

# Nieman Reports

October, 1949

## SHOULD NEWSPAPERS CRUSADE?

*Answer: Yes*

George Chaplin

Turnover Among Newsmen

William M. Pinkerton

The Guild and Education

Norval Neil Luxon

The Character of the Newspaper Job

Louis M. Lyons ✓

A Dutchman Looks at the U. S. Press

Jan Roelof Klinkert

A Country Editor's Creed

Donald A. Norberg

The Story Behind the Story

"CBS Views the Press"

Seminar on Russia

Houstoun Waring

Nieman Scrapbook

—

Letters

—

Nieman Notes

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

# Nieman Reports

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

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

---

VOL. III, NO. 4

OCTOBER, 1949

---

## "Not Only Evil But--"

by Ernest H. Linford

With justification the press has puffed out its chest since the directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors condemned newspapermen in Illinois for accepting state government salaries which were actually bribes for supporting the Green administration.

After the report came out it was revealed that seven "country editors" in Georgia were similarly on the Talmadge administration payroll, lending persuasiveness to the board's suggestion that newspapers look around in their bailiwicks for such goings-on.

"The press of the country should be alert to the importance of avoiding not only evil but appearance of evil," said the ASNE board statement. In a way that is the most interesting sentence in the report issued by the 15 editors after investigating the Illinois scandal. While usually aware of public relations of others, many editors are blind to their own "appearance of evil."

Last summer the National Editorial Association held its annual convention in Salt Lake City. This "grass roots" press is supposed to enjoy special credence and confidence that is denied most metropolitan papers. They are close to and a part of the "people." Though the NEA conclave took place about the time the majority of the nation's bigger papers were waking up tardily to the importance of the revelations of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Chicago Daily News concerning the Green-press alliance, the affair received no official recognition at the "country editors'" convention. Since such meetings are mostly devoted to lighter things, this was not surprising. Some editors expressed concern, however, about freedom of the press where government was concerned, and their answers to questions indicated they felt the Illinois affair had damaged the prestige of the Fourth Estate.

The conventioning editors were guests at several meals

and receptions given by large corporations, and under the heading, "They Made It Possible" on the NEA programs, 22 firms and organizations were thanked for "making this convention a success." Seventeen hosts were business concerns and organizations, including General Motors, the United States Brewers Foundation, Ford Motors, Geneva (U. S.) Steel, Kennecott Copper and the Utah Manufacturers Association. Geneva Steel and Kennecott have large operations, so like the other Utah companies they could legitimately play host to Utah visitors.

There is nothing new, of course, about corporations being host to newspapermen. Organizations and groups with axes to grind once threatened or whipped editors into line but now they wine and dine them with persuasive public relations specialists as hosts. Only the most fastidious newsman rejects invitations to dinners on grounds he might be "corrupted." There is danger, however, of carrying this sort of relationship too far and some state press associations are guilty of downright panhandling and wheedling of companies into taking over part of the financial burden of their conventions. That approaches the "evil" with which the ASNE is concerned. Some big corporations have such a grip on communities—and whole regions—that their alliance with the press is not so much different from that of the Green machine and the rural press.

Few, if any, NEA members feel obligated to support U. S. Steel's wage policies because of the meal and tour at the firm's expense in Salt Lake City last summer. The editor who accepts theatre passes does not have to run all the publicity the movie manager requests, but neither is the editor always eager to review a picture honestly. Granted, General Motors and the United States Brewers Foundation did not expect any more than normal good will from the press when they fed the editors. Nevertheless, from a strict public relations point of view, the organized editors made themselves and their organization vulnerable to criticism. Professional unionists and others are already convinced that the press is joined with big business in an alliance against the working man. When editors allow corporations to take over the burden of feeding and entertaining them at conventions, there is fuel for the fire.

Recent concern over political bribery among editors is highly encouraging and indicates the American press is gradually weaning itself away from political support. The press, however, needs also to be alert against even the appearance of other kinds of bribery.

Well known now is the California Medical Association's boast that 700 newspapers in that state joined in its campaign against "socialized medicine" after it judiciously placed its advertising in those papers. If one dollar had been spent on advertising on behalf of national health insurance, what would have been the reaction of the AMA, and the conservative press? The difference between influencing the press by an advertising campaign and by wining and dining is a difference in degree.

The press can help avoid evil and the appearance of evil by keeping itself reasonably clear of all "special interest" pressures—and appearance of pressures—whether they come from government, organized agriculture, organized labor or by any other group or organization which puts its welfare ahead of the general public good.

---

Ernest H. Linford is an editorial writer on the Salt Lake City Tribune. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1946-47.

# TURNOVER AMONG NEWSMEN: A Small Sample

by William M. Pinkerton

*This is a report of a random sample of 239 workers in journalism. It compares where they were in 1938 with where they were in 1948. One-third of the newspapermen shifted into other work during the 10 years. Less than one-half of the newspapermen remained on the same newspaper. . One-third of the radio men shifted into other work during the 10 years. More than one-third of the magazine people shifted into other work. In general, the newspapers fed into the other fields of journalistic work—magazines, radio, teaching. The flow back into the newspaper business was slight. On one metropolitan newspaper, which has policies definitely directed to promoting stability of staff, the loss of newspapermen to other callings was no greater than in teaching. Less than 20 per cent of the editorial workers left this paper, and less than 10 per cent of them left newspaper work.*

Most people in the craft would agree that newspapermen move around. Typically, a newspaper career embraces work for more than one employer in more than one city. But the range is great. Some men work productively and successfully all their lives for a single employer. Others, who would like to, have their jobs shot out from under them by consolidations or failures. Some move several times before they settle down. Some are relatively unsettled all their lives. We know these things from our own experience and that of our friends and acquaintances.

Each man's picture of turnover in the craft is a little different from the next man's. It is colored by his own experience, and by the particular people and shops he has known. It would help to have a general look at the business, to get some picture of what the typical case would be.

Some of us have been arguing the need for reliable studies of turnover in the newspaper craft. Working newspapermen themselves don't need such studies particularly, but they could be a great help to those men responsible for personnel policy on newspapers. Too often, the boss feels hurt to learn that one of his men wants to leave—when a knowledge of the actual mobility in the craft would steel him to the expectation that men will move on from time to time. Is movement inherent in the calling? Can personnel policies influence the extent to which a staff remains stable? In what situations should personnel policy be directed to the expectation of a changing staff? If editors and publishers asked more of these questions, and found realistic answers, there would be a considerable lessening of misunderstanding between newspapermen and the institutions for which they work.

The fall cleaning operation in my office brought to attention a couple of documents which could shed light on the question of turnover in the newspaper industry. From sheer personal curiosity, I ran a little study to see what these documents would show. This is an unpretentious affair—a couple nights' work by an amateur. But the results interested me, and it seemed possible they would interest others. I don't think they prove anything. But they show the kind of information we ought to have. I should hope that this rough survey might prompt more ambitious study in some of the journalism schools and communications research centers.

**THE SAMPLE.** My sample is probably too small to be statistically significant. It consists, at the outset, of 239 persons working in the broad field of journalism, of whom 190 were on newspapers.

My sources are two: The Alumni Directory of the University of Wisconsin School of Journalism for 1938 and for 1948. The choice of Wisconsin is random. I had the documents because I went to Wisconsin. It happens, however, that the University of Wisconsin has been teaching journalism almost since the turn of the century. My sample, which could have gone further back, actually included graduates of every class from 1917 to 1937. Thus, it covers a variety of work experience ranging, at the outset, from one year to 21 years.

The sample is a-typical in that all those covered demonstrated an interest in journalism, with the emphasis on newspaper work, by entering on a course of professional study in college. None of these people blundered into newspaper work or related occupations.

Since University records were less complete in 1938 than in 1948, the sample represents far less than the total of Wisconsin graduates now, or then, in journalism. To make comparisons, it was necessary to eliminate all those listed in the 1948 Directory who did not appear in the 1938 Directory.

There are some errors in the data. Wherever it was clear that a person worked on the business side of a newspaper or magazine, he was eliminated. But this distinction could not be clearly drawn in all cases. Undoubtedly, several persons working in journalism were not included for lack of adequate data in the 1938 Directory. In a few cases, it was necessary to guess from inadequate data exactly what a person was doing at the later date.

Allowing for such errors as may be permitted in an honest amateur effort, my sample boiled down to this:

Of the 239 persons engaged in journalism in 1938, 190 were working for newspapers (these ranged from big city dailies and press services to small dailies and country weeklies); 17 were working for magazines (including trade journals as well as magazines of general circulation); 9 were working for radio stations; 19 were teaching journalism at the college level; 4 were working for state and regional press associations.

The sample included both men and women. The 51 women represented 21 per cent of the total. (Of these, incidentally, only 8, or 15 per cent, retired to housework during the 10 year period.)

In years of experience as of 1938 the sample breaks down as follows: 1-5 years, 71 (including 21 women); 5-10 years, 66 (including 10 women); 10-15 years, 64 (including 13 women); 15-21 years, 38 (including 7 women).

The decade represented by this study is obviously one of

## NIEMAN REPORTS

great turmoil. There probably has been greater turnover than usual during these ten years. My data do not show how many of these people were displaced for military service, or the extent to which war service influenced shifting from one employer to another or from one kind of work to another. A few individuals had to be eliminated from the sample because they were still in military service in 1948.

What the study of these 239 case-histories shows is this: NEWSPAPERS: Of 190 men and women working on newspapers in 1938, only 88 (or 46 per cent) remained on the same newspapers in 1948. These plus 39 who moved to other newspapers (66 per cent) remained in the newspaper business. After ten years, two persons had moved from radio into newspaper work, and one from a trade journal to a newspaper, bringing the total of these experienced people remaining in newspaper work at the end of 10 years to 129, compared with 190 at the beginning.

Of the 64 leaving newspaper work entirely (34 per cent) the largest number (32) went into business and government, principally in advertising and public relations work. Two went into the movies, three went into radio, 14 joined magazines and six undertook the teaching of journalism. Seven women apparently retired to housewifely duties.

Somewhat more of those with from five to 15 years' experience in 1938 stayed in newspaper work than of those in the older and younger age groups.

A SPECIAL CASE: On inspection, it appeared that people working for the Milwaukee Journal did not seem to follow the general pattern. An analysis showed that the Journal had 21 employees of this experienced group in 1938, and 21 employees of the group in 1948. Four people had left the Journal in the interim, but four others had been added to the Journal staff. Of the four people who left the Journal, two went to other newspapers, another entered public relations, and the fourth, a woman, presumably retired to housework. Although this is an admitted small sample, it is believed to be typical of experience on the Journal, a newspaper which is generally known to value continuity of service and to promote, by positive policies, the continued service of its staff members. The contrast is great enough to suggest the value of further study.

MAGAZINES. While newspapers lost in the total re-distribution of experienced personnel, magazines gained, wholly at the expense of the newspapers. Of the 17 persons working for magazines in 1938, 10 (or 58 per cent) remained in magazine work in 1948. Meanwhile, 13 persons had shifted from newspapers to magazines, bringing the total in magazine work to 23. Of those who left magazine work, one went on a newspaper, one became a journalism teacher, four entered public relations and advertising, and one quit for housework.

RADIO. Radio held its own, by giving two men to newspapers and one to public relations while taking three men off newspapers. Radio's loss of experienced manpower during the 10 year period amounted to 67 per cent.

TEACHING. Although far from the most promising calling financially during this period, the teaching of journalism demonstrated far greater stability of personnel than any other branch of journalism. (Incidentally, the higher number of teachers in this sample is accounted for, in part, by the fact that the Wisconsin School of Journalism was a pioneer in the training of men for professional teaching. It is not unlikely that a greater percentage of its graduates has been drawn to this work than would be true of some other journalism schools. Since Wisconsin Ph.D.s now head such distinguished schools as those at Northwestern, Stanford,

Wisconsin, Minnesota and Illinois, to name a few, this cannot be counted a loss.)

Of 19 persons teaching college journalism in 1938, 17 (89 per cent) remained in teaching at the end of ten years. Six more had left newspapers to join them, and one had quit a magazine to teach. The two who left teaching entered public relations. Four persons were engaged in state and regional press association work in 1938, and one of them quit to enter business.

THE SHIFT OUT OF JOURNALISM. The lure of business and government showed a power of attraction for people in all lines of journalism. This means primarily the burgeoning business of public relations in its various aspects. Roughly, 18 per cent of the people engaged in all branches of journalism in 1938—newspapers, magazines, radio, teaching and state press association work—quit to enter business or government in the following ten years. The greatest number—34—came from newspapers where the greatest number of people (190) were concentrated. The greatest percentage (26 per cent) of loss was from magazines. It is probable that some individuals, at the same time, drifted from business and government back into journalism. This is an important balancing factor, which is not covered in this study.

SUMMARY. In this study of 239 people in the field of journalism, these facts emerge:

Less than one-half of those on newspapers remained on the same paper after ten years. By contrast, a newspaper which positively encourages continuity of staff was able to hold more than 80 per cent of its workers during the ten year period.

One-third of those working on newspapers left the newspaper business during the ten years.

One-third of those working in radio shifted into other work.

More than one-third of those on magazines shifted into other work.

About one-tenth of those teaching college journalism shifted into other work.

Almost one-fifth of those employed in all fields of journalism—newspapers, magazines, radio, teaching and state press association work—shifted out of journalism during the ten years.

These shifts represented primarily a loss of experienced workers from the newspaper field.

CONCLUSION. The sample is too small to justify any deductions regarding the movement of manpower in journalism generally. Certain observations may be made regarding the turnover of manpower within this small group of professional workers:

1. In this group, mobility is an equal factor in newspaper, magazine and radio work. Employees move from one employer to another and from one media to another and out of journalism entirely to an equal extent in all three media.

2. The case of one newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, would seem to indicate that a high turnover is not inherent in the newspaper business. Where personnel policies are directed at preserving staff continuity, turnover can be held at a very low level.

3. Judging from this small sample, newspaper work appears to continue its function as the basic training ground for a large area of mass communications work in America.

4. Within the larger field embracing newspapers, magazines, radio and public relations work, movement would seem to be typically away from newspapers into the other agencies.

# "SHOULD NEWSPAPERS CAMPAIGN?"

## *Answer: Yes*

by George Chaplin

*The San Diego Journal, with a vigorous managing editor and a conscientious publisher, has carried on effective campaigns in the interest of the health of the community for the past several years. Managing editor George Chaplin has moved to the same position on the New Orleans Item since this article was written for presentation to the California Publishers Association in June. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1941 when he was city editor of the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont.*

By a campaign, I mean a concerted and continuing effort by a newspaper to reveal, emphasize and seek to correct conditions which are, or give clear indication of becoming, opposed to the public interest.

Some people use the terms "campaign" and "crusade" interchangeably. I don't think it really matters, so long as we know what we mean by the words.

When I was asked to discuss newspaper campaigns, I was told "The San Diego Journal campaigns have attracted very wide and very favorable notice among California daily newspapers."

I have strong feelings on the matter of newspaper campaigning or, more to the point, the prevailing lack of it.

What I am saying here represents my views, but it also represents, in synthesis, the views of a number of other editors, to whom I wrote. I felt that it would make for a more provocative and helpful discussion if I could bring in a variety of opinion.

Well, as it turned out, I didn't get as much variety as I had expected. I now realize my error. I didn't get a true cross-section. I wrote, not to average editors, but to outstanding editors. And, with some qualification but hardly a dissent, they all favor campaigning.

I am confident that had I pulled out an **Editor & Publisher** yearbook and written to several dozen editors whose names I extracted at random, the response would have been different.

Even if a majority had said they favored campaigning—and I mean campaigning in the sense that I defined it—their papers would belie it. Take a closer look at your exchanges. Where do they stand?

I must agree when Erwin Canham of the **Christian Science Monitor** says, "The gravest fault in all of us is a kind of irresponsibility. That is one word which spells to me the greatest need in the American press."

The first article in the Bill of Rights tells us we're something special. We have a special constitutional guarantee enjoyed by no other business. The government is told to keep its hands off, the implication being that once you start limiting the freedom of the press, you run the risk of losing that freedom.

We have that constitutional protection because Thomas Jefferson fought for it. He felt a strong central government harbored abuse—and the public must be protected from that abuse.

Alexander Hamilton took a different view. In the **Federalist** he contended that freedom of the press must depend on public opinion and "on the general spirit of the people and the government."

I personally think there's validity in both views, for freedom of the press is safe only as long as the people of this country want it to be safe.

I say that because freedom of the press is a freedom that belongs to the public rather than the publisher. Or as Ted Dealey of the **Dallas News** put it recently, "Newspapers are not owned by the people who print them, but by the people who read them."

Having been given a special protection by the Constitution, it is the responsibility of the press to battle vigorously and unceasingly in the public interest.

Here is how Louis Seltzer of the **Cleveland Press** replied when I wrote to him:

"People in the community of Greater Cleveland, for whom the **Cleveland Press** is primarily published, sustain us in business.

"In return for this, the least we can do is everything constructively possible to make sure that the community of Greater Cleveland is in good condition, that those things which are inimical to its health, welfare and safety are campaigned against, strengthened or improved, that those things which are needed should be advocated with as much vigor as the paper can bear upon them."

Louis Seltzer naturally agrees with the basic view that a newspaper should honestly print the news in its news columns and comment on that news in its editorial columns. But he significantly adds that "apart and beyond that is this other responsibility to the community itself—dischargeable only by an alert, vital, courageous editorial crusading spirit."

It is in connection with this last-mentioned obligation that so many newspapers fall down and sell their communities short.

As E. S. Pulliam Jr. of the **Indianapolis News** writes me, "If we don't campaign or aid those who campaign, who else will do it?"

There are smelly situations adversely affecting the public interest in every town in America—in your town and in mine. It is the newspaper's duty to ventilate them—to open the windows and let in fresh air. It isn't always a popular move.

Jonathan Daniels of the **Raleigh News and Observer** says "I have a feeling that many of those who criticize crusading want to sell news without having to show courage. I think it would be a pretty sad day for the American press when it ceases to be vigilant of both the liberties and the dangers of the people."

On the **San Diego Journal**, we believe in campaigns. And I am not talking about campaigns which favor mother love and the chastity of women, nor about campaigns which are

against sin and the ragweed menace. I mean campaigns on public issues that merit them. We feel it is especially the duty of a newspaper to be the guardian of those who cannot protect themselves—the young, the aged, the sick. How are your public institutions for the juvenile offender? For the superannuated? For those whose minds have snapped?

As we see it, news sometimes is creative. Sometimes generative. And sometimes preventive.

If an outmoded firetrap housing the mentally ill should burst into flame and cause great loss of life, it obviously is news. But isn't it news, too, that such a possibility of disaster exists?

A newspaper can be active or passive. It can let the news flow in or it can go out and get it.

Joseph Pulitzer in discussing the effect of newspaper campaigning on public opinion recently said, "Sooner or later, public opinion will crystallize. When it speaks there can be heard the voice of the dissenting minority, exercising its great privilege of dissent. But over and above that can be heard the roar of a great tidal wave. That tidal wave is the inexorable force that in this country we know as the power of public opinion. Another name for it is American democracy."

On the **Journal**, we believe in what James Pope of the Louisville **Courier-Journal** calls "intelligent, justified, productive campaigns, and not cheap, sensational, harmful ones." We also agree with Mr. Pope that a campaigning paper must not get puffed up and self-important, that self-righteousness must be guarded against constantly.

We heartily agree with Ben McKelway of the Washington **Star** that opposing points of view must NOT be suppressed. And with Herbert Elliston of the Washington **Post** that a paper should ride the campaigns and not let the campaigns ride the paper.

And we agree when Roy Roberts of the Kansas City **Star** and Lee Hills of the Miami **Herald** caution against campaigning for the sake of campaigning.

Malcolm Bingay of the Detroit **Free Press** asks only that campaigns be based on sound information so that the innocent are not hurt and the truth shall prevail. Only venal and cowardly editors avoid campaigns, says Mr. Bingay.

Virginius Dabney of the Richmond **Times-Dispatch** feels that campaigns should not nag, anger or irritate people unnecessarily. And, of course, he is right. No one likes a common scold. No one likes a nagging wife or nagging husband. Where does campaigning leave off and nagging start? It is a matter of timing—one of the most important elements in any campaign.

I will give details about three recent **Journal** campaigns—concerning quack psychologists, mental hospital conditions, and vice in Tijuana.

It goes without saying that the quack psychologist is one of the most dangerous of all charlatans. Posing as an expert, he not only robs his unsuspecting patients but usually aggravates already disturbing emotional ailments.

These frauds found San Diego, like many another city, a lush territory—until the day a chance remark was made to us by a local welfare worker.

We assigned a reporter to the story. He immediately got off letters to Dr. William Menninger and other leading authorities asking what harm quacks do. Then he devoted two weeks to research, doing extensive background reading, and conferring with local welfare and psychiatric experts.

Then the **Journal** reporter applied for and obtained a city license as a consulting psychologist, simply by walking into the Civic Center and plunking down an 84-cent fee.

He next posed as a patient and visited one of the many fakes then operating in San Diego. He simulated distress, recited a number of symptoms. Then our reporter casually remarked that he came of a wealthy family.

The quack quickly let him know that it was not an incurable case. "You see," he told the reporter, after asking his extraction, "the Dutch and the Scotch-Irish within you are continually at odds."

The quack assured our man that he could be cured—but that it would take several visits a week over a period of months. And in just this case, there would be a special low fee—only \$10 a visit.

We ran the story on page one the next day, with an appropriate cartoon. The quack's lawyer phoned, threatened to sue, but never did.

The stories continued day after day. It was found that a number of students at San Diego State College were being victimized by these phoney mental doctors. The district attorney announced his support of the campaign, as did veterans' groups, social welfare and other agencies.

But it was not all clear sailing. The chiropractors were against regulation, as was the County Medical Society. We printed their views in the news columns—but differed sharply with them on the editorial page.

We hit the story off and on for two months, by which time a regulatory ordinance was prepared by the City Attorney and submitted to the City Council. We ran a page one editorial the afternoon before the Council met. The ordinance was passed unanimously.

Several of the quacks closed shop. Others moved outside the City limits. All applicants for psychologists' licenses must now go before a municipal board of experts and pass muster. Of six who recently applied, three were turned down cold.

The San Diego ordinance is believed to be the first of its kind and copies have been in wide demand throughout the country. **Newsweek** magazine devoted an article to it, as did **McCall's Magazine**.

A state bill regulating psychologists is now before the Legislature.

That was one **Journal** campaign. The reporter who handled it, Richard Looman, was recently awarded the Sigma Delta Chi award for the best reporting of 1948. The judges said that in addition to the importance of the subject matter, they were impressed by the fact that "the entire series was straightforward factual reporting which did not resort to the sob sister type of embellishment that characterizes many such campaigns."

We believe with Frank Starzel of the AP in "the bitter draught of straight, unvarnished facts and truths" rather than in the sugar-coated pill.

There was a good feeling around our newsroom when we won the Sigma Delta Chi award, but a greater prize was the satisfaction of knowing we were meeting our responsibility to the community.

A related campaign concerned the plight of those in California's mental hospitals. The pioneering in this field had been done by Al Ostrow of the San Francisco **News**, who recently received the Lasker Award. Our campaign just

went to show that there are plenty of opportunities for newspapers to join hands in a common endeavor.

The immediate motivating force in the *Journal* campaign was our reading of Albert Deutch's book, *Shame of the States*. The California chapter dealt largely with conditions at Napa State Hospital.

Unless Napa were a conspicuous exception, we felt, Californians should know more about the living conditions and chances for recovery of more than 36,000 patients in mental hospitals and homes for the feeble-minded.

Getting the surface story and the shocker material would have been simple. But this was one story we didn't want to grab and run. Our goal, instead, was the full, trusting cooperation of hospital directors and attendants.

To this end, we persuaded Assembly woman Katherine Niehouse of San Diego to accompany a reporter, Lionel Van Deerlin, and a photographer, Henry Kierstead, to five of the institutions. Our two staffers later visited two other institutions independently.

Once convinced that our purpose was to embarrass no one, but to assist in getting the things needed for mental therapy, we found the hospital officials extremely helpful. The superintendent at Patton pointed out structural defects in an auditorium building condemned since the 1933 earthquake. The acting superintendent at Stockton led our staffers through a labyrinth of passageways in a 95-year-old building to show them more than 100 patients strapped in artificial restraints. These restraints were made necessary, he explained, by lack of attendants.

The series, profusely illustrated, stirred considerable reader interest, as evidenced by a heavy mail. We sent tearsheets to Governor Warren and received from him a three-page letter in which (a) he stated that although progress was being made, California still had a long way to go to reach even minimum standards for mental hospitals. And (b), he said, "it seems to me that the press in California is performing a service in bringing forcibly and graphically to the attention of the public the conditions that presently exists in our institutions."

At the same time, the governor called a two-day conference of experts in Sacramento and groups were named to chart a course for the future. I don't believe that this conference came about because of the *Journal* articles alone. I think it was probably due more to the cumulative effect resulting from the *San Francisco News* stories. One San Diego psychiatrist said the conference capsuled 50 years of progress.

Several other large dailies in the state hit the mental hospital situation for a day or so, then kissed it off. Which to me is *not* the way to campaign.

As far as we at the *Journal* are concerned, mental hospital conditions in California are a continuing story. And we're going to keep hammering away. I know the same will be true of the *San Francisco News*. I hope it is true of other papers. Incidentally we offered reprints and mats of our series without cost to any other California dailies which were interested. I am glad to say that some 10 were.

Now, for mention of a third *Journal* campaign—this one against vice in Tijuana, which is just across the border from San Diego.

This was a campaign which, like Topsy, just grew. It

started out with what was intended to be a conservatively written four-or-five article series on venereal disease—its causes, its cures, facts every reader should know.

Paul White, our associate editor, handled the series. But as so often happens when a competent newsman gets below the surface of an ever-continuing story, White happened upon some statistics that were sensational in themselves.

These figures were officially issued by the venereal disease control officer of the Eleventh Naval District, which extends from the Mexican border to Los Angeles and eastward into Arizona.

A "hold" had been put on this information by the Navy, but White got it from other sources and a supporting document was photostated. This is what was established—the little border community of Tijuana was responsible for more than half the VD infections of Naval personnel in the entire 11th District. In the month of June, 1948, 72 infections were traceable to San Diego: 123 to Los Angeles and 201 to Tijuana.

The Navy report went on—between July 1, 1947 and July 1, 1948, Tijuana had been named as the place of exposure on 1791 contact reports. Majority of the men infected were between 18 and 21. Man days lost because of Tijuana VD during that year totalled 42,984. That is, 42,984 eight-hour man days.

The effects of the series of articles were various. There have been two so-called cleanups of Mexican police, one ordered personally by President Aleman after he read the *Journal* series. But wide-open prostitution is still flourishing in Tijuana—and we're not writing "30" to the story.

A Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has now set up, with headquarters in El Paso. When this begins to function the women in Tijuana will receive regular medical treatment, something now unavailable except at high cost from private physicians. United States officials in Washington gave the *Journal* credit for a considerable share of the success at the meeting which set up the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau.

United States Senator Harley M. Kilgore visited San Diego, read the *Journal* series, and called upon the Senate Armed Services Committee of which he was then a member, to order a full-scale investigation. Unfortunately, nothing tangible has been done by the Committee. The *Journal*, at the end of the series, urged that Tijuana be placed off-limits until the vice was cleaned up. The Navy has refused to do this—which simply demonstrates that even a strong campaign is not always assured 100 percent success.

In passing, I will mention that we have had other campaigns. We were able to have the City of San Diego eliminate some glaring inequities in its police and fire pension system. We also go in for what might be termed humanitarian campaigns—a revolving wheel chair fund for the indigent; books which are projected onto ceilings for the bedridden; a Santa Helpers fund to get food, clothing and funds for the needy. We naturally back the obviously worthy causes such as vitally needed bond issues and the Community Chest campaign. Last fall, when the Chest drive fell short, we sponsored a four-hour radio show featuring the City's top talent. I regret to say it still didn't draw enough funds to reach the goal.

I'm not suggesting that anything per se should be done with a suggestion advanced before the ASNE that papers that don't measure up to certain standards should be read out of the society. I think it's a matter for the individual publisher's conscience for, as someone has said, our newspapers are just as good as the men who own and operate them. On the *Journal* we are fortunate to have a publisher and general manager, John Kennedy and Howard Chernoff, who not only encourage campaigns but demand them.

On many papers editors get less understanding and support from topside. Too few publishers and general managers have come up the editorial way. Too many have come up through the business office, the advertising department, the bank, the law office. These men, whatever their virtues business-wise, simply do not think as editorial men. On their

papers an editor has one of two choices. He can accede to the front office mentality or he can try to do a selling job. He can and should try gradually to indoctrinate the powers that be with the fundamental idea that while a newspaper is a business it is also a public trust and that once it ceases to be a public trust it is no different from the corner shoe shop or grocery store.

In my book a newspaper which does not campaign, which does not carry on a constant two-fisted fight for the betterment of the community, is violating its trust.

I wrote to Palmer Hoyt on the *Denver Post* and I asked him, "Should Newspapers Campaign?"

He replied, "Should a foot racer sprint? Should a singer sing? Should we celebrate Christmas?"

There doesn't seem to be anything to add to that.

## A SEMINAR ON RUSSIA

by Houstoun Waring

For two weeks in August I attended the Press-Radio seminar of the Institute for the Study of the Soviet Union. As this may become a pattern for other interior areas in America, readers of *Nieman Reports* may like to familiarize themselves with the plan.

Dr. Ben M. Cherrington, director of the Social Science foundation of the University of Denver, asked President Eisenhower of Columbia University a year ago if it would be possible for his Russian Institute faculty to spend one summer term in Denver. The invitation was accepted and plans were made for three sections of the institute: (a) a series of four dinner meetings for leading business and professional men of the Denver area; (b) the Press-Radio seminar, with day and night sessions for two weeks, which was attended by men and women from seven states; and (c) an intensive five-week course with college credit for mature students and educators. The last-mentioned course drew 115 people from 26 states and four foreign countries.

The institute was important to the central part of the United States, as no concentrated study of the Soviet Union is carried on, as far as I could learn, except on the two coasts; namely, at Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, California, and the University of Washington.

Russian Institute professors who came from Columbia were Geroid T. Robinson, John N. Hazard, Abram Bergson, and Philip E. Moseley. All read and speak the language, and all have spent considerable time in the Soviet Union. They served the government as experts on Russia during and after the war, and two-thirds of their students at Columbia are or will be in government positions. The other one-third of the students will use their knowledge in academic life, for the most part.

Prof. C. Dale Fuller, coordinator of the institute in Denver, stated that less than one-tenth of our knowledge about the Soviet Union is "cloak and dagger stuff." The other 90%, he said, comes from painstaking research. Newsmen don't have the time or the inclination for such research, and it is at

such institutes that they may quickly learn what a few American scholars have taken years to assemble. I found myself wishing that every American editor might secure a sound foundation of fact about Russia from similar institutes in a dozen places about the country. Much of the hysteria in the press would disappear if the policy-makers on our newspapers obtained a quiet long-range view of the situation. Equally important would be a series of seminars for our congressmen!

It should be explained that the Russian Institute does not concern itself with the Communist party in the United States except in passing. Several of the newspapermen expressed the wish that another seminar be held with this as a topic. Just where the instructors would come from was not suggested.

As one of the advisory board members that served with Dr. Cherrington in making plans for the institute at Denver, I should like to mention the need (sadly enough) of demonstrating the objectivity of the institute. Otherwise, local patriots will denounce it as Communistic and scare away many influential citizens who should learn a few truths. The device we used was to preface all our announcements with General Eisenhower's name, and to state that it was through him that we had obtained the Russian Institute. In spite of these precautions, there were some rumblings as the institute progressed, and the *Denver Post* was called upon to editorialize on the matter. The gist of the editorial was that to be 100% American many people thought one had to be 100% ignorant about Russia.

The English desk of the Voice of America became interested in the Denver experiment and had four of us, at the conclusion of the institute, prepare two broadcasts by means of panel discussions.

Feeling of the newspapermen attending was that in the explosive situation between the two world powers, ignorance of each other is the worst kind of dynamite. They were surprised to learn that, due to the ideological screening of facts, the Russians are more ignorant of us than we are of the Soviet Union.

---

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

---

# THE GUILD AND EDUCATION

by Norval Neil Luxon

*A university administrator asks whether the Guild is really interested in professional education for journalism. Norval Neil Luxon, assistant to the president of Ohio State University offers a program for Guild cooperation in training for newspaper work which is based on a relationship of many years. This is from a talk he was invited to give at the National Convention of the American Newspaper Guild in June.*

Why hasn't the American Newspaper Guild shown more interest in professional education for journalism?

I recognize the fact that the Guild has been chiefly concerned with obtaining higher salaries and better working hours for editorial department employees, but as one who has been directly and intimately connected with journalism education for twenty-three of the past twenty-eight years I regret that the Guild with its twenty-five thousand (I am told) members has in the past decade and a half had practically no contact with or seeming interest in professional education for journalism.

This situation, I reiterate, is a matter of deep regret to me. It would seem that the Guild—the organization of working newspapermen—should be deeply interested in and gravely concerned about the preparation which young men and women, planning to make journalism their life careers, receive in the colleges and universities of the nation.

By getting improved working conditions and higher salaries for reporters and desk men, you have made the business more attractive. Journalism schools are crowded today as they never have been before. But higher salaries do not *per se* guarantee better performance or better qualified performers. A Class D player is still a Class D player whether his salary is one thousand or one hundred thousand a year. In other words, isn't the Guild interested in improving the quality and performance of the newspapermen of the country with the end result of improving the finished product?

I raise these questions objectively. And I am sincerely interested in the answers.

For the benefit of some of the younger members of the Guild—and possibly also of some of the oldsters whose memories may not encompass all that has happened at Guild conventions—I should like to point out that the professional educators in the field of journalism have been not only willing but eager to co-operate with the Guild since its inception. The professional schools sent a committee to the 1934 St. Paul convention, fifteen years ago when the Guild was just getting under way, which tried with little—I should say no—success to gain some recognition for journalism school graduates in the apprenticeship plan.

In 1937 our representatives at the St. Louis convention made no headway and in 1938 the dean of one of the leading professional schools got such a cold reception at the Toronto convention that he is still thawing out his chilblains. That experience ended for some ten years attempts on the part of journalism teachers to co-operate with the Guild. Last September, at my invitation, Chandler Forman, Guild vice president, appeared on the program of the American Associ-

ation of Schools and Departments of Journalism, of which I was president. He also took part in a panel on the program of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism and, I believe I am correct in saying, sat through the three-day sessions of the two professional societies.

May I say that, because I am interested in professional education for journalism, it does not follow that I think that all reporters should be recruited from the ranks of journalism school graduates. On the contrary, were I a city editor—which I have not been for nearly twenty-four years—I would, if the Guild and other controlling factors gave me a free hand, have a staff comprised about as follows:

One-third School of Journalism graduates with experience on campus newspapers and on small-city dailies.

One-third College of Arts graduates with majors in history, economics, political science, sociology, or the sciences from such institutions as Princeton, Harvard, Oberlin, Swarthmore, Williams, or Duke, for example, including a few Phi Beta Kappas, and

One-third newspapermen with varied backgrounds of experience on any and all beats with little or no formal education but with sufficient ability and enough ambition to have caused them to advance themselves materially in their chosen line of work.

Such a staff would be an ideal one and a pleasure to work with. I have no hopes of ever having the opportunity to recruit such a staff but each of us is entitled to his dreams.

The Guild with its twenty-five thousand members is undoubtedly a significant factor in the American newspaper scene. Because of this fact, I want to discuss my ideas on the Guild's relationship to professional education for journalism. Two and one-half million students are enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities. Education makes for better newspapermen and for more intelligent newspaper readers. As the American public becomes better educated it demands more and better education for succeeding generations.

May I interpolate here that one of the things that has maintained my interest in a campus job is year after year seeing freshmen come to the campus of the Ohio State University, as they do to the campuses of the private institutions, from homes where neither the father nor the mother had a high school, let alone a college, education. I have checked admission blank after admission blank of potential journalism students upon which was written the statement that the father finished the eighth grade and the mother the sixth—or the father the second year of high school, with the mother's high school diploma the only diploma in the family.

When the President's Commission on Higher Education made its report last year, it said,

"It is urgently important in American education today that the age-old distinction between education for living and education for making a living be discarded."

The state universities do not need to discard this distinction because they never recognized its existence.

My reason for emphasizing state university education is that it was in such institutions that professional education for journalism was founded and made its early growth. The first professional school of journalism was founded by Walter Williams at the University of Missouri in 1908. Nine of the ten charter members of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism in 1917 were in state universities or state colleges. Today, twenty-seven of the thirty-five members of the Association of Accredited Schools and Departments of Journalism are in state universities or state colleges.

In the forty-one years since Walter Williams founded his school to educate newspapermen for the Missouri press, professional education for journalism has come a long way. Today the thirty-five accredited schools, in institutions from New York to California, from Oregon to Georgia, offer a wide variety of curricula which have been carefully examined and officially approved by a joint committee of newspapermen and professional educators.

What, then, do I think the relationship of the American Newspaper Guild should be to professional education for journalism?

First, let me say that I think that the schools of journalism have a duty, a responsibility, to present to their students as objectively as is humanly possible the facts about the Guild. On the whole, from sixteen years of observation, I think that the Guild fares better in this respect than many of its members seem to think. I honestly believe that if there is any bias in the presentation of the Guild's case to students by most journalism teachers, it is a pro-Guild, rather than an anti-Guild bias.

You must remember that any educational institution is interested primarily in objective presentations of controversial matters. No journalism school dean or director with the proper ethical viewpoint would permit a faculty member to become a spokesman in the classroom for the American Newspaper Guild, any more than he would permit him to speak for the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Federation of Labor, or the American Legion. Each should be discussed objectively within the framework of the subject under discussion.

Now for some specific recommendations to the Guild for co-operation with schools of journalism and professional education:

**First:** Grant some significant preferential treatment to graduates of accredited schools by reducing the apprenticeship period. To be exact, give at least one year's apprenticeship credit to the beginning reporter who has earned a degree in an accredited school.

I am told on good authority that certain employers have done just this thing. That is, they have started graduates at one- or two-year levels higher than the basic starting wage.

**Second:** Supply speakers who will appear before classes and meetings of student journalistic organizations to present the Guild point of view.

I am sure that local units in or close to university communities will find journalism school heads ready to co-operate in this respect.

**Third:** Co-operate actively in supporting an annual lecture by an outstanding journalist to which not only journalism students but the university community and the general public are invited.

The shining example of this type of co-operation between the Guild and a School of Journalism is the Annual Memorial Lecture jointly sponsored by the Newspaper Guild of the Twin Cities and the School of Journalism of the University of Minneapolis. Lectures honoring the memory of three Minneapolis newspapermen and Guild members who lost their lives in World War Two have been given the past three years by Marquis Childs in 1947, Thomas L. Stokes in 1948, and James B. Reston last month.

**Fourth:** Co-operate, at least to the extent of not actively opposing, in the development of programs for summer or vacation internships on newspapers for journalism students and, what is even more valuable, for journalism teachers.

I know that the clock cannot be turned back. But I can't refrain from saying that some of the most valuable training I received was as what today would be called an "intern" reporter on the Columbus Citizen in the summers of 1921 and 1922 while I was still a student. I know that many problems arise in connection with this suggestion, but I am optimistic enough to believe that they are not insurmountable. Both students and instructors would benefit immeasurably if a workable plan could be evolved.

**Fifth:** Stand ready to co-operate if asked to make suggestions regarding improvement of curricula or introduction of new courses into the schools.

Members of the Guild are in a position to assist in revising courses and curricula in the schools to meet the demands of the modern newspaper.

**Sixth:** Establish scholarships for deserving students in professional schools of journalism.

Many schools have scholarships given by individuals or by newspapers in memory of graduates or newspapermen. Such financial aids are always of benefit to deserving and needy students.

**Seventh:** Award prizes for outstanding stories in and top performance on campus newspapers in institutions where professional schools of journalism are located.

Up to this point I have not mentioned the matter of Associate Units of the Guild. I approach this highly controversial subject with some trepidation, I must confess, but I cannot dodge it and do not intend to. I am a middle-of-the-roader on this question. I have listened to arguments by and have received many letters from extremists on both sides. I have spent many hours discussing it quietly with other middle-of-the-roaders who are teaching journalism. I served as moderator on a panel on the question last September in Boulder.

As an educator with what I think is an objective point of view, I recommend that the Guild abandon its program to establish Associate Units on college and university campuses. I make this recommendation after considerable study.

Before I cite the reasons why, in my opinion, the Guild should change its policy on this point, let me say that I do not question the right of the Guild to organize such units, providing the rules and regulations governing student or-

ganizations on individual campuses are observed, nor do I question the right of a student to join a unit.

What I question is the wisdom of exercising these rights.

Why do I recommend that the Associate Unit plan be dropped?

First and realistically, because it has not proved successful. Associate Guild Units do not exist in many of the major institutions. On the few campuses where units have been formed, only a handful of members have retained their interest and their membership. I make this generalization on the basis of correspondence with a number of directors, some of whom are favorably disposed toward the idea.

But let me be specific about the one campus which I know firsthand. At the Ohio State University, in 1947-1948, seventeen students out of an enrollment of 197 juniors, seniors, and graduate students, joined the Unit. They were enthusiastic. This past year, two students out of a professional enrollment of 212, retained their membership. And these two were graduated early this month. Is a membership of one per cent of the student body—or even nine per cent—sufficient justification to continue the movement? Remember, this happened in an institution which officially recognized the organization and did nothing to deter students from joining.

The argument that formation of the Associate Units was necessary to present information about the Guild to students is, in my opinion, faulty. Actually, as I pointed out earlier, information about the Guild is presented objectively, in most instances, to the students by their instructors in any number of journalism classes. Schools of journalism that I have visited subscribe to the *Guild Reporter*, as they do to *Editor & Publisher*, and the publication is on open shelves for all who care to read.

The founding of the Associate Units has, in some cases of which I have firsthand knowledge, worked to the detriment of not only the Associate members of the Guild, but all graduates of those schools where Associate Units have been established. The boycotting of the entire graduating class of a school because one per cent or nine per cent—or any per cent—of its student body holds Guild membership is neither intelligent nor defensible, but such has been threatened. Whether the threat has been or will be carried into execution, I do not know.

But I do know, on testimony from journalism school heads from coast to coast, that journalism graduates encounter a strong feeling against the Guild in medium-sized and small-city newspapers.

One director, writing to me, said, "It seems to me that one of the first things the Guild could do . . . is to recognize our teaching problem in all its aspects, including placement. We ought to give the Guild its due, but we have to live with prospective employers who are not sold on the Guild as well as with some who are. And for the most part, beginners have to break in on the former papers."

That, to me, is stating the problem of the professional journalism educators realistically and not unfairly.

Another journalism professor, sympathetic to the Guild and an adviser to an Associate Unit, wrote:

"It's being proved right along that using Schools of Jour-

nalism simply as recruiting grounds isn't fair either to the Schools or to students." He went on to say, ". . . they (the students) were up against the reality that the men who were in a position to give them jobs didn't approve of students who joined the Guild before they had jobs. You can't blame a student for putting his desire to eat ahead of any abstract conviction. And most journalism graduates start on small-town or non-Guild papers. So associate memberships at Ohio State dropped from an enthusiastic seventeen in 1948 to an unenthusiastic two in 1949."

Another quote. This from a professor who is a member of the Guild each summer but who withdraws from membership when he returns to the classroom. He sincerely attempts to maintain an objective attitude as a teacher. He suggested that I ask the Guild—and I quote—" . . . what advantage a student can have in joining the Guild on campus that will outweigh the boycott he may face when he seeks his first job. Pro-Guild as I am," he stated, "I fail to see any."

A director writes, "For many a student, a junior Guild membership is the surest guarantee that he will not get a job."

The head of still another school says, " . . . it should be stated bluntly that on several campuses the Guild Associate Units are harmful to students in that the presence of the chapter causes some publishers (rightly or wrongly) to boycott the graduates of the particular institution."

This is plain talk. But it is a cross-section of the opinions of journalism educators.

In conclusion, I think that the American Newspaper Guild, or a similar organization providing collective bargaining for editorial employees, undoubtedly is here to stay. Its growth in sixteen years to a membership of twenty-five thousand indicates that. For better or for worse you play a significant role in the contemporary scene of American journalism.

Professional education for journalism is also here to stay. In forty-one years it has made notable advances, not the least of which has been its recent accreditation program through which prospective students, newspaper editors, college and university presidents and administrators, and counselors of high school and college students may learn which professional schools have the stamp of approval of the educators and the industry.

The American press is unique. Despite its weaknesses, it is of unequaled excellence in the world today. The interests of Guild members and journalism teachers in further improving the press are inextricably interwoven. The character of a profession is a composite of the character of its ethical and technical performance. You in your way and we in ours are constantly striving to improve that performance. In my opinion—and I can understand exactly why other matters have taken precedence—the Guild has not sufficiently stressed the need for education and for broad training for those entering newspaper work.

Individuals, more than ever before in world history, have a right to demand objective, unbiased, and intelligent reporting of today's events. I commend any co-operation which the Guild and the educators may evolve which will speed us on our way toward that goal.

# BLESSED ARE THE MEEK: A Country Editor Gives His Code

by Donald A. Norberg

*Donald A. Norberg, editor of the Albian (Iowa) newspapers, wrote an editorial in a country weekly that received national attention when reprinted in the Christian Century. He was invited to address one of the Sunday vespers at the University of Iowa. He discussed "Religion and the Press." This is from that talk.*

Being the editor of a weekly newspaper in Iowa is a privilege. I wouldn't trade jobs with Henry Luce of Life and Time or with Gardner Cowles of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

But I know, as you know, that every privilege carries a corresponding responsibility.

There are, in Iowa, 400 weekly newspapers.

There are 40 daily newspapers.

About the dailies I know little, and I shall not pretend to give advice to the Daily Iowan . . . the Press-Citizen . . . the Register and Tribune and the other 36.

But . . . mind you . . . for every big and little daily newspaper there are 10 big and little community newspapers.

Even in literate Iowa not all families read daily newspapers. Some of those who do probably read the Chicago Tribune which I would prefer NOT to include in these rather broad statistics.

However . . . you'll find comparatively few homes in rural Iowa that are not reached . . . one way or another . . . by their community newspapers.

\* \* \*

Not long ago we had sales people going door to door selling the newspapers I love best. In one of our towns a salesman stopped at the first of six houses on a block. The folks were Monroe County News subscribers. In the next house he found the family there also read the News . . . after borrowing it from the neighbor. He moved on down the block . . . and met the same answer at each door.

Six families each week were reading the same copy of the Monroe County News.

Whether the sixth family received the News six days late the salesman didn't learn . . . and perhaps it is just as well. He might have been told that being six days behind time wasn't abnormal for the Monroe County News.

\* \* \*

That duplicate reading situation exists for many community newspapers. In the case of the News we prefer to think that Monroe county families just can't get along without it.

But it could mean they can get along without it just dandy if they have to pay for it.

\* \* \*

What I'm getting at is that weekly newspapers can wield a tremendous influence in the Democracy because they reach so many homes and are read by the page rather than by the department.

And it is my belief that the influence our weekly newspapers wield now . . . AND WILL HAVE IN THE YEARS AHEAD . . . is measured by the SPIRIT IN WHICH THEY ARE WRITTEN.

I believe it must be a Christian spirit.

I would recommend, to weekly newspaper writers everywhere, two teachings of the Gentle Jesus:

First—Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

Second—Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

\* \* \*

There is a difference . . . a great difference . . . between meekness and timidity.

Meekness does not call for the sacrifice of courage.

Many times men and women . . . with the kind of intentions allegedly used for paving the path to hell . . . say they envy me.

They say that if they were the newspaper editor fur would fly and certain individuals and groups would certainly be told what is what.

I like to tell these men and women about an editor who keeps on his desk a little rock. He calls it the first stone.

Each time he starts to write in bitterness . . . in anger . . . in hatred . . . or in selfish interest . . . he picks up the first stone.

He can't throw it. He must be a wonderful editor.

There are many courageous editors and publishers in Iowa who have this good and great quality of humility.

One is the lovable Kenneth Baldridge of Bloomfield.

Another is George Ver Steeg of Pella, who not only writes the good life . . . but lives it.

Still another is the aggressive and able Carl Hamilton of Iowa Falls. And there are many more.

But there are timid editors and publishers in Iowa, too.

One mark of a timid newspaper is the absence of an editorial page.

A newspaper which has no editorial page is like a man who doesn't feel the hair curl on the back of his neck when he takes into his own the soft, warm, trusting hand of a little child. . . .

A newspaper which has no editorial page is like a college boy who never wants to kiss a pretty girl . . . is like a woman who buys the first hat she tries on her head . . . is like a boy who doesn't want to become a railroad engineer, a fireman, a policeman, pilot, cowboy or racing car driver.

A newspaper with no editorial page has only synthetic circulation . . . because it has no blood, and no heart.

\* \* \*

The newspapers of the meek are not bound by custom and tradition, but the newspapers of the timid are.

It may be necessary for our metropolitan newspapers to maintain . . . or try to maintain . . . the idea of simple observation and neutrality. I don't know about that.

But I do know that about community newspapers . . . they can be no more neutral than can a mother in comparing her own with the children of the neighbors.

**COMMUNITY NEWSPAPERS CANNOT JUST OBSERVE,** and report on, THE PARADE OF HUMANITY. They've got to march in it.

And if the Christian spirit is in them, THEY'LL LEAD THE PARADE or at least guide it to a better place in the sun.

\* \* \*

The meek are the marchers . . . the builders.

The timid . . . the selfish . . . the lazy are destroyers. Because they seek only to hold tight to WHAT CAN BE in a world given a blueprint by Jesus Christ.

And BLESSED, then, ARE THE PEACEMAKERS: FOR THEY SHALL BE CALLED THE CHILDREN OF GOD.

Peace is not just the absence of war.

Peace is positive.

Peace is many things.

It is understanding and trust between neighbors and nations. It is the free flow of goods and ideas and ideals among men. Peace, fundamentally, is the simple Christian philosophy of the BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.

I think Peace in all its phases should be the primary objective of the community newspaper . . .

Because the community is the starting place for a peaceful world.

\* \* \*

Although they start from different spots and travel different routes, Mike Cowles of the Des Moines Register and Henry Wallace of the Progressive Party reach a common conclusion.

Both say this is the century of the common man.

Mr. Cowles contends that because it is his century, the common man must do something for the world.

Mr. Wallace contends the world must do something for the common man.

You will realize, of course, that I have boiled their philosophies down to a point of possible misinterpretation in order to reach my own—but I think Mr. Cowles and Mr. Wallace are both right.

Our task . . . then . . . is to guide the common man—who is you, who is me, who is all the folks we know . . . into a greater understanding of his responsibilities as expressed by Mr. Cowles and of his privileges as expressed by Mr. Wallace.

What better avenue is there . . . for this great educational job . . . than an informed and informative community press?

Particularly if it is a Christian press . . . that tackles the job with energy . . . with honesty . . . with humility . . . and with faith.

\* \* \*

There are many things to be done in this CENTURY OF THE COMMON MAN . . . and what is so truly wonderful about life is this:

We're doing them.

Let me give just a couple of examples:

One day I stood at the rail of a ship in a Japanese harbor. Out in the water, in little boats, were aged Japanese men and women. They were searching for garbage . . . for bits of cloth . . . for slivers of soap discarded by American sailors. They were after food, clothing and cleanliness . . . and for them they had to take what others had cast aside.

A boy, not more than 18, moved to the rail beside me. He watched. Then he turned suddenly to me and asked: "Is this why we fought the war, Mac?" There were tears in his eyes.

\* \* \*

I said I didn't know, for sure.

"I guess" . . . I said to the little sailor . . . "it is up to you and me—what we fought it for."

As he walked away he said only, "Okay, Mac."

Because he cried . . . a little . . . as he saw how degrading and dirty and merciless war can be . . . I believe with all my heart that sailor today is among the common men who understand responsibility in the march for peace among common men.

I think when he prays 'give us this day our daily bread' he puts emphasis on those plural pronouns. I think he understands, too, the responsibilities of production and distribution attached to the privilege of consumption.

The Monroe County News and I have to believe in that boy . . . and in the boys all over this nation who wondered, as did he, if we fought the war to destroy the dignity of man.

Without that faith the Monroe County News and I are lost . . . and without it you are lost, too.

\* \* \*

The appreciation of human dignity is a primary step in the achievement of PEACE THROUGH THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.

Perhaps the greatest thrill I've had as a newspaper writer came just the other day when I did a story about a girl in our town.

She had been awarded a School of Nursing Scholarship by the Iowa division of the American Cancer Society.

I have known this girl through the three years I have been in Albia as a friendly, smiling youngster . . . a good scholar, a capable executive in school organizations . . . and I've known her as a member of a family with income well under a thousand dollars a year.

It was fun . . . writing that story and the lines to go into the newspaper with her picture.

It represented another interpretation of the great American Dream that it isn't who you are . . . BUT WHAT YOU DO . . . that counts.

Soon after that edition of the Monroe County News hit the street the telephone on my desk rang.

"I have just read the story about the girl given the Cancer Society Scholarship," a woman's voice said.

"Yes?" . . . I questioned.

"The newspaper didn't identify her as a Negro girl," the voice continued.

I explained that the girl didn't receive the recognition because of the color of her skin . . . but rather because of her heart, and her mind . . . and her will for service.

I explained that in the Monroe County News men and women and boys and girls are American . . . that we draw no artificial lines between them.

The voice interrupted my speech to say that I needn't get huffy about it.

She had phoned, the woman said, simply to say that it was the most significant signpost on the route to the brotherhood of man she had seen in a newspaper in a long, long time.

Her call was first of several in the same vein.

Gee, but I'm proud to be the newspaper editor in that kind of community.

# THE STORY BEHIND THE STORY

*For two years a unique series of weekly critiques of the New York press has been broadcast Saturday evenings over CBS by Don Hollenbeck under the title, "CBS Views the Press." This has become the most consistently realistic and reasonable review of the service of daily newspapers done anywhere, but as radio sound is even more perishable than newsprint, it has left no published record. Three instances here are lifted from broadcasts of the past Summer.*

## How the Times Got Its Scoop on the Bones of St. Peter

Readers of the New York *Times* got quite a story for their three cents the other morning: Camille Cianfarras dispatch from Rome which said that the bones of Saint Peter are understood to have been found less than twenty feet below the pavement of the Saint's basilica in the Vatican. Now there is nothing official about this, in fact as is usual in a story of this kind, you can't quote anybody directly, or depend on anyone publicly to back up a statement you've made, even if you know it's true beyond the seasonable shadow of a doubt. As Cianfarras story pointed out in the second paragraph, Vatican archaeologists who made the discovery of the remains of the founder of the church have taken an oath of secrecy, and are forbidden to confirm or deny it. But Cianfarras story was written with what seemed to be so much corroborative detail, complete with diagrams and sketches, that even allowing for the official silence about it, it seemed to us worthy of singling out as an outstanding job by a reporter; the apparent uncovering of a secret which has been closely guarded for two years.

Let's see how Camille Cianfarras managed to get it out of the Vatican and into the New York *Times*. A word or two about the reporter himself might be in order here: he is 41 years old, Rome correspondent for the *Times*, and has been there off and on since 1935. He is a native of Long Island City, and began his news career with the United Press in New York. For that agency, he went to London, then went to work in Rome for the *Times* in 1935. He was arrested at the outset of war, along with other American correspondents in Italy, but was repatriated in 1942. Returned to this country, he was sent to Mexico City by the *Times*, and three years ago, went back to Rome. He's now in this country on vacation, and he's told CBS some of the background to his latest exploit. Cianfarras says he got started on it when he got a query from Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the *Times*; Markel wanted to know if there might be a magazine story in the excavations which were being made in the Vatican grottos. That was two and a half months ago, and there's a coincidence here: it was about that time that Barrett McGurn of the *Herald Tribune*'s Rome bureau had sent a dispatch to his newspaper in which he quoted an authorized spokesman for the Vatican as saying that ten years of digging beneath the Basilica of St. Peter had demonstrated that the Saint was buried there.

McGurn's story was based on an article in a Vatican publication, and one sentence in that story was significant. It said, "The article did not say whether actual bones of St. Peter or his tomb had been found, but it said evidence was discovered that several altars have stood during the centuries at the spot under the dome of St. Peter's which long has been thought to have been the site of the tomb." There was the hint of the story, and on the basis of Editor Markel's

query, Cianfarras took it from there. He went to the Vatican, and began asking questions. He says he was met with such coolness, such strenuous urging to wait until an official announcement could be made on the subject, that his interest and reportorial skill were challenged. He then tried to get the leading Vatican archaeologist to write a magazine article for the *Times*, but his invitations were sidetracked, and he soon learned that the archaeologists were under oath not to talk or write about the operations or anything that had been unearthed. Then, as Cianfarras tells it, "I just sat around a few nights trying to figure out what it was all about. I tried to think of something that might give me a hint. Then, one evening, I recalled something the Pope had said in an address to some students. It meant absolutely nothing to me at the time, but I remembered a reference to St. Peter's tomb. I went and looked it up, and found that the Pope had said, 'Under the central point of the gigantic dome was and is the place of St. Peter's grave.' That seemed enough to Cianfarras to give him the basis of his story, and from then on, it was a five weeks job of asking more and more questions, of checking with friends and news sources in the Vatican before he felt he had enough circumstantial evidence with which to sit down and write a story.

He also did some extensive investigation and question-asking in order to make rough drafts of the sketches and diagrams which accompanied that story in the *Times*. But we had noted a curious thing about that story: although it appeared in the issue of August 22nd, it carried a date-line of August 7th—quite a lag in these days of rapid communication, and an especially notable lag for a story of such magnitude. Could Cianfarras have put it on a slow boat? Could it have got mislaid around the *Times* office? Neither possibility seemed likely, and Cianfarras cleared up the discrepancy for us. He said he had airmailed it from Rome on Aug. 6th, the day before he sailed for home. He hadn't cabled it, he said, because he was so satisfied that he had it exclusively that he could safely airmail it and save some expensive cable tolls. It arrived all right, but he says the *Times* editors had held up publication because it was over-long as he had written it at first, that it was the sort of story they wanted to have reworked and revised, also that they wanted the reporter on hand to check closely with the artists who would prepare the final sketches and diagrams from his rough drafts. With all the checking and rewriting and drawing done, they got it into the paper, and few stories recently have caused so much comment and interest—except in the newspaper business. Cianfarras said officials described the discovery as one of the most important contributions yet made to the history of the origins of Christianity in the west. They said, he wrote, that it confirmed legends and

traditions reported by historians during the past 1,800 years. And as if to clinch its first story, the **Times** next day carried a brief dispatch from Rome giving Vatican reactions—it said the secret had been so closely guarded that the news came as a complete surprise to most persons inside the Vatican. It was thought the news was to have been saved for the inauguration of Holy Year, which begins on Christmas Eve, but now that the story had been published by the **Times**, the official announcement might be made earlier. So we may be learning officially soon the extent to which the New York **Times** is right or wrong in this story which Camille Cianfarra dug out after weeks of work and in the face of official silence.

So much for the **Times**—how did the rest of the newspapers handle it? In journalism, you can do one of a number of things about a story on which you've been scooped—you can ignore it, or you can jump right in and make it just as much yours as it is your competitor's—a little behind, maybe, but you can catch up. Or you can try to knock the story down, discredit it, although this isn't general journalistic practice; mainly, an editor looks the other way when his rivals hit a jackpot. This is especially true in the case of a story of the sort under discussion. The only New York newspapers who keep men of their own in Rome are the **Times** and the **Herald Tribune**; the rest of them depend upon the news agencies for coverage, so in this case it depended on how the news agencies picked up the story. And at first, they did it in a way that tended to discredit the **Times** story; an Associated Press squib on the day the story appeared ran this way, as we saw it printed in the **Sun**: "Published reports that the bones of St. Peter have been found in a forgotten grave under St. Peter's Basilica were described as fantasy by a Vatican source today. The church informant denied the reports which have cropped up from time to time recently in the Italian press and abroad. The reports had said the bones were dug up twenty feet under the Basilica's main altar, and are being guarded in the study of Pope Pius XII." That's all—exactly 76 words to brush off a story which, if it is substantiated officially, will turn out to be one of the great stories of this or any other century. There's that hurdle of official substantiation to get over, of course, but there have been plenty of stories out of the Vatican in recent months to suggest to a wide-awake editor that something big might be developing—as long ago as last January there had been indications of it; there was that Vatican publication article upon which the **Herald Tribune** account had been based last June. Incidentally, the **Herald Tribune** was made to look particularly laggardly by the publication of Cianfarra's article, even though weeks before it had had the tiniest nibble at the bigger news. On the day before Cianfarra's article was printed, an obscure little item in the Sunday **Tribune** said that a collection of nearly 2,000 coins, some of them seven centuries old, had been gathered in the grotto of the Basilica of St. Peter's where the Apostle is believed to have been buried. This too was an Associated Press dispatch, and from its wording was based on an official handout by the Vatican news office.

The Associated Press, which had fumbled the story Monday with its brief denial, made up for its error on Thursday evening by filing almost an eight-hundred word resume of the **Times** story and the latest word from Vatican City. This Associated Press story was lavish with credits for the New York **Times**—on six different occasions it quoted Cianfarra's story, and this perhaps was the reason editors of Friday morning papers still paid no attention to it. But the AP was

crowding the story by now; it got still more new developments—the Vatican Radio had urged the faithful to await a great revelation concerning the tomb of St. Peter.

This time it was different: the afternoon newspapers went for it, page one of the **Telegram**, the **Sun** and the **Journal-American**, page five of the **Post**. But only the editors of the **Post** did not edit out of the dispatch the credit the Associated Press had given the New York **Times**. There seems still to prevail a sort of horror about mentioning a rival newspaper. So it took five days before the other New York papers recognized that the **Times** might have had something—a recognition they might have given on Monday, and we could have picked up our evening papers and read in effect, "We see by the **Times** this morning," and so on. But that's really too much to expect.

## Purple Is Hard On the Eyes

Wanted: a new vocabulary for crime stories. We make this forlorn and undoubtedly hopeless plea after having gone through some of the newspaper accounts of the shooting in Hollywood—the cafe ambushing of an underworld character named Mickey Cohen and three other persons, one of them a law enforcement agent assigned to protect Cohen from just such an attack. Los Angeles has been going through quite a civic scandal involving possible police connections with the underworld, and the shooting punctuated that scandal with a pretty violent exclamation mark. New York newspaper readers got the story in various ways and with various accents.

But it remained for Thursday morning's **Daily News** and **Mirror** to slam the shooting story with everything they had in the way of type, ink and adjectives. The **Mirror** gave it all of page three, and the **News** did nearly as well, although managing to squeeze in a local political story. Both the **News** and **Mirror** had some extra special help in their accounts: in the **Mirror**, Lee Mortimer, night club editor, wrote an interpretive article. With his apparent close knowledge of what goes on in the underworld, Mortimer wrote that the shooting could be attributed to the fact that Cohen had tried to declare his independence of the international crime and vice syndicate operated from Italy by Lucky Luciano, through Frank Costello, Joe Adonis and the Fischetti and Capone brothers. In a story of this kind, the thing is to get in as many names as you can—nobody can ever prove you were wrong, anyway, and it makes a lot more thrilling reading. In the last paragraph of the **Mirror's** main story, we came across an intriguing bit: a shotgun slug had gone astray, and that one, the **Mirror** said, was believed to have entered the restaurant and caromed around the room, brushing the legs of a Hollywood columnist. Well, there seemed an opportunity to get in a prominent name—Hollywood columnists are pretty well known persons. It turns out to have been none other than Florabel Muir, buxom, red-headed veteran **News** reporter who has spent recent years in Hollywood doing special assignments for the paper—she's not exactly a Hollywood columnist in the sense that Louella Parsons and Hedda Hopper are, but since it was Florabel Muir, the reason for her name having been omitted in the **Mirror** became plain. The **Mirror** carries its rivalry with the **News** to the extent that it declines to list the latter's television programs, even though some plaintive **Mirror** readers have been heard to ask if this isn't carrying things a bit too far. But to return to our subject: Florabel Muir of the **Daily News** and her part in

the shooting. "Our Miss Muir, the **News** headline said, "was on the spot." And under that, our Miss Muir explains that it was only because she had stopped to buy a newspaper that she wasn't in the hospital or the morgue—she had started to leave the restaurant with the Cohen party.

Whatever detained Miss Muir, she did get downstairs in time to be nicked in the hip by a ricocheting shot, although it wasn't enough to prevent her going after her story—she writes that she ran outside to see if they had got Mickey, and then she attributes to the felled gambler a remark which, to borrow a phrase from the **New Yorker**, we doubt ever got made. "He called to me," Miss Muir wrote, "that he had been shot as he stepped into an automobile driven by one of his henchmen, Frank Nicoli."

Miss Muir explained her presence on the scene by saying that she had been trailing Cohen for weeks, expecting him to be shot any night.

But we began all this with a plea for a new vocabulary in crime stories, and that's where the word henchmen comes in. It must have been used fifty times to describe the employees, associates, or whatever they are, of the wounded gambler, and since gamblers are always going to have these people about them, we submit it is high time another title be given them. What it would be, we wouldn't know, but leave it to the ingenuity of American journalism to figure out. Somehow, though, when a story of this sort comes along, it brings out all the overworked, out-dated, side-of-the-mouth jargon of the trade, and we submit a couple of samples as evidence. In the **News**, this: "Gangland put the finger on Mickey Cohen, a mobster who sang, in a burst of gunfire today. . . . The shooting took place in front of Sherry's, a swank filmland restaurant." In the **Mirror**, this: "Mickey Cohen, mob kingpin of the movie capital—(spelled with an o in the **Mirror**) and successor to the late 'Bugsy' Siegel, was wounded with three companions . . ." and so on. These are press association stories, to be sure, but copy boys have for a long time been sharpening pencils for copy readers who then use them to excise the purple patches—or should do so if they are capable practitioners of their art. But somehow, the purple persists: Cohen's home is a palatial residence, he has a sleek, dark sedan, his haberdashery shop on Sunset Blvd., is as swank as Sherry's Cafe, he is a gambling czar, a kingpin, he is a dapper, and finally, he is mowed down as gangland blazes while it puts the finger on him in a burst of gunfire.

## The Press and the Robeson Riot

In considering the press' treatment of last Saturday night's big story—the rioting at Peekskill in which nine people were hurt and which broke up a scheduled concert by Paul Robeson—we must widen our sights and include in the discussion the out-of-town press. We must also consider the power of publicity, and in this case of publicity which began the series of events which were climaxed last Saturday night. In New York City, we are sometimes inclined to overlook the very real power of the press; in fact, in New York and other great cities, the press by no means possesses the influence it does in smaller communities. The big papers may exhort, bemoan, praise or belabor; they may or may not get something accomplished. But when a smaller journal in a more closely-knit community goes after something, things are bound to happen. What happened at Peekskill Saturday night may be traced pretty directly to the power of publicity, and the in-

fluence of a community newspaper. Five days before Robeson's scheduled concert, the Peekskill **Evening Star** published a front page story about it, pointing out that the concert was to be sponsored by People's Artists, Inc. an organization tagged as subversive by the California Committee on un-American Activities, and said the concert was in aid of the Harlem Chapter of Civil Rights Congress, which has also been labeled subversive by the former Attorney General Tom Clark. The story went into detail about Robeson's pro-Communist sympathies and activities, and in that same issue of Tuesday, August 23rd, there was an editorial, and a letter to the editor. The editorial deplored Robeson's political opinions, and said that every ticket purchased for the concert would drop nickels and dimes into the till of an un-American political organization. It concluded with these words: "The time for tolerant silence that signifies approval is running out. Peekskill wants no rallies that support iron curtains, concentration camps, blockades and NKVDs, no matter how masterful the decor, nor how sweet the music."

The letter to the editor was signed by Vincent Boyle, and one paragraph in it pointed out that some years ago, the Ku Klux Klan appeared in the nearby community of Verplanck and received their just reward. The writer referred to a beating that had been given the kluxers by the local residents, after which they let the community strictly alone. And his letter went on, "I am not intimating violence in this case, but I believe we should strive to find a remedy that will cope with the situation so that they will never reappear in this area." Next day, the **Star** carried on: reported criticism of the concert by the Peekskill Chamber of Commerce, but said that legally, the concert could not be halted. The Town of Cortlandt, within whose limits it was scheduled, does not require the issuance of a permit for a public gathering, the paper said, and if the audience at such a meeting conducts itself in a peaceful manner, and does not cause a disturbance, the meeting could not be prevented. At the same time, the **Star** announced that a meeting of veterans' organizations had been called, and that Victor Sharro, a labor party official had appealed to Attorney General Nathaniel Goldstein as saying that the **Star** had published an article and an editorial which Sharro contended advocated that citizens "do something to see to it that this affair is disrupted or to see that it is not carried out in a peaceful manner." Parenthetically, the **Star** commented that it had merely revealed the nature of the organizations sponsoring the concert, and that they would benefit by the ticket sales. On Thursday, the **Star** reported that angry veterans had made plans to stage a protest parade near the concert scene, also that there had been other requests to state and county officials pointing out the possibility of violence. By Friday, the **Star** was trying to calm things down a little: in a front page editorial it said, "At no time, either in its news columns or editorially, has the **Evening Star** ever advocated 'violence' as a means of disrupting this or any other kind of program. We did state, however, and do here reaffirm, our conviction that the time for tolerant silence that signifies approval has run out, and that it is high time to speak forth." The **Star** commended the veterans' groups on their plans for a peaceful protest, and it urged citizens of the community to do their part by staying away from the concert. In the same issue, the **Star** printed letters to the editor in support of the concert, one of them from Vincent Sharro of the labor party asking that the **Star**, since it had created so much publicity about the concert, state unequivocally its opposition to any form of organized or un-

organized action that would create or tend to create an incident of any kind. An editor's note appended to the letter pointed out that the **Star's** page one editorial of that date covered this point. Donald Ikeler, general manager of the **Star**, amplified this for CBS: he said that in using the phrase, "The time for tolerant silence that signifies approval is running out," the newspaper had intended only to suggest that people speak out against the concert, that peaceful picketing or a boycott of it would be effective. Saturday's **Star** estimated that upwards of 5,000 people would jam the line of march for the protest, that probably not more than 2,000 would attend the concert itself, that there would be no extra details of state police on hand. It also quoted the opinion of a Peekskill attorney that so long as ticket holders were not prevented from entering the concert grounds, the protest meeting was entirely legal. But the momentum had been gained; the words violence, anger, disturbance, and so on had been used so often that the stage had been set for the trouble which resulted.

Now to the treatment of the story by the New York Metropolitan press. Peekskill correspondents of the big newspapers handled the job, and in a riotous situation, they did an extremely good job, so far as reporting as well as they could what went on. There were some of the usual conflicting figures, but on the whole, a satisfactory job was turned in. The United Press was ahead of almost everybody with its account, furnished to them by the news staff of station WLNA, including News Editor Ray LaPolla, Francis Lough and two other staff members who were on the scene from the beginning; LaPolla recruited four other volunteers to help in the coverage of what one WLNA news broadcast called one of the biggest stories ever to develop in the Peekskill area. By Monday, the New York newspapers had begun to print editorials on the affair, and some of them provided food for thought. The **Mirror**, for instance, which said, "War veterans demonstrating against Robeson clashed with his supporters Saturday. That is too bad. Riots are ugly things. But Robeson has been asking for it."

The **News** took pretty much the same point of view when it said, "Most Americans, especially young veterans who recently fought to save their country, are not much impressed by fine legal distinctions. Their tendency is to go in for some direct and hardboiled action when they run afoul of people whom they know to be bent on overturning our Government and making slaves of us all." Again, the **News** says, "these riots were deplorable. But as long as the domestic Reds and their cronies have this double standing before the law, we think these riots are going to occur from time to time."

Very much in contrast to these points of view is that taken by the New York **Times**, which pulled no punches Monday morning. It asked what Paul Robeson's political ideas, however misguided, have to do with the right to sing. Or, said the **Times**, if a man can be enjoined from singing in public in this free country because his opinions are wrong and illogical, shall the injunction be enforced by mob action? "We think," the **Times** said, "these questions answer themselves. Lamenting the twisted thinking that is ruining Paul Robeson's great career, we defend his right to carry his art to whatever peaceably assembled groups of people he wishes. That is the American way."

Some of the other editorial comment was less forthright than this of the **Times**, or of the **News** and **Mirror**, which al-

most seemed to condone the violence. The **Sun** found that it was perhaps not altogether surprising that emotions boiled over at Peekskill, although it deplored the rioting and pointed out that it had simply provided the Communists with an opportunity to pose as martyrs and to intensify their diatribes against America, citing the rioting as an example of an American attitude which proclaims liberty for all but makes distinctions in granting it. This point of view was also expressed by the **Herald Tribune**, although it said that whether there was any provocation to violence beyond the concert itself, is not known. **Time** magazine described the affair as an example of misguided patriotism and senseless hooliganism more useful to Communist propaganda than a dozen uninterrupted song recitals by Paul Robeson. The **Post Home News** and the **Compass** were the most indignant over the incident, the **Post** professed to see the Ku Klux Klan in the background, and there were a number of stories about a cross having been burned, although it hasn't been possible to confirm this. Editor Ten Thackrey of the **Compass** wrote Tuesday's story himself, and began it as follows: "The budding storm-troopers of Peekskill and surrounding Westchester County, under the benevolent protection of county and state officers, staged a Munich-style putsch at Lakeland Acres Saturday night, complete with such native American-Fascist touches as blazing Ku Klux Klan crosses."

Accompanying this inflammatory story is a gruesome picture of an unidentified woman with a black eye, described in the caption as having suffered the injury at the hands of hoodlums at the concert. Perhaps the most frightening pictorial job was done by the **Daily News**: Monday morning's page one was given over to a very uncomplimentary photograph of Paul Robeson at a news conference by Walter Kel勒—a photograph which portrayed Robeson as anything but one of the greatest singers of our time—it made him rather an ogre. The **News**, though, seemed to think so highly of it that it reprinted it next day in smaller size as an illustration in that editorial which looked with understanding on the tendency of Americans to go in for some direct and hardboiled action when they run afoul of people whom—that's the word the **News** used—whom they know to be bent on overturning our Government and making slaves of us all. In the follow-up stories, there were some interesting points too. The **World-Telegram** quoted Donald Ikeler of the Peekskill **Star** as saying that there would have been no rioting if it hadn't been for the stabbing of one of the veterans, but that doesn't square with what reporters on the scene say, nor did Ikeler's own paper tell that story in its account of the rioting. A number of reporters interviewed by CBS agreed that sometime before the stabbing, there had been a number of violent encounters. You can report a story of this sort from any point of view you like—that's pretty well illustrated in two contrasting cases, the **World-Telegram** and the **Compass**.

The **Telegram** has concentrated on getting its stories from anti-Robeson sources, the **Compass** has gone to the other extreme, even to the point of helping to maintain a scare atmosphere: reporting that residents of the neighborhood are closing up their homes and leaving because they are afraid of what might happen to them. The observation has been made that reporting of stories of this sort tends to subjectivity—that the reporter's own emotions and opinions become involved, or rather, in many cases, the emotions and opinions of his newspaper become involved, and he gets the story he is sent to get.

# THE CHARACTER OF THE NEWSPAPER JOB

by Louis M. Lyons

*The merger this Summer of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, the American Society of Journalism School Administrators and the Association of Accredited Schools and Departments of Journalism, with their hundreds of members, is an impressive milestone in the development of education for newspaper work. This is now an accepted function of some seventy colleges and universities, and accepted also by the newspapers, whose "accrediting" of schools and departments of Journalism is important to the annual crop of 5,000 journalism graduates. At the University of Minnesota, where the journalism teachers held their convention this Summer, the program dealt with preparation for journalism. This article is from one of the talks.*

My only qualification to consider the education of newspapermen is that I was one for 25 years and never anything else. I was happy in that job and wouldn't have swapped my luck for any other. I knew better talk in a newspaper shop than even in a university. And nowhere is there finer fellowship. I have always believed the newspaper job one of the finest tickets life offers. I don't pretend to know the mysteries of the various ways that journalism schools prepare people for newspaper work. It would be a waste of time if I undertook to discuss them. I am not going to. But I want to stick my neck out and discuss the men for the newspaper job.

I say they must be the best. No others will do. Newspapers are now paying enough to attract and hold some of the best as their earlier pay scales often could not do. They have the Guild to thank largely for that and though no paeans of gratitude are heard from the publishers, their successors will realize the boon to their business. I don't mean to peg my standards to pay scales. You don't want the fellow who is attracted only by the pay. But a certain minimum standard of living is essential to the man who would hold his head up among his neighbors and educate his children and take part in his community. Even the most dedicated man should not have to spend his life resisting pressures to lure him into public relations or advertising so that he can support his family.

But pay alone isn't enough to attract and hold the best men. The job must have in it those satisfactions in workmanship that will let an able man fulfill his own capacities, and that standard of integrity that holds the respect of his neighbors; in short, professional standards.

Now a great deal of nonsense is talked about professions. The tendency is, once a vocation gets into a college curriculum, to begin calling it a profession. It is easy to prove that newspaper work is not a profession. And it is not, I think, easy to show that it is. But it is vital that it become a profession if it is not; that the people in it act as if it were and be the kind of people who can and will act so. Indeed that is the great issue, I believe, and the great struggle facing newspapermen. It is vital that newspapers be run by professional standards. This is not easy to bring off. The very terms of employment are against it. To start with, you have the professional corps controlled by a business. The business man, the publisher, hires the newspaperman. That is not the normal condition of a profes-

sion. The newspaperman is not a free agent as the doctor or lawyer or accountant is, to select his clients and enter into direct professional relations with those he serves. Yet the newspaperman must surmount this condition of his employment and serve his readers with the same professional concern for their interest as the doctor or lawyer. Else he has no professional standard. There is no other that will do. On whosever payroll he works, he must recognize the interest of his reader as the sole concern to serve. On that he must be uncompromising or he has nothing to stand on. By serving the interest of the reader, I mean simply, as respects news, that he be given the facts straight and uncolored and adequately; and, as respects editorials, that they be presented with the kind of integrity that considers solely the interests of the community.

I don't mean that newspapermen should be talking about professional standards all the time. Nobody but an intolerable prig would do that. And the newspaperman does not have to. He has always the concrete case—the story—and the issue is whether it goes into the paper straight and is played solely in proportion to its importance to the reader.

Carr Van Anda, the great managing editor of the *Times* under Ochs, used to say, "The reader is entitled to it." He said it when he was demanding the fullest detail on every story and even paying premiums for any additional detail worth a paragraph. He said it when he was bombarding the offices of a steamship line that was trying to withhold facts or passenger lists of a great disaster at sea.

And the present manager of the *Times*, Arthur H. Sulzberger, has been saying:

"On the structure of press freedom there must be imposed the responsibility of the press. The community has the right—and indeed the duty—to insist on such responsibility. It has a right to demand certain standards. What appears in the news columns of a newspaper is a matter of legitimate public concern. The news lies, in a sense, in the public domain, and we are the trustees of a great national interest."

Mr. Sulzberger, a publisher, is setting forth the highest professional standards. I choose to be an optimist, and one solid basis for optimism is that a publisher is demanding these professional standards. He is not alone.

Eugene Meyer last year announced completion of a plan under a committee of trustees, which he said was "to insure

the continued operation of the Washington Post as an independent newspaper dedicated to the public welfare."

Eugene Meyer is a publisher, and so is his son-in-law, Philip Graham, now running the paper. When one of his editors telephoned him one night to report a ticklish piece of news, dealing with an important person who was on personal terms with the publisher, and asked how he wanted it handled, Graham said: "I am not available to discuss that now and I don't believe I can be reached between now and press time." In short, he was saying: "It's your problem, handle it as a newspaperman."

There are not enough newspaper owners who take such a rigorous professional attitude about the newspapers they are in position to control. But there are some.

The press is three things. It is a business, necessarily. It is also, when it meets journalistic standards, a profession. And at its highest it is an institution. We recognize an institution when we see one. It was said of the London Times in 1885 that "Reading the Times was more than a habit. It was a habit that was handed down." And of the editors, that "They asked themselves not so much what were their personal convictions but 'What should the Times say?'" They recognized in short the character of an institution.

But an institution takes its character from the men who dominate it. Ochs made the New York Times an institution.

The old World and the present Post-Dispatch would not have become the same kind of institutions if not dominated by a Pulitzer. The Chicago Tribune is certainly a projection of the prejudices of Col. McCormick.

As to the business of newspaper publishing, the ordinary standards of business are not enough for the management of so sensitive and strategic an institution as a newspaper. The great publishers have been dedicated men, with a high sense of trusteeship.

Josephus Daniels expressed it in his last will and testament leaving his paper and his hopes to his sons:

"I have never regarded the News and Observer as property but as having an unpurchasable soul. I have regarded the stock I owned in the paper as certificates of a trust to be administered for the common good of the people of North Carolina. I enjoin those who direct the paper in the tomorrows never to advocate any cause for personal profit or ferment. If the paper should at any time be the voice of self interest or become the spokesman of privilege it would be untrue to its history. . . ."

It may be useful to look at the same problem in another field for a minute. Take engineering. It has some parallels to newspapering. The engineer is usually hired by a corporation. But the job he does, if it is a safe job, must be done by engineering standards. Engineers have been much concerned about the status of their work, as to whether it is a profession.

Vannevar Bush, speaking to engineering alumni of the Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard last February, said this, that could just as well have been said about journalism:

"The hallmark of a profession is that its members minister to the people. It is out of this concept of ministry—of the assuming of responsibility for the vital affairs of others because of superior specialized knowledge—that there has grown up the idealism of the professional man and the recognition in him by others of altruism which is its own reward. Upon this recognition by the people is based the continuance of a profession, for it exists only as the people, because of confidence in its integrity and faith in its general

beneficence, permit it to maintain its prerogatives and to speak with authority in its own field."

But the standards of journalism are, so far, very individual standards and must be carried by each reporter. And carried at some hazard, for they may be shared by his boss but that cannot be guaranteed, and whether they are recognized by the opposition is something else.

Not all proprietors of newspapers are willing to leave the handling of the news to standards of professional journalism. Many of them so control their papers that they show no relation to professional standards. Consider the situation of the newspapermen on such a paper. Either they surrender their standards or they fight for them, or they go somewhere else. What we need is more who will fight for them. And that is not a quixotic suggestion. I have recently rejoiced to hear a number of top managers of newspapers demanding more newspapermen who will stand up to their publishers and fight for sound newspapering. It is the great need of the newspaper business. And it is not entirely wanting. But the number who fight for sound newspaper standards is far too scant for the need.

The publisher whose quirks and prejudices override professional standards does not live forever. He will do far less harm himself than the longer destruction that results if he has corrupted a whole generation of his juniors to follow in his pattern.

I remember a speaker at my college commencement 30 years ago saying to us that our generation in its time would own and run America. This would come about simply because his generation in control would pass from the scene and the then youth would take over. He offered this as a prospect for the future to offset any discouragement or cynicism about the present. But it is ground for hope only if the oncoming generation are not so conditioned to practices which cry out for correction that when it comes their turn they will be hardened to the old grooves. We see that happen all around us. It is the occasion of much of the cynicism of young men.

The young newspaperman, like any other, must often bide his time. But he must have in him the flame that will keep his fires up. The other day, a man who has just come to a key place on a great paper came to see me. He needed a couple of good men for his page and one of them needed to be a mature, solid man who would add weight to it now. We thought over the possible men. I named one. He said he'd thought of him and had been reading his editorials, but there was no fire in them. I said that was because the management wouldn't give him his head. "Then why hasn't he been working on the management?" my friend demanded. "His fires are banked." Presently he brought up another name of a man we agreed was first rate. "And his fires aren't banked," the editor observed. That was his test.

Too many newspapermen too easily accept the limitations and dictations of a publisher who is not himself a newspaperman and needs education by his editors. He is or should be a business man. The standards of his news room should be set by professionals, just as the engineering standards of a construction company should be set by engineers, not by a contractor.

This is not an impossible assignment, or not always. It may not be easy. There are situations where the only thing for an honest newspaperman to do is resign. The profession of journalism needs more men who will resign in the clutch and publishers need to realize that the best men will resign.

rather than lose the standards that give them self respect on the job.

But very often it would not be necessary to resign. Many a managing editor, city editor or editor is much more nearly indispensable to his publisher than he realizes. When the issue is one of dealing honestly with the reader, it is one on which a paper with any regard for its reputation cannot afford a resignation by the editor who fights for the interest of the reader. If able editors who know what standards ought to be would maintain a stout resistance to their infringement, they would soon have less dictation and pressure from the circulation department and the advertising and promotion departments, as well as from personal whims and prejudices of the publisher.

To the newspaperman who greets this observation with a cynical snort, I would point to the social workers who within a generation have imposed their professional standards on public welfare departments in the face of political patronage and indifference. What they have done, journalists can do.

John Winant used to be a neighbor of mine in New Hampshire and when he was governor I used to go up and see him sometimes. I asked him once to describe to me some of the major political problems of his State.

"There's just one real political problem for me," he said. "That's keeping people honest."

That is the basic issue in journalism—the integrity of the news. Too many are too comfortable to care whether what the reader gets is as full and fair and adequate a report as possible of those matters of public concern on which the citizen needs from his paper the raw materials to make up his mind as a voter.

It is impressive to a student or a young newspaperman to hear of instances of uncompromising integrity. From them he builds his own heroes, who will stand by him in the clutch. I remember hearing Heywood Broun tell of a talk with Arthur Brisbane, who was trying to hire him for Hearst. Broun said "No," as he had before. But then they talked amiably of other things, among them a finely sculptured head of Brisbane's father, Albert, a writer of a different stripe. Broun admired the head. "Yes," Brisbane said. "He never would have worked for Hearst."

I heard an editorial writer describe a session he and his editor had with their publisher and his business manager on the question of the stand the paper would take in the last presidential campaign. The session lasted all day, with the two editorial page men arguing throughout against the publisher's views. They lost that argument. But what impressed the editorial writer was the way the editor talked to the publisher. "I didn't know a publisher could be talked to that way," he said. It was a discovery to make early for later application.

The reporter is ever in the front line. He is often the only man in the office who knows the whole story. He has an obligation when the length and play of the story are under consideration to see that his editors really understand it before they order it cut or buried inside. Timid editors may go even further than the publisher intended in passing on his orders. The reporter's duty is to stand up to them and see to it that they cannot mistake the effect of their orders.

I remember a reporter who returned to the office after looking into a complicated and serious conflict about to break open between the dairy farmers of the region and the big milk distributors. On reporting to the city desk that he had the story, he was told, "The front office says: 'No milk strike

story.'" The reporter's jaw fell open. "Why there are 22,000 farmers involved in this. They know the story and a lot of them read this paper. They'll all be onto it if we keep this story out. We're on top of the story right now before anybody else."

"Well, you go downstairs and tell the boss," said the city editor.

The reporter did, dreading the ordeal but feeling he had to make the try. He found the publisher was quite unaware of the real situation. He had had a phone call from a big distributor who had urged him not to panic the public by headlines about a threatened milk strike. "Of course we want to tell the story," he told the reporter. "All I want is to keep the term 'milk strike' out of it." It was easy to tell the story without using 'milk strike' though it might have been a better story without that limitation. That publisher's attitude was by no means ideal, but it was not nearly so far below par as his city editor's. Except for an aggressive reporter, his paper would have failed to carry a story of regional importance. It would have been weakened by it in the confidence of its readers. And make no mistake, reader confidence is the greatest asset of a paper, an irreplaceable asset.

In terms of the work of journalism schools, what I am asking for, is first, selectivity. The men permitted to prepare for journalism should have the character, the force, the zest for public service to be safe men to entrust with the professional standards journalism needs. For, let me repeat, journalistic standards in operation are so far highly individual. You have them or you don't. And on the best or worst papers, it makes a great difference which kind of reporter is on the story and which kind of desk editor is handling it.

Journalism should not be bracketed with public relations or other soft vocations in anybody's catalog.

The curriculum for the apprentice journalist should require him to have as solid an education as any student preparing for any profession; education, especially in American history, and in government and economics and all that makes a background to deal with public affairs. I asked an editor what field he particularly needed covered by a new editorial writer he was seeking. "A good editorial writer should be able to cover almost any field," he replied. "He should be interested in city politics, in state government and in national and international issues, and he should be able to write about baseball too."

It goes without saying that the journalist should learn the tools of his trade, that is, writing. But writers are seldom made if they do not have some natural gift for writing, and the presence or lack of this should be detected in selection of students.

No one need apologize for journalistic style at its best. It is a lean economy of language written in a simple structure that is effortless to read, and given vigor by a sense of the sound and movement of the action described. Philip Gibbs described the first need of the journalist as "a feeling for the quality of words." I would want to put ahead of that Frank Sibley's requirement of "perennial curiosity." But practice in effective writing is far more valuable than learning the tricks of constructing leads. In a soundly written story the lead takes care of itself. Editors who demand an artificial contrivance in place of a natural start just don't know their business. Great literature has a subtle influence

on style. So does all greatness and I would make a special plea for biography, especially such biography as exists of great journalists and great journalism. Even at my age I found last year immense inspiration in the *History of the London Times* ("The 20th Century Test") the epic story of the struggle to the death of the highest standards of journalism (those of Buckle and Bell) against a lower standard—Northcliffe's. Northcliffe was the new owner seeking to reduce a great office tradition to the kind of push-button journalism by which he controlled his other papers. It was a struggle that ended for Moberly Bell, the massive man who fought for the standards of the office, in defeat and death. But the resistance of the office continued magnificently, even after the death of Bell, and the forced resignation of the editor, Buckle, and triumphed in the end in the form of the trusteeship set up to preserve the standards of the *Times* from any future Northcliffe.

No newspaperman can read that story of imperial journalism at its greatest without being greatly moved by it. It is from some such standard that a William Allen White naturally treats with lofty scorn a Frank Munsey "who found journalism a noble profession and left it an eight per cent investment." The task of education for journalism is to replenish the supply of William Allen Whites and keep down the power and influence of the Frank Munseys.

Great writing, great history, great models are stronger stuff for the young newspaperman to have under his belt than a full line of leads and headline banks.

There is, also, in my opinion, a danger of too slavish a following of current techniques and patterns of newspaper writing and make-up. The danger is that students will be conditioned to too brittle, too arbitrary, too limited, too conventional a pattern of how to write and how to handle the news. Journalism needs originality and boldness and imagination in breaking through some of the dogmas of what is news and how to print it. Newspapermen have learned too little from the freer style of *Time* and from the finer style of the *New Yorker* and from the best newspaper writers. The rigidities of news patterns are cramping the style and limiting the usefulness of news services, news writers and news desks. The stronger men of the next chapter are going to break through these rigidities to more natural and serviceable forms.

This is not just an odd notion of mine. It is certainly a view shared by most writers who have forced their writing to the strait jackets of news forms. These absurdly restricting conventions ultimately cost newspapers their ablest writers, who seek more flexible media. Let me cite one of

our ablest journalists, James B. Reston of the *New York Times*, on this point. He was speaking of the reporting of foreign policy but what he said can be applied generally to news:

"We too are often the prisoners of old techniques and prejudices, which color our judgment of what is news, and how it should be written and displayed. We still have a tendency to make this complex modern news conform to our old techniques. It is a natural reaction—space is limited and type will not stretch—but you cannot often make an intricate debate on the European Recovery Program sparkle without distorting the whole picture."

"We have no right to twist the mass of facts into forms which are exciting but misleading; to take out of it that portion that conforms to our prejudices, to preserve the shocking or amusing, and leave out the dreary but important qualifications which are necessary to essential truth."

"Our preoccupation with what happens today, like our passion for the bold and simple, also often minimizes our value as reporters and recorders of great events. I am arguing for a more modern test of what is news; for the reporting of ideas as well as the reporting of action; for the explanation of intricate and fundamental issues, even if they have no gee whiz angle."

If journalism teachers are discouraged or skeptical, I suggest that the public—the readers—are on the side of those seeking to establish responsible standards. It is no accident that on both sides of the Atlantic the state of the press has recently been subjected to searching scrutiny by bodies whose standing compelled public attention to their findings. And it is a landmark in the history of the American press that the Hutchins Commission assigned to a study of freedom of the press, added a factor of its own, to title its report "A Free and Responsible Press" and to assert that only a responsible press can remain free.

That lifted the sights to a higher target. In the same direction was a recent talk by James A. Pope, managing editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, to the journalism students at Ann Arbor. Pope demanded "the full dimensions of the news" as the primary responsibility of newspaper editing.

Such definitions of newspaper standards provide the banners of professional journalism which those who believe in them have an obligation to keep high in the consciousness of the readers of newspapers and in the hearts and minds of all who aspire to be newspapermen.

# Nieman Scrapbook

## NEWSMEN AT WORK

### Bill (Atomic) Laurence Attacks Arthritis

Extraordinary scientific detective work by William L. Laurence has opened a promise to the United States of a large working supply of seed from the rare African plant *sarmentosus*, the seed that may free millions of arthritic and rheumatic fever victims from their agonizing torture. When Bill's by-line story on Aug. 16 disclosed that an expedition would be sent to Africa to gather ample quantities of the seed for research and for replanting in tropical lands owned by this country, only a few Government officials knew that the whole project was Bill's idea, and his alone. Even men on the staff didn't know it.

That secret came out the next day at a Government press conference in Washington. Immediately, praise swelled up from all quarters. The consensus was that this achievement equaled Bill's exclusive work on the development and use of atomic energy, including his eye-witness account of the release of the atomic bomb over Nagasaki.

\* \* \*

The story goes back to last April 19, when Bill hurriedly left a biologists' convention in Detroit to fly to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn. He acted on a tip from Dr. Howard Rusk of the *Times* that Mayo was about to announce a powerful new drug that almost overnight could free crippled arthritis victims from pain and restore them to normal activity.

At Mayo's Clinic on the night of April 20, Bill's eyes widened at what he saw on the lecture room screen—fourteen men and women, "hopelessly" crippled, leaving their beds of pain, and their wheelchairs, to walk briskly after injections of the new drug, cortisone.

There was a catch in it, though. A single day's treatment for a patient required bile from forty head of cattle. It cost Merck & Co. of Rahway, N. J., \$18,000 to produce three weeks' supply for one patient. There was a second catch. A patient would lapse back into a crippled condition where treatment could not be kept up.

Bill's exclusive story on the Mayo lecture, telephoned to the office the night of April 20, ran next day on Page 1.

\* \* \*

A week later in Washington at a National Academy of Science meeting, Bill talked briefly with Dr. Louis F. Fieser,

a great chemist and authority on hormones, on the astonishing properties of cortisone, which up to that time had been identified only as "Compound E."

Bill wondered whether it might not be possible to find some comparatively cheap and convenient substitute for ox bile, the cortisone base. Dr. Fieser recalled that a certain plant seed yielded a cortisone base.

He remembered that research men had found it but that nobody knew what plant the seed had come from. There was no time for further detail. The doctor hurried off, and left Bill brooding on the subject.

Later, Bill recalled that he stared after the doctor's retreating form and muttered a pregnant "Holy Gee," because the information so overwhelmed his imagination. His mental gears slipped into high.

Back in New York, he called Merck & Co., whose chemists had worked with Dr. Edward C. Kendall and Dr. Philip S. Hench, the Mayo men who had done the arthritis research. The Merck chemists told Bill that the name of the substance was *sarmentogenin* but that it was not known what plant it came from.

Bill questioned Dr. Kendall about *sarmentogenin*. Dr. Kendall referred him to Dr. Walter A. Jacobs of the Rockefeller Institute in New York.

This brought the trail almost into Bill's own backyard. He lives near the Institute. He called on Dr. Jacobs and got this story:

In 1915 Rockefeller Institute received labeled "Strophanthus hispidus." Up to from an herb dealer a shipment of seed that time this seed had been used chiefly to produce a poisonous drug used as a heart stimulant.

Dr. Jacob and his co-workers were astonished when the seed labeled "Strophanthus hispidus" yielded *sarmentogenin*, which nobody had ever come across before.

The Rockefeller men realized then that the package had been mislabeled. This knowledge came too late. None of the seeds from that package—ostensibly from the *sarmentosus* plant—had been saved. They had no way of tracing or identifying it.

Eleven years after this incident Rockefeller Institute received two packets of seed labeled "Strophanthus sarmento-

sus." One of these yielded *sarmentogenin*, the other did not. These findings were puzzling.

The Rockefeller research men were unable to tell Bill where their *sarmentosus* seed had been grown. The only clue they could give him was that German scientists had done some further research on *sarmentogenin*.

Each of these research men, working independently through the years, had not bothered to push his findings. There was no call then for cortisone base. It remained for Laurence to collect and present the findings in simple synopsis.

Bill, by this time, had become a feverish medical Sherlock Holmes. He plunged deeply into musty German medical lore in the Public Library. He learned definitely from this research that of the known types of *Strophanthus*, only one held the missing seed. He acquired an extensive knowledge of the history, chemistry and substance of these plants.

His next move was a call to the Botanical Gardens in the Bronx. There he was able to get photostats of pictures of the flowering *sarmentosus*. The trail was getting hot.

In his research Bill stumbled upon the incidental information that a group of Swiss scientists had worked on *sarmentosus* in 1948. Following this clue, he obtained from Dr. T. F. Gallagher at Memorial Hospital a report on the Swiss findings written in German.

All this detective work had been done on off-time. It has carried Bill into mid-June. His key clue, now, was a bit of information he had gleaned from a man employed in a private drug corporation. This informant told him flatly that the Swiss group had definitely identified the seed as *sarmentosus* and had sent an expedition to Africa to gather a crop of the seeds.

Now Bill had his story complete. It was clear to him that the obscure *sarmentosus* plant was destined to become the most important medicinal crop in the world. He planned to write the story as a Sunday science piece. As he sat down at his typewriter, it occurred to him that the story had enormous political and economic implications. He figured that if the plant were available only in British-controlled Africa, as his information indicated, its discovery might cause the British to clamp an em-

bargo on its export, to maintain a monopoly. This was a story, he realized, that first must be told to the President of the United States.

Disappointed at losing a good story, but sure his decision was right, Bill closed his typewriter. He was a little shy about calling the President, but his wife eagerly put through a call to the White House, and Bill spoke to Charles Ross, the President's secretary. He told Ross the story and asked for an appointment with the President. Ross told him to send the President a letter outlining all he had dug up. Bill mailed the letter on June 21. He had a telephone call next day from Ross. The President would see him at 11:15 A.M. on June 28.

No one in the office, not even the managing editor, knew what Bill had been up to. He had done his research on his own time. He had invested his own money in additional books on the subject.

Now he asked the city desk for the day off on Tuesday, June 28.

He took with him, on the midnight to Washington, a confidential memorandum to the President, with additional data on the rare African plant, in which he told the President, "This is to medicine what the atom bomb is to physics." He took along samples of seeds of another member of the Strophanthus family which he had obtained from S. B. Penick, a medicinal drug house, and pictures of the flowering sarmentosus acquired from the Botanical Gardens.

The interview with the President lasted twenty minutes. Bill expanded on the information in his letter, stressed the political and economic aspects of the discovery, and emphasized the need for Government action and haste.

"May I respectfully suggest," he asked the President, "that some of our leading experts on African plants be sent to equatorial Africa as soon as possible, for the purpose of gathering a substantial supply of sarmentosus seed and living plants? I suggest this, Mr. President, because I have reason to believe that, at present, only the Swiss are fully aware of the great potentialities of the plant and that they are already taking steps to assure a supply for themselves, if not bottle it up completely. I think there is need for immediate action."

The President listened attentively. He told Bill, "You're right. This is very important. I'll get in touch with Brannan (Secretary of Agriculture) and Ewing (Federal Security Administrator).

As Bill was leaving, Ross, who had

sat in on the interview, said, "Why don't you call Ewing yourself and talk to him?"

Bill called the Administrator, outlined his business, and was told to come right over. Ewing was intensely interested. Bill impressed upon him the need for haste. The plant, he told Ewing, blooms in early fall and young seeds contain most of the material. If it isn't found by September there will be a year's lag. Also, he pointed out, there is always the chance that the British might stumble on the plant at any time, and the United States might lose out completely.

"How about secrecy?" Bill asked Ewing. He was taking no chances on the Government breaking his story first. Ewing agreed that the story had better be kept quiet.

Bill returned to New York. He called his old friend, Dr. Leonard Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service in Washington, and filled him in on the whole story.

\* \* \*

On Friday afternoon, Aug. 12, Dr. Scheele called from Washington. "An expedition has left for Africa," he told Bill. "It's headed for Liberia. The plant grows there, too."

Bill jumped. There was no longer need for secrecy. Liberia is a land where

American capital has invested large sums for development of Liberian resources. Relations between the two countries are extremely amicable.

"Hold everything until Monday," Bill told Dr. Scheele. "I'm coming down to Washington."

Then, for the first time, Bill told his story to Turner Catledge, acting managing editor. Mr. Catledge gave him an enthusiastic "go ahead."

In Washington on Monday, Aug. 15, Bill spent from early morning until mid-afternoon with the Surgeon General. "We'd like to have something left to tell ourselves," Dr. Scheele said. Bill agreed not to say the expedition had already left for Liberia. He would let the Government make that announcement a day or so after his story had run.

At 3 P.M. Bill rode in the Surgeon General's car to the *Times* Washington Bureau. He wrote his story from there and filed it.

He went down to Union Station, had supper alone, and wearily took the sleeper back to New York. In Grand Central Station next morning he picked up Tuesday's paper. His exclusive story was on Page 1. Not a line had been cut.

Bill took a deep breath and relaxed. Then he went home.

—*Times Talk*, Aug. '49.

## BERT HULEN'S LAST ASSIGNMENT

Bertram D. Hulen, twenty-three years on the New York *Times* Washington staff, was one of thirteen correspondents who died in a KLM plane crash in India on July 12, a few days after his sixtieth birthday. His last dispatch to this newspaper appeared on July 10, datelined Java.

The dawn watch on the radio desk first put the story on the air at 7 A.M. Two hours later, as assistant city editor Frank Adams sat down at his desk, with only the barest details of the tragedy available, his telephone rang.

It was an overseas call from the largest newspaper in Amsterdam, Holland. The reporter across the seas wanted a statement from the *Times* on Mr. Hulen's death. Mr. Adams said the *Times* was deeply shocked, but did not have enough facts yet to make any extended comment.

In Washington, after the death list had been officially verified, bureau chief Arthur Krock posted the following notice on the bulletin board:

Bertram D. Hulen, our well-loved associate, died in the line of duty. And

the duty was self-imposed, as was characteristic.

When the Netherlands Government notified me of the inspection trip to Indonesia that was planned, I went over the staff situation with Mr. Huston and the upshot was I asked Mr. Hulen if he wanted to go. As our regular staff man at the State Department the choice was indicated, and by chance Mr. Hulen also had covered a special news lead some months ago that dealt with Indonesia.

"Is this an assignment?" he asked, "because of course if it is I go without question."

"No," I said, "it is not. It is an opportunity if you find it so and want to take it."

He asked for a night to think over the matter and discuss it with his wife. I reminded him the trip might be rugged, in consideration of his age, and involved obvious risks.

The next morning Mr. Hulen came in and said that Mrs. Hulen and he had gone over all the circumstances.

## "The Challenge of Cancer"

"Want to go," he said. "And thanks for the chance."

"You're as game as they come," said I lightly, not anticipating how tragic the proof would be.

A great gentleman, a good reporter, a loyal friend and a devoted citizen of the United States passed with Bert Hulen.

\* \* \*

Friends recalled he was a steady, reliable, methodical newspaper man. Colleagues said he probably took with him to the grave more state secrets than have been entrusted any other correspondent. Washington officials had complete confidence in his integrity and knew it was safe to repose such secrets in him.

\* \* \*

At the request of *Times Talk*, Lewis Wood of the Washington bureau wrote out these remembrances:

A companion of great worth, fine reputation, essential dignity and unfailing courtesy departed from the Washington bureau when Bert Hulen died in India.

His character was strong. His convictions were rigid. He was a conservative in dress and thought and habit. He was a conservative with a New England conscience, and all the righteous virtues of that region. No man was ever more meticulous as a factual reporter or truer to his individual faiths than he; none more modest or admirable in the revelation of this steadfastness.

Yet woven through the New England virtues was the dry wit of New England. His pipe clenched in his teeth, he grinned and lines deepened at the corners of his eyes as some humorous note struck him.

During the heated New Deal years, he described himself as a "middle-of-the-roader," looking upon the tumult merely in an objective fashion. Ostensibly he appeared to believe he could shed his prejudices and view the scene dispassionately. Yet one could never be positive whether he said this with tongue in cheek. Somehow a little flicker of amusement lit his face.

In recent months he told of a brother living in Maine, a retired engineer. Someone inquired how the brother's political philosophy compared with Bert's "middle-of-the-road" attitude.

"Well," Bert answered with a faint, slow smile, "I think he's just a trifle to the right of me."

"But," Felix Belair burst out, "there's no place to stand on the right. There just isn't anything there!"

For his assets and for his friendship, men who have worked so long with Bert Hulen will miss him as the years go by.

—*Times Talk*, July, 1949.

In publishing the current series of articles by Lester Grant on "The Challenge of Cancer," this newspaper has sought to present a summary for laymen of some of the problems the medical scientists face. The layman has a deep concern with their search for greater knowledge, since cancer is an enemy of life itself—an enemy which each year appears to be taking a greater toll. Cancer is a problem of growth—a part of the mystery of life itself.

The cancer cell itself was found more than a century ago. Tools for controlling it (curing it, if you will), once it is detected and detected in time, are already known: surgery and radiation. But the scientists' central problem, the need for basic knowledge, is one of extraordinary difficulty. The public has contributed generously, dimes, dollars and thousands of dollars, to the scientists' search without understanding very much about the baffling difficulties in the way, or about the use that would or could be made of its gifts in the laboratories. We believe that with greater understanding of the years of patient, persistent, inspired effort required to follow out one tiny hopeful line of

reasoning, and with greater understanding of the theories and hopes and occasional gleams of light that spur the researchers on, the public will be more than ever convinced that the search must continue, more than ever willing to give it indispensable support.

This series is the outcome of many months of work, countless interviews, consultation and checking with the men grappling directly with the cancer problem, by a reporter specially qualified for the task. Mr. Grant received in 1947 one of the Nieman Fellowships annually awarded by Harvard University to working journalists. At Harvard he specialized in medical reporting, studying and associating with medical school students and faculty. The series will be concluded on Monday. Letters of appreciation and requests to this newspaper for booklet reprints of the articles suggest that his is a significant contribution in explaining the vast effort, talent and imagination now being applied to one of science's toughest—and most vital—problems.

N. Y. Herald Tribune, June 17.

## Who Makes a Free Press?

In common with scores of American newspapers, the *Chronicle* recently printed a statement by the United States Air Force that its B-36's could bomb Russia's 70 strategic targets without effective resistance to their bases.

Later, on the editorial page we expressed the opinion that the Air Force has no business making such a statement public, that this incursion by the Air Force into the psychological side of foreign relations was unauthorized and dangerous.

There is a paradox: If we thought the Air Force statement irresponsible and dangerous, why did we print it?

The incident was one of the hundreds which annually enter into the complex problem of the free press.

The free press, it should be generally recognized, is not an institution somehow entitled to exist in a vacuum. It is a branch of free people; a free press in a dictated society, or a dictated press in a free society, would be functional contradictions and either the press or the society would have to be changed to conform.

Our society being free and the great majority wishing to keep it so, the editor cannot interfere with the flow of thought without gravely abusing the pa-

rent freedom by which the newspaper exists and which it serves. Had the *Chronicle* suppressed the Air Force statement, we would have been in the unthinkable position of knowing that the Air Force was taking an action concerning all of us, but trying to conceal this fact from that part of the free people we serve.

The same rule applies to the bad press. This paper rejects the "ethics" of press solidarity and speaks out on occasion against the bad press, but only as a part of the public. We would not undertake to censor the bad press, and we would not agree to any censorship at all beyond that implied by the libel laws and the people's power to kill a bad press through nonsupport.

In connection with the Air Force statement, Representative McCormack said: "If ever a free press is destroyed in this country, it will be the press that destroys it." This is only superficially true: The free people being the true custodians of the free press, if we ever lost the free press it would be because the people had ceased to realize that the free press is uniquely involved in the general freedom, that the people uniquely hold the power to keep it responsible.

San Francisco Chronicle—March 30, 1949

# Oregon Opinion Factory Pours Ideas Into Nation's Press

by Richard L. Neuberger

The editor of your daily or weekly newspaper, the one that you and your family read, probably receives each week a set of pink-colored sheets euphemistically known as "Industrial News Review."

These sheets consist of ably-written editorials. Some of them are on the most worthy subjects—observe Fire Prevention Week, give generously to the Red Cross, get a regular checkup at your doctor's.

Sandwiched in between this fluffy white exterior are other pre-fabricated editorials. They hint that the government is to blame for the power shortage, that price controls would take meat off our tables, that chain stores are good for a town, that health insurance is "socialized medicine," that there is really no such thing as monopoly in the United States.

What does your newspaper do with these editorials? Well, some throw them in the wastebasket; others reprint them "without credit." In other words, they don't give "Industrial News Review" recognition for such outstanding literary output. Why is this? Usually publications like to get credit for material which is reprinted elsewhere.

Could it be because the Federal Trade Commission showed some years ago that E. Hofer & Son, the publishers of "Industrial News Review," have received financial contributions from such corporations as the New York Edison Company, the United Gas Improvement Company and the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey? Is this why "Industrial News Review" warns that a Missouri Valley Authority would be "vicious and unwarranted" or public housing the start of state socialism?

E. Hofer & Son operate from Portland, Ore. From their comfortable headquarters there, they can look out on the Willamette river, a stream happily controlled only by dams which are privately owned. Strangely enough, no information finds its way into "Industrial News Review" that the Willamette is the most polluted river in the West and that its salmon are all but gone.

Through the U. S. mails—a dreadful socialistic device—the Hofers mail their bright pink editorials to 13,000 newspapers all over the nation. They even have a cracker-barrel columnist, "Joe Serra."

Of course, the editorials are pink in the color of the paper only. In doctrine they reflect a viewpoint on American economic life which faded at about the time that Teddy Roosevelt succeeded McKinley.

The Hofers also publish a monthly magazine. Its titles follow along this line:

"The Threat of the TVA."

"The Economic Consequences of the Public Utility Act of 1925."

"The Menace of the Columbia River Authority."

These, too, may be reprinted without credit or permission. Are not the Hofers generous beyond understanding? Free, for nothing, no coin of the realm required, they allow editors from Maine to California to reprint Charles M. Barbe's temperate, reasoned warning of the menace of the Columbia Valley Authority.

Such an Authority, says Mr. Barbe, "is one of the most dangerous and subversive bits of legislation ever to be presented to an American Congress. . . . It is a vicious and un-

warranted usurpation of power by a radical-minded, slightly left of center Federal administration."

Why do the Hofers do this? They themselves say the "findings are not copyrighted and are submitted for consideration or reproduction, in whole or in part . . . Its desire is to encourage constructive comment on basic questions upon which our people must be informed in order to uphold American principles and ideals."

This devotion to the Republic leads the Hofers to such patriotic utterances as this: "This argument that private capital cannot meet our power needs is baseless. The greatest industrial regions in the country are adequately and efficiently served by the business-managed utilities."

Could this sublime patriotism have anything to do with the fact that the allotments to the Hofers from private utility corporations have reached \$100,000 a year? Does this devotion to Americanism stem from the fact that so eminent a patriot as Samuel Insull announced in 1923, that material from the Hofer agency henceforth would cover the entire country?

And cover the country it does. Not long ago *Nieman Reports*, the publication of the Nieman Fellows at Harvard, had occasion to follow a Hofer editorial which mentioned President Conant of Harvard. The editorial took a statement by Mr. Conant out of its text and showed him as a most rabid defender of so-called "free-enterprise."

The editorial appeared in more than 50 papers all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. Naturally, the papers did not credit the editorial to "Industrial News Review," for the Hofers unselfishly shun all credit. So the views paid for by private utility companies and business corporations appeared in numerous editorial columns as the original views of the free press in the United States.

The observers only can observe that the Hofers have done their work well. Have they not boasted that their "views" are used in every state of the Union? For example, if P. S. Arkwright, president of Georgia Power Company, says that "socialism breaks down character," the Hofers see to it that these cogent opinions are made the subject of a vigorous editorial tying up public ownership with socialism.

Obviously, no mention is made of the impact on character of public school, public post offices, public colleges and public trolley systems. Nor does the editorial refer even obviously to the fact that such "socialistic" communities as Tacoma, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Los Angeles and San Francisco engage in numerous public ownership ventures.

One can only wonder what would happen if farm or trade-union organizations in America attempted a duplication of the Hofer agency. What would the free press say if a newspaper published, as its own, an editorial on farm cooperatives which came not from the typewriters in the newsroom but from a propaganda organization financed and fostered by farm cooperatives?

Would a publication continue in good standing in the American Publishers' Association if it ran a CIO or AF of L editorial, word for word, as its own original product?

What, then, of the papers which reprint the Hofer literature that so generously "is not copyrighted and is submitted for consideration or reproduction, in whole or in part?"

## *Scrapbook*

# Church and Press---Enemies or Allies?

by James O. Supple

Until recently the treatment of church news in the secular press bumped along at a deplorable low, paralleling the death notice, the betrothal announcement and the garden party to raise funds for the Junior League's pet philanthropy. Church news consisted of an occasional sentence about mission collections or a report on the ladies' aid. The church made the front page only when death with due apology swooped down on a bishop of any denomination whatsoever (the press has always been morbidly fascinated by bishops) or on the pastor of the most fashionable local suburban congregation.

Now the prospect for church news changes. Why? Because of the emergence of the social gospel. In the past few years, dating back to the aftermath of World War I, the clergy and religiously concerned laity have begun to re-examine America's spiritual values. Ultimately this has meant moving from the armchair to the convention hall, moving from thought and analysis to resolution and action. We of the newspapers began to get the social pronouncements of the churches on labor, internationalism, racism, peace. With the cataclysmic events of the twenties and the resultant strife of the thirties the nation's churchmen, aroused to basic Christian issues as they had not been aroused for decades, began to speak out not only in their pulpits, but, even more important, in their denominational conventions and through federation resolutions.

The churches at last are speaking out. But do the vast majority of people know it? Do millions of Americans know that the Christian ethic today stands uncompromisingly against materialism, the materialism of the excessive left and the excessive right? Do the unchurched know what the churches think of housing, of unions, of foreign policies, of rising prices and the other issues of daily life? The answers to such questions depend on the answer to this one: Are the churches given adequate press coverage on their position on these problems and is what they are saying and doing being brought to the people?

The answer is largely No. This must be blamed partly on the press and partly on the churches themselves.

The controversial socio-economic stand of Christianity does run into a certain

amount of suppression from large segments of the press. The press is willing to carry Myron Taylor resolutions because these seem to reflect simply a squabble between sects, and everybody is attracted by a dogfight. But the more basic reactions of the churches on many subjects find it impossible to make their way into many a newspaper in an ungarbled and unbiased form. The attitude of the isolationist press, particularly in the middle west, toward the Federal Council's peace commission and the Methodist "Crusade for a New World Order" furnished examples of the way in which Christianity can be smeared or ignored when it becomes unequivocally Christian. When the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference condemned the Taft-Hartley bill only two of the daily newspapers in Chicago permitted the Associated Press story to be published in their pages. What would have happened if the Catholic group had endorsed the bill?

Quite aside from such suppression and censorship there is another problem—the fact that large sections of the press while they do not try to censor church news insult it by being casual about it. When the provisional committee of the World Council of Churches met at Buck Hill Falls to finish the plans for setting up that body which were later to culminate at Amsterdam—certainly an important meeting—the New York Times, the Chicago Sun-Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Philadelphia Bulletin, Newsweek, Time and the Associated Press sent representatives but no one else did.

This is not to say that the field of church publicity is a barren desert. A few groups have developed their public relations intelligently, including the National Episcopal Council, the Seventh-Day Adventists, the Methodist Information Service, the Northern Baptists, the National Lutheran Council, the Federal Council of Churches and a few others. But these are the glaring exceptions to a frightful rule.

It is, however, when we pass from church life at the national level to what goes on in the relations of local congregations with the local press that we come to the most perplexing and irritating phase of the problem. The local pastor

and his members need to stop thinking of the newspaper primarily as a means of publicizing the individual church program. They need to start thinking of the press as an untried way of bringing to the unchurched, to the skeptical and, even more important, to the vast millions of the indifferent, the relevance of the Christian gospel in a frightened, chaotic age. They must think of the press as a means not for the announcing of bazaars but for the spreading of the gospel through news.

What do I mean by spreading the gospel through news? I mean that every week there are events which show how the Christian churches are trying to solve the social and allied problems that dominate the lives and interests of millions. The local pastor needs to grasp the fact that telling about these events is doing a better job of evangelizing the indifferent millions than would be the listing of 25 sermon topics in the same space. If it's publicity for his church that the pastor is after, this evidence that the church is really accomplishing something somewhere relevant to men's actual difficulties is the best publicity conceivable.

At an American Press Institute seminar at Columbia University I was asked to analyze for editors from all over the country the church pages in their papers. It was gratifying to see that most of them gave considerable space to the churches, but it was appalling to see how the space was used. I waded through column after column of agate-type announcements of meetings and sermon titles. One paper contained three solid columns of sermon topics draped around four columns of advertisements listing the same sermons! And in all this expanse of space there was precious little to indicate that anywhere the church was really doing something.

What was most discouraging was the contention by some of the editors that they were bored to distraction by their paper's church coverage, that they greatly wanted something better, but that when they went to the local clergy to suggest changes they were told that the monotonous listing of sermon topics, with the frequent insertion of photographs of the ministers, was eminently satisfactory. Some of these ministers had actually turned thumbs down on the

proposal to print news of an active Christianity in the space which their unvarying church calendars were preempting. These pastors had tragically failed to understand that the church belongs in the newspaper not as a list of Sunday school and preaching announcements but as the record of one of the most dynamic forces at work in the making of today's and tomorrow's history.

If the local pastor wishes to let the unchurched know that his parish is not just the Gothic pile at the corner of State and Main he can best do so by trying to make the religious news in the local press reflect the vitality which is being shown in these days by a working Christian faith. If the religious news is

vital, if it shows the emerging social strength of modern Christianity, then the unchurched will seek out the local church. They will never seek out a religion represented to them by a flock of one-paragraph announcements of rummage sales.

—The Christian Church, Aug. 17.

---

**James O. Supple** of the Chicago Sun-Times is one of the effective church editors on daily newspapers, as evidenced both by his readable copy and the certificate of the Associated Church Press awarded him two years ago for his secular reporting of religious news.

---

## TRIAL BY NEWSPAPER

by Alan Barth

In the course of the Alger Hiss trial, counsel for the defense suggested that the presiding judge, Samuel H. Kaufman, cite a New York newspaper for contempt of court. The judge declined to do so, although a contempt citation might have had pretty substantial grounds.

The newspaper had published some allegations about the defendant which had not at that time been made in court and had drawn some pretty damaging inferences from them. For that matter, a number of papers and individual commentators had delivered themselves of some extremely biased reporting and some highly inflammatory comment, going at least as far as the law allowed in advising the jury as to what verdict it ought to reach.

The jury in this case, as in most cases of the kind, was not locked up during the course of the trial. Its members were told by the judge at the conclusion of each trial day to refrain from reading newspapers—an injunction not easy to obey with absolute fidelity in a city where headlines shriek at passersby from ten thousand newsstands. Maybe they followed the judge's instructions literally.

But the press, or at any rate a part of it, certainly made it very difficult to confine the jury's attention exclusively to the evidence and the pleas admissible in court.

Of course, the press has a right to print, and the public has a right to read, a full account of what goes on in any American courtroom. But a man on trial for his life or his liberty has a right to a trial in an atmosphere free from in-

timidation and excitement and other improper influences. This latter right is too often impaired by newspapers—and impaired for reasons which have much less to do with public service than with the stimulation of street sales.

Judge Kaufman didn't crack down on the press as a tougher judge might have done. He simply observed in connection with the problem: "What the court can do about it, I don't know, but after the conclusion of this trial that subject should be considered, either by the court or through some other method."

This temperate and tentative observation respecting a matter very much within the judge's responsibility elicited from Rep. W. Kingsland Macy of New York an oratorical outburst on freedom of the press which must have set the authors of the first amendment revolving in their graves. After all, they were also the authors of the sixth amendment.

"Mr. Speaker," said Mr. Macy on the floor of the house, "I label such an unprecedented and unheard-of statement by a federal court judge a direct threat to the freedom of the press . . . What did the judge mean by such a challenge? In the history of American courts, I do not believe such a similar statement has ever been made. What plans did he have to make the American press succumb to his will?"

There was more of this sort of buffoonery. But a sample ought to suffice. No one rose to ask if the press had plans to make the American judiciary succumb to its will. No one even asked if the press had plans to bring its own freedom into conformity with the fundamental right of Americans to a fair trial.

This last question is a question which ought to be raised by the members of the press before it is raised in Congress. The press had better find an answer if it wants to keep its freedom unimpaired.

Judge Kaufman's concern about the role of the press in relation to the courts, so far from being unprecedented or unheard-of, is a concern which has been felt and expressed by a great many members of the judiciary, federal and state alike.

Justice Frankfurter of the supreme court, for example, observed in an opinion a few years ago that "cases are too often tried in newspapers before they are tried in court, and the cast of characters in the newspaper trial too often differs greatly from the real persons who appear at the trial in court and who may have to suffer its distorted consequences."

Clarence Darrow, to quote the bar instead of the bench, once said this on the subject: "Trial by jury is rapidly being destroyed in America by the manner in which the newspapers handle all sensational cases. I don't know what should be done about it. The truth is that the courts and the lawyers don't like to proceed against newspapers. They are too powerful. As the law stands today there is no important criminal case where the newspapers are not guilty of contempt of court day after day. All lawyers know it, all judges know it, and all newspapers know it."

Like Clarence Darrow, I don't know what should be done about it either. But I do know that so many responsible men are now angered by the excesses of a few newspapers that freedom of the press is in danger of curtailment for all. The recent attempt on the part of the Baltimore Supreme Bench to put the press of that city in a straitjacket in respect to the reporting of crime news is an illustration in point.

Freedom of the press, like any other freedom, implies responsibility. I think the American press, if it is to maintain its freedom, must force responsibility on its own practitioners. Its rights cannot embrace the power to override the rights of others.

Codes of fair practice are hard to frame and even harder to enforce—especially in a field so fiercely individualistic as journalism. But I think that American newspapers had better try collective self-discipline in some such form. And I hope the American Newspaper Guild will assume leadership in the attempt.

from *Guild Reporter*, July 22.

# Objectivity in Foreign News Reporting

by Frederick A. Woodress

Neither editors nor the public pay much attention to by-lines and dispatches cabled from overseas.

That is a conclusion drawn from a symposium of editors, writers and journalists on "objectivity in foreign news coverage." The writer made this study last year as part of a journalism course at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

The study also revealed that few editors will venture to judge news objectivity in the entire field, the reason being that few editors have the time to read the thousands of words filed daily from overseas by competing news services and special correspondents.

None of the participants agreed on a definition of objectivity; few would subscribe to this writer's definition. Consequently, this project, begun as a survey on the five "most objective" and the five "least objective American foreign correspondents," ended as a symposium on objectivity.

Some journalists confessed that they gave little attention to by-lines on cabled dispatches; others wrote they thought the publication and its objectivity were more important.

One, Charles W. Morton, Associate Editor of *Atlantic Monthly*, wrote that he did not consider objectivity as the important fault with American overseas reporting because:

"I am afraid that my own interest is more in its omissions, its lack of curiosity, and its conventionality rather than in questions of objectivity. I think that most news correspondents are naturally objective and that bias sets in at other stages of operation.

"What I do object to is sending abroad scores of able news gatherers and then stultifying them by obliging them to forward the various foreign ministry handouts and political utterances, leaving out almost entirely the fascinating details of what life in the foreign country actually turns up from day to day.

"If we realize how confused many of us are about domestic politics, I cannot help wondering why we report foreign politics in such ludicrous detail and expect the American public to keep these ephemeral personalities accounted for.

"We know little or nothing about business, science, industry and cultural affairs in foreign countries. I

have learned more from a few business men, who had gone overseas simply to drive a bargain or two, than I have from most of the foreign correspondents. I think this is phenomenally true in South America, Scandinavia and even in France."

Paul Bixler, editor of the *Antioch Review* now on leave as editor of the Ford Foundation added, that "this would mean more feature stories, perhaps run as series—an excellent thing. The spot news in the foreign field is probably overdone," he concluded.

Besides Mr. Morton and Mr. Bixler, the professor in charge of the class where this project originated, those participating in this study were:

William Hessler, editorial writer, *Cincinnati Enquirer*; John Hersey, author; Don Hollenbeck, CBS commentator; Francis P. Locke, associate editor, *Dayton (Ohio) Daily News*; C. G. Wellington, managing editor, *Kansas City Star*; Ben Yablonky, professor of journalism at New York University; John Gunther, author; Bruce Bliven, editorial director of the *New Republic*; Joseph Barnes, formerly of the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* and the *N. Y. Star*; and Bert Andrews, *N. Y. Herald Tribune*.

William H. Hessler's attitude toward overseas by-lines is probably typical of many an editor. He explained why it was difficult for a working newspaperman to judge the objectivity of the men who file dispatches from abroad.

"I don't pay much attention to by-lines, except in the *Times*," Hessler commented. "And most of the press association dispatches I see do not carry by-lines. In other words, out of the several hundred men in the field, I see frequently the work of eight or ten that I recall by name."

Bruce Bliven's succinct reply was similar: "I don't follow the names of the foreign correspondents carefully enough to make an intelligent answer."

Several journalists objected to the wording of the question on the five most and five least objective foreign correspondents. Don Hollenbeck cautioned that the questionnaire seemed to "call for rather too much sharp differentiation between black and white; I don't feel qualified to deliver judgments so unqualifiedly."

Joseph Barnes agreed with Hollenbeck that "your (the writer's) definition of 'ob-

jectivity' seems to me so personal that I would have no confidence that my own nominations would fit in any way with your standards or those of the other individuals to whom you sent the survey."

The writer based his definition of objectivity on the following statement in the book, *Your Newspaper*, attributed to Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard University:

"One of these veterans who has come back to Harvard . . . thought he'd like to spend a year or so in studying what he called objectivity. . . . We talked about what objectivity meant. We agreed in the first place that there are statements of fact and if you are objective, you state the facts correctly. That is, you have your dates correct, and you don't ascribe statements made by one man to another man, and so on.

"Now I feel pretty sure there is something wrong about that, but it is an idea which is very widely prevalent in this country—that the only duty of a person who is serving the public in the capacity of public information is to be sure that all possible views are presented. I believe there has to be somebody somewhere who puts these things together, so that the reader doesn't have to do it all by himself.

"As it is today, you are placing a heavy burden on the reader of the paper. The newspapers say, in effect: 'We'll present you with the dates and the words that were uttered on such and such an occasion, and what so and so thinks, and you have to work out the truth behind it (or, if you don't like the word 'truth,' the solution of the problem).'

"My idea would be that all conflicts and differences of opinion should be viewed constantly in the light of the general public interest, and that the reader should be shown how the pieces of the daily puzzles of life would look in this light."

Ben Yablonky, a former *PM* reporter and one of the nine Nieman Fellows responsible for the book, *Your Newspaper*, thought the field of objectivity to be too broad a one to narrow down to the five most and five least objective foreign correspondents. He stated:

"You are trying to evaluate several hundred foreign correspondents from every corner of the earth. I don't think that any one man can supply the an-

# Nieman Notes

swe. It seems to me a better question would have been to name the particular newspapers or wire service which produce the best—or worst job. Actually, it is the newspaper's policy which in large measure conditions the kind of reporting we get on any front."

The men who contributed to this symposium name the N. Y. Times as first for its objective foreign correspondence and the Herald Tribune second. They also mentioned foreign correspondence in the Washington Post, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Sun-Times and the Christian Science Monitor. These same journalists who hesitated about naming individuals had no objections to selecting newspapers even though the original questionnaire did not call for them.

Some of the participants chose individual correspondents, nevertheless. While the results are not significant, they are worth listing. The following received at least one nomination and sometimes more as "most objective foreign correspondents":

Drew Middleton, Cyrus Sulzberger, James Reston, W. H. Lawrence, W. L. Laurence, Herbert Matthews, Anne O'Hare McCormick, Walter Kerr and Thomas Hamilton, all of the N. Y. Times; Joseph Barnes for his work with the Herald Tribune, Homer Bigart and Bert Andrews (Washington correspondents), also of the same daily; Eddy Gilmore and Wes Gallagher of AP; A. T. Steele, Chicago Daily News; Frederick Kuh, Chicago Sun-Times; Homer Metz, Christian Science Monitor; and Edward R. Murrow, CBS.

One journalist included some domestic reporters and newsmen in his grouping for the "least objective" overseas reporters. He named Westbrook Pegler, John O'Donnell, Paul Mallon, Karl Von Weigand and "Hearst correspondents in general, particularly those in Japan."

---

Frederick A. Woodress, now an Antioch graduate, works as a picture researcher at the Methodist Division of Foreign Missions Office, NYC. He is the author of "Impasse," one of Margaret Mayorga's *The Best One Act Plays 1948-49* (Dodd-Mead). He has been a reporter for short periods on the St. Louis Star-Times and two Ohio dailies. He helped to write the 87th Infantry Division history, published in 1946.

---

1940

A tour of duty at Camp Pendleton, California, this summer gave Weldon James of the editorial page of the Louisville Courier-Journal a chance for a reunion with George Chaplin, then still managing editor of the San Diego Journal. Both are alumni of the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont, which sent an extraordinary series of Nieman Fellows to Harvard in 1939, 1940, 1941 in James, Chaplin and Harry Ashmore, now executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette.

\* \* \*

Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, had articles featured simultaneously in both Collier's and the Saturday Evening Post, the week of August 20. His Post article: "The South's Forgotten Man"; his Collier's article: "A Southerner Looks at the North."

1941

The Nashville Tennessean assigned Nat Caldwell to go with TVA Chairman Gordon Clapp on his economic survey of the Near East. He left New York September 7 on a three months' mission to write a series of reports on the ground. Caldwell has covered TVA since the start of Norris Dam.

\* \* \*

George Chaplin moved from managing editor of the San Diego Journal to managing editor of the New Orleans Item in August. The Item was bought this summer by David Stern, for whom Chaplin was managing editor of the Camden Post until the sale of the Stern papers in Philadelphia and Camden.

1942

Social Action for May carried as one of its major articles a piece by Robert Lasch of the editorial page of the Chicago Sun-Times on the "State of the Press." "Reform," he says, "must come from within . . . The gulf between press and public must be bridged . . . The mission which newsmen are groping for is the historic one of representing the people."

1943

Thomas H. Griffith and his wife, Caroline, spent his vacation from Time, Inc., in a trip to Europe at the end of the summer.

1945

Frederick W. Maguire was appointed associate professor of journalism at Ohio State University this summer, leaving Michigan State. He is joint author of "Journalism in the Liberal Arts," an article in the Journal of Higher Education for June which argues for the place of journalism courses in social science divisions of universities.

\* \* \*

*The Way West*, by A. B. (Bud) Guthrie, Jr., was the Book-of-the-Month selection for October. The University of Montana conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature on Guthrie in July. Former city editor of the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, a Nieman Fellow in 1944-45, Guthrie moved into the front rank of American authors with his first novel, *The Big Sky*, in 1946.

1946

A daughter, Mary Charlotte, was born to John and Charlotte (Fitz Henry) Robling at Des Moines, August 20; weight seven pounds, five ounces.

\* \* \*

William Henry Leary announced the marriage of his daughter, Mary Ellen Leary, to Arthur Harnett Sherry on July 25. Mary Ellen is state political reporter on the San Francisco News.

1947

Stephen M. Fischer, after the conclusion of the United Nations radio broadcast series for which he wrote script, joined the staff of the Daily Compass this summer.

\* \* \*

Jack Foisie of the San Francisco Chronicle won the Propeller Club's first prize feature award in its third annual contest for writers of marine news. It carries \$250, a plaque and a trip to New York City for the Propeller Club convention, October 19-21.

1948

A son, Carl Howard, was born to Eve and Carl W. Larsen (Chicago Sun-Times) on August 10.

\* \* \*

In September, Random House published a novel by George Weller, *The Crack in the Column*, a story of Greece under occupation and in her civil war. A war correspondent in Greece, Weller is now assigned to the Near East for the Chicago Daily News.

# Letters

## "The Stringer's Complaint"

To the Editor:

Irresponsible performance by the press properly is a subject in which the *Nieman Reports* show sustained interest. Thus, it was with amazement I noted in the July issue what seemed to me an illustration of irresponsibility by the *Reports* themselves. I am thinking of "The Stringer's Complaint" by Russell Collins, and also of the harsh criticism of Associated Press handling of an aspect of the Coplon case in which Glenn Everett accused the AP of slanted reporting and inadequate investigation. Research that is stopped short of digging out all available information must mean slanted reporting and the fact that this is unwitting makes it no less dangerous and reprehensible than the deliberate slant.

Mr. Collins' piece illustrates the insufficient report. When he and the AP disagree on the time of arrival of a plane at Westover and he is right, he assumes the AP errs because it pays its representatives so little they have no incentive anywhere to do a competent job. He supports his case for measly pay by citing the experience of one man who sent the AP 48 stories in one month and got a check for \$25.

He erred on the rate of pay. The Boston Bureau of the AP informs me that, while the reporter whom the bureau identifies as the one cited by Collins, did send in 48 stories in one month, only 29 were used. Certainly Collins does not expect the AP to pay for stuff submitted but not used.

The fact completely ignored by Collins is that the AP in a vast number of instances is under no obligation at all to pay anything to what he calls a stringer.

In this vast number of instances the "stringer" are reporters for Associated Press members which are under obligation to supply the AP with news from their territories. The AP—wrongly, I think—pays these reporters, for stories used, as an incentive. The AP idea is that the extra money will stimulate the reporter's interest in the AP so that he will more promptly and regularly do the job he is paid to do.

In the Springfield-Westover territory, where Mr. Collins is the Boston *Globe* correspondent, the AP has three member newspapers, two in Springfield and one in Holyoke. Reporters for those papers are not AP stringers, they are employed

by their publishers for certain work and part of that work is to cover the AP. They are paid for this work by their publishers. If they do not do it satisfactorily, their publishers and editors should be denounced, not the AP.

The reporter cited by Mr. Collins presumably was employed by a radio station which is an associate member of the AP. My examination of AP by-laws convinces me that associate members do not have the obligation of full members to supply news to the AP. They are encouraged to supply news, however, and one of the means of encouragement is payment to reporters for sending items to the AP. The reporters who do this are employees of the associate member and serve the AP while being paid by their employer. Thus, whether the reporter whom Mr. Collins defines as an AP "stringer" is working for a full member or an associate member, the check he gets for serving the AP is "velvet" in that he earns it for work done during time for which his employer is paying him.

Mr. Collins' attack on the AP may be attributed to ignorance, both of the relationship between reporters on AP members and the AP and of the fact the "stringers" are paid employes of AP members. Such ignorance is hard to imagine on the part of any working newspaperman. Certainly the editors of the *Nieman Reports* cannot share such ignorance. Thus, I must conclude their acceptance of Mr. Collins' piece makes them guilty of an irresponsible journalism of the kind they so consistently condemn.

William H. Heath, Editor  
Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette.

### Very Superior

*Nieman Reports* was a Christmas gift to my husband from an aunt (at his request) in 1947 and he didn't know what the date or extent of his subscription was. In order to be sure of its continuance we are sending \$4.00 for a two year subscription. He thinks the publication a very superior one.

Elizabeth H. Allen  
(Mrs. Forrest Allen)

Cleveland Heights 21, Ohio

### From John Gunther

Best thanks for your courteous reminder. Indeed I do want the *Nieman Reports*, and I hope very much I haven't missed any issues. There is no magazine in the country that I look at with greater interest and satisfaction.

New York City      John Gunther

### A Progress Report

THE NIEMAN FELLOWS REPORT, edited by Louis M. Lyons. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948. 135 pp. \$2.75.

From a daring educational experiment in 1938, the Nieman Fellowships at Harvard University have grown into one of the most encouraging enterprises for the improvement of the American press since thoughtful newspaper editors led the way in establishing the first schools of journalism around 1910. Lucius Nieman, late publisher of the Milwaukee Journal, bequeathed his newspaper to his employees and his widow left part of her own fortune to Harvard with the request that the university use it for what it considered the most practical means of improving journalism in the United States. After due consideration, university authorities decided, rather than add another to the existing schools preparing undergraduates for journalism, to offer an opportunity for a year's study in any branch of the institution to men and women who were already in the field. From the funds of the Nieman Foundation, ten to fifteen practicing newspaper persons were brought to the campus annually, receiving a monthly stipend equivalent to the salaries they had been paid by their newspapers.

Nieman Fellows do not receive credit for their work, nor do they formally enroll for a fixed group of subjects. They are a distinct type of "roving scholars," with sufficient maturity and experience to enable them to choose wisely and to linger long enough in each class to gather more than a superficial fund of facts. The present book is a progress report, largely in the Fellows' own words, of a decade's operation of the plan. It adds up to a personalized inventory of university-level study such as few institutions have been fortunate enough to obtain from their student body. Viewed through the

eyes of more mature individuals, the summary does not differ remarkably from what might be expected from a discriminating undergraduate. An Oregon newspaper editor writes:

"In taking stock of my own Nieman experience, I felt it is divided into three phases. First, the fumbling out of accustomed work habits into the freer reflective activities. For me this was a slow and sometimes discouraging process. There is no note of regret intended here. For a person long engaged in routine, I believe it is tremendously useful to go through the business of getting the brains aired and reconditioned, and in this phase of the program I wish to report success to the extent of the equipment at hand.

"The second phase consists of consolidation of the information gained in and out of the success. The loose ends are conspicuous by their quantity, particularly in the side leads.

"This suggests the third phase, the running start; the momentum that will, or will not, persist after leaving Harvard. This affords the final examination for the Nieman year—if the individual slows down to a walk, he has failed. I can only guess, but I'm guessing that the momentum will continue."

This, of course, is the theory behind the Nieman Fellowships—to provide the stimulus for continued intellectual effort on the part of the journalist after he returns to the workaday order of life. While it is the theory of all education, it has special significance for the Nieman Foundation because it aims at more immediate, concrete results in the form of better newspapers. If these results come about, they will in turn yield benefits to the general public, a fact which is not always so obvious among other college products. The question whether these results have actually come about cannot yet be answered. One decade is hardly adequate time for a basis of evaluation in a program so ambitious. To interpose that the Fellows who have been selected are outstanding newspaper persons anyway, is to beg the question. All that can be said thus far is this—that the program has found favor with the newspapermen and women themselves, many of whom entered it with distinct skepticism; and that there is still the need (whether Nieman Foundation supplies the best answer or not) for a continually improving newspaper institution. To exploit Joseph Pulitzer's aphorism, "This nation and its press will stand or fall together."

What Pulitzer meant was that, in a democracy, national policy necessarily

rests upon popular attitudes, that the press and its latter-day correlative media of communication constitute one of the prime educative forces in inducing more intelligent popular attitudes, and that the press to become a more effective educative force must have progressively better-prepared personnel. Pulitzer and like-minded editors sought to meet the need by giving final impetus to the movement for schools of journalism. In the generation since then, a natural evolution has gone on—from original efforts to make the schools into training centers in techniques, the trend in the last two decades has been in the direction of upper-class and graduate-level curriculums aimed at the integration of broad areas of general knowledge into a report which may be adequately translated into the language of the reading and listening public. A combination of the student, practitioner, and scholar has become the ideal. In this process, professional education for journalism has not yet integrated itself—the work of the Nieman Foundation has not yet been actually engrafted into the schools of journalism, but the conviction of leaders in journalism education is that it will be, in time. For, in

the final analysis, the best system of education for journalism will be that which can select, from among college undergraduates or from self-taught practitioners, those who show promise of fusing education with life—which can conduct those candidates through a regime of general studies at an advanced level and prepare the candidate for the most skillful utilization of this material, as the medical school does with the material of the natural sciences, the engineering school with the physical sciences, and the like—which can go with these same candidates into the profession, or offer them opportunity to return for post-graduate clinical study.

This is the prospect which makes the Nieman program of such significance in higher education. In a free press, it is obvious that improvement must come from within. That the American press has much room for improvement is encouragingly recognized by the Nieman Fellows themselves, who speak in terms of humility and self-doubt with respect to their own experience.

William F. Swindler  
University of Nebraska  
—in *Journal of Higher Education*, Oct.



## Harvard Faculty Committee

## To Advise Nieman Fellows

At the opening of the Harvard College year, President James Bryant Conant appointed a new Faculty Advisory Committee for Nieman Fellows.

It includes Archibald MacLeish, first curator of the Nieman Fellowships, now back at Harvard as Boylston professor of rhetoric, and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, long a member of the earlier smaller executive committee on Nieman Fellowships. The other faculty members are strategically placed to serve as consultants to the Fellows on courses and to act as liaison with the principal professional schools and departments whose work is of interest to the Fellows.

The Faculty Advisory Committee members are:

Archibald MacLeish, Boylston Professor of Rhetoric;

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Francis Lee Higginson Professor of History;  
John K. Fairbank, Professor of History (International Studies);  
Merle Fainsod, Professor of Government;

Archibald Cox, Professor of Law (Law School);

A. Baird Hastings, Hamilton Kuhn Professor of Biological Chemistry (Medical School);

Samuel A. Stouffer, Professor of Sociology, Director of the Laboratory of Social Relations;

Bertrand Fox, Professor of Economics and Business Administration (Business School);

Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships, chairman.

# A Dutchman Looks at the U. S. Press

by Jan Roelof Klinkert

As a European who has actively participated in the American way of life for more than two years, I have been asked:

"Is the American press carrying out its responsibility in the coverage of news?"

My first observation is that there is an inherent tendency in American journalism to give the public what it wants. I think this is dangerous as well as a regrettable tendency. Dangerous, because it is very hard to discover "what the public wants," as Messrs. Roper and Gallup recently experienced. Regrettable, because oftentimes there is very little relationship between our wants and our needs. The American public probably wants to hear that all Indonesians are freedom-loving, innocent children of nature, and all Dutchmen are brute, mechanized imperialists. I suspect their need to be different, however. News, especially foreign news, does not fit into prejudiced patterns of good and evil. As Sir Willmott Lewis, London Times Washington correspondent, once told newsmen: "Good and evil mingle in the best and worst of causes."

I see, moreover, an aggravating circumstance in the fact that, at least in my opinion, there is no need for such classification of the news. My question to the wise men:

"Why is it that in covering the news, the American press in general tends to make certain persons, certain groups and certain nations appear consistently black or consistently white, consistently right or consistently wrong, consistently good or consistently bad?"

My next observation as a foreign witness is that American journalists have an apparent liking for intimate detail, especially in intimate matters.

During the last few days the wife of a baby specialist in St. Louis has received enough play and space in the American press to make any conference of foreign ministers jealous. It hurts me to say that even today in America the quickest and most effective way to break into print in the majority of newspapers is to live according to either Dr. Kinsey's findings, or Al Capone's example. It is not quite yellow journalism any more. But there is still plenty of yellowish journalism.

I hope that the editors and reporters of America will not hesitate in giving both Ernest Bevin and Paul-Henry Spaak a break as far as news treatment is concerned. Even when Dr. Kinsey continues to write books, and Al Capone's pupils continue to dodge taxes.

In the coverage of foreign news by the American press of late there has been an unwarranted emphasis upon conflict rather than agreement, upon antithesis rather than synthesis. A British friend of mine visiting in this country once told me after a few weeks' stay: "If I could be sure that things are as bad internationally as the American papers tell me, by George, I would go right back to England and join the Home Guard."

To be sure, there is plenty of conflict and plenty of strife on the international scene. And it is the obligation of the American press to tell us about it. But we are no less entitled to hear the good news. And there is plenty of that too. My next question to the wise men:

"Why is a biting dog, or a biting man, still more news-

worthy than are a well-behaved pet and a loving owner?"

But I am convinced that the American press is the freest in the world. That remark, unluckily, has become a cliche. And just to show that I do not intend it to be that way, I repeat: I am convinced that the American press is the freest in the world. I am not convinced, as my previous remarks may have indicated, that it is the most responsible press on this earth. But, in my opinion, freedom precedes responsibility. And only a free instrument can have any hopes of eventually becoming truly responsible.

If I were to give the name of what I consider the greatest paper in the world today it would be the name of an American paper. At the same time, if I were to indicate the world's worst newspaper, it likewise would be an American one. Good and evil mingle in the best and worst of causes.

I detect a growing sense of responsibility among the future crop of American journalists. The emphasis upon the ethical standards of the profession as it is given in training institutions for future newspaper workers, has impressed me deeply. Such a responsible training for a difficult profession, I regret to say, is still sadly lacking on the other side of the Atlantic.

"Is the American press carrying out its responsibility in the coverage of news?" I wish I could say "yes" in answer to that question. Neither can my response be negative. The heart of that matter is that neither prejudice nor overconfidence will bring us the solution.

I am convinced that American journalism has advanced rapidly, in theory as well as in practice. But—as Scotty Reston has so rightfully emphasized—the question before us is not if we have made progress, but if we have made enough progress. In that same spirit: The question is not if we have given the American public what it wants, but if it wants enough of it. It is not if we present foreign news, but if enough of it has been presented. It is not if we are responsible in our reporting, but if we are responsible enough in presenting the news.

The curious course of history has brought about our present condition, in which the decisions of the American people will no longer affect only themselves. They will equally affect the Dutch and the British, the French and Finns, the Russians and the Indonesians. To put it in colloquial terms: we are all in the same boat.

But only the Americans have access to the rudder. And the American press is their principal log, for the present as well as the future.

If you run aground, we run aground. If you have to swim, we have to swim. The question as to the responsibility of the American press is not merely an academic one. To millions of hoping Europeans and Americans alike, it may mean the difference between smooth sailing or historic disaster.

---

Jan Roelof Klinkert, a Dutch student in the School of Journalism at the University of Minnesota, was asked for his observations on the American press at Journalism-day last Spring. This is from his talk.

---