M. Lyons** is curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

The Concern with Fair Play

Several hundred newspapermen, attending two national conventions in Denver, recently debated Gov. Stevenson's charge that this nation comes close to having a one-party press. Many agreed with Stevenson; others contended that news columns were equally fair to both candidates in the presidential campaign.

Several editors declared that they granted the same amount of space to Stevenson as to Eisenhower. However, a study of daily newspapers in the Congressional library shows that in most newspapers Eisenhower got the bigger play in pictures and in text. Where the volume of pictures and words was the same, trained newsmen could still detect favoritism for Eisenhower.

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, a Stevenson paper, pointed out that the Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service did not send a New York *Times* story to its clients. The story said that the correspondents in Eisenhower's entourage would cast 24 votes for Stevenson, 7 for Eisenhower, and 6 were undecided. Later in the campaign, the *Christian Science Monitor* reported 43 of the Eisenhower correspondents favoring Stevenson and 13 wanting Eisenhower for president. We did not see that piece of news in any other daily.

The New York *Times*, a pro-Eisenhower paper but eminently fair, announced in October that the service men in Korea favored Stevenson by two to one. Had the results been reversed, the story would have rated banner headlines. As it was, most big newspapers did not carry the item.

Another device used by the metropolitan press was to pooh pooh the size of Stevenson's crowds and to exaggerate Eisenhower's. Photographs were used, showing vacant seats where Stevenson spoke, but no big daily printed a picture of Eisenhower in the Hollywood Bowl with the vast majority of the seats unoccupied.

About 80% of the daily press circulation was for Eisenhower and 11% for Stevenson. The rest was uncommitted. Cer-

tainly Stevenson got a better break than this would indicate, and the conservative press was probably much fairer to the Illinois governor than the liberal weeklies and labor periodicals were to Eisenhower. On the other hand, the few newspapers supporting Stevenson, such as the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, gave fairer treatment to both candidates than most of the Eisenhower papers.

It must be faced that it is not only in elections that the press fails to print all the news. We once made a list of topics which the press avoids, and we ran up a total of 40 categories. For example, most newspapers studiously ignore any good news about Great Britain's so-called socialized medicine. The American people have never been told that all British political parties, including Winston Churchill's Conservative party, have heartily endorsed this health program.

As long as we have a free press, the editors may publish or withhold what information they like. The citizen must assume some responsibility for informing himself and should seek sources of knowledge in addition to the radio, TV, big magazines, and the metropolitan newspapers. These mass media are entertaining; they are nearly complete in their coverage; and several of them are notably fair. But a citizen should not let them do all his thinking. He must balance his information diet with books, seminars, lectures, and one or two small magazines like *Harper's Saturday Review of Literature*, *New Yorker*, *Nation*, or the *Reporter*.

A one-party press is nothing new in America. It is probably less biased than it has ever been. The uproar occasioned by Stevenson's remarks is evidence that conscientious editors are striving to be fair. Having tried to play the news as it is and perhaps shown a slight favoritism, our best editors are deeply concerned. They must come to realize that man can only approach fairness, never completely achieve it.—Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, Nov. 28, 1952.

Left, Right at Harvard

Harvard University, America's oldest and wealthiest, was twice in the news over the recent week end.

Sen. Pat McCarran, pressing his hunt for Communists, was saying that American colleges, including Harvard, are interlaced with Communist professors. Bella Dodd, an ex-Communist turned informer, was testifying that there are 1500 Communist teachers in the United States, many of them placed strategically at Harvard, Columbia, New York University and many other old and respected institutions of higher learning, including Smith, Wellesley and Vassar among the women's colleges.

At the same time, Harvard was in the news on quite the other side of the spectrum. Gen. Eisenhower had just announced his choice for the ambassadorship to the Court of St. James. He is the impeccable, Harvard-educated Winthrop W. Aldrich, almost the personification of Wall Street in his chairmanship of the Chase National bank. And he is to replace the equally impeccable Harvard-educated Walter S. Gifford, former president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., current holder of the portfolio. Then a couple of days later Gen. Ike designated as the forthcoming secretary of commerce the impeccable, Harvard-educated Boston banker and Republican party finance chairman, Sinclair Weeks.

There she stands, Harvard way over on the left, if one believes Sen. McCarran; way over on the right, if one believes what the detractors of Big Business and Wall Street would be bound to say about her. There she stands, in fact—according to such evidence as has come to light in the illuminating speeches of President Conant—a courageous, unruffled guardian of the American tradition of free inquiry and uninhibited interchange of ideas, the kind of interchange that hitherto has made America not only intellectually vital but industrially great.

Perhaps it is worth citing one bit of internal testimony, rendered by a Harvard freshman in a letter to his worried parents a month ago:

I have been thinking about your letter all day. I don't know what to tell you about the Communists. I have never seen or heard one so I don't

know what they're like . . .

Perhaps there are Communists at Harvard. Nevertheless, I believe (Sen.) McCarthy has forgotten about the other 10,000 men here who love this country and will some day, perhaps, lead us out of the darkness into the light.

So what if there is Communistic literature in the library? If an intelligent individual cannot read without being swayed by it, he is not worthy of his freedom. If he takes it for what it is worth (which is nothing) and makes up his own mind to reject it, I say that he is a better man than the one who has not read it at all."

This is not "one-sided education." Why should it be? In a few weeks I will be reading Karl Marx, but that doesn't mean I will come home a socialist. Please remember this. Those who are ignorant of communism are those more easily persuaded toward its cause.

The day American educators let themselves be stampeded by the McCarrans and the McCarthys into the narrow corridors of conformity, the age of ignorance will have come to America, and the end of ignorance is impotence.

Dayton Daily News
Dec. 3, 1952

A New Code for Newspapers

Many times in the past quarter century we have heard the leading editors and publishers of the nation say substantially: "We sell our space to advertisers, but in the news and editorial columns both advertiser and non-advertiser are treated alike."

That seemed like good journalism to us, but in recent years we have begun to question whether such a code is actually put in practice or whether it is desirable.

The free press cannot exist without advertisers, and without newspapers it is doubtful if democracy could continue in America. Therefore, it follows that the business patrons of the newspapers are a bulwark of our society.

Understanding this relationship, some editors attempt to bring prosperity to the business and industries which support their newspapers. They do this by feature

articles, short news stories, and often by personal influence.

All news of commerce and manufacturing cannot be printed, and it seems fair that the news which does get into the paper pertains to the firms which advertise.

It must be emphasized that this preferred treatment stops with what is commonly known as "free publicity." If the advertiser becomes involved in court or with public officials, the facts must be printed the same as about anyone else. If the advertiser seeks some privilege, such as a zoning change, a tariff benefit, or a subsidy, the newspaper's greater interest is to the public. And if the advertiser's policies (in regard to labor, expansion, taxes, etc.) have an impact on the community, again the editor must inform the people. Not only must he print the news, but he is morally obligated to take a stand editorially—very possibly a stand that is adverse to the economic interests of his customer. This, of course, is done day after day by better newspapers, and the fact goes unnoticed by readers because it is so commonplace. Yet it is remarkable that newspapers, which are in a highly-competitive business, will take a position against a patron if the public interest requires it. Other media of mass communication seldom display this courage, and neither does any other branch of the business world that we know of.

Let it be said for the advertisers that they practically never object to this practice of the American press, for they subconsciously realize that the tradition is a valuable element in the success of democracy. Respecting these advertisers for broad-mindedness, we feel that they should be supported when they are serving in honest fashion the realm of trade. That is why we question the policy of "treating advertiser and non-advertiser alike."

Anyone can point out the dangers in giving preferred news coverage to the advertiser. In the final analysis, no code of ethics can possibly guide an editor except in broad terms. The application of the code depends on the fortitude and sense of social values of the newspaperman.

Littleton (Colo.) Independent
Jan. 9, 1953

Nieman Notes

1939

The Chicago *Daily News* sent Edwin A. Lahey to Africa in March for an assignment of several months—one of the top news assignments of the year by an American newspaper.

1940

William B. Dickinson was moved from the position of news editor of the Philadelphia *Bulletin* to chief of their Washington Bureau, to succeed Carl McCordle, now Assistant Secretary of State.

1941

Vance Johnson, Washington correspondent of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, gave his daughter, Jeanne, in marriage to Fred W. Noble, Jr., December 26 last, at the Wesley Methodist Church, Chevy Chase, Md.

1942

Special commendation was given by the Heywood Broun Award judges for nine entries, one of them by Thomas Sancton of the New Orleans *Item*. His citation was:

"Thomas Sancton of the New Orleans *Item*. Sancton wrote many stories over a long period exposing abuses in Louisiana's Angola prison. Other reporters on other papers also worked on the story which has brought many prison reforms, but the judges particularly commended Sancton for his warm human sympathy and for his personal efforts in the rehabilitation of prisoners. His writing style was good."

Mr. Sancton is also serving this year on the faculty of Tulane University, giving a course in feature writing.

1943

James Etheridge is back again with the Florida Taxpayers Federation after an interlude to carry on his brother's paper in Perry, Ga., during his brother's illness, and to handle the application for a TV station of Nelson Poynter, publisher of the St. Petersburg *Times*. Etheridge sends the "Standards for Ownership of a Newspaper or Radio Enterprise," which Nelson Poynter introduced into the hearing on his TV application, printed elsewhere in this issue.

"In spite of the fact that the AP carried this full text on its trunk wire, we have heard of only one paper (in Denver) that used it," Etheridge writes.

Frank Stephenson Neal II was born November 22, 1952 to Irena and Fred Neal at Boulder, Colorado, where Fred teaches government at the University of Colorado.

William A. Townes returned to California in February as editor of the Los Angeles *Daily News*, and immediately began a program to put more vigor and interest into that paper. An account of his early operations on the *News*, as reported in *Newsweek* February 23, is reprinted in this issue.

1945

Robert Bordner of the Cleveland *Press* won the 1952 annual Guild Award for Public Service with a campaign for development of the lake front of Cleveland. This award was made by a local panel. The other classes of awards were judged by the 1953 Nieman Fellows at Harvard.

Bordner writes:

"I am glad that the Cleveland Newspaper Guild does not submit the Public Service entries to the Nieman Fellows, because that permits me to try for the big prize without any hint of favoritism.

"Anyhow, as the clips will show, I got the big one again, for one year's clips out of my 25-year campaign to recover from the railroads the filled lands along Cleveland's lake front, for public development.

"Incidentally, it was nice to get the award because ninety per cent of the work never shows any results in the paper itself. But that is one of the things that makes the *Press* unusual, an assignment to get a job done, regardless of its failure to pay off in stories in the paper. And the continuity of such an assignment makes it effective; though mayors and governors come and go, my assignment goes on forever."

The *Press* commented editorially:

"We're especially proud that most of the six first prizes by *Press* people were in the field of public service: Bob Bordner's crusade for a better lake front, for instance, the culmination of 25 years of devotion as this paper's full-time expert on city planning."

Carl Wagner, son of Charles A. Wagner, Sunday editor of the New York

German Made News Editor On San Francisco Chronicle

William German, former head of the copy desk of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, has been named News Editor, it has been announced by Larry Fanning, Managing Editor.

German, 34, joined the *Chronicle* staff in 1940 as a copyboy. He served successively as a reporter, assistant to the foreign editor, copy reader and head of the copy desk.

A graduate of Brooklyn College, German holds a graduate degree in journalism from Columbia University.

In 1949, he received a Nieman Fellowship. Awarded annually to a number of American newspapermen, Nieman Fellowships are used for a year's study at Harvard.

San Francisco *Chronicle*
Feb. 1,—press release

Mirror, will be graduated from Harvard in June.

1947

Jack Foisie started an assignment to Korea for the San Francisco *Chronicle* in March.

Paul L. Evans, information service chief of TVA, gave a talk on recent TVA developments at the Georgia Press Institute in Athens, Ga., February 21.

Frank Carey, AP science writer, was in Cambridge in February to cover the meetings of the American Physicists' Association.

Stephen Fischer is public relations manager for *Scientific American*. With his publisher, Gerard Piel, he attended a Nieman dinner in January on science reporting.

1948

Carl Larsen was made assistant city editor of the Chicago *Sun-Times* in December, following his coverage of Adlai Stevenson's campaign.

George Weller, home on a vacation from his assignment in Rome for the Chicago *Daily News*, talked to a seminar of the Nieman Fellows at Harvard in February.

Ann Weller, George's daughter, was one of the six Wellesley College honor students

acclaimed at Honors Convocation March 17.

Come spring, Rebecca Gross, editor of the Lock Haven (Pa.) *Express*, was off to Europe on another background tour.

1949

From Robert R. Brunn, assistant American editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*:

"The 1948-49 group may be interested to know that we are living out here in Lexington, encased in California redwood for that Western feeling.

"I'm still an assistant American News Editor in town. Besides doing my share of getting the paper into shape each day with the usual editing of stories and inside page layout, I've had a busy and instructive time answering letters from readers all during the campaigns. We ran an awfully close survey on play of stories and pictures. It's our policy to answer every letter and with a good deal of conscientious digging for answers when a specific one is due.

"One of these days I'm going to get over there with some front pages of the paper as well as some copies of the zee page (first page second section) to show you what we're doing about layout. It seems to me that its real progress. One of the problems has always been that a large part of our circulation area is outside of the immediate reading circle. So, when the *Monitor* appears on street stands in California it looks like any other daily newspaper and the tendency is for people to think it's stale stuff. Actually it's written to stand-up, as you know. Our problem has been to give the layout a timeless quality. On the front page we've been doing it in the mail editions (not in Boston) with more slabs, bigger pictures, more dramatic makeup, more overlines, more italic type—what is in effect more of a magazine approach. This is true too of "my" page where much of the experimentation has gone on and where it has been possible to depart even further from regular newspaper layout practice. I'm trying to use much more white space, dramatic cropping of pictures, magazine-type heads that tease as often as they inform—all of this to impart a sense of vitality and daily freshness which the staid newspaper format cannot give.

"The writers have reacted strongly in favor of it whenever a story of theirs has been given this magazine-type play. We've had little reader reaction (it's been going on for more than six months) but we feel that our reward in that direction is that more of the zee page (and front page) stories are being read because the reader is led into them, *tantalized a bit*, invited in. The old problem is to get the white space, newsprint costing what it does. But I'm convinced that for every inch of white space you can cajole, three or six or more inches of type are read, not just surveyed with a quick glance."

The New York *Times* brought **Tilman Durdin** home from Indo-China to be in Washington during the American visit of Premier Maher of France at the end of March.

1951

Dwight Sargent's series of twelve editorials "If We Were Governor," was printed in a pamphlet by the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald* and sent to all members of the Maine legislature.

Angus MacLean Thuermer took off for India in March for the State Department information service with his wife, Alice, daughter Christina and son, Angus, Jr., born December 18th in Washington, D.C.

Hugh Morris is now chief of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* bureau at Frankfort, the State capital.

1952

Robert W. Brown, editor of the Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*, was program chairman for one of the three days of the Georgia Press Institute, which held its 25th annual meeting at the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism at the University of Georgia, Feb. 19-20-21. Brown organized a series of sessions for the former Nieman Fellows of the South, held at the Institute. Those attending were Sylvan H. Meyer, editor, Gainesville (Ga.) *Times*; Robert Lasseter, editor *Rutherford Courier*, Murphreesboro, Tenn; Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., associate editor, Paducah (Ky.) *Sun-Democrat*; Hugh Morris, state political reporter Louisville *Courier-Journal*; Elmer L. Holland Jr., associate editor Birmingham *News*; James P. Etheridge, secretary, Florida Taxpayers' Federation; Paul L. Evans, information service director, TVA; William Freehoff, editor, Kingsport, Tenn.

News; Clark Porteous, Memphis *Press-Scimitar*, and Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard. Mrs. Holland, Mrs. Lasseter, Mrs. Meyer and Mrs. Lyons attended the sessions. Brown, Evans and Lyons were speakers on the Institute program. Jim Etheridge's brother, Cooper Etheridge, is president of the Georgia Press Association and opened the Institute's 25th anniversary. The School of Journalism at Athens, under Dean John E. Drewry, has been host through this quarter century.

Nieman Fellows who recall **Lawrence Nakatsuka's** earnestness for statehood for Hawaii will be interested to learn of his appointment March 2 as secretary to the Governor of Hawaii, a new position in Hawaii. He was sponsored for his strategic post in the 49th State by his paper, the Honolulu *Star-Bulletin*, whose publisher, J.R. Farrington, was long Hawaii's delegate to the United States.

Larry writes:

"The offer of the job came without much advance notice. A week ago, I got a phone call from the man who had just been appointed Governor by Ike and confirmed by the U.S. Senate. At his office, he asked me to serve. I was flattered and told him I would answer in a day or two, as he was scheduled to be inaugurated in a hurry.

"When I informed the editor and the managing editor of the offer, they smiled. Unknown to me, they had recommended

New Play in Manhattan

Touchstone (by William Stucky) deserves respect, if very little praise. The play, which closed at week's end, concerned a small Southern Negro boy given to seeing visions. The community gets het up, but the boy's doctor father insists that he needs psychiatric care. Playwright Stucky could not give his ticklish subject matter effective or even very intelligible form. Though the play seemed mostly a bald clash between reason and faith, it raised other problems, and was only interesting when it stopped raising problems and dealt with a human situation. Yet, for all it lacked, it approached both racial and religious matters in a low-pitched, un-sentimental way. He has still to master his medium, but Playwright Stucky is at least not the slave of its cliches.

Time, February 16, 1953

me for the job. So I left my job with their blessing and with a tacit understanding that I could return to the paper anytime I got fired or tired of the job.

"I was told by my superiors that the new job would broaden my background and experience. This is an understatement, because, in three days, I feel as though I've learned a new world of facts and faces.

"I never was one for politics in the sense of participating in active partisan politics. But this is excellent experience which ought to come in handy for me in the future as a newsman. After all, my new job may not last long; I have no guaranteed tenure but serve only at the pleasure of the Governor.

"Minnie is carrying on magnificently as a mother and as a housekeeper, and Paul at three and a half months is plump, happy and healthy.

"This Saturday, March 7, Jack Foisie of the San Francisco *Chronicle* arrives in Honolulu on the same ship as Adlai Stevenson. I'll be there to welcome Jack and we'll be host for a day before he moves on to cover the Korean War."

1953

The third and fourth Nieman babies of the year were born just ahead of press time for this issue.

Mark Strohmeyer, to Nancy and **John Strohmeyer**, (Providence *Journal*) March 30: weight 7 lb. 10 oz.

David Stewart Barschdorf, to Phyllis and **Arthur Barschdorf** (Hammond, Ind. *Times*) March 16: weight 7 lb. 6 oz. David has a sister, Linda, 6, and a brother, John, 7½.

The two preceding arrivals were:

Christina Louise to Betty and **Robert Nielsen** (Toronto *Star*) Jan. 20.

A son, Kimo, to Linda and **Keyes Beech** (Chicago *Daily News*) on December 5th.

The Townes Crier

When William A. Townes took over as editor of the tabloid *Daily News* in Los Angeles a fortnight ago, he promised first the staff and subsequently his readers a newspaper that was "aggressive and friendly." Large measures of these assets, he apparently felt, could be used to restore the *News's* failing health (*Newsweek*, Sept. 15, 1952). Last week, the Oklahoma-born Townes, who became a courthouse reporter when he was 14 (and a high

school sophomore), and later won a national reputation as a "newspaper doctor,"* was showing Los Angeles what he meant by "aggressive."

While, as he shyly admitted, "I haven't been completely over the building yet; I was here a week before I found the dark-room," Townes already had put his heretofore successful methods to work. He had spruced up the afternoon tabloid typographically, giving its six-column pages (it is the only six-column major daily in the country) a horizontal block make-up that made it more sprightly looking and easier to read. He had departmentalized most of its inside pages much like a news magazine, dropping column rules, and abolishing virtually all jumps of stories to inner pages. "The typographical changes are relatively unimportant," characteristically said Townes, who is so diffident that he blushes when giving his newly inspired staff a soft-spoken order.

Then he turned his attention to making the *News* "a genuinely friendly paper, intimate with the people." A veteran public-service campaigner, the 43-year-old Townes lit on narcotics addiction in Los Angeles as his lead-off crusade. In signed editorials and front-page exposes, he demanded that officials act, and promptly credited the *News* for the wave of arrests that followed. All this friendship was too much for the

News's rival, the energetic and thriving tabloid, the *Mirror*, which previously had been watching the *News's* transformation with quiet, if professional, interest. The *Mirror's* editor and publisher, Virgil Pinkley, in an up-front editorial, claimed that the *Mirror* had been crusading against narcotics for two years and "welcomed, even at this late date" the assistance of rival newspapers, "especially if their concern is genuine."

With the official stir against narcotics momentarily overshadowed by the newspaper's feud, Townes said quietly: "I had no idea the *Mirror* would react as it has. It's childish. We just can't take it lying down."

Then the feud took on a new aspect. The *Mirror* announced on its front page that three comic strips (Joe Palooka, Dixie Dugan, and Mickey Finn) were "moving over to the *Mirror* from the Los Angeles *Daily News*." Townes immediately belittled the exodus. This week, he retorted, the *News* would be adding four new comics to fill the gap.

*As editor and sometimes publisher of papers in Spartanburg, S. C., Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., and Santa Rosa, Calif.

Newsweek

February 23, 1953

camp. The New York Sunday *Times* report by its own correspondent also failed to report whether or not the House Un-American Activities Committee had recommended concentration camps.

If the House Un-American Activities Committee's report recommended concentration camps, should not this have been reported? Will we someday be like the German citizens around the concentration camps who were shocked to find the Ohrdof, Dachau and Buchenwald had grown around their clean model homes? Anyone who has ever seen the effects of concentration camps, can never have a disregard for any aspect of the human situation.

It is popular to blame our present distrust of ideas and thoughts on the defection of a small group of individuals prominent in our national life who have gone wrong. The blame, I think, lies deeper than that. It lies on those of us who disseminate information through all channels of communication. The blame is on all of us, whether worker or professional man, who have failed to instill confidence in our American ideals and institutions. It was the late F.D.R. who when heckled about his "brain trust" replied that he trusted brains. Our strength lies in society's ability to be fully informed.

Certainly in the present struggle, security safeguards must be maintained. However, there are no gentle concentration camps. Odd Nansen's book clearly describes his promotion from a gentle concentration camp in Norway with sunning in the summer months to the camps in Germany which became progressively less gentle. Odd Nansen saw Poles, Frenchmen, Germans, Norwegians, Jews hanged from gallows where the rope one time was too long and the next time too short; where he watched thousands marching off to the gas chambers led by the slaves of their own nationality.

I would like to sum up in the words of A. J. Liebling, that wonderful pathologist of American journalism, "If editors the country over had this story in their offices and rejected it in favor of the fluffy wire stuff most of my specimen newspapers are filled with, then the national press is in a low state of health. It has been tube-fed a long time, and like the man in Pittsburgh, ought to relearn how to

Letters

Concentration Camps in the U. S.?

Several years ago, having become acquainted by sight, sound, smell, touch and pain of the results of German concentration camps, I developed the macabre hobby of collecting publications about them. In my collection I have such books as *Doctor of Infamy*, the story of Nazi medical crimes; *Buchenwald*, by the late Leon LeLoir, des Peres Blancs; *The Accused*, a personal story of imprisonment in Russia by Alexander Weissberg and *From Day to Day*, by Odd Nansen of Norway who spent three years in Nazi concentration camps. In addition I have a group of photographs of Buchenwald taken by my Air Force Group among which are pictures of the still smoking crematories. This gruesome collection is a monument of man's degradation for all

to see and be reminded to what ends evil forces can lead people.

So, on Sunday, the 28th of December 1952, I found my attention caught by a story in the Boston *Globe* on the report of the House Un-American Activities Committee to the outgoing 82nd Congress. The Sunday *Globe's* UP story quoted Senator Karl E. Mundt, Rep. South Dakota, a former member of the Un-American Activities group, "I am not very hot for the idea of concentration camps." That was all. I had already read the Worcester Sunday *Telegram's* AP report which featured the fact that the House Un-American Activities Committee recommended repeal of the "Taft-Hartley non-Red oaths"; but no mention of the House Committee's consideration of concentration

chew. If the story never came over the press-association wires to where the editors could see it, or if it came in such feeble form that it could not be properly evaluated, somebody ought to begin mending that fine-mesh net that the heads of press associations are always bragging about. From where I sit, that net looks more like a toothless rake."

Samuel Bachrach, M.D.
44 West St.
Worcester, Mass.

Dr. Bachrach's letter was referred to Murrey Marder of the Washington Post, a Nieman Fellow of 1950, whose present assignment is to agencies dealing with subversive activities. Mr. Marder writes:

The only reference that I can find to concentration camps in the Un-American Activities Committee's year-end report is a very indirect one. The report reprinted all the recommendations which have been made by the Un-American Activities Committees over the years. The 1950 recommendation, among many other things, said:

"H.R. 10, providing for the supervision and detention of undeportable aliens, should be enacted into law in order to deal with thousands of alien Communists refused acceptance by the country of their birth."

I personally doubt that is what Sen. Mundt was referring to. I think it is more likely that the quotation somehow concerned the "Emergency Detention" provisions of the McCarran International Security Act of 1950. Why that would have come into a story on the Un-American Activities Committee report, I don't know, except that it is the one law on the books which does in effect authorize detention camps, and it has been reported several times that such camps are in existence on a standby basis.

I would refer the good doctor to hearings, in the last Congress, on the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations. In there, James Bennett, Director of Prisons, was questioned about the camps set up to carry out the "Emergency Detention" provisions of the McCarran Act. This was reported then, and earlier, although the Justice Department has been very untalkative about the detention camps. As I recall, there are about six camps in the country,

former military camps, which are being maintained for this purpose.

The "Emergency Detention" portion of the McCarran Act is Title II of that law, and a generally little-known section. Ironically, it was put in there by the liberals during the confusing attempts to block the McCarran Act. Many of the liberals voted for it in the hope the McCarran bill would get so loaded up with impossible sections during the floor debate that it would be recommitted. Others, however, particularly Sen. Paul Douglas—a chief sponsor of this section—felt it would be far better to have something on the books which set up some legal safeguards for persons detained, than to leave it to the

whim of the authorities in event of an emergency. It went into the law, therefore with confusing motives.

It authorizes, in time of war, invasion, or insurrection, the detention of persons when there is "responsible ground" to believe they will engage in espionage or sabotage. It provides for various reviews of such detention.

I have been trying for some time to get further clarification of the whole detention camp business. Perhaps with the new Administration there will be a chance to review this business. I appreciate the doctor's concern.

Murrey Marder

The Saalfelden Incident

Mr. Alexander Kendrick's criticism of the Toledo *Blade's* treatment of the Saalfelden incident, which you published in the January *Nieman Reports*, requires a rejoinder, for the *Blade's* point escaped Mr. Kendrick.

He dismisses in a phrase the treatment given the story by American newspapers, and then discusses what he said about it in radio broadcasts. The *Blade's* chief objective in investigating the affair at Saalfelden was to point out that the press in this country had largely ignored an incident which had put the United States in a bad light in Europe. The *Blade* was not concerned, except in passing, with the propaganda which the Communist papers manufactured out of the Saalfelden riots, as Mr. Kendrick seems to imply. The *Blade* was concerned with the hostile reaction of the British press, and especially that section of it which is friendly to the United States. In the *Blade* booklet ample documentary evidence was reproduced to show that non-Communist British opinion was outraged by the American action at Saalfelden, and that this fact was reported in a grossly inadequate manner by the press of the United States. Finally, the *Blade* made no attempt to examine what Mr. Kendrick and other radio broadcasters said about Saalfelden, since their comments are not a matter of permanent public record.

With regard to Mr. Kendrick's comment on the *Blade* article, it is apparent that he must have glanced through it has-

tily. For instance, Mr. Kendrick says that "the *Blade* pamphlet fails to make clear" that the rough handling of the British by American MP's "was done under extreme provocation." Yet, precisely this point was made in the article (see column 1, page 26, of your issue for October, 1952). Specific instances of provocation were cited, and the conclusion was reached that the MP's had done "as well as anyone could have done under such trying circumstances." It is difficult to see how the point could have been made any clearer.

Again, contrary to Mr. Kendrick's assertion, the *Blade* article did make it clear that the Western powers had abandoned the gray pass in 1948, that is was the Russians who continued to insist upon it, and that the Western powers had long been engaged in a fruitless attempt to persuade the Russians to abandon it. What Mr. Kendrick passes over is the important fact that ordinarily the American MP's let the Russians do their own work, and seldom bothered to check to see if travelers were carrying the gray pass which the Russians demanded. This fact is conceded by the State Department, and it is surely an odd coincidence that a decision to check for gray passes was reached just as a trainload of Communists arrived.

However, Mr. Kendrick's remarks do contain one admission that other apologists have been reluctant to make; namely, that at Saalfelden the American MP's were actually engaged in doing the Russian's work for them. Mr. Kendrick's

explanation for this curious circumstance is so singular that it deserves to be repeated:

Why should American authorities, who have no travel restrictions in their zone, then prevent travelers from entering the Russian zone? Not for reasons of high politics, but for the same reasons that impel the State Department to stamp passports not good for travel in the Communist countries—that is to say, reasons of personal safety. I don't know how many scores of Americans have been taken off the train en route to Vienna, by armed Russian soldiers, because their gray cards were not signed . . .

This is, of course, an indirect acknowledgment of the fact that American MP's usually let the Russians do their own checking, and let travelers pass on to the Russian zone without asking for the gray pass.

But, in addition to that, consider the specific case under discussion by Mr. Kendrick. At Saalfelden there was a group of young people, most of whom were Communists, bound for a Communist festival in Berlin. The Russians wanted them to come, were paying for their transportation, and offered to waive all gray pass regulations to let them through. Yet Mr. Kendrick suggests that the American MP's were actually doing the young Communists a favor in taking them from the train, since their "personal safety" might be endangered if they arrived in the Russian zone without the gray pass. In all fairness, Mr. Kendrick's explanation is simply fantastic.

Mr. Kendrick is at some pains to make it plain that he did not allow himself to be unduly influenced by the official explanation of the Saalfelden incident which was handed out by the occupation authorities in Vienna, and that he reported fully and completely on the affair in his radio broadcasts. The *Blade* is quite willing to admit Mr. Kendrick's statement as true, but at the same time it cannot accept his remark that the American high commissioner's action in the affair of the gray pass was "important in principle and

practice." It was neither, for the high commissioner was well aware that his Russian colleagues would never give up the gray pass simply to let a few British Communists make an excursion to Berlin. The tit-for-tat exchange between Mr. Donnelly and Gen. Sviridov conformed to the familiar pattern which everyone has come to expect of our diplomatic dealings with the Russians. It was precisely what the *Blade* called it, a "meaningless diplomatic exchange," since it proved only that Mr. Donnelly had scored another point in his negotiations with Gen. Sviridov.

In the case of the Saalfelden incident, however, Mr. Donnelly scored his point at the expense of valuable prestige for the United States in Europe. Mr. Donnelly prevented British citizens, traveling on British passports, from reaching a destination that was not under American control. If the British government chose to issue passports to those people, then Mr. Donnelly should have had the good sense not to intervene. These facts were reported in great detail in the British newspapers, but the American press contented itself—in the few instances where the affair was mentioned at all—with a brief summary of the official apology. Therefore, the *Blade* believes that it was fully justified in making its report of the Saalfelden incident, and in calling it to general attention.

Harvey S. Ford
Toledo *Blade*

Easiest and Best

To the Editor:

Thank you for your reminder that my subscription to *Nieman Reports* had expired; and additional thanks for sending me the extra copy, so I wouldn't miss an edition.

In the hustle of everyday newspaper work, I find *Nieman Reports* the easiest and by far the best way of pausing to take stock of the reason and the importance of the work at hand.

Enclosed you'll find my check for a subscription renewal.

William Metz
1037 Koohoo Place
Lanikai, Hawaii

For An Army Tour

To the Editor:

Please renew my subscription to *Nieman Reports* to cover a two-year subscription.

Nieman Reports, I feel, is just the publication I have been looking for to keep me informed and in touch with the newspaper world during the two-year army tour I am just starting.

Robert S. Reed
Maple Valley, Wash.

New Ideas

To The Editor:

I am enclosing my two dollars to continue my subscription for another year. Thank you very much for continuing to send the *Reports*.

I have enjoyed reading all of the issues I have received. Albeit, I shall, in all probability, never be a Nieman Fellow, I do have aspirations of becoming a competent journalist. *Nieman Reports* have aided greatly in continuing to give me new ideas and theories.

Although I am a sports reporter, and most of your material deals with other phases of journalism, I have found that the general principles you discuss apply equally well to my immediate tasks.

I can only hope that I have learned effectively to apply some of the techniques and ideas I have learned about, or hope I have learned about, through reading your pages.

Could you please change my address to:
Dick Sutherland
Route 7, Box 622
Roanoke, Virginia

"Mystery"

To the Editor:

How I remember to rummage around in my receipt file every January to discover it's time to renew my subscription to *Nieman Reports* is a mystery to me. Luckily, I never miss.

Enclosed please find a check for \$2 for a year's renewal.

I couldn't do without it.

Gordon F. Gray
Dayton, Ohio