

Nieman Reports

October, 1953

Obligations of A Newspaperman

John B. Oakes

Hoosier Heritage

Norman E. Isaacs

Repercussions of a Visit to Moscow

Rebecca F. Gross

Mexico's National Hour on Radio

Marvin H. Alisky

Mr. Bennett and Mr. Greeley Visit

David M. White

Full Text of ASNE Report on the Wechsler-McCarthy Case

Editorial Pages and Writers, Michael Bradshaw — Tips to Kibitzers of the Press, Arthur C. Barschdorf — Behind the Headlines in Egypt, James Batal — Unique Position of the Newspaper, Oveta Culp Hobby — Can Communism Be Controlled Without Sacrificing Liberty?, Francis P. Locke — Inciting Suspicion, A. Gayle Waldrop — The Menace to Free Journalism in America, Mary McCarthy

Scrapbook — Nieman Notes — Editorials on McCarthy and the Press

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council, elected by former Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. It aims to provide a medium for discussion by newspapermen of problems common to their profession.

NiemanReports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Malcolm C. Bauer, Portland, Ore.; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Lexington, Ky.; John M. Harrison, Toledo, O.; John L. Hulteng, Providence, R. I.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, Ohio; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, Ohio; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeier, Providence, R. I.; Leon Svirsky, New York City; Walter H. Waggoner, Washington, D. C.; Lawrence G. Weiss, New York City; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Mass., Chairman.

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

VOL. VII, NO. 4

OCTOBER, 1953

The Unique Position Of the Newspaper

by Oveta Culp Hobby

There have been people who seemed to think that the newspaper as a free American institution is fading slowly from the picture.

It is true that there are in the United States a good many fewer daily and somewhat fewer weekly newspapers than prior to—say 1920. But newspaper circulation for every thousand of population today is at an all time high. And the reason why, in spite of this, there are fewer newspapers, is not the lethal effect of the radio. It is economic. The almost fantastic increase in the cost of newsprint, the increasing cost of editorially and mechanically producing and distributing newspapers, and the inevitable competition between the strong and the weak, has brought about mergers, and in some cases, death.

Probably the principal reason why radio has had little or no adverse effect on newspapers is because millions of people have learned to read happily while listening.

And the ability of Americans to do two things at once—listen and at the same time read, write, study or bake a cake, is even more conspicuous in the younger generation, as any one knows who has heard teen age children complain that they actually can't concentrate on their math, or whatever, unless the radio is going.

But now the newspapers face another threat—television.

That, I admit, is something once again. I suppose one could shell peas or knit while watching television. But you certainly can't watch a ball game, or Kukla, Fran and Ollie, or Zsa Zsa Gabor and read a newspaper at the same time.

In fact, in the case of Gabor, I think you would be ill advised to try it!

Still, I believe that the newspapers will survive even this

competition, and will continue to grow—in circulation and in *value*, in what I suppose we must call this, the "television era."

The reason, I think, lies strangely enough in the very totality of the television experience.

When you look at one television program, you can hardly look at another at the same time. When you tune your receiver to one channel, you automatically rule out whatever experience you might receive over any other channel until you again turn the tuning knob.

What you have missed is unlikely, except in extreme cases, to be repeated as television fare. Thus, if you are watching a comedy during a news program, or perhaps during an interview with Mr. Churchill, you will have to get that news or the sense of that interview elsewhere. You will always be able to get it from your newspaper. In fact, you will depend on getting it there. The newspaper will still be a vital means of communication.

There is another reason which may seem to you a little less logical; but I think I can assure you that it is no less real. It is this: There is no one more anxious to read the Sunday newspaper account of Saturday's football game than the person who saw it from the stands. There is no one more anxious to read in his newspaper the proceedings at the U.N. than the person who has just left the session. And I believe there is no one more anxious to read about a fire than the man or woman who has witnessed the conflagration so recently that his hair still smells of smoke.

Seeing an event whets a person's appetite to read about it or to read an interpretation of it.

This, if I am not mistaken, is where the newspaper promises to go step in step with television. It allows readers to relive events; to evaluate their significance; to contemplate ideas, and to study criticism. It converts them from viewers to thinkers—a highly important conversion in this day and age.

Specifically, I expect the great newspaper of the future to lean farther and farther toward news and news interpretation. The news must always be there.

For one thing, television can't bring it all; and if it did, no one could be there at the set to get it all. The homeward travelling commuter, hot to know who is ahead—th White Sox or the Cubs, or whether his Illinois Central or garter stock is travelling up or down on the big board, can't carry a television in his pocket. He buys a newspaper.

I therefore think that this "threat" of television, like chain newspapers and radio, will not reduce the need for and importance of newspapers. I think it will increase their need and importance.

This is from a talk by Oveta Culp Hobby, Federal Security Administrator, before the Economic Club in Chicago on March 23. Mrs. Hobby is herself publisher of the *Houston Post*.

"The greatest threat to press freedom" - McCarthy.

The Dangerous Obligations Of A Newspaperman

by John B. Oakes

Most emphasis nowadays when one is talking about the press and its freedom is on the rights of the press; the right of newspapermen to print what they want to print; the right of publishers to publish; of editors to edit; of reporters to report; of readers to read.

Now I am not in any sense disparaging those rights. They're embodied in the First Amendment to our Constitution and they form part of our very history, our traditions and our life.

What the Constitution really guarantees is the right of the public to have free access to information rather than the right of any class or group to supply that information. That is the real reason why this guarantee is in the Constitution, and it is too bad that more newspaper people do not realize that this is so. Some of them do. The publisher of the newspaper with which I am lucky enough to be associated, the *New York Times*, put it this way: "In the newspaper business, as I see it, the citizen has the right to a free press. Under that right the publisher has the obligation to produce a responsible newspaper."

And that brings us right back to that word "obligation." The newspaperman has the obligation of giving something in return for the special protection afforded him by our laws and by our customs. Since it is impossible to require him to act in a given manner because to do so would infringe the very freedom which is guaranteed, he is left with the moral obligation to make himself and his newspaper worthy of that freedom.

In specific terms, this is simply the moral obligation to tell the truth. In general terms, it can be described as the newspaperman's sense of responsibility. In other words, it is the determination to tell the whole story so far as humanly possible with truth and without passion or prejudice. That is the mark of a responsible newspaper as it is the mark of a responsible newspaperman.

I want to say right here that unless we have a responsible press, we are in danger of losing our free press—and we would deserve to lose it. So the most important practical question facing the American press comes down to this:

just how responsible is the press of our country today? It isn't a question that can be easily answered but it is of direct public interest. We on the *Times* think, and we have stated, that "the newspapers of this country are touched with a great public interest and their responsibility should be as much a matter of public concern as is their freedom."

The American press has been under bitter attack for failure to live up to that responsibility. The attack is nothing new. It varies in intensity with the degree of political excitement in any year but perhaps it hit new heights, at least in modern times, during the last Presidential campaign, when charges were made with frequency and with bitterness that the United States was suffering from a one-party press. It is worth spending a few minutes looking into this.

Let me ask even those of you who may be most angry with the press to take a deep breath and to look at American newspapers in the proper perspective. The press of the United States is far and away the best in the world. That may not be saying much but it's true. While the best British papers may be comparable with the best of ours, there are not many of them and the worst of them are far worse and I honestly believe that these are relatively more numerous. The same thing is true in general of the Continental press.

Even the most rabid proponents of the one-party press theory in the United States would have to admit that what they are talking about is something totally different from the one-party press in the totalitarian world. There it is an absolute; here at its worst it is but relative.

Just how relative is it? Do we merely mean that most American newspapers have editorially supported one party in the last few elections? There is no doubt that is exactly what is meant by a great many people. Governor Stevenson himself put it this way:

"The overwhelming majority of the press is against Democrats, not after a sober and considered review of the alternatives, but automatically, as dogs are against cats. As soon as a newspaper sees a Democratic candidate, it is filled with an unconquerable yen to chase him up an alley."

And the statistics of editorial support in the American daily press do bear out Mr. Stevenson's use of the phrase "overwhelming majority." An authoritative survey pub-

Mr. Oakes is an editorial writer on the *New York Times*. This is from a talk given to the 20-30 Club of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York City.

lished a few days before the election showed that Stevenson was supported by 14½ per cent of the dailies with 11 per cent of the circulation, while Eisenhower was backed by 67 per cent of the dailies with 80 per cent of the circulation. Although the proportions are less striking, a roughly similar situation existed in the four preceding elections, in which the newspapers were overwhelmingly against Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt.

But I would like to ask why this condition should be described as evidencing a "one-party press." Starting from the premise that more newspapers are pro-Republican than pro-Democratic, it is hardly surprising that in the last election—in view of what happened among the voters—even more papers than usual were pro-Republican. Is it particularly astonishing that the enormously increased Republican—or let's call it pro-Eisenhower—strength among the voters should have been paralleled by increased Republican support among the editors? On the other hand, it is worth remembering that even so there was some very strong editorial opinion lined up on behalf of the Democratic candidate. This was true in Atlanta, in Louisville, in New Orleans, in Nashville; and not only the South. It was true in Milwaukee and in St. Louis. The *New York Evening Post* was for Stevenson; the *News* in Los Angeles; the *Sacramento Bee*—and of course there were many more. And in some of these cases the newspapers supporting Stevenson were the most powerful papers in their own communities as well as nationally known.

No matter how successful the Eisenhower Administration may be, I predict here and now that support for the Republicans will diminish in the nation's press by 1956—maybe even by 1954—because editors are inherently critical—as they should be—of the party that happens to be in power.

The basic fact in all this is that editors of both the Republican and Democratic papers have complete freedom of choice. They may make their choice for the best or worst of motives but the important thing is that it is free. Personally, I think it is unfortunate that the overwhelming majority of important publishers do seem to line up alongside one particular party. I think it would be better if the press were more evenly divided politically but, at least, the choice of party is not forced upon any newspaper.

But the argument that there is a one-party press sometimes refers not to the charge that most newspapers lean editorially to one party but rather that they allow their editorial opinion to spill over into their news columns. This is really a most serious charge. It is really the heart of the criticisms against the American press. And if true, it would certainly mean that newspapers are not living up to their obligations and their responsibilities. But the case has not been proved—not yet anyway.

The *Oregon Journal*, which was for Stevenson, said this:

"Both Portland newspapers and most upstate Oregon newspapers leaned over backwards to give fair news treatment to both candidates, regardless of editorial policy. Most responsible papers of the East did likewise. Unfortunately we cannot say as much for some of the papers."

Able newspapermen disagree on this point. Roscoe Drummond, correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*, had this to say during the campaign: "The Democratic nominee is getting considerably less than an even break in the news columns of the daily newspapers across the country." But Mr. Drummond's managing editor, William Stringer, said: "On balance, the impression is that the American press as a whole did a fairly creditable job in reporting the campaign, with some deplorable exceptions."

There certainly isn't any doubt about the exceptions. Some newspapers, newspaper chains and news magazines were unquestionably guilty of gross distortion of the news to the benefit of their own candidate, who usually turned out to be General Eisenhower. I know that many specific instances in various parts of the country can be cited and no *New Yorker* need look for glaring examples further than his own city.

However, I cannot resist giving you one or two examples from other places. There was the Montana newspaper, for instance, which offered its readers a report of the National Plowing Contest in Minnesota, at which both candidates delivered major addresses. The paper gave a full account of the speech of General Eisenhower, whom it was supporting for Presidency, and then added at the bottom of its story: "Governor Stevenson also spoke."

Then there was the evening newspaper in Clarksburg, West Virginia, that didn't print a word about the fact that the President of the United States was going to make a whistle-stop there that day. The editor explained later: "I saw no reason why I should help the Truman crowd." But the next day, after the President had gone, his visit was noted in the second half of a two-part story in which Mr. Truman received a total of fourteen lines. Describing this incident, the *New York Times* correspondent went on to say: "The first part (of the story) recalled the time eleven years ago when showmen arrived with an embalmed whale on two railroad flat cars and 'stunk up' Clarksburg."

Now, just so you won't think these horrible examples are anything new in American journalism, let me mention the headline that appeared in a newspaper called *Columbian Centinel* of March 4, 1801, introducing the news—not editorial—account of Thomas Jefferson's inauguration: "Yesterday Expired—Deeply Regretted by Millions of Americans—And by all Good Men—The Federal Administration—of the Government of the United States."

As a matter of fact, the press nowadays is far less guilty than it used to be of highly editorialized comments in the

news columns. Until about a half century ago the news accounts of practically all American newspapers could hardly be distinguished from their editorial statements. There is no doubt that we have improved but the question is have we improved enough. I doubt it.

And that is the reason why I am one of those newspapermen who strongly believe that an impartial survey of the press should be undertaken. I regret that a committee of Sigma Delta Chi, the journalistic fraternity, has refused to recommend such an inquiry because of the difficulty of defining terms and setting standards. I also regret that a resolution to the same end was rejected recently by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, practically without debate. I think the task can be done and ought to be done, perhaps by one of the foundations. I think that, rightly or wrongly, the confidence of the American public in the fairness of the American press has been shaken and that it would be tremendously to the interest of the press itself, as well as of the general public, to have such a survey made. Editors are quick to protest such matters as the exclusion of newspapermen from the Jelke trial but they are very slow to look into this problem of whether or not the public is really beginning to mistrust its newspapers.

I think the most serious indictment of the American press is not that it isn't as good as it ought to be but that with rare exceptions it refuses to take seriously the public criticism heaped upon it. As the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, one of the few newspapers that has urged such an impartial inquiry, said in a recent editorial: "The American press is storing up trouble for itself." I agree that it is.

The greatest threat of all to press freedom in the United States would be a completely irresponsible press, but the principal attempts to infringe on press freedom come from outside the newspaper world.

In the thirties it was fashionable to assert that the press was held in chains by its advertisers because of the economic dependence of newspapers on their advertising. However, the fact is that this is one threat to press freedom that is grossly exaggerated. I certainly do not deny that on rare occasions individual advertisers or even groups of advertisers do try to put pressure on the newspapers. I know of a case some years ago when the leading paper in a large Eastern city was urging the election of a reform mayor to oust the entrenched political machine. That machine had strong connections with some of the most important department store executives. One day they came around to see the editor and threatened him with the loss of all his department store advertising if he did not withdraw his support from the reform movement. The editor told them to get out of his office, which they did. They also carried out their threat. The paper immediately lost thousands of dollars in local advertising,

which it could not afford to lose; but it stuck to its political guns and after the reform mayor was elected, the advertisers returned to the columns of the paper. I can vouch for the accuracy of that story because the editor was my father.

But I can also say that this type of pressure is exceedingly rare today. Somewhat more frequent perhaps is the kind of unspoken pressure that results in newspapers failing to print something that they might have published if it were not for fear of displeasing a large advertiser. But it is the paper that has no advertising revenue at all that is the one to beware. Its bills have to be paid and if the advertising is lacking, then it is at least conceivable that someone or some interest is meeting these bills—and not for the sake of charity.

A much more fruitful area in which to search for pressures against press freedom is in the vast realm of religious and racial special interest groups. There is hardly a major newspaper in the country that has not felt such pressure from otherwise perfectly honest citizens, who can work up a very genuine emotional steam on issues of this sort. Such pressures are particularly troublesome because they are exerted by hundreds—sometimes even thousands—of individual citizens acting in accordance with plan. Labor certainly constitutes a major pressure group too and so do business interests; but it is true that since religious and racial groups can arouse the strongest emotions among their own members they are the groups that nowadays seem most easily to impel the individual to action.

The classical threat to press freedom comes not from the readers but from government. In wartime the necessities of censorship are understood and the press normally accepts this limitation on its freedom in the national interests. A different kind of curb on freedom of the press has grown up during the post-war years. With increasing effectiveness, news is censored at the source in various departments of the government in Washington. It becomes more and more difficult for even the most able and energetic reporter to penetrate the paper curtain set up by a multitude of government press agents, whose purpose is not only to inform the public of the good things their department is doing but also to keep the public from knowing the bad things. It is a fine line between security and suppression, and the answer has not yet been found for the kind of cold peace in which we are living.

But probably the most acute threat to press freedom today is found not in the areas which I have mentioned but in the kind of tactics that have sprung up in recent years in some political circles. I am referring directly to the tactics of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin. Senator McCarthy has worked in two principal ways.

The first method he tried was through the advertisers. In more than one instance he has asked persons or corporations advertising in publications opposed to him to remove their advertising from those publications. This may seem a rather round-about attack on freedom of the press but in the hands of as vicious a demagogue as Senator McCarthy it could be very dangerous.

In November, 1951, *Time* magazine ran a cover story about McCarthy which was not precisely complimentary. A few months later eleven national advertisers in *Time* had received a letter from him reading as follows:

"*Time's* advertisers make it possible for the Luce chain to send into millions of American homes . . . dishonest, twisted news . . . Many of those advertisers are militantly anti-Communist and intensely American. When I know that they are not aware of the facts and because of that are unknowingly helping to pollute and poison the waterholes of information, I have a duty to bring that to their attention."

The inference, of course, is that *Time* is pro-Communist because of its attack on anti-Communist McCarthy and *Time's* advertisers are helping to promote pro-Communist propaganda by advertising in *Time*. So far as I know, none of the advertisers paid any attention to this campaign but it takes little imagination to guess what the effects of such tactics might be on a small publication which had earned McCarthy's wrath. I understand that McCarthy has tried the same thing against the *Milwaukee Journal*, which is one of his most active newspaper opponents, and against other publications as well.

The second form of attack used by McCarthy on the press is illustrated by the Wechsler case. Here Mr. McCarthy employed his great power as chairman of a Senate investigating committee to interrogate an editor who had been bitterly opposing him, and who was vulnerable to the extent that he had, as a very young man many years ago, been an acknowledged member of the Communist party. Mr. Wechsler had long since renounced Communism and, in fact, has been in recent years through columns of his newspaper an eloquent enemy of Communism, but he was also against McCarthy, as many millions of other loyal anti-Communist Americans are. I am convinced from reading the transcript of his hearing that the only reason he was called to Wash-

ington was so that McCarthy could harass and intimidate him, not as an ex-Communist but as an editor of an anti-McCarthy newspaper. Whether or not this kind of bullying had any effect on this editor seems to me to be beside the point. It is a clear example of attempted intimidation and as such seems to me to be a very real threat to press freedom.

In fact, in my view, far and away the most serious danger to American newspapers today lies in the success of such strong-arm politicians as McCarthy. The kind of terroristic emotionalism which McCarthy employs is an enemy of truth and of the ideals for which a free press stands. The fundamental reason for a free press is an informed democracy; when a democracy no longer wishes to be informed because it is so emotionally wrought up that it cannot tell truth from falsehood, then it has already lost its freedom. That is precisely the path down which McCarthyism can lead us.

The effect of McCarthyism is, of course, not to do any real damage to the Communist conspiracy at which it is allegedly aimed; but rather to confuse the issues, to equate the unorthodox and the unpopular with the treasonable and the subversive, to frighten dissenters and to establish a line of thinking that is standard and safe. The election and re-election of people like McCarthy would tend to indicate that this process has already begun.

But I don't think that it has gone far enough to cause anyone to despair. I think we are a very long way from anything that could be remotely described as a police state, but I do believe that this is the time, if ever there was one, for the press to make itself worthy of the freedom that it still retains and that, as I see it, is the most urgent obligation of the newspaperman—to do what he can to make the press worth fighting for.

In a democracy, freedom of the press is not a luxury. It is a necessity and that means freedom to print the unpopular, the unorthodox, the unpalatable. Only governments that lack self-confidence restrict freedom of the press. If we believe in a democracy, we must believe in defending one of the foundation stones of our democracy—always providing that it is solid and straight and not corrupt and crumbling of its own weakness. It is the obligation of newspapermen to see that that foundation stone is strong; it is the obligation of all citizens to see that that foundation is not undermined.

Hoosier Heritage

by Norman E. Isaacs

It seems to me high time somebody in Indiana started recalling the great liberal heritage which belongs to Hoosiers—and, more important, started doing something about it.

I have gained the impression these past few years that too many people in Indiana seem disposed to forget it; indeed, to act as if it were a dark and shameful secret. Instead, it is one of the glories of Indiana that it contributed so greatly to America's democracy.

I worked in Indianapolis when it was a proud newspaper city. Jim Stuart, of whom I am inordinately fond, gave me my first job on the *Star*. Then I worked for the Indianapolis *Times* in a day when it was a great, crusading newspaper.

I worked there for a man who was a great editor, but whose name, I regret to say, most people today probably never heard. He was Boyd Gurley. He won the Pulitzer Prize for his newspaper for exposing the Ku Klux Klan and helping send at least one governor and several other political lights to prison.

Boyd Gurley believed in that Indiana which took pride in the fact that it was one of the principal links in the famed Underground Railway of Civil War days—when fleeing slaves were transported in the darkness from post to post and to the freedom of the North.

He believed in that Indiana which knew of and respected—even if it didn't agree in the slightest detail with—Robert Owen's New Harmony experiment—the first communist settlement in the New World. Here you had primitive Christian communism. It was pure idealism and it failed. Fifty years later it was to be studied by Marx and Engels. But Indiana respected Robert Owen's independence and never thought of it in the curious ideological twist which now makes it a nasty word. I wonder how many of you know that only about seven miles or so from where you sit is the site of another experiment in communism.

It is down on State Road 45, the old Blue Springs Community, where about 125 years ago they tried to establish another Site of Harmony. Unlike Owen's, this one lasted only about a year.

Boyd Gurley believed in the Indiana which produced Eugene V. Debs, four times the Socialist candidate for President of the United States, and the real spiritual father of the C.I.O. idea of vertical unionism.

Norman Isaacs is managing editor of the Louisville *Times* and president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Conference. This is from an address to the School of Journalism at Indiana University.

Later, still, I worked at the Indianapolis *News* where I occupied the office next door to the one in which Kin Hubbard use to work. Kin Hubbard's fictional "Abe Martin,"—like the real-life Will Rogers—wasn't afraid to speak his piece.

Yes, all these men lived and flourished in an Indiana that generated ideas—and was proud of it.

Certainly, there was disagreement. Plenty of it. And some of it on occasion pretty violent disagreement. But for the most part and aside from that degrading period when the Klan swaggered through the state, it was kept on the level of honest Americanism—a tolerant Americanism.

Indiana was America—a small America, but a real, working sample of the whole.

It was a state that produced the widest possible range of political thinking—from a Robert Owen and a Eugene V. Debs to an Albert J. Beveridge and a David Maclean Parry.

It was the kind of atmosphere in which the ferment of ideas produced many kinds of men—many of industrial and productive genius, many of artistic bent.

It was an atmosphere that produced writers at an astonishing rate—Edward Eggleston, James Whitcomb Riley, General Lew Wallace, Meredith Nicholson, George Ade, Booth Tarkington, Claude Bowers, Theodore Dreiser.

It produced composers and painters and musicians and architects.

And from Indiana sprang great newspaper names—Kent Cooper, Elmer Davis, Roy Howard, George Jean Nathan, Don Herold.

This was the Indiana tradition which I knew as a boy. And I grew up in a belligerent school of journalism. It was a journalism close to the people. John T. Holliday's Indianapolis *News* was literally "The Great Hoosier Daily" and many a Hoosier actually learned his ABC's from its pages. It was a journalism scornful of the politicians, like Kin Hubbard having "Abe Martin" say:

"Now and then an innocent man is sent t'
th' legislature."

The Indiana tradition was one which could make a James Whitcomb Riley and a Eugene Debs fast friends and make the state's beloved poet write about the state's leading radical figure like this:

"And there's 'Gene Debs—a man 'at stands
And jest holds out in his two hands
As warm a heart as ever beat
Betwixt here and the Judgment Seat!"

The Indiana of my own young newspaper days was one

in which free debate could—and did—flourish without our calling each other names. We met in college halls to discuss such things as whether the Communists had a right to be on the ballot, whether the American Legion was a force for good or not, on public housing, on the subject of race—on everything and anything. We had some real burrs under the saddle. Bishop Oxnam—not yet a bishop—was then president at DePauw. Homer T. Rainey was president at Franklin. These were sturdy men who said what they thought. And while other Hoosiers might disagree with them, they respected them, at least, as sincere and honest Americans.

In Indianapolis, there were clergymen following the outspoken tradition of Henry Ward Beecher. I remember well the great liberal triumvirate of Father Lyons—later Monsignor Lyons, Rabbi Feuerlicht and Dr. Frank Wicks. Time and again, they spoke up for the American freedoms.

This was the Indiana that produced people like Ernie Pyle and Wendell Willkie.

John Stempel was one of Ernie's closest associates when they went to school. They alternated in the job of news editor to *The Student*. John remembers Ernie's brush with the Klan in his first newspaper job in LaPorte. Ernie covered a Klan meeting and the Kluxers followed him to his room and warned him not to report what he had seen and heard. Ernie quietly refused.

Like Boyd Gurley, Ernie Pyle wasn't afraid.

Wendell Willkie was first a Socialist in belief, then a Democrat and finally a Republican—and a candidate for the Presidency. Wendell Willkie was also a hero—because never for one minute did Wendell Willkie fear decent and forthright Americanism.

It was Willkie, the Republican from Indiana, the standard bearer of his party, who went before the United States Supreme Court to defend a Communist—in that man's right to believe in what he believed.

Wendell Willkie wasn't afraid.

But looking now at Indiana—and at some other states as well—I grow a little discouraged.

This isn't the America in which I grew up, or about which I was taught.

I hate Communism for what it has done to the human spirit—for its murder and pillage, for its treachery, for its crushing of the human soul. Yet for all this, I do not think that it was any great crime for Americans to have played around with Communism, or even to have joined it. I think they were damn fools, but I always thought that an American had a right to make a fool of himself if he so pleased.

My own philosophy is mostly based on Thomas Jefferson and I think one of the Persians (I've forgotten who) expressed the Jeffersonian spirit ever so neatly—that the

truly great man is he who would master no one and one who would be mastered by none.

That, I firmly believe, was the philosophy of the Indiana that brought forth and nurtured people like Pyle and Gurley and Debs and Willkie and Oxnam—and so many others, including the famous Hapgood family.

But that isn't the kind of America you happen to be growing up in at the moment. You happen to be growing up in an atmosphere of suspicion and petty prejudice—and fear.

From what I have read and been told by people who were there, this is the kind of atmosphere that existed in Germany in the days just before Adolf Hitler took over power. People felt that it was safer to be quiet rather than run the risk of being abused by loud-mouthed oratorical bullies. The physical bullies came later. In Germany, it was the period when it had been unfashionable to speak for the kind of liberalism that left men free to think as free men.

If you come into your inheritance with fear in your mind or your soul, God help the press and God help America.

I don't care what it is you choose to think—but go ahead and think it—and say it out loud. And give other men the right to say what they think. That's the kind of proud and unafraid America we once had—and which we can have again.

The people who would put limits on Americanism are the very people who have confused license with liberty—and, as a result, some fine and decent people have been smeared and attacked for no reason other than that they expressed their beliefs. I have nothing against investigations. I think they are a right and proper function of the Congress. I do, however, challenge some of the methods—methods which result in smears, rather than fact-finding. This is license. It has produced a good deal of the fear of which I speak.

In all this, the press has shared some of the responsibility. There is a reason for it. These new-type attacks by the self-designated super-patriots caught the press unprepared.

We had come to accept objectivity in reporting as a sort of well-defined path. If a responsible official said it, we could quote him, and our responsibility was done. And timing—the today angle—was also important to us. We were not prepared for the constant shifting of ground, for the piling up of charge upon charge. We didn't make the news, we simply reported it. It was understandably difficult for us in American newspapering to realize we were getting a taste of the kind of technique which had been used by Hitler and by Stalin. So we were publishing, in good faith, wild accusation after wild accusation.

We had to learn by experience. And most of us have learned. We have learned the moment accusations are made to move fast to try to get the other side. Sometimes,

it is expensive tracing people down by long distance phone, but we go ahead and do it. Newspapermen who take their responsibilities seriously do their best to see to it that the other side gets a fair rebuttal—in approximately the same place in the paper that the original was printed. This is equity—and journalism owes equity of treatment to its readers—who, please remember, are also the nation's citizens.

A good example happened within the last few weeks. Right when former President Truman was visiting the East, Senator McCarthy issued a statement saying that he had been informed that Truman, while President, had failed to turn over to the FBI lists of spies which had been given to him by the Canadian Government. He said he was asking that it be checked and that he might call Truman in to testify. That is Page One news—McCarthy saying he might call Truman to testify.

Personally, I thought it was claptrap, that McCarthy was doing his usual, adept headline-hunting. I said so at the time, but it isn't my business to inflict my personal guesses on the readers. It was worth Page One and that's where the *Louisville Times* printed it.

A week later, McCarthy announced that he had received a letter from Attorney General Brownell saying that the Department of Justice had no knowledge of such a suppression by the former President, but that a further check would be made. McCarthy repeated the whole thing over again. Now this, you see, is repeating the charge—or, as it turned out, repeating the lie.

Anyway, we printed that, too—on Page One. Then, only last week, McCarthy finally said that he wasn't going to call Truman after all—that the FBI said it was not true. McCarthy made no apology for this slur on a former President. I think he owed him one, no matter what he might think of Harry Truman. But all he issued was an off-hand statement, saying that since the FBI said it wasn't true, he saw no reason to call Truman.

We gave that story the same treatment we gave the first two stories—Page One. I hope that your own Indiana papers did the same thing. In many cities of the United States, this rule of equity has become a standard practice and I trust that Indiana newspapers are playing the game as fairly.

As I say, we have been learning the hard way. We have learned that there cannot be arbitrary limits on objectivity—that, like Government, we have to move ahead and adjust our newspapering to the kinds of modern attack to which we are subjected. It matters not whether the attack comes from the Right or the Left—we have a duty to our citizen-readers to play it down the middle, as fairly and squarely as it is humanly possible to do.

All the men of little minds who put limits on Americanism are also seeking to put limits on the press—shackles. The lefties, or the rightists, it makes no difference—they

have never liked a free press. It is too bad that we still have newspaper owners and editors—although not in any large degree any more—who put their partisan political beliefs ahead of their American freedoms. It astonishes me to see newspaper proprietors in this day and age stomaching a philosophy that would do away with their own freedoms.

I don't like to keep bringing McCarthy in. He just happens to be the chief little mind of the moment. I wonder sometimes if the newspapers which support him so avidly aren't blinded by their partisanship.

Surely they know him to be an advocate of the circulation and advertising boycott against those who disagree with him. It is a matter of record that he tried it against the Madison (Wis.) *Capital-Times* and the Milwaukee *Journal*. He called for it against *Time Magazine*. And on the Senate floor he publicly attacked a chain of stores for sponsoring on the radio a commentator who opposed him.

I regret to say that some of the newspapers which support the Senator do not also report this kind of material. It is too bad, because the citizens are entitled to know what manner of man this is.

Having grown up in newspapering, I can testify as to how much we have improved through the years. You can look back in the files by ten-year gaps and you will be literally startled by the improvement. Sometimes I think that American newspapering has improved more in the last quarter of a century than any other service function in our national life.

When I broke in, the business still had a good many of the old-fashioned drunks. Some of them worked with their hats on. That was the Chicago tradition. They drifted in, asked for a day's work on the rim of the copy desk, then lasted one, two, or three days, depending on how soon they tied one on in a big way.

We did a lot of things wrong. We were in a terrific hurry. We were superficial. We didn't write very well. Police was a big beat and much of our work centered around crime news. Those were the banner-line stories. If a kid of 13 or 14 got into trouble, bang went that child's name into the paper. If a photographer took a picture of some poor, demented person, it was likely the newspaper would print it. Like the moral values of the country, the moral values of the newspapers of the late twenties and early thirties weren't terribly high. That was the journalism of the day.

Today, you see a different type of newspapering. It is the rare and backward paper which today publishes the names of youngsters in conflict with the law. When newspapers now take an interest in mental hospitals, as they frequently do, seeking to improve the lot of the poor souls there, the good ones see to it that the faces are carefully masked out. Today, police is a minor beat. The good paper today is a good servant to the community.

Gone is the drunk. The people I know in newspapering are respectable, intelligent, hard-working. Almost all of them have college degrees and many of them are winners of research fellowships. The *Courier-Journal* alone has nine Nieman Fellows on its staff.

These are the changes that I have seen come about. But there is one great sameness between the old and the new.

The newspaperman of the twenties wasn't afraid. And neither is the good newspaperman of today.

The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* wasn't built by men who were afraid. Nor was the *Milwaukee Journal*, the *Washington Star*, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*. Minneapolis, Des Moines, Denver, Louisville—none of these papers were built by men who were afraid.

They were built by men who have had a professional mission in life. They didn't try building newspapers on promises of what they were going to do. They delivered. They've called the shots as they have seen them. Sometimes they happen to have agreed. Sometimes not. The important thing is that they have taken their positions honestly. They have handled their news columns cleanly and efficiently. And all of them have fought cleanly—in the American tradition.

One of the great stories handed down in newspapering concerns the old *New York World*. The *World* had an editorial campaign going, opposing the child labor amendment. I gather the reporters were sent down South to gather material to back up the campaign.

But what they saw and learned didn't back up the campaign. It showed the reverse. The reporters who wrote their stories weren't afraid of Joseph Pulitzer, owner of the *World*. Neither were the editors. They printed the stories. And thus it was that right in the heat of this campaign, Mr. Pulitzer announced in his paper that he was reversing his editorial position—that he had been wrong, his reporters right.

I regret that this sort of thing doesn't happen as often as it should. Unfortunately, there are newspapers today where both editors and reporters curry favor with ownership—they try to adjust their reporting to what the owner happens to favor. Those owners who have adopted this Hollywood yes-man technique and who seem to dread hiring men who might disagree with them aren't newspaper professionals. They are business hacks.

Last fall, in Boston, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association heard Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard's noted professor who wrote "Free Speech in the United States." Professor Chafee told the editors that the cause of freedom of speech in the United States is in greater danger than it ever has been since all the Jeffersonian newspapers were suppressed by the Sedition Act of 1798.

"It is not just a question of Communists," said Professor

Chafee. "More and more ideas are getting stigmatized as 'disloyal' and 'subversive.' Their suppression is your concern." And he quoted a great New York jurist, Cuthbert Pound, who made a classic utterance many years ago:

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

This, I submit, is in the true Indiana heritage. It is the heritage of free men.

American newspapering depends on that heritage.

All it takes is to be an old-fashioned American—with some iron in your soul.

Inciting Suspicion

by A. Gayle Waldrop

"Red Probers Find 54 Educators Refusing to Answer Questions on Communist Links" runs a recent page one headline in a three column 24-point head.

The ninth paragraph of this story was as follows:

"Although members of the two committees concede it is no admission of guilt for anyone to seek the protection of the fifth amendment, they obviously look with suspicion on an individual who uses it."

Don't newspaper readers, after seeing such a headline and reading eight paragraphs before the semi-qualifying ninth also "look with suspicion?"

"The figures given a reporter," the AP story proceeds, "cover only persons questioned in open sessions of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee." Then follow lists of seventeen universities and colleges and five public school systems, with which now or formerly the educators were connected. Unreasonable as it may be, doesn't the suspicion directed at the individuals attach itself to the schools named?

Newspaper editors should be concerned about such headlines and stories written as this one was.

They should be above the suspicion that they are being "used" by Congressional Committees.

Aren't newspapers that use such headlines and such stories doing what the laws of most states forbid prosecuting attorneys to do—commenting on the failure of the defendant to testify?

Only six states permit comment, Austin W. Scott, Jr., associate professor of law, University of Colorado, tells me: California, Connecticut, Iowa, New Jersey, Ohio, Vermont. California and Ohio passed constitutional amendments specifically allowing comment; Iowa and New Jersey have no self-incrimination constitutional provision; Connecticut held that comment did not constitute a violation of the self-incrimination constitutional provision; and Vermont's statute expressly allowing comment was held not to violate its constitution.

All states other than these six forbid comment, including Massachusetts and South Dakota which held that their statutes allowing comment were unconstitutional.

As to comment in federal cases, the United States Supreme Court has not held one way or the other, but doubtless comment is forbidden there too. This Court has twice dealt with the problem of whether a state which allows comment thereby deprives the defendant of life or liberty without due process of law. In each case the Supreme Court held no, saying that although we might not permit comment in federal trials, we recognize that a state may give a fair trial even if comment is allowed.

The Colorado Supreme Court, however, has at least twice declared that comment by the district attorney on the defendant's failure to testify is improper, once stressing the constitution and once the statute.

Most states have statutes on this subject that read like Colorado's:

"Hereafter in all criminal cases tried in any court of this state, the accused, if he so desires, shall be sworn as a witness in the case, and the jury shall give his testimony such weight as they think it deserves; but in no case shall a neglect or refusal of the accused to testify be taken or considered as any evidence of his guilt or innocence."

Such statutes, it can be readily seen, do not expressly say that no comment may be made on the defendant's failure to take the stand. But many cases have held, and 42 states have laws, forbidding comment.

Is the story cited in the same class as the instruction of a trial judge to the jury that no inference should be drawn from the defendant's failure to testify? Hardly, when "members of the two committees . . . obviously look with suspicion on an individual who uses it [the protection of the fifth amendment]." Most states probably hold as Colorado does, that the defendant is entitled to such an instruction *if he asks for it*; and perhaps, even if he doesn't ask, *the judge* ought to give it.

A number of eminent legal scholars and legal bodies have urged that comment be allowed, it should be pointed out. In this list are the American Law Institute (Model Code of Evidence) and the American Bar Association. But

the laws against comment are still on the statute books in 42 states, and presumably hold in federal trials.

For one reason or another, refusal to testify is not necessarily inconsistent with innocence. If the defendant has a criminal record, he will not want to be impeached by the prosecutor's bringing this out for the purpose of showing he may be lying. If he does not present a good appearance, the defendant may not wish "to take the stand." If he does not wish to subject himself to the giving of testimony involving "guilt by association," to be made an accomplice in "witchhunting," he will refuse "to take the stand," in order to protect someone else.

And who can decide whether he wants to protect someone else, or *himself*? It may be self-preservation that dictates his invoking the fifth amendment. Why?

"Because he can argue that, if today he admits present or past party membership, tomorrow or next month the government might decide to prosecute in one of several ways," James Marlow, AP columnist, wrote last March . . . "There are some laws, particularly the Smith Act, under which a party member could be tried and convicted. . . . So a man who ducks behind the fifth amendment today to avoid answering about party membership can plead it might lead to jail for him at some future time."

Ironic footnote: until the nineteenth century Anglo-American law did not permit the defendant in a criminal case to testify in his own behalf, the theory being that he had an interest in the outcome of the case and so might lie. Now if he refuses to take the stand, he is looked upon with suspicion, as if he were guilty!

It is no more to the credit of a newspaper to aid, if unwittingly, in throwing suspicion on persons making use of laws for their protection, than it is for a university to withdraw an invitation to a lecturer because someone charges that he is a member of organizations that are on the Attorney General's "list." Such actions violate the spirit of the Bill of Rights, which all men and all newspapers should support in these and at all times.

Prof. Waldrop is head of the journalism department at University of Colorado and author of "Editors and Editorial Writers."

"If you want to be misunderstood, misquoted and misinterpreted, take a trip to Russia."

Repercussions of a Visit to Moscow

by Rebecca F. Gross

If you want to be misunderstood, misquoted and misinterpreted, take a trip to Russia. If you want your journalistic writings classed with the Scriptures, write a few articles about such a trip; the devil will promptly quote you for his purpose.

The "devil" in such an instance, or so I have found, is the reader who does not want to know what you saw, or what you did, or what you make of it, but who does want you to reinforce his preconceived ideas. He reads what you write, looking through the colored spectacles of his ingrained attitudes and emotional viewpoints, and accepts and rejects what you say, not on the basis of the report itself, but on the basis of its emotional appeal to him. This reader, who may even be an editor, wants only such facts as may coincide with the predetermined "line" he takes on everything coming out of Russia.

I was one of ten Americans, newspaper publishers and editors, radio people and a couple of free-lance writers, who were in the party primarily to look after the business of the trip, who spent seven days in Moscow the first week in April. We were the first American news writers admitted to Russia for several years; among the first to receive visas since the start of the "cold-war" period. Our visit, as we suspected at the time, was one of the initial gestures of a "let's be nice to the West" policy, but we didn't know whether that policy was a genuine shift of attitude following the death of Stalin, or a superficial experiment.

All of us on that brief stop in Moscow were well aware that spending one week in Moscow could not make us experts on Russia; it could hardly scratch the surface of our ignorance of Russian activity and policy since the end of World War II. If our trip was worth anything, except as an interesting sight-seeing interlude, it would lie in the factual observations we could make, the little details we could notice, which might add something to

our knowledge of daily life in Moscow, contribute a few additional items to the sum of our current information on routine activities there, within a month after the death of Stalin.

Although some of us would have preferred not to do much talking and writing about our brief sojourn in Moscow, on the sensible grounds that a week's visit is not long enough to warrant anyone's making definite pronouncements on any unfamiliar city, we could not elude the pressures put on us for reports of our activities. The best we could do was to speak only of what we had seen and done, carefully noting our limitations, hoping that no one would inject meanings beyond our bare, objective statements.

That was too much to hope. We concluded our week in Moscow by traveling to East Berlin by train, across the Ukraine, Poland and the Russian-occupied zone of Germany. The emotional reaction to our story of what we had seen and done in Moscow began at a press conference in West Berlin. It was typified later in two incidents in the United States—the treatment accorded our visit by the editor of "Press" in *Time* (magazine), and the inexcusable job of blue-pencil surgery done by the *Daily Worker*, the New York Communist sheet, on an article I wrote for the June number of the *ASNE Bulletin*.

The press conference in the Kempinsky Hotel in Berlin the night we returned from Russia was a reporter's nightmare. Correspondents, including Communists, from all parts of Europe were there, asking questions at random, while the chairman of our group tried to maintain some continuity and distribute the questions among the members of the party. Most of the questions obviously were not designed to elicit information from us about the details of our visit; they were "loaded." The Communist reporters tried hard to throw out questions that would give them a chance to develop the propaganda line; others tried to draw out answers that would be critical of Russia. Only about half the questions asked, in my opinion, were honest queries, seeking factual responses.

As I recall, I answered only one question. Someone asked whether there were slums in Moscow and I replied that, by American standards, we saw rather extensive slum areas.

After this conference, which I considered very unsatisfactory and inconclusive, bound to create many misunder-

Rebecca F. Gross has been the editor of the Lock Haven (Pa.) *Express* for eight years. Her publisher, Frank D. O'Reilly, encourages such searchings for information as her recent trip to Russia. Other of her sorties from Lock Haven have included a stretch in the Waves (1943-45), a year at Harvard on a Nieman Fellowship (1948) and other observation trips abroad. At home she directs the news and editorial staff on a strong community newspaper.

standings, I talked to a Hungarian journalist who was bitterly critical. The room was full of anti-Communist correspondents, he said, who had come to hear us assail the Russian system, and who were now calling our answers to the questions "pro Communist" because we did not paint Moscow as a hotbed of obvious misery. We had reported that our opportunities for observation were limited by our lack of knowledge of the Russian language, by the shortness of our stay, and that we had seen plenty of evidences of police control, shortage of consumer goods, and crowded housing conditions, but that was not enough. He was in no mood to be reminded that we had had no opportunity to visit slave camps, political prisons, or the Kremlin office of Malenkov. He did not want to be told that we could have criticized the Russian system without going to Moscow. Neither he nor many of the other correspondents who met us in Berlin were primarily interested, it seemed, in asking us for significant factual details that would round out the Western picture of what life looks like in Moscow. They wanted us to criticize or praise, not to report.

When the account of this conference was published in *Pravda* and the other Moscow newspapers, and other Communist papers in Europe, as distributed by Tass, all the comments that could be construed as critical were omitted. My remark on slums did not appear, and the statement of some of my colleagues that we were cordially treated by the Russians we met in Moscow (which was true) was transmuted into the statement that the group "stressed unanimously that all the Soviet citizens with whom they had occasion to associate were imbued with a deep love of peace."

This press conference was our initiation into an emotional pulling and hauling in which the attempt to talk objectively about the sights and people of Moscow with the same detachment one would use in reporting on the sights and citizens of any other large city in the world was overshadowed by questions and comments implicitly demanding the emotionalism of criticism or defense.

I had made a strong effort, during my short stay in Moscow, to look at what I saw with the objectivity of the sociologist and the social anthropologist and, I hope, the trained journalist. I expected this attitude to be shared and appreciated by the objective American press, although I was quite sure, from the beginning, that the Communists both inside and outside Russia, would do their best to make propaganda out of our visit and anything we might say about it, good, bad or neutral.

My expectation that the Communists would twist our words to their own uses was soon realized.

I had been less prepared for the fact that a few newspaper and magazine writers, on the other side of the fence, could be flagrantly insistent that reports from Russia

should conform to a "line" almost as preconceived and rigid as the one the Communists followed. My article in the *Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors expressed the feeling that the American press and its readers should value objective reports from such a place as Moscow, recognizing that facts are scarce, emotions keen, and the need great for more dependable knowledge of the Russian people, as human beings, as Russian citizens and as subjects of Communism. This article was very frank; it had been written for the thoughtful consideration of people concerned with the responsibility of selecting information for the American public, and was directed specifically to the newspaper executives who make up the membership of the society.

Excerpts from the article were published on June 3 on the editorial page of the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, a newspaper which, some weeks earlier, had defended the American visitors to Moscow against the diatribes of critics who resented objective descriptions of the marble-lined subway, the wide streets and tall buildings of Moscow, as somehow subversive. The *Post-Gazette*, in condensing my article, omitted several paragraphs of introduction, a few phrases listing the writing I had done for nationwide publication, a description of our flight to Moscow, our hotel and our financial arrangements, and a few other details which were not essential.

One additional sentence was omitted, however, which I regretted. In the body of the article I had listed the general reaction of the Russian people we met to whom we put questions about the government's restrictions on information and foreign visitors, concentration camps, and the other aspects of life under Russian Communism which Westerners abhor. I had cited the party-line answers we received and added that "To me, such conversations were a waste of time." That sentence had been added to make clear my feeling that we were likely to get more useful information by keeping our eyes open than by fruitless attempts to trip up the skillful Communist dialecticians whom we met.

The *Post-Gazette* condensation also omitted two paragraphs at the end of the article, which made the point that the ten visitors to Moscow had not been converted to Communism by what they saw and that their objective and accurate reports on the sample of Russian capabilities which they saw in Russia, telling both "good" and "bad" should be viewed, not as reactions to Communism, but as slight contributions to a truthful answer to the question, "What goes on in Russia?"

On June 18, the *Daily Worker* published excerpts from the article as it appeared in the *Post-Gazette*, giving due credit to me, to the *Post-Gazette*, and to the *ASNE Bulletin*, and dutifully indicating its blue-pencils by appropriate rows of little dots.

Some of the omissions did not disturb the sense of the

article. I have no quarrel with the dropping of explanatory paragraphs, but I do object—and promptly wrote to the Editor of the *Worker* to say that I did—to cutting other paragraphs in two, throwing out every part which definitely expressed my non-Communist attitudes. These sentences were chopped out, for instance:

“Should our reports of what we saw and did be pro-Russian, out of deference to our role as visitors and tourists, or should they be anti-Russian as an expression of our antipathy to the philosophy of Communism?”

“It seems to me that American newspaper and magazine editors, and American readers of the news, are making a great mistake when they ask any observer to do anything but tell them exactly what he saw. If they demand that he should bolster their own preconceived ideas, on pain of being accused of treason or stupidity, or both, are they not taking a step in the direction of the policies exemplified for so many years by Communist newspapers, which publish nothing that does not conform to the party ‘line.’”

“Such a trend would remind me of the insistence of the Russians on news reports portraying Americans as downtrodden victims of Wall Street, suffering slaves eager for the liberating day when Communism may triumph over the ‘contradictions’ of capitalism.”

“Our seven days in Moscow certainly were not sufficient to permit us to get the whole truth about Russia, a truth which has eluded many men who have spent years in the study.”

“To understand (Russian) behavior, it seems necessary to differentiate between their reactions as human beings and their reactions as Russians, and between their motivations as Russian people and their motivations as Communists and members of a Communist society. Even in a short seven days, one begins to see that it is necessary to divide Russian behavior into the things Russians do because they are human beings, the things they do because they are Russian, and the things they do because they are Communist.”

“Russia will not vanish or change her nature if Americans refuse to recognize all the facets of Russian life and character, just as the truth about the United States is not changed by all the anti-American and untruthful propaganda published and disseminated and believed by Russians.”

Not only were these paragraphs, among others, omitted from the *Worker's* republication of the material quoted by the *Post-Gazette*, but the editor of the *Worker* gratuitously contradicted one of my opening statements by a bold-indent interpolation.

As printed in the *Post-Gazette* and the *Worker*, my article began with this paragraph:

“Some of the reactions to our visit to Moscow, in the American press, have made me wonder whether some editorial minds in this country have not fallen into the same

error the Russians have made in their ‘hate America’ campaign.”

Apparently unable to cut out this reference with the same surgical skill he showed with his blue pencil in the latter parts of the article, the editor of the *Worker* interpolated under that paragraph, the following note:

(*Nowhere in the reportage of any of the 10 editors was any evidence given of the actual existence of a “hate America” campaign.*)

This statement was factually untrue. I wrote the following letter immediately to the editor of the *Worker*:

“My attention has been drawn to your publication yesterday of certain excerpts from an article of mine which was printed originally by the *Bulletin* of the ASNE. I must object to your statement, interpolated into the quotations from my article that ‘nowhere in the reportage of any of the 10 editors was any evidence given of the actual existence of a “hate America” campaign.’

“In my article in the *ASNE Bulletin* I stated that I had written five articles for the Associated Press and given an interview to *U. S. News and World Report*. If you had examined this material you would have seen that I gave specific instances of the ‘hate America’ campaign which I observed in Moscow. I described cartoons hung up in the art gallery and mentioned an anti-American ballet, among other things.

“In your cutting up my article to remove anything that would not conform to the *Worker's* editorial line, you altered its tone and intention completely. I must ask you to publish this letter along with the omitted portions of my article in the earliest possible edition of your publication.”

When two weeks passed without any reaction from the *Daily Worker*, I wrote another letter, again requesting correction of the editorial misstatement, and asking publication of the most pertinent paragraphs they had omitted from my original article. When this letter, too, produced no reaction, I wrote another article, which was printed by Editor & Publisher in Bob Brown’s “Shop Talk at Thirty.” In it I told the whole story of how the *Worker* had mutilated my ASNE article.

Two days later, the editor of the *Worker*, Alan Max, wrote that he had been out of town, and his office had mislaid the original clipping from the Pittsburgh paper. He was taking steps to get another copy, he said. In a few days, the *Worker* published the entire clipping from the *Post-Gazette* together with my original letter of objection, and an introductory piece to the effect that they had not intended to imply that the Moscow travellers had not “thought” they detected anti-American propaganda there.

It took well over a month to get the *Worker* to go that far toward a correction of the false impression it gave of my original article; but so far as I know it has seldom gone even that distance.

Perhaps I am too impatient, however. Glancing over some correspondence between the *Express* and the editors of *Time*, I note that the space of a month elapsed between the writing of a letter from Frank D. O'Reilly, Sr., president, of the *Express*, and his receipt of a reply from *Time*.

Time, it may be recalled, was the bellwether of a few spokesmen of the American press who poked ridicule at the members of our party who sent out initial reports describing downtown Moscow, the mosaic-decorated subway, and the apparent freedom with which the group was being allowed to inspect the city. *Time* aped the New York *Post* to dub the party "Rover boys"—not an inapt description—and opined that the rovers had "fallen flat on their faces" as dupes of the Russians. I had escaped personal mention in the article, except for a notation saying that I was not in the picture (I was still in the airport waiting room trying to find my gate pass when the photographers were at work).

Mr. O'Reilly resented *Time's* superficial attitude. He felt it was wrong to assume that any non-critical report was, per se, pro-Communist, or to imply that a report on subway stations, streets and buildings was an endorsement of Communism. He wrote *Time* a letter on April 13, enclosing copies of an editorial in the *Express*, which said, in part:

"What *Time* didn't point out was that, ordinary as such a trip might have been in London, Paris, or even West Berlin, it was the height of the unusual in Moscow. Not even members of the U. S. embassy staff or American reporters stationed permanently in Moscow had been given in recent years such freedom of the city. . . .

"If, for example, *Time* were showing a European visitor the sights of Philadelphia, would it tour the worst housing areas of that city and, possibly, the Eastern penitentiary? No, such a visitor, be he Russian or otherwise, would be taken to the Liberty Bell, and Independence Hall, Valley Forge and like sites, just as the editors in Moscow were taken to the Kremlin, the leading industrial plants and other points of interest. . . .

"Those editors who wrote while they were in Russia were fully conscious that everything they said was subject to censorship. They confined themselves wisely to non-controversial remarks; thus it was that their reports were largely a recital of what they saw and where they went. They scarcely were there long enough to have any opportunity to delve into anything to make any adequate report of economic conditions, arms preparations or similar factors. . . .

"If *Time* can't get a reporter into Russia, why doesn't Mr. Luce try to go. He recently visited the Far East. He'd better go to Russia himself and see what he can report before his magazine gets so superior with others."

Neither Mr. O'Reilly's letter, nor any reference to the *Express* editorial appeared in *Time*. Under date of May

12, however, Mr. O'Reilly received a note signed by Patricia Berman, "for the editors of *Time*." It was as follows:

"Many thanks for sending us copies of the Lock Haven *Express* with Miss Gross' articles and editorial. In Mr. Luce's absence, your letter has been forwarded to this department for reply.

"*Time* felt that the unrelieved enthusiasm of the American newsmen in Moscow was a bit overzealous. Perhaps we might have waited until the group returned but, as a newspaperman, you certainly realize that the trip made news while the travelers were still in Europe. In the interest of fairness, most papers should run follow-ups of a lot of their articles, but no newsmen or editor can be persuaded to do it on that basis alone, after the story has lost its newsworthiness."

To this amazing statement, the *Express* responded editorially, with this comment:

"We want to repudiate immediately the all-inclusive incrimination which *Time* apparently seeks to throw over the entire profession of journalism, through the implication that no editor, and no newspaper, will take the trouble and space to be fair unless the topic is red hot from the news standpoint. . . .

"We try to avoid unfairness in what we write, which *Time* rather admits it did not do. Recognizing that the limitations of deadlines may put us at a disadvantage in getting all sides of a newsworthy story, we are not only willing, but eager, to follow up our reports with corrections, amplifications and explanations, if future developments indicate that our original report was unfair, incomplete or inadequate.

"We do not see what is wrong with such a policy, even for *Time*—or for other big magazines and some newspapers, where one sees accuracy, fairness and completeness sacrificed to speed, smartness and a supercilious style of expression."

Time moved a little faster in replying to a letter provoked from Eugene Simon, president of the *Valley Daily News* of Tarentum, Pa., by the same "Rover Boys" article in *Time* April 13. The day he arrived in the U. S., returning from the Moscow trip, Mr. Simon wrote to *Time*, although he, like myself, had not been singled out for specific ridicule. However, only five of the ten people in our party had cabled dispatches from Moscow which were distributed in the U. S. before we reached Berlin, and I had sent only one. *Time's* implications covered all of us, unless one were to assume that they were based merely upon a few phrases from one or two articles.

Mr. Simon's letter was published in the May 4 edition of *Time*, but minus about half its content. His corrections of specific errors of fact were published, as well as his backing up of Publisher John Biddle of Huntingdon, Pa., whose descriptions of the Moscow subway and the new building of the Moscow State University for the United

Press had received the principal barrage of scoffing by the New York *Post* and *Time*.

Time, however, did not print the following portion of Mr. Simon's letter:

"Could it be that *Time* was a bit disturbed at being rather badly scooped by newspapers on a good story? One should be a better sport about not being on the spot in Moscow. Your vast experience should also have taught you how easily things taken out of context might be distorted.

"Did *Time* consider that maybe the tremendous interest displayed by U. S. press wire services and newspapers all over Europe represented a strong interest and curiosity in the West concerning Russia? Even if some things there and in the states are similar (i.e. dairy farm equipment), as *Time* helpfully pointed out, is it not constructive to let our people know, since we (and even *Time*) know so little about the inside of Russia.

"Tut, tut, *Time*, you should not be so disgruntled with those who do not conform to the *Time-Life* party line.

"Might also add that our family are subscribers of *Time* and have enjoyed it, but we don't enjoy the opinionated and smart-alecky reporting we often find in your still fine publication. Don't insult the intelligence of the American people. I know that is not your intention.

"P.S. It will be interesting to see what is censored from this letter, plus the Editor's Note."

Mr. Simon tells me that he received an answer to his letter dated April 27, informing him that his letter would have to be condensed, but explaining "this comes under the heading of editing and not censorship."

I have not had time to read all the clippings I have received containing published reactions to our Moscow trip; and I know I have not had clippings of everything that was published in the U. S., let alone abroad. I have heard, however, that some of the most critical articles written by any of our group have been quoted in the Russian press, apparently for the same reason that the American press publishes some of the more extreme concoctions of the creative artists who write for *Pravda*. It was inevitable that our reports should be twisted, taken out of context, and perverted, by the intentional mishandling of Communist propagandists. But, the American press, including the news magazines, should be above such tactics, whether racing to a deadline, or editing letters to the editor.

So far as I can analyze it, the chief value of our visit to Moscow was not the discovery that the streets are full of policemen, that women do manual labor, that apartments are crowded, that many people are in prison or concentration camps, and dark limousines rush in and out of the Kremlin entrances at all hours. We knew all that before we ever went to Russia.

These are the important things we learned:

1. By revamping, building up and beautifying the city of Moscow, in its central area and in the new outlying suburbs, the Russians are creating an impressive propaganda center, to dazzle visitors from the rural regions, the outlying republics, the oriental countries, and the Communist parties outside of Russia.

2. The continuous production process we saw in operation in the manufacture of automobiles, candy and bread, indicates that the Russians are capable of accelerated output in any type of industry which can be organized for mass production.

3. In Moscow, men, women and children (all over 15, the Russians said), are being trained for industrial production; students are being mass-educated, especially in technology and science; and infants from the age of a few months are being supervised six days out of seven by agents of the state, under an umbrella of propaganda which constantly teaches them that they are the most advanced nation in the world, inheritors of a great national tradition.

4. Living conditions are much rougher than ours, clothing is less stylish, worn longer, made of shoddier cloth, and drab and unattractive by comparison with American clothes; food is simple, substantial and monotonous; homes are crowded and dull—the thrill of home ownership is entirely absent in Moscow, where the state is the only landlord; working conditions are below the American standard, hours are longer, and pay is less. Some people want these facts added up to mean that the people are unhappy, dissatisfied and ready to revolt. That is true in the satellite countries, which have been drained and persecuted to help build up Moscow and the heart of Russia. But in Moscow, I suspect, the present conditions are better than those of the past, and the standard of living, low by comparison with ours, conceals a standard of military expenditure which was hinted at by the efficiency of the Russian army units which, methodically and brutally, put down the riots in East Berlin, in Czechoslovakia and Poland, in May.

This analysis may not be the right one. Whether right or wrong, however, it is based upon the accumulation of little details which I was able to notice in Moscow, even when I traveled in company with a convinced Communist guide paid by Intourist.

I believe that the objective and accurate presentation of such details, aimed at giving a correct and complete picture rather than at bolstering comfortable beliefs and hopes of the past is the only honest thing an American news writer can do, if he has the chance to visit Moscow. And, if he has the chance, I also believe it is his duty to take it.

Whatever the future holds in our relations with Russia, under Malenkov or his successors, we can deal with the situation capably only if we know as many facts about

Russia and the Russians as we can gather from reliable sources. We should not dry up those sources by throwing ridicule and inflicting distortions upon people who are more interested in objective facts than in maintaining favorite fictions or sacred stereotypes.

Our ignorance of Russia, which is not our fault, but the fault of those who have tried to isolate Russia and the Russians from the rest of the world, can be compared, perhaps, to our ignorance about the causes and cure of such a disease as cancer, or the ignorance of a military commander about the capabilities of the enemy force he may have to fight.

In the first case the tactic is research, in the second military intelligence. We do not fight disease by ignoring the facts; instead we glean all the facts we can and study them carefully. We do not charge a man with being in favor of a disease because he studies its germs.

Calculated Optimism

MEXICO'S "NATIONAL HOUR" HAS 100 PER CENT RADIO COVERAGE

by **Marvin Alisky**

"The National Hour" is a radio program series unique not only in Mexico but also in the broadcasting world in general.

Mexico, like the United States, has a broadcasting system consisting of privately-owned radio and television stations. In the 1920's and the 1930's, the Mexican federal government operated several stations, but now relies on spot announcements, news releases, and special shows over commercial stations and commercial networks as its broadcasting means of communicating with its citizenry. Unlike other countries with privately-owned broadcasting systems, however, Mexico for more than fourteen years has commanded the services of all of its stations simultaneously to voice the government's own weekly program, "The National Hour."

Every Sunday from 10 to 11 p.m., every radio station in Mexico, including the three English-language stations

Marvin Alisky, now assistant professor of journalism at Indiana University studied Mexican broadcasting to earn a doctoral degree at the Institute of Latin American Studies in the University of Texas. A native of San Antonio, he has travelled in Mexico since boyhood. To study Mexican radio he visited 80 radio stations in every State of Mexico and did graduate work in the Instituto Tecnológico de Monterrey.

In military practice, we do not charge an intelligence officer with favoring the enemy because he comes back with a list of the enemy's resources, instead of lazily reporting the opposing force lacking in strength.

Or do we?

When I made a comment like this to a retired Army officer, he said it was not unknown in the Army for intelligence reports to be discounted by a commander who preferred to follow his preconceived ideas. When I made such a comment to a physician, he declared sourly that a lot of doctors would rather prescribe a "wonder drug" than study symptoms.

I do not think we should base our policy toward Russia on preconceived ideas or trust entirely to the "wonder drug" of atomic defense, as an alternative to a careful analysis of all available knowledge.

near the United States border, carries "The National Hour," produced by the Ministry of the Interior (*Secretaría de Gobernación*), chief component of the presidential cabinet. A hookup of 100 per cent of a nation's radio stations would not be unusual in countries with a state-owned or state-operated system of broadcasting. But Mexican radio stations are privately owned and operated, with the exception of two standard-frequency cultural outlets, and their shortwave duplicators, belonging respectively to the National University of Mexico and to the state government of Jalisco.

In the United States, on December 8, 1941, when President Roosevelt asked Congress for a declaration of war against Japan, all four of our networks carried the address, as they have aired many other important events before and since. However, many non-network outlets did not air this broadcast. Even Pearl Harbor did not give the United States a hookup of 100 per cent of the nation's radio stations. In Mexico, such a network is achieved every Sunday night. This factor alone gives "*La Hora Nacional*" a uniqueness among nations with privately-operated broadcasting industries. Program content further singularizes the series.

The format of "The National Hour" is nothing unusual. It merely consists of progress reports on various govern-

mental activities sandwiched between popular musical selections. The reports are delivered either in a newscasting style by two alternating voices or else by means of a three-actor dialogue. The musical selections are rendered by the republic's most popular singers and musicians, who lend their talent to the government in a manner similar to that with which United States radio, television, stage, and screen stars rally to the aid of a government bond drive for national defense. Of course, the cast has the added incentive of performing to 100 per cent of the listeners tuned to Mexican stations.

It is not the format but the tone of the news reports which rates the series as noteworthy. In attitude, these reports are flavored with the optimism of a Chamber of Commerce, and attempt to enshrine enterprise, both public and private, to a point where the completion of any new installation has come to be regarded by the people as a national triumph.

"The National Hour" cannot take credit for such fervor among listeners regarding national progress. The Mexican Revolution itself gets credit for engendering the enthusiasm; this series merely reflects that national attitude and reinforces it, bolstering the Mexican clamor for new roads, new schools, new industries. "The National Hour" merely reports on the progress of the Revolution.

Mexico has had many revolutions of the military revolt type, most of them during the Nineteenth Century, but the republic has had only one Revolution, spelled by Mexicans with a capital "R" to distinguish it. *The Revolution* began as a military revolt in 1910 to overthrow the dictatorship of Díaz, this military struggle lasting sporadically until 1920. Since 1920, up to the present time, the Revolution has been a social process, a series of governmental and private reforms designed to give land to the peasants, literacy to the rural isolates, economic betterment to the nation, and political democracy to the citizenry. Every federal and provincial regime of the past four decades has been publicly dedicated to the Mexican Revolution, a non-Communist struggle for social justice that antedates the Russian revolution by seven years. The Mexican Revolution encourages both governmental and private-enterprise industrial and social projects. "The National Hour's" news reports are designed to bolster enthusiasm for such endeavors.

Examination of a specific broadcast will help bring the attitude behind this radio series into focus. Take, for example, the broadcast of January 4, 1953. Between the opening down beat by orchestra leader Daniel Pérez Castañeda and the customary closing strains of "Over the Waves," one hour and six minutes of entertainment and news was heard. Occasionally, as on this particular night,

the program will run more than its scheduled sixty minutes, but rarely has it ever run under the allotted time, so well stocked is it with entertainers and news of governmental activity.

The broadcast in question featured motion picture stars Roberto Cañedo and Leticia Palma, and radio-television and recording artists Pepe Guizar, María Christina, Miguel Aceves Mejia singing popular and folk songs. Silvestre Vargas and his mariachi band played rural regional tunes. The regular National Hour orchestra spotlighted popular dance music by Agustín Lara, "Mexico's Irving Berlin." Verbally there was a salute to the efficiency of the Mexico City police, a three-actor sketch about the government's drive against monopolistic price rises, an explanation of what the law requires regarding the prices of medicines, a progress report on airport expansion in the state of Campeche, financial credit news from the *Banco de México*, announcements about new equipment from the Secretary of Defense, news of current world-wide recognition of Mexican art, news of governmental activities in the Federal District, and a progress report on the Mexican petroleum industry. This last-named item contained such phrases as "Mexico's own national well being" and "Mexican resources for the better way of life for Mexicans."

In general, the news of national economic and social progress is not couched in phraseology that can be considered to be boastful, but rather, highly optimistic. Key phrases emphasizing public and private accomplishments are written in newscasting style, giving the reports the aura of straight news. For example, on the broadcast cited as a typical show, the news of current acclaim of Mexican art abroad, the paintings of Rivera in particular, was reported thus:

. . . Paris critics commented that Mexican art rediscovered its Indian elements, and thus developed its current soulful expression.

Financial news from the Bank of Mexico included the report that:

Credit for equipment on cooperative farms continues to be extended. Better equipment facilitates increased crop yields. . .

The reports never go beyond the last-mentioned comment in the realm of opinion dispensing. The comment that better equipment will mean better harvests hardly can be refuted. Further, it helps give meaning to the item on farm equipment credit, reminding listeners once again of the significance of the governmental loans.

In a country where mountainous terrain, illiteracy, insufficient roads and telephones, and unequal distribution of newspaper and magazines conspire against integration of many communities into the national life, radio has

proved to be a valuable medium of mass communication. From 33 to 42 per cent of the population cannot read, depending on which sets of statistics you use. In any case, more than one-third of the Mexican people are illiterate. The historical and social phenomena responsible for this situation are too complex to be dealt with within the narrow scope of this article. Suffice to say that the situation exists. As for adverse terrain, the fact that more than half the total area is more than 3,200 feet above sea level should give a clue as to the mountainous hindrance to communications.

Radio has shown itself to be one means of reaching illiterate or semi-literate villagers in hinterlands with few or no roads linking them to the federal and state capitals and the nearest cities. The fact that the typical Mexican, with a monthly income of less than 200 pesos, cannot afford to buy a radio is offset by the common Mexican practice of group listening.

In the United States, as television comes to a community, group viewing becomes a temporary part of that community's way of life, for householders, hoisting TV antennae from their rooftops, soon find that these aeriols become magnets, beckoning neighbors to drop by for visits and video entertainment. In Mexico, radio is still a novelty in many villages and towns. A man fortunate enough to own a radio will find himself with company. Merchants use radio much as operators of bars and restaurants in the United States use television as a lure for customers. Little better than one home in four in Mexico has a radio, yet government statisticians estimate that a majority of the Mexican people are now within earshot of radio broadcasts. "The National Hour" reaches certain groups of citizens that no printed media are reaching.

Much has been written in the Mexican press, as well as in the United States press, of the growing industrialization of our southern neighbor. Industrial expansion below the Rio Grande indeed has been steady in recent years, but the 1950 Mexican census showed that a majority of Mexicans still live in towns of 2,500 population or under. It will be many years yet before the typical Mex-

ican is no longer found in a tiny village, earning his living from the land or from rural arts and crafts. Mexico City, with its three million population and its cosmopolitan atmosphere, is a glamorous show place, but it does not typify the Mexico of twenty million other Mexicans.

There are many Mexican communities where newspapers and magazines are not regularly distributed. There is practically no place in the republic where the powerful voices of Mexico's key radio stations can not be picked up on an ordinary receiver. In the United States, the maximum power allowed any station is 50,000 watts. In Mexico, XEX has 250,000 watts, XEW operates with 170,000 watts, and XEB uses 120,000 watts. There are 215 standard-frequency stations located in every state in the republic, with only the territory of Quintana Roo lacking a commercial transmitter. As for receiver distribution, it is better in the cities than in the towns, better in the central region surrounding Mexico City and along the United States border than it is south of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. Still, the government feels it is reaching a good cross-section of Mexico with its Sunday night program.

The number of radios actually tuned to this hookup of 100 per cent of the stations in Mexico has never been determined. Joe Belden and Associates, the Nielsen-Hooper of Mexico, surveys audiences of commercial stations, but does not cover the 10 to 11 p.m. period on Sundays since the element of competition is missing. A few Mexicans, to be sure, must be tuned to various foreign shortwave frequencies at the time "The National Hour" robs them of any choice of domestic programs. Some Mexicans are tuned to United States stations, especially those outlets in our Southwest where sufficient Spanish-language audience abounds to warrant Spanish-language programs. Listeners in southern Mexico can dial a few outlets in Guatemala. But any radio tuned to a Mexican station is certain to hear the same thing from 10 to 11 p.m. Sundays, "The National Hour," entertainment flavored with news of national progress, calculated optimism.

Behind the Headlines in Egypt

by James Batal

What is it going to be like, to work once again in Egypt after an absence of ten years?

That question was foremost in my mind when I flew from Boston on November 16, 1952 to start on a six months' research assignment in the Nile Valley for the Society For Applied Anthropology.

Much had happened in Egypt since I had worked for O.W.I. in Cairo for 18 months during World War II. The

most important event was the military coup d'etat on July 23, 1952 and three days later, the deposing of King Farouk and his exile to Italy. The American press had referred liberally to the new government as a military dictatorship.

On January 26, 1952, a mob set fire to historic Sheppard's Hotel and applied pyromaniacal torches to other Western business and Western institutions.

A few months earlier Egyptians and British clashed over

the Suez Canal issue, with needless loss of life.

In male patronized coffee houses and at private social gatherings, the humble and the mighty gossiped about the scandals among the royalty and the politicians, and no Egyptian publisher dared expose the facts for fear of incurring punitive palace wrath.

Whenever a riot, demonstration or manifestation took place in Egypt, one could be comfortably certain that somewhere in the datelined story from Cairo there would appear the phrase "fanatic nationalism."

Then there was the Palestine war with the humiliating defeat of the Egyptian army by the Zionist inspired Israelis, supported generously by American dollars. Later came the revelation of the arms scandals, linking the royal palace and leading politicians with purchase of faulty ammunition and firearms for the Egyptian soldiers in Palestine.

Cabinet ministers changed frequently, but somehow the same old familiar faces took their turns on the political merry-go-round.

Rabble-rousing politicians had their field-day, too, inflaming the masses of poverty-ridden people against imperviously entrenched imperialism, so as to cover up their own dereliction of duty.

Then, of course, there was the censorship of the press, a hangover from the days when Rommel threatened Alexandria, and revived with the start of the Palestine war in 1948.

These were some of the events that had occurred during the past decade and as frequently as they happened so often did I, here in the United States, ask myself:

"What are the background facts behind the outward facts?"

Now I was on my way to Egypt and would learn the answers for myself!

To understand fully the military seizure of power in Egypt, one must first realize that there is a difference between Western and Eastern civilization. The East has democratic principles, too, but they are not practiced in the same way as in the West. Human rights and civil liberties are so taken for granted by Americans that too often we forget that people in other parts of the world outside of Europe do not have such privileges. In the American sense of understanding, therefore, there is *no* military dictatorship in Egypt because Egyptians have not been deprived of any of the rights they ever had.

When General Mohammed Naguib and his military colleagues established the Revolutionary Council to rule Egypt, their primary purpose was to rid the country of the bribery and corruption that had infested it—from the inner sanctums of the royal palaces to the most menial public servant. If the label dictatorship can be applied to the new regime in Egypt, then it can properly be said to be a benevolent dictatorship. Have human rights and civil liberties been

suppressed or restricted under General Naguib? On the contrary, they have been extended. Is there a police state in power? On the contrary, there is no infringement upon personal movements.

How about the abolition of political parties, as decreed by General Naguib on January 18, 1953? Political parties in Egypt did not represent the people as political parties do in Western democracies. In this Nile Valley, political parties did not operate on democratic principles. People rarely had a choice in *nominating* their leaders. That was done in the party headquarters in Cairo. Villagers had no alternative except to vote for those nominated in Cairo. The parties in Egypt represented the privileged few and not the masses. Those who rode to leadership or eminence in political organizations eventually became wealthy as a result of their associations in politics. Principles were traded for riches. Corruption infected political ranks everywhere.

To rid a body of a disease it is often necessary to call in a surgeon to operate. Under General Naguib, political parties are banned in Egypt for a three-year period. Their assets and quarters were confiscated. The Constitution of 1922 has been abolished and a committee of 50 representative citizens is drawing up a new constitution for the new Republic of Egypt that was proclaimed in mid-June, 1953.

How has the average Egyptian fared under General Naguib's regime? Among his first acts was to reduce the price of sugar. Profits had been gouged from the public to the benefit of a former cabinet member whose family had controlled the sugar market in Egypt. The masses of the people could not afford to buy apples because the fruit—an imported article—sold for 55 piasters (a piaster is 2.8 cents) an oke (about two pounds). General Naguib ordered the price reduced to 15 piasters and even at that figure, the grocer still was able to make a fair profit. One Egyptian grocer was so incensed at the number of strange faces that came into his store to buy apples at the lowered price that he exclaimed: "Even common Egyptians are coming into my store now to buy apples!"

General Naguib reduced the price of bread, the one essential food item that sustains the masses, otherwise impoverished. The military regime put teeth into the labor laws for the first time in Egyptian history, granting the laborer more human rights than he had ever before possessed in the 5,000 years since the pharaohs ruled the Nile Valley. An agrarian land reform law was proclaimed whereby the lowly fellah (peasant farmer) now is able to own up to five acres of land that he formerly tilled for the exclusive benefit of the wealthy pasha class. Certainly these acts are not a suppression of the rights of the masses of Egyptians.

Censorship of the press? Yes. But censorship existed under the British during World War II days. Later it

was slackened, but again it was revived under King Farouk to prevent his escapades from being publicized. Then came the war in Palestine in 1948. Egypt, like all other Arab states, is still technically in a state of war with Israel. If any one regards the truce, sponsored by the United Nations in the fall of 1948, as effectively implemented between Israel and the neighboring Arab states he has only to read, not the American press but the foreign journals, to learn about the skirmishes that occur almost daily between the Israelis and the Jordanians. Arab countries consider Zionism as serious a threat to their freedom as the United States does Communism.

It is true that in Egypt censorship is not restricted to military matters. When the coup d'etat was successfully executed, military men seized the Cairo radio station, a government operated system, and placed censors there and in each newspaper office. The United States did the same thing during its occupation in Japan and Germany when fighting was still going on. However, censorship controls in Egypt were relaxed within a few weeks, and now civilians serve as censors.

On the whole, stories sent to their newspapers by foreign correspondents are censored far less, for example, than the French Republic censors the press in Tunisia or Morocco. This is not true for Cairo newspapers. As a matter of fact I learned more about the tensions along the Suez Canal (after the talks with the British were broken off last May) in the foreign press than I did in the Cairo dailies. General Naguib is determined that the masses of the Egyptians shall not be aroused into a hysteria against the British as they were by his predecessors in their futile and insincere efforts to force the British out of their Suez Canal base. One must look at this kind of censorship through Egyptian mentality and not through the American concept of freedom of the press. The United States has been a free and sovereign country for 170 years. With 80,000 British soldiers camped on Egyptian soil, Egypt is sovereign in name only.

Americans can not begin to understand the Arabs until first they know the Arab philosophy or what the Arabs themselves call "mental psychology." The disastrous fires in Cairo on January 26, 1952, were the action of a mob venting its resentment against the West for the West's decades of impingement of their sovereign rights. The buildings destroyed in that fire represented only Western businesses or Western institutions.

Egyptians tend to regard the Suez Canal as the cause of their modern problems. It is this canal, they will tell you, that has enabled colonialism and imperialism to deprive them of their sovereignty. Ever since deLesseps struck his bargain (that cost the lives of 30,000 Egyptian canal diggers) with the Khedive Ismail back in 1859, that international waterway has been exploited to the benefit

of the West and to the detriment of Egypt, Egyptian scholars assert.

And so with the United States statesmen preaching about the rights of indigenous peoples to determine their own form of government and with the United Nations echoing similar sentiments, Egyptians feel that in this modern age of enlightened human rights, it is high time that the British military forces evacuate the Suez Canal zone—the 1936 treaty notwithstanding.

Egyptians will point out that while the British insist upon a sacrosanct observance of the treaty's termination in 1956, the British themselves have violated the agreement by basing 80,000 troops along the Canal zone instead of the 10,000 allowed in a treaty framed originally by the British. The Egyptians look upon the United States as linked with British imperialism, thus enabling them to continue their control in the Nile Valley.

A high ranking military officer explained the situation thus:

"We want to be a truly sovereign nation and in our efforts to force the British to end their imperialism in our country, the American Press too frequently refers to us as fanatic nationalists. Today nationalism is an opprobrious term in the West, but it was not too long ago when nationalism was considered an instrument of freedom. When the American colonists dumped the British tea in Boston Harbor, that was an act that today could be called fanatic nationalism, yet it was one of the steps that eventually led to American independence. And yet what are we, the Egyptians, trying to do? Exactly what the American colonists did some 175 years ago: to free ourselves from occupation by foreign troops and thus become a truly sovereign state. It seems hardly fair for Americans to brand us as fanatic nationalists when our aim is simply freedom.

"I believe it was the English who gave the world the concept that a man's home is his castle. That is regarded as a sacred principle in England. And yet the West was not horror-stricken when English troops used their tanks and bulldozers to wipe out scores of humble homes of Egyptians in a village near the Suez Canal in 1951. I know of no single American newspaper that wrote in protest of that arrogant destruction of property. Is it right to call Egyptians fanatic when what they demand is simply that the British get out of our country which they have occupied against the wishes of the people since 1882?"

Ask any Egyptian: "Why don't the Arabs make peace with Israel?" Most every one will reply: "Would you make peace with an intruder who has stolen your home and property? What about the Arab refugees, of whom the U. N. officially says there are more than 800,000 living now for five years in misery and poverty, even after the U.N. passed resolutions calling upon Israel to allow the refugees to repatriate themselves or to be compensated for their property instead, if they so wish?"

While the Arabs suffered a humiliating defeat in Palestine, it was precisely that war that has given rise to a renaissance in the spirit and life not only of the Egyptians but of all the Arab states. It was the corruption in the royal palace and among the politicians that gave birth to the movement that finally brought about the coup d'etat. General Naguib and his followers realized that if decency and principle were to be restored to Egyptian life, then the evil forces must be routed out.

Farouk and his entourage had contemptuous disregard for government by law and order. This contempt expressed itself upon the occasion of the annual election of officers at the Army Officers Club. Farouk made it known he wanted a certain general elected president. The officers disregarded his wishes and instead elected General Naguib. Thereupon Farouk ordered the Officers Club closed. That was the straw that broke the camel's back. A short time later came the coup d'etat and with it a wholesale cleansing

of government offices and public officials—all without the loss of a single life.

General Naguib has recruited into his wide reform programs men of character and ability. He has for the most part chosen men of integrity and experience. Men who would have nothing to do with public office under Farouk are now rallying to Naguib's support. The political opportunists are gone. The feudal land-owners and the wealthy pashas have lost their power. General Naguib has instituted government for the people. Government by and of the people will take much time for achievement but at least General Naguib has set the course, this time with earnestness and sincerity—qualities before lacking in Egyptian political life.

James Batal, former Massachusetts newspaperman, recently returned from a research assignment in Egypt. Mr. Batal was a Nieman Fellow in 1946, has since worked on problems of the Middle East.

Mr. Bennett and Mr. Greeley Visit

by David M. White

I kept looking at the steersman who was guiding this classy little boat across the river. Funny thing about the boat, too, because I'd expected sort of a gondola with a cadaverous looking fellow pushing it with a long pole. At any rate the steersman looked familiar to me and I finally took my curiosity out of my mouth and asked him if he'd ever lived in Jersey. He had, and I was sure I'd seen him before. Did he take Contemporary Geo-Politics 404 at Rutgers in 1936? No. Well, maybe he had sold underwater fishing spears at Macy's in 1947, the year Millie and I went to Virginia Beach for a week. No. Finally, I remembered where I'd seen him and he confirmed that he had worked there. It was at the Tunnel of Love at Palisades Park. He was the guy that came out in an emergency boat whenever the other boats got fouled up.

So here he was working this shift on the Stix river, and all I could think of was, it's a small universe. He wondered how I'd gotten a visitor's visa, since all of the rest of the folks he had ferried over appeared to carry extradition papers and were resigned to making permanent residence there. Frankly, I was surprised when they gave me a visitor's visa, but the precedent had been set quite a while ago when a chap named Orpheus had gotten permission to talk to his wife Eurydice. Seems that Orpheus was having income tax troubles and his wife was the only one who could get him straight on why he had taken an exemption for his father-in-law.

We approached the shore and my steersman buddy docked the launch. It wasn't foggy but somehow I couldn't see a thing although the solid ground under my feet told me we were there. Of course, I was in the land of shades,

so I remembered to put on those tricky astro-polaroid glasses that Waldemar Kaempffert had rigged out for me. Walking up to a little building designated Information and Registration, I presented my visa and asked if I might proceed without any delay to the nature of my business, my interviews with Horace Greeley and James Gordon Bennett. The information clerk dialed a number and talked to one of his superiors, then turning to me he said that I would be taken to Mr. Bennett's quarters and later to Mr. Greeley's. The two gentlemen were not on speaking terms, and hadn't been since they arrived here 81 e.c.y.'s (earthcomputed years) ago. Mr. Bennett was on the portion of the island reserved for hard-bitten Realists and spent most of his days playing in a round-robin chess tournament with Prince Metternich, Ed "Blackbeard" Teach and a new fellow named Djugashveli who'd just recently come from Russia. Mr. Greeley was on the other side of the island with the Idealists, and his cronies included Hank Thoreau, Thomas Jefferson and the Rev. Elijah Lovejoy.

After the guide frisked me to be sure I didn't have a souped-up camera hidden under my shirt, he insisted that I give him the 4-D polaroid glasses, for "security" reasons. He guided me into some kind of vehicle and in a moment we were at our destination. Putting on the glasses, which the guide returned to me, I found myself in a dingy little basement printing shop, whose sole furniture was a rickety chair and a table made from a long plank on a couple of barrels. Bennett looked up from behind a big pile of *Heralds* and said, "Alright, young man, come to the point. You want me to give you my idea about the newspaper

situation in the States. At least that's what you said when you wrote for this interview. You thought you could flatter me, eh, by saying that I was the greatest *realist* the American newspaper world ever produced. I've been flattered by smarter lads than you. Abe Lincoln offered to send me to France as Ambassador, because he wasn't happy about the way the *Herald* looked at his war. Well, never mind about that. I'll tell you what I think about the newspapers in the States today, and you won't like it. I think that if all the newspapermen in the country caught the galloping galumphis and died overnight, the people wouldn't miss the papers too much. Might miss them for a few days, but these radio and television boys would close in like a fat buzzard over a carcass, and it wouldn't be long before the newspaper was a dodo in a museum.

"You want to know why, lad? Because the boys who run the newspapers today are too busy worrying about the machine to give a hoot what the machine is grinding out. They worry too much about whether the teletypesetter will save \$40 a week, and they don't worry at all whether Johnny Doe who buys the paper is happy and excited about what he's getting. Nobody'd say I was a poor business man, but I didn't keep my nose in the bookkeeping ledger all the time and have a hemorrhage about it. Like that Will White said about Frank Munsey (gad, every time I think how that curmudgeon bought my *Herald* I could spit), he turned a once noble profession into an 8% investment. May he rest in trust!

"Mark this one down, boy. The boys running the newspapers today think they can run them the way I did a hundred years ago. Tell them to wake up, that the times have changed, and that people change, too. Sure, I made money and built up circulation on sensational stories, but when I broke the Jewett-Robinson story it was something new in journalism. So they've rode the formula into the ground, and every day they've got to have a big, juicy story. You can find blood and thunder every day, to be sure. With 150 million characters roaming the States you're bound to find the obtuse and the screw-loose. They don't see the news as I did, as another chapter each day in a new *comédie humaine* by Balzac. They don't see the characters as more subtle and cruel, more noble and profound than even the boy from Stratford could write them, not anymore they don't. But I did. And that's why my paper was an exciting and exhilarating adventure every day for the man who plunked down his two cents in this little shop. No, they said to themselves if old man Bennett could bag the market with a story about a murdered chippy by the name of Helen Jewett, we'll give them murdered chippies till it comes out of their ears. They say to themselves as long as they buy the papers we'll give them whatever slop they want, but some day they're going to wake up and find out that the bird has flown. They have all kinds of meetings in which they pat themselves on the back and say that the

American press is the greatest in the world, when it really is only the biggest. Greatest and biggest aren't the same words in my vocabulary. My *Herald* was never more than eight pages, but by the time you take out the watered stock, the recipes for Aunt Tilly's pickled popcorn, the phony psychologists who help the neurotic readers about as much as firewater helped the Chippeway Indians, the pages of inane, banal cartoons, I'll match my *Herald* with your modern papers and give you cards to spare.

"I don't know whether you've got the insides to go back and tell them what I've told you, lad. And if you did they'd only say that Bennett has gone completely off the deep end. So go back and tell them that James G. Bennett refused to comment on current newspaper practices in his former country. Why be a fool, boy, when you can play it safe? Keep your mouth shut and someday you might even own your very own house in Kew Gardens or New Rochelle."

Excusing himself to get back to his chess game with Metternich, Bennett was gone before I could so much as catch my breath or even mutter a hasty thanks.

All I could think was, Wow, the old boy sure takes a dim view of the American press. As I walked out from the musty basement office of the New York *Herald*, my guide was waiting for me. Again he insisted that I remove my 4-D glasses and once more I felt myself in some vehicle and moving at quite a speed. Expecting to find myself in front of the old *Tribune* building near Fulton Street, I was a bit surprised to find myself in a lovely meadow, and there seated on the bank of a swift-rushing creek, glasses atilt, white linen duster et al, was Horace Greeley.

Greeley discerned my wonderment and said, "You would be the young man from New York who wants my views on today's press, no? I suspect that you expected to find me at the *Tribune* shop, but I'll let you in on a little secret. Down here we're allowed to recreate whatever place we liked best when we were up there. As for me, I once spent some time at Brook Farm up in Massachusetts. So this is our Brook Farm and it's very restful and pleasant. I have lots of time for reading, and when I'm tired of that I take long walks with my friend Thoreau. Sometimes in the evening our friend Jefferson brings out his violin and plays for us, and sometimes we just talk. Yes, we talk about newspapers, past and present."

I told Mr. Greeley that I had just come from my interview with Bennett, and this brought a smile to Greeley's face.

"I'll bet he gave your ears quite a tromping with his views. He doesn't think much of your press today, I'm told. You know, of course, that Bennett and I aren't on speaking terms, although I do think it rather inane to carry one's quarrels from up there over to here. But really he is an awful hothead. You say that you interviewed him be-

cause he typified the *realist* to you, and I suppose that makes me the *idealist* in your eyes."

I allowed that was not far from my thinking.

"Well," continued Greeley, "I've been called worse things. My own thinking about the press today is that somehow, maybe because the world has become so large and at the same time so small, somehow newspapers don't play as important a role in American life as they should. Maybe it's because the papers themselves don't really know where they fit in. It seems to me that if a newspaper is the conscience of a people, and that's what I always thought it should be, its first job is to understand the world and the people whose conscience it is.

"I think people in America take newspapers for granted, the way they do with too many other things. The same kind of apathy that keeps them away from primary elections, or that makes most Americans shrug their shoulders and say, 'Politicians are politicians' with all the logic of 'pigs is pigs.' A nickel won't buy much in America any more, I'm told, so if it still buys a newspaper nobody's going to get excited about it. I sometimes think that it might not be a bad thing if Americans lost the press for awhile, if a newspaper became as rare as uranium-235. Might make them think about what they lost, and it might make them want something better when it came back. At the same time, it might not be so bad for the newspapers if all the people just vanished from the face of the earth for awhile, just awhile. All the people except the newspaper publishers and their staffs. So they could just stop for awhile and ask themselves what direction they're heading, and what reason they have for existing, and what do they do for the people.

"You see, I've always thought of the newspaper's role as something like what a good minister does for a community. A minister uses his pulpit on Sunday to speak his sermon and the newspaper uses its editorial columns to do the same. Any minister who sees that some of his parishioners are crooks or hypocrites and fails to invoke moral indignation upon them isn't worth the starch in his fine linen collar. Likewise, any paper that temporizes with sloth and mediocrity in the community it should be serving isn't worth a plugged end rule. Every paper in the United States that lets itself get fat and contented and mediocre is adding its contribution to the apathy that people will feel toward the press. Apathy and worse to come.

"To carry my analogy a bit further, the minister's days are filled with plenty of other activities than his apostolic one. He visits with the sick of his parish, attends civic meetings, plans the financial security of his church, he does

lots of things. So does a newspaper—in fact, it's expected to be many things to all types of people. But no matter what else they do, or whatever some people may feel about it, both the newspaper and the minister ought to give more to the community that they take. Sure, the community may reward the newspaper by making it a wealthy enterprise (and I'm not going to say that is bad), but the paper should give so much to the community, so much genuine service, that all the money in the world couldn't pay it back for the good which its presence spells for the community. How many papers do you have like that today?

"The most inconspicuous member of the town has got to feel that it is *his* paper as well as the big industrialist who lives in a mansion. When I was editor of the *Tribune*, my office was filled with people who kept telling me what they liked and often what they didn't like in the *Tribune*. Does the little insignificant man in your town feel that he can go to the editor of your newspapers, and what's more important does he even give a hoot about going? Or does he shake his head and say, 'I don't share anything in common with the publisher of that paper; we're no more alike than the Ford I drive and the Cadillac in which his chauffeur takes him to work.' Whose fault is it, young man, if such a social distance has come between those who make newspapers and those who read them?

"Still, I'm not as pessimistic about the future of the press as Bennett seems to have been with you. Sure, television may give a man the idea that he is there at the event, but there is something about a man that makes him want to hold on to the event, to ponder it, to see it in the black and white of his newspaper. I think there are many facets of its relationship with the people of the community it serves that the newspaper has not yet understood. When I was editing the *Tribune* it was the period that some historians called the era of personal journalism. Well, that's no longer the case, but do the newspapers have anything to put in its place? Does your press today have any distinct personality, and more important, can it still make rapport with the people—make them excited, or agitated or full of righteous indignation? As far as I'm concerned that's the crux of the problem, and we're not soothsayers or fortune tellers down here. I don't know how it's going to come out any more than you do."

It was indeed a strange and disconcerting dream, yet all things considered, not without a message of strength and hope.

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

Editors Can't Agree on Threat to Freedom

The ASNE Report on the Wechsler Case

Text of report addressed to Basil Walters, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

To Mr. Basil Walters, President, American Society of Newspaper Editors.

You appointed this Special Committee, at the request of James A. Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, to study and comment on the hearings by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, held on April 24 and May 5.

As we understand our assignment it is not our function, nor is it our wish, to commit either the individual members, the Board of Directors, or the American Society of Newspaper Editors to any uniform opinion or to any course of action. We are not pronouncing any general judgment on the public service of anyone in politics or in journalism.

You have reminded us that the ASNE does not speak for its members on political matters. These members are of every sort of political persuasion. We are, in politics, not a committee of several hundred persons, and required as such to reach agreement. We are, in effect, several hundred committees, free to differ with each other and to express these differences as we choose.

In commenting on the Wechsler hearings newspapers with members in the Society did disagree on whether they constituted a threat to freedom of the press; and members of this committee disagree also as to the extent to which this threat existed.

Indeed, the disagreement ranges from the opinion that Senator Joseph McCarthy, as committee chairman, infringed freedom of the press with his question of the *New York Post* (an opinion held by the chairman of the committee), to the contrary viewpoint that the senator's inquiries did no damage to this freedom. In between are committee members who were disturbed by the tenor of the investigation, but do not feel that this single interchange constituted a clear and present danger to freedom of the press justifying a specific challenge.

We have studied the transcripts of the two hearings most thoughtfully. Perhaps we can fulfill our mandate from you best by reciting some of the facts that emerged, and appending such comment as the committee as a whole finds proper.

1. On April 24, 1953, Mr. Wechsler appeared before the Senate committee and stated he had come voluntarily in response to a telephone summons received the preceding day. However, the committee's chief counsel, Roy Cohn, said that a telephone request to appear "under Senate

rules is an order to appear, under penalty for failure to comply."

2. At the outset of the hearing, Mr. Wechsler was questioned about certain books he had written, reportedly used in the overseas libraries of the Government Information Program. He told of four books he had authored—two between 1934 and 1937, while he was a student at Columbia University and affiliated with the Young Communist League, and two after 1940 when he had broken his communist connections and become outspoken against communism.

Senator McCarthy stated that it was because of these books, and of Mr. Wechsler's communist affiliations (which existed admittedly when two of them were written) that he had been summoned.

Mr. Wechsler disagreed and said this was only a pretext. He contended later that ". . . the record shows that the interrogation dealt overwhelmingly not with my work as an author, but with my activities as an editor and with the policies and personnel of the newspaper I edit."

3. Further questioning by Senator McCarthy probed into the editorial policies of the *New York Post* under Mr. Wechsler's editorship and into the political affiliations of members of his staff, with particular emphasis on editorials and columns critical of Senator McCarthy and other congressional investigators, as well as of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Comment: It is here, of course, that the question of infringement on freedom of the press arises chiefly. We urge that every member of this Society read the transcript of the testimony. We believe that only in this way can all the complex factors affecting the issue be judged.

If, as some members believe, Senator McCarthy was using the power of government to probe into a newspaper's editorial conscience and challenge its right to criticize government; and if (in the language of a concurring opinion by two justices of the Supreme Court in a case in this field) he held a club over speech and over the press "through the harassment of hearings, investigations, reports, and subpoenas"—then the conclusion of these editors is understandable.

If, on the other hand, the questions were designed only to establish Mr. Wechsler's personal opinions as expressed in print and attempt to relate them to his disputed attitude toward communism, without any intention to punish or

to challenge his right to these opinions, the opposite conclusion is equally understandable.

Since the committee is not in agreement on this crucial issue, it is the responsibility of every editor to read the transcript and decide for himself, and, if he likes, to try to convince the public his view is the correct one.

Obviously the committee as a whole cannot express a judgment it cannot reach.

4. Senator McCarthy repeatedly questioned the sincerity of Mr. Wechsler's anti-communism; Mr. Wechsler defended himself vigorously against this skepticism and avowed his purpose to continue fighting both communism and the political views and methods of the senator.

5. At no time did Mr. Wechsler decline to answer questions about his past actions and his opinions, or claim any special privilege, because he was a newspaper editor, though he did state several times that he hoped the ASNE would study the case. At the May 5 hearing, when he was accompanied by counsel, Mr. Wechsler submitted a list of persons whom he had known to be affiliated with the Young Communist League during the period of his connection with it, although he asked that the list not be published lest it do injury to persons who had since changed their views. The request was granted.

6. At no time did Senator McCarthy try to prevent the witness from speaking freely and making complete response to points of challenge.

7. The hearings were closed to the public and the press, though the record was later made available at the request of Mr. Wechsler and the proceedings are or have been printed in Public Documents.

Comment: Such hearings, unless they clearly involve matters requiring secrecy for the protection of the nation's security, should be open. A transcript in cold type fails to reveal the moods and manners of disputants, and these are essential to a true understanding of such an interchange.

8. During the hearings Mr. Wechsler accused Senator McCarthy of trying to intimidate him, the *New York Post*, and the press generally. When asked by Senator McCarthy if he had been in any way intimidated, he did not give a direct answer. He has said that he feared chiefly the intimidating effect a hearing might have on other editors.

Comment: On April 6, 1936, Frank C. Waldrop of the *Washington Herald* was summoned before the House Committee on Military Affairs after he had written a story critical of the chairman, Representative John J. McSwain. On the advice of his counsel, Mr. Waldrop refused to answer any questions about this story, and eventually his subpoena was cancelled.

It seems to us that all editors might well ask their attorneys to study the question of whether, in case any of them ever are called to testify before any committee about any line of inquiry, they should answer questions relating to their editorial or news judgments.

If there is a genuine constitutional question here, then it should be raised and settled. Not being constitutional lawyers, the committee members obviously could offer only their several opinions, which would not provide any final answer.

This committee feels that the issue raised by this hearing serves a useful purpose. It focuses upon an essential and constitutionally guaranteed freedom a fresh vigilance and enforces a salutary re-examination in each editorial mind of the editor's ideas and responsibilities.

While the committee is signing this statement, as representing a maximum area of general agreement, some members feel it to be inadequate, and therefore are submitting to you statements clarifying their own views.

Also, the chairman of this committee has compiled an historical summary of some of the conflicts between the press and legislative branches of government cases he feels are in varying degree pertinent to the present question. This review will be available to members of the Society.

The report of the full committee bore the signatures of the following:

Paul Block Jr., co-publisher, *Toledo Blade*; Raymond L. Crowley, managing editor, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*; William H. Fitzpatrick, associate editor, *Wall Street Journal*; George W. Healey Jr., editor, *New Orleans Times-Picayune*; L. D. Hotchkiss, editor, *Los Angeles Times*; Joseph W. Lee, editorial director, *Topeka State Journal*; James S. Pope, executive editor, *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Times*; J. R. Wiggins, managing editor, *Washington Post*, committee chairman; Herbert Brucker, editor, *Hartford Courant*; William M. Tugman, editor, *Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard*; Eugene S. Pulliam, Jr., managing editor, *Indianapolis News*.

Four members of the ASNE Committee filed a supplementary report that said that Senator McCarthy's methods were not only a threat to freedom of the press but also "a peril to American freedom."

The supplementary report was signed by the following: J. R. Wiggins, managing editor, *Washington Post*, committee chairman; Herbert Brucker, editor, *Hartford Courant*; William M. Tugman, editor, *Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard*; Eugene S. Pulliam Jr., managing editor, *Indianapolis News*.

Four See Press Freedom Imperiled

Additional Comment on the Wechsler Case

by: **J. R. Wiggins, Managing Editor, Washington Post; Herbert Brucker, Editor, Hartford Courant; William M. Tugman, Editor, Eugene (Ore.) Register-Guard; Eugene S. Pulliam, Jr., Managing Editor, Indianapolis News.**

To Mr. Basil Walters, President

American Society of Newspaper Editors:

On April 24 and May 5, the investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate summoned before it James Wechsler, the editor of the New York *Post*.

He was asked to appear in the course of an inquiry into the contents of the overseas libraries maintained by the government of the United States. Committee investigators had discovered that books written by Mr. Wechsler were on the shelves of these libraries.

The First Amendment provides:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press . . ."

Three "laws" (at least) made by Congress were involved in the summoning and interrogation of Mr. Wechsler. They were:

First: The Legislative Re-Organization Act of 1946. It provides that the committee is to have broad jurisdiction over: (A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations, and (B) Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. In pursuing this broad purpose it is to have the duty of:

"(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject of such reports;

"(B) Studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member."

Second: The Senate "rule" whereunder, by declaration of the investigating Senate Committee, the "request" that Mr. Wechsler appear before it was "an order to appear, under penalty for failure to comply."

Third: The statute cited as 5 United States Code An-

notated, section 192 which provides for punishment by fine and imprisonment for wilful default in appearance or refusal to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry before a committee of either House of the Congress or a joint committee thereof, etc.

It appears therefore that under laws made by Congress, or color thereof, Mr. Wechsler was present by compulsion and under the necessity either to answer whatever inquiries were propounded to him or face prosecution for refusal to do so. Action under these laws, or under any other laws that have been made or could be made by Congress, in abridgment of freedom of speech or of the press was barred by the inexorable command of the First Amendment.

The First Amendment speaks in "unequivocal language" and "the unqualified prohibitions laid down by the framers were intended to give liberty of the press, as to other liberties, the broadest scope that could be countenanced in an orderly society." [Note: These quotations are from the majority opinion in *Bridges v. California*, 314 U. S. 252, 62 S. Ct. 190, 86 L. Ed. 192, 159 A. L. R. 1346 (1941)]

Among the manifold forms of oral and printed utterance thus safeguarded from interference by government probably the most precious is expression of opinion or sentiment on the conduct of government affairs. And among the most precious of these guaranteed rights is expression of opinion or sentiment adversely critical of conduct of government. Mr. Wechsler was interrogated at length and in minutiae concerning expression of opinion adversely critical of conduct of government by members of the Senate, House of Representatives and agencies of the government. Any attempt by Congress to apply sanctions or punishment upon or by reason of matters about which he was queried would be, as Thomas Jefferson said of the Sedition Act of 1798 (which did purport to provide punishment for utterance upon such matters) a "nullity as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image." [Note: The quotation is taken from page 231, *Crisis in Freedom*. John C. Miller, Little Brown and Company, Boston, 1951.]

The Amendment declares no exceptions. "The evils to be prevented were not the censorship of the press merely" or laws abridging freedom of speech or of the press by means of such sanctions as licensing or punishment for seditious

"but any action of the government by means of which it might prevent such free and general discussion of public matters as seems absolutely essential to prepare the people for an intelligent exercise of their rights as citizens." [Note: The quotations are from *Cooley*.]

So it is that the Amendment bars at the threshold abridgment by means of governmental investigations, inquiries, disclosures. "It has always been recognized, and it is well to remember, that few, if any of the rights of the people guarded by fundamental law are of greater importance to their happiness and safety than the right to be exempt from all unauthorized, arbitrary or unreasonable inquiries and disclosures . . ." "While the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses and that a witness may rightfully refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or where the questions are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry." [Note: The quotations are from *Sinclair v. U. S.*, 279 U. S. 263, 49 S. Ct. 319, 73 L. Ed. 692.]

The Amendment thus limits the power of investigation as well as the power to apply sanctions by way of censorship before publication or by way of punishment after publication. As the courts have held, "public inquiry" is "an impingement upon free speech" and "the realistic effect of public embarrassment is a powerful interference with the free expression of views." [Note: The quotations are from *U. S. v. Rumely*, 90 App. D. C. 382, 197 F. 2d 166 (D. C. Cir. 1952)] Justices of the United States Supreme Court have pointed out that the potential restraint of vexatious inquiries equals in severity such legal sanctions as taxation, a board of censorship or a licensing system. They said: "Through the harassment of hearings, investigations, reports and subpoena government will hold a club over speech and over the press. Congress could not do this by law. The power of investigation is also limited." [Note: The quotation is from the concurring opinion of Justices Douglas and Black in *U. S. v. Rumely*.]

Neither the fact nor the extent of the abridgment is to be tested by the fortitude against intimidation of the particular editor or other person subjected to summons and inquiry. The test is not the capacity of resistance against the "finger of government levelled against the press" enjoyed by editors as a class of daily metropolitan newspapers or other newspapers. The protection of the First Amendment is not solely for the very courageous or the very orthodox or the very secure. The "preferred position granted speech and press by the First Amendment" attaches to all who may wish to use oral or printed words to "bid for the minds of men in the market place of ideas" and to all who may wish to hear or read, however timid or unorthodox or insecure they may be or feel. Freedom of the press is not for the newspaper press alone. What journalism

defends against all the pressures of government is the right of all men, readers and hearers as well as utterers, to share information and opinion. [Note: The quotations are from the above-mentioned concurring opinion.]

Whatever the circumstances cited for the summoning and whether or not their citation was genuine or a pretext for harassment for adverse criticism, legislative intervention, whether by investigation or imposition of sanctions, can find constitutional justification only by dealing lawfully with abuses. The rights of free speech and free press themselves must not be curtailed. The circumstances cited demonstrate how "imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion . . . Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government." [Note: The quotations are from *De Jonge v. Oregon*, 299 U. S. 353, 57 S. Ct. 255, 81 L. Ed. 288 (1937).]

We carefully examined the transcript of the interrogation of Mr. Wechsler and have made a thorough study of precedents involved. From these inquiries we conclude that:

(a) Freedom of the Press in these United States, as it has been understood since the adoption of the Constitution, could not long survive the repeated exercise by Congress of unlimited inquiry into the conduct of newspapers.

(b) Congressional interrogation, such as occurred in the United States Senate committee on April 24 and May 5, if frequently repeated, would extinguish, without the passage of a single law, that free and unfettered reporting of events and comment thereon, upon which the preservation of our liberties depends, for more is comprehended in the term "freedom of the press" than just immunity to punitive statutes, it having been the intent of the founding fathers to free the press from all restraints and harassment by government.

(c) Newspapers put to the necessity of explaining to government agencies, legislative or executive, their news and editorial policies, under oath, would exist in such permanent jeopardy that their freedom to report fully and comment freely inevitably would be impaired. They would exist under an intimidation and harassment wholly incompatible with American ideas of liberty. A press that is under the continuing necessity of accounting to government for its opinions is not a free press—whether the government be a good or bad government. A press put to the frequent necessity of explaining its news and editorial policies to a United States Senator armed with the full powers of the government of the United States, is not a free press—whether the Senator be a good or a bad Senator.

(d) The people suffer some diminution of their right to know fully and comment freely upon their own gov-

ernment whenever a single newspaper, however worthy or unworthy, is subjected by one Senator, however worthy or unworthy, to inconvenience, expense, humiliation, ridicule, abuse, condemnation and reproach, under the auspices of governmental power. If the spectacle of such an ordeal raises in the mind of the most timid editorial spectator an apprehension, a fear, a doubt and anxiety as to the safety with which he may report and as to the immunity with which he may legally comment, American freedom to that degree has suffered an impairment. We leave to others the debate over how extensive this impairment ought to be before protest is made. We choose to protest at its very commencement. We would sooner suffer the criticism of having exclaimed too soon, too much and too loudly against an invasion of freedom of the press than endure the reproach of having stood silently by when government took the first step toward the silencing of the free press of this country.

(e) Motives of legislators and newspapermen do not alter the principles involved in any proceeding that threatens an extension of legislative power beyond those precincts within which it has been confined by the letter of the Constitution and by the spirit of our free institutions. A good Senator extinguishing the freedom of a bad newspaper may sentence generations yet unborn to a deprivation of their liberty quite as absolute as that which might flow from a bad Senator extinguishing the freedom of a good newspaper. Men need not sit in judgment upon Senators or newspapers in order to decide when freedom of the press is threatened. The noblest Senator that ever lived cannot interro-

gate the meanest editor that ever existed under the auspices of governmental power without putting in jeopardy the people's right to a free press. We deal here with matters of principle and not affairs of personality. Communism by its methods of internal subversion, threatens free governments everywhere with destruction from within, and this threat is so immediate and so real that loyal Americans are inclined to bear, with more patience than they would ordinarily exhibit, governmental measures that involve personal inconvenience and annoyance. They must submit, in many cases, to what has been described as "the necessities of state." At the same time, they must stand on guard against any real impairment of their fundamental rights and liberties.

(f) Newspapermen, by the very choice of their profession, avail themselves of the privileges and immunities of a free press, guaranteed in the Constitution, and they assume at the same time certain obligations and duties, not the least among which is the duty to defend the freedom of the press against all attack. Where such an invasion of freedom occurs, other citizens may speak or remain silent without being identified with the trespass; but the silence of the press is invariably construed, and properly construed, as an indication that no trespass has occurred and its silences inevitably will be summoned to the support of like trespasses in the future. In our opinion, therefore, whatever inconvenience results, whatever controversy ensues, we are compelled by every command of duty to brand this and every threat to freedom of the press, from whatever source, as a peril to American freedom.

Background on Investigations of the Press

An Historical Summary of Some of the Conflicts Between the Press and Legislative Branches of Government

J. R. Wiggins

In a matter of such importance, we are not free to consult our prejudices and our opinions alone; we ought first to consult the history of legislative investigations of the press. This course has the virtue of lifting us out of the heat of our immediate environment and into a climate where abstract issues may be examined with greater impartiality.

In England, the institutions of which so greatly influenced our own, Parliament frequently summoned writers

and printers before them for interrogation. In the reign of George II, one Fogg, the proprietor of *Mist's Journal*, and a man named Dyer, who edited a news letter, were compelled to express on their knees contrition to the House. The English historian, Lecky, points out that:

"Almost every injury in word or act done to a Member of Parliament was, during the reign of George II, voted a breach of privilege, and thus brought under the immediate and often vindictive jurisdiction of the House.

Among the offenses thus characterized were shooting the rabbits of one member, poaching on the fishponds of another, injuring the trees of a third, and stealing the coal of a fourth."

The first great step toward a free press in England was the lapse of the licensing laws and the end of prior censorship in 1695. This, however, was not in itself freedom of the press. Newspapers still had to get the right to report parliamentary proceedings, which they did not obtain until 1771. They still had to gain protection against repeated parliamentary punishment for breaches of privilege. They had to modify prosecutions for seditious libel, by the passage of the Fox Libel Act in 1795. They still had to be assured against destructive and discriminatory taxation—an assurance not obtained until 1850. It took more than 100 years to gain the whole complex of freedoms that make up a free press: (1) the right to get the truth, (2) the right to print it without prior restraint, (3) the right to print without fear of harassment or punishment for opinions offensive to Parliament or executive, (4) the right to distribute, (5) the right of access to printing facilities.

It was this whole complex of rights which Americans had come to regard as constituting press freedom by the time the Constitution was adopted. It was just the narrow freedom to print without restraint that was in the minds of those who wrote the First Amendment. Federalists and Republicans alike united in giving the Amendment the broadest meaning. In 1798, when Marshall, Pinckney, and Gerry were in France, they answered Tallyrand's criticism of some American newspaper comment by saying:

"The genius of the Constitution and the opinion of the people of the United States, cannot be overruled by those who administer the Government. Among those principles deemed sacred in America, among those sacred rights considered as forming the bulwark of their liberty, *which the Government contemplated with awful reverence and would approach only with the most cautious circumspection*, there is no one of which the importance is more deeply impressed on the public mind than the liberty of the press."

It was not, in other words, a matter of what government might do legally, but a matter of even approaching this liberty of the press with "cautious circumspection."

The First Amendment, Chafee points out, "is much more than an order to Congress not to cross the boundary which marks the extreme limits of lawful suppression. It is also an exhortation and a guide for the action of Congress inside that boundary. It is a declaration of national policy in favor of the public discussion of all

public questions. Such a declaration should make Congress reluctant and careful in the enactment of all restrictions upon utterance, even though the courts will not refuse to enforce them as unconstitutional."

Cooley has pointed out: "The evils to be prevented (by the First Amendment) were not the censorship of the press merely, but *any action of the government by means of which it might prevent such free and general discussion of public matters as seems absolutely essential to prepare the people for an intelligent exercise of their rights as citizens.*"

Notwithstanding the First Amendment, Congress soon attempted to restrict the freedom of the press by statute with the passage of the Sedition Act, in the Adams administration. But, more interesting to our present purposes, than this statutory infringement, was an early case of congressional action against a newspaper editor. In his newspaper the *Aurora*, William Duane attacked a measure to decide the disputed elections of President and Vice President. He said that the measure "was calculated to influence and affect the approaching presidential election, and to frustrate in a particular manner the wishes and interests of the people of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

The Committee of Privileges, to which the subject had been referred, saw in the publication that which tended "to defame the Senate of the United States, and to bring them into disrepute." By Senate resolution, March 14, 1800, Duane was ordered to attend at the Bar of the Senate. When the Senate laid objectionable restrictions on the efforts of counsel to prove the truth of his assertions, Duane declined to attend. His counsel, Thomas Cooper, argued:

"Where rights are undefined, and power is unlimited; where the freedom of the press is actually attacked, under whatever intention of curbing its licentiousness, the melancholy period cannot be far distant when the citizen will be converted into a subject."

The Senate on March 27, 1800, concluded that Duane was guilty of contempt and charged the Sergeant-at-Arms to take him into custody—by the supporting vote of Vice President Thomas Jefferson. One historian of the period says:

"Just then Mr. Duane had business out of town too urgent to be neglected or else the Senate became conscious that it had overstepped its bounds; at any rate there was no arrest. Instead a prosecution for libel was substituted as a mode of punishment."

Duane's friends petitioned the Senate with a long resolution including this paragraph:

"We had thought that the plain and acknowledged principles of natural justice would have prevented the accusers from being also the judges, the jury, and the punishers."

With Jefferson's election, the prosecution for sedition was dropped.

It was a long time before Congress dealt again with a similar case.

One of the most notable of such cases, in American history, occurred in 1915 when a committee of the United States Senate investigated the *New York Times*.

The account of this investigation that appears in *The History of The New York Times*, by Elmer Davis, cannot be improved upon. It follows:

"Because the editors of the *Times* had expressed their opinions on some questions of public policy, opinions not altogether in agreement with those of the Senators on the committee, they were summoned to Washington and asked if anybody was paying them for those opinions, and if so, who. The pretext for this inquisition—in view of the course taken by the committee, it can hardly be called anything else—was the *Times's* opposition to the administration bill for the purchase of foreign ships interned in American harbors. The paper opposed this because it opposed the intrusion of the government into business, and because it had its doubts whether the purchase in time of war of ships interned to escape capture by the enemy was valid in international law. There was much and reasonable opposition to this measure; the *Times* had no monopoly of its opinion. But the Senate appointed a committee to inquire 'if influence had been exerted' against the bill. . . . The Ship purchase bill was forgotten; Senators asked Mr. Miller why the *Times* opposed parcel posts; why it thought a this and that about railroads and about the trust prosecutions; why certain stories were not put on the front page. The *Times* by that time was virtually on trial for all its opinions, and its editors no doubt experienced some weariness as he laboriously explained that the editors of a newspaper advocate certain policies because they believe them best for the public interest, that not all news can be put on the front page, that the relative value of news is a matter of judgment and that the judgment of all newspapers is not always identical.

"Having got through this, however, the committee took up another line of argument. Senator T. J. Walsh of Montana, its Chairman, asked if the *Times* had 'any business connections of any character with England.'

"Mr. Miller said that it had none aside from maintaining its own correspondents there. Then Senator Walsh wanted to know if Mr. Ochs had 'any financial support of any kind in England.' Mr. Miller said that he had none whatever, whereupon Senator Walsh explained, rather apologetically, 'I asked because I was informed that was the case.'"

The *Times*, says Mr. Davis, then made an elaborate

explanation of its ownership and demanded to know who had given Senator Walsh the information. It was finally acknowledged that the information had been furnished the committee in an anonymous letter. Mr. Davis concludes his story of the inquiry:

"However, the chief importance of this incident does not lie in its bearing on the reputation of the *Times*. As was said in the paper's editorial columns at the time:

"This is not a personal issue. It is a question of the extent to which a government's machinery may be privately misused to annoy and attempt to discredit a newspaper whose editorial attitude has become distasteful and embarrassing."

"And it was in the name, not of the *Times*, but of the whole American press—a press which for nearly two centuries had been free from governmental control—that Mr. Miller, at the close of his interrogation by the committee on the *Times's* editorial attitude toward every subject of public interest, addressed some remarks to the committee:

"I can see no ethical, moral or legal right that you have to put many of the questions you put to me today. Inquisitorial proceedings of this kind would have a very marked tendency, if continued and adopted as a policy, to reduce the press of the United States to the level of the press in some of the Central European empires, the press that has been known as the reptile press, that crawls on its belly every day to the foreign office or to the government officials and ministers to know what it may say or shall say—to receive its orders."

"Questions of that kind, he said, 'tend to repress freedom of utterance and to put newspapers under a sort of duress.'

"That the *Times*, in this case, was fighting for the freedom of the entire American press was pretty generally recognized. There was much editorial comment on Mr. Miller's statement and on the committee's procedure. The *World* called the questions 'a public inquisition without an open arraignment'; the Baltimore *American* said that the hearing was 'the most extraordinary exhibition of bad judgment, peevishness or evil motives the country has had from a Senate committee for years.'"

The 1936 Issue

In 1936 a Senate committee investigating lobbying raised again issues on infringement on freedom of the press. The episode is very amply covered in the 50th anniversary reports of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

In March of 1936, it was discovered that the Federal Communications Commission had furnished the lobbying committee headed by Senator Hugo Black, millions of private telegrams. The committee then issued a subpoena requiring the Western Union to furnish it with the telegrams of the Chicago law firm of Winston, Strawn and Shaw. The District of Columbia Supreme Court pro-

nounced the subpoena unlawful and enjoined the Western Union from furnishing the messages.

The committee, it was then learned, had obtained, or was seeking the telegrams of the Cowles Publishing Company of Spokane, telegrams and press messages of the Wichita Falls *Record-News*, and the Wichita, Kansas, *Beacon*. It also obtained a telegram sent by the late William Randolph Hearst to one of his editorial writers. Hearst brought two suits—one against the Communications Commission and the committee and the other against Western Union. The ANPA reports in its Volume 50:

“The Communications Commission, a co-defendant in the latter suit, set up as part of its defense the contention that the constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press protects only against previous restraints—a theory, as we have seen, which has been thoroughly disapproved by the Supreme Court.”

Hearst was denied an injunction against the committee in an opinion holding the Court without jurisdiction over a Senate committee. The ANPA feared that if this opinion were final, “we would find ourselves faced by a legislative tyranny as vicious as the executive tyranny which our forefathers set out to suppress three centuries ago in England.”

Chief Justice Alfred Wheat of the District of Columbia Supreme Court said he could not see how freedom of the press was involved in the Hearst suit. He concluded: “You cannot say that the proprietor of a newspaper is not amenable to ordinary judicial process, or that his communications with subordinates are sacred.”

As to the Senate committee, the Court concluded that it had no jurisdiction. He confessed that he did not know where that left the situation but he thought, “it is better to leave us without any remedy than it is for the court to assume jurisdiction to try to coerce or control a committee of the Senate. . . . If the Senate committee has been proceeding in a way which some people might regard as unlawful, it is better to let them continue to do it and let that be corrected in some other way than for me to proceed in the way that seems to me to be unlawful to attempt to correct what they do that I do not agree with.”

Justice Wheat thought he had a perfect right to enjoin the Communications Commission from doing something unlawful, but he held that the Commission no longer had any Hearst telegrams and that there was therefore nothing for the court to do.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed the decree of the lower court on November 9, 1936, in an opinion by Justice J. Groner.

Judge Groner’s opinion reiterated the view of the lower court that “a dragnet seizure of private telegraph messages as is alleged in the bill, whether made by persons professing to act under the color of authority from the govern-

ment or by persons acting as individuals is a trespass which a court of equity has power to enjoin.” It sustained the lower court in assuming jurisdiction as the Communications Commission and stated that “if the bill had been filed while the trespass was in process, it would have been the duty of the lower court by order on the Commission or the telegraph companies or the agents of the Committee to enjoin the acts complained of.”

The Court declined to restrain the Senate Committee from making use of the telegrams it had obtained, contending that so to do would violate the constitutional separation of powers. It held that the courts “cannot enjoin legislative debate or discussion of constitutional measures because of the incidental disclosure or publication of knowledge unconstitutionally acquired.” Then, said the Court:

“If it be insisted that this is the acknowledgment of a power whose plenitude may become a cataclysm, the answer is that the Congress ‘is as much the guardian of the liberties and welfare of the people as the courts’; and in this view the assumption may properly be indulged that, attention being called to the unlawful nature of the search, the Senate will not use its proceeds in disregard of the appellant’s rights.”

What is then the remedy if a committee invade the rights of a citizen? The Court thought it settled law that:

“If appellant were before the Senate Committee as a witness and were questioned as to matters unrelated to the legislative business in hand. . . . he would be entitled to refuse to answer; and if, for his supposed contumacy, he were imprisoned, he could secure his release on habeas corpus.”

This ended the court action on the Hearst complaint. Hearst could fairly claim that he had triumphed in his opposition to the release of messages by the Communications Commission, thus shutting off one source of information. He could argue with equal force, that though the “separation of powers” doctrine shut him off from a judicial remedy, and left him at the mercy of the Senate—the tenor of the court’s opinion sustained the moral argument that his rights had, indeed, been invaded.

As an aftermath to the Black Committee, came a more spectacular case, even more directly involving the press in a congressional investigation.

On April 3, 1936, the Washington *Herald*, the ANPA reports, published a story by Frank C. Waldrop, connecting Rep. John J. McSwain of the House Committee on Military Affairs with some war surplus speculators. McSwain subpoenaed Waldrop to appear April 6 before his committee. When the committee met to hear Waldrop, his attorney stepped forward and informed the committee it was proceeding improperly, “pursuant to a threat of its chairman

and without legislative purpose, and that his client would answer no questions."

Says the ANPA report:

"The committee, particularly its chairman, became enraged at this challenge. The chairman ordered the reporter to take the stand, administered the oath, and then asked, 'Your name is Frank C. Waldrop, is it not?'

"With a smile the witness replied, 'Upon the advice of counsel, I decline to answer.'

"Then followed one of the most disgraceful exhibitions in the history of congressional inquisitions. . . . finally he (Waldrop) was told to stand down, but to hold himself subject to recall.

"The committee proceeded for several days with its inquiry. As witness after witness gave more and more aging testimony, its chairman became more and more embarrassed.

"On April 15th, a halt was called. At an executive session the committee voted unanimously to end its inquiry, not to print the record of its proceedings and to make no report to the House.

"The following day Mr. Waldrop's counsel demanded and obtained a cancellation of his subpoena.

"Thus did a courageous reporter, in the face of threats, innuendo and malicious insult, uphold the traditions of American Journalism."

These investigations were very aptly commented upon by Colonel Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the *Chicago Tribune* and the Chairman of the ANPA Freedom of the Press Committee in his address to the ANPA meeting that year. Among other things, Colonel McCormick said he had counselled resistance to the Black committee's subpoena by reading a friend a "quotation from a famous legal decision which has recently been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States as follows:

"A general roving offensive, inquisitorial, compulsory investigation, conducted by a commission without any allegiance, upon no fixed principles and governed by no rules of law or of evidence and no restraints except its own will or caprice, is unknown to our Constitution and laws and such an inquisition would be destructive of the rights of citizens and an intolerable tyranny. Let the power once be established and there is no knowing where the practice under it would end."

The report of the Freedom of the Press Committee of the ANPA said, in part:

"The direct harassment of the press by the notorious Black Committee is a comparatively recent development of the inquisition which the committee started the day after it was constituted by resolution of the United States Senate on July 11, 1935. But even before the committee started its

direct attacks on the freedom of the press its record is instructive for two reasons:

"The committee from the beginning has had these characteristics: Its hearings have been conducted in a manner which is a combination of the tactics of the police court pettifogger with the blustering arrogance of a Jeffreys. Its agents have consistently ignored and defied the law and the Bill of Rights. Its members have as consistently disclosed by their words and actions that regardless of any lofty directions in the resolutions under which they act, their real and sole purpose is to harass and punish any who presume to exercise their rights of citizenship. Thus the earlier operations of the committee teach us the tactics we may expect in its current attack on the freedom of the press.

"Furthermore, the constitutional guarantee of the freedom of the press does not and cannot stand alone. It is no more sacred in the eyes of those who seek to destroy the Bill of Rights than any other section of that charter, and if they attack one section, they may be depended upon, in time, to attack all.

"As a free press is the greatest protection ever devised for the other guarantees of the Bill of Rights, so also do these guarantees guard and reinforce the freedom of the press. If they are nullified it is weakened, and therefore the Black Committee, when it seeks to make unpleasant and even dangerous the right of petition for redress of grievances, when it tries to set at naught the guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure, when it flaunts the fifth, or 'due process of law' amendment to the constitution, it is in each instance, attacking the freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment."

One of the resolutions adopted by the ANPA stated in part:

"Whereas, the members of the committee (Black committee) and their agents have violated the first amendment to the constitution by indiscriminate seizures of the telegraph correspondence and press messages of newspapers, which is an infringement of the freedom of the press, and have further violated that amendment by a campaign of intimidation and harassment designed to prevent citizens exercising their right of petition for the redress of grievances"

Some indication of the attitude of leading newspapers toward such senatorial investigations can be gained from a comment in the July 11, 1935, issue of the *New York Times*. When the Senate was considering the Black resolution to investigate lobbying, Arthur Krock said:

"Private lives and personal liberties will be raided as if the Czarist police were operating again. Business files will be thrown open to the enraptured gaze of those who love to pry into the affairs of others. Legitimate opposition to

measures already passed, pending or rejected at this session of Congress will be twisted into felonious plots against the commonweal."

The Rumely Case

One of the most recent and most significant cases in which a congressional committee has been charged with conducting inquiries in violation of the First Amendment is the case of the *United States v. Edward A. Rumely*.

Donald Richberg, counsel for Rumely, in summarizing the case, declared that the prosecution of Rumely could only be explained by "the ever growing intolerance of criticism, characteristic of those entrenched in political power and their ever growing desire to suppress the opposition of citizens who exercise the essential liberties of a free people—those freedoms of speech and of the press which are guaranteed by our Constitution to protect our people against the oppressions of Government."

Rumely, as secretary of an organization known as the Committee on Constitutional Government, in 1949, was cited for contempt by the Lobbying Committee of the House, for refusal to disclose the names of persons who had purchased books from his organization.

Rumely was convicted of contempt in the U. S. District Court, District of Columbia. The U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the judgment of conviction and remanded the case with instructions to dismiss the indictment, on April 29, 1952. The reversal was on two grounds:

(1) That there was interference with the freedom of the press. It held that to publicize the names of the purchasers of Rumely's books and pamphlets (which the committee had intended) was a "realistic interference with the publication and sale of those writings." Said the Court: "This is another problem which we examined in the Barsky case, and we there held that the PUBLIC INQUIRY there involved was an impingement upon free speech. We are of the same view here. There can be no doubt in that case or in this one, that the realistic effect of public embarrassment is a powerful interference with the free expression of views."

(2) That the committee had exceeded the authority given it by Congress. On this head the Court said: "We are of the opinion that the demand made upon appellant [Rumely] for the names of purchasers of books from his concern was outside the terms of the authority of the Buchanan Committee, since the public sale of books and documents is not 'lobbying' (which the Buchanan Committee was authorized to investigate)."

The United States Supreme Court, in an opinion handed down March 9, 1953, affirmed reversal of conviction. The majority opinion, written by Justice Frankfurter, held that the resolution creating the committee did

not empower it to go into Rumely's efforts to "saturate the thinking of the community" by publishing books and pamphlets, but limited it to investigating actual "lobbying activities" by making "representations directly to the Congress, its members, or its committees." So the majority opinions of the Court did not pronounce new doctrine on the constitutional limits of congressional investigative power, but branded the inquiry into opinion-making as beyond the scope of a committee appointed to investigate lobbying. Nevertheless, the majority took cognizance of the fact "that there is wide concern, both in and out of Congress over some aspects of the exercise of the congressional power of investigation." They felt that it was their duty to construe the statute with an eye to possible constitutional limitations so as to avoid doubts of validity. They said: "Patently, the Court's duty to avoid a constitutional issue, if possible, applies not merely to legislation, technically speaking, but also to congressional action by way of resolution."

A concurring opinion by Justice Douglas, joined by Justice Black, also held that "lobbying activities" meant direct contact with Congress, not attempts to influence public opinion through the sale of books and documents.

The concurring opinion examined the constitutional issues as well, in a passage that is filled with current interest. It stated:

"Of necessity I come then to the constitutional questions. Respondent represents a segment of the American press. Some may like what his group publishes; others may disapprove. These tracts may be the essence of wisdom to some; to others their point of view and philosophy may be anathema. To some ears their words may be harsh and repulsive; to others they may carry the hope of the future. We have here a publisher who through books and pamphlets seeks to reach the minds and hearts of the American people. He is different in some respects from other publishers. But the differences are minor. Like the publishers of newspapers, magazines or books, this publisher bids for the minds of men in the market place of ideas. The aim of the historic struggle for a free press was 'to establish and preserve the right of the English people to full information in respect of the doings or misdoings of their government.' (*Grosjean v. American Press Col*, 297 U. S. 233, 247) That is the tradition behind the First Amendment. Censorship or previous restraint is banned. (*Near v. Minnesota*, 283 U. S. 697) The privilege of pamphleteering, as well as the more orthodox types of publications, may neither be licensed (*Lovell v. Griffin*, 303 U. S. 444) nor taxed. (*Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105) Door to door distribution is privileged (*Martin v. Struthers*, 319 U. S. 141) These are illustrative of the preferred position granted speech and the press by the First Amendment. The command that 'Congress shall

make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press' has behind it a long history. It expresses the confidence that the safety of society depends on the tolerance of government for hostile as well as friendly criticism, that in a community where men's minds are free, there must be room for the unorthodox as well as the orthodox views.

"If the present inquiry were sanctioned the press would be subjected to harassment that in practical effect might be as serious as censorship. A publisher, compelled to register with the federal government would be subjected to harassing inquiries. A requirement that a publisher disclose the identity of those who buy his books, pamphlets, or paper is indeed the beginning of surveillance of the press. *True, no legal sanction is involved here. Congress has imposed no tax, established no board of censors, instituted no licensing system. But the potential restraint is equally severe. The finger of government leveled against the press is ominous.* Once the government can demand of a publisher the names of the purchasers of his publications, the free press as we know it disappears. Then the spectre of a government agent will look over the shoulder of everyone who reads. The purchase of a book or pamphlet today may result in a subpoena tomorrow. Fear of criticism goes with every person into the bookstall. The subtle, imponderable pressures of the orthodox lay hold. Some will fear to read what is unpopular, that the powers-that-be dislike. When the light of publicity may reach any student, any teacher, inquiry will be discouraged. The books and pamphlets critical of the administration that preach an unpopular policy in domestic or foreign affairs, that are in disrepute in the orthodox school of thought will be suspect and subject to investigation. The press and its readers will pay a heavy price in harassment. But that will be minor in comparison with the menace of the shadow which government will cast over literature that does not follow the dominant party line. . . . *Through the harassment of hearings, investigations, reports, and subpoena government will hold a club over speech and over the press. Congress could not do this by law. The power of investigation is also limited.* Inquiry into personal and private affairs is precluded. . . . And so is any matter in respect to which no valid legislation could be had. . . . Since Congress could not by law require of respondent (Rumely) what the House demanded, it may not take the first step in an inquiry ending in fine or imprisonment."

Some particular interest attaches to this concurring opinion by reason of Justice Hugo Black joining in it. The Senate committee of which he was chairman in 1936, as a

United States Senator, took a firm stand for the almost unlimited power of a congressional committee to investigate.

The La Prensa Cases

While the United States Supreme Court was considering the limits of congressional investigating power and reaching agreement on the necessity of confining committees to the powers conferred on them by Congress, Argentina was witnessing the dangers of uncontrolled legislative inquiries.

In 1949 Peronista congressmen sponsored a "special parliamentary committee" to investigate the "conduct of foreign and Argentine citizens." The committee was given the task of looking into some letters written about clauses in a commercial treaty with Great Britain. It was composed of three senators and eleven congressmen who had been appointed initially to "investigate all matters directly or indirectly pertaining to (police) tortures." The committee, in spite of its rather narrow directive, began investigating the press. In November 1949 it descended on *La Prensa*, in its first investigative act. During the balance of 1949 and the first months of 1950 it broke into printing plants and other establishments throughout the country. "On some newspapers they set up police guards, others were denied paper, and many were closed down for reasons that had not the remotest connection with the original purpose of the investigation. A large number of papers were closed down because they had failed to comply with the demand to include the phrase 'Year of the Liberator General San Martin' after the date line. Protests were made in vain that the Committee—much less only two of its members—had no right to impose such penalties." (Gainza Paz in his book, *The Defense of Freedom*.)

Events in South America suggest that the Supreme Court, in the Rumely opinion, wisely estimated the dangers of congressional investigations not strictly confined to purposes approved by Congress.

So much for the history of some of the congressional inquiries in which the press has been conspicuously involved.

It is important, however, that editors and citizens generally understand clearly the issues involved in this case. It is important that they be furnished the facts about the interrogation (comprised of the law and the transcripts) and a history about the laws of conflict between the press and legislative power from which a perspective for judgment can be gained.

August 13, 1953

Can Communism Be Controlled Without Sacrificing Our Fundamental Liberties?

by Francis P. Locke

I am convinced that Communism can be controlled in this country without sacrificing our fundamental liberties—that is, assuming that we are an adult population worthy of enjoying and capable of cherishing these liberties. If we aren't, then we will lose our liberties anyway—one way or another—and I am not so sure in the end that we would have any legitimate claim to them, nor am I so sure that it would matter enormously whether they were trampled out by a Communist or a Fascist tyranny.

It seems to me the Communist threat to the United States—that is, the internal Communist threat—cannot be approached realistically unless it is subdivided. There is what seems to me the largely fancied threat that the Communists—through books, pamphlets, teaching in the schools and colleges—will be able to convert a large number of Americans to their faith. This is the threat to which most of the Congressional investigators seem to be addressing themselves most assiduously. I think as a threat it is virtually non-existent. The Communist movement, as far as numbers are concerned, has been falling from the eyes of the duped and the woolly. As long as we keep our social order healthy and our economy on even keel, I can see no faintest possibility of conversion to the false doctrines of Marx, whether pure or whether modified as by Stalin, Malenkov, Beria & Co.

Then there is the very real and genuine threat of treason, sabotage, minor insurrection in wartime, leakage of military secrets by men and women who for all practical purposes are enemy agents. That is a serious challenge, but I think it can be met by the FBI, the courts and proper administrative agencies of government without getting into the area of public hysteria and hullaballo, indiscriminate smearing, pressure to mass conformity. For this is the area in which the business of spy-catching reaches sharply into the realm of diminishing returns; and it is the area in which, conversely, the danger to our fundamental liberties, and to the vitality of our intellectual, scientific, critical, inventive life-stream multiplies as by geometrical progression.

I know it would be brash of any man, even if he be President Eisenhower or Herbert Brownell, to say that he has succeeded in tracing the fine line of demarcation at which security for the individual and security for the nation come into natural balance and optimum affinity. We

Francis P. Locke, associate editor of the *Dayton News*, gave this paper at a colloquium of the 20-year class at Harvard Commencement last June. Mr. Locke was a Nieman Fellow in 1947.

may never find the golden mean. But I think we can find it approximately—and that this approximation will be close enough that we can say we are controlling Communism in this country and at the same time that we are not sacrificing our fundamental liberties.

I've got to think that—because what is the alternative? It is to reverse the question of the evening and ask—and answer dismally—this question: "Can we control Communism if we do sacrifice our fundamental liberties?" The answer to that question, in my own mind, is a "no" so resounding, so utterly convincing, that a "yes" answer to the other question, even if it partake heavily of the element of faith, is the only escape from nihilism.

For a clearer understanding of this caveat, we have to make a distinction between security, as written with quotation marks around it, and security in the broader sense. In the current, specialized sense, security means measures to prevent insurrection, sabotage, espionage and information leaks. Now this *is* an important area. We've got to have this kind of security, and legitimate doubts will have to be resolved in its favor. For instance, Justice Holmes' yardstick of "clear and present danger."

But we must never forget the requirements of security in the broader sense—the active, dynamic security which is the sum, in terms of national strength and positive national policies, of everything we are able to make of and do with, our total national resources, both material and human. As Germany was safer with the Panzer divisions than France was with the Maginot line, as the lion is safer in the forest than the porcupine, so will America be safer if she relies on the dynamic security of power fed by imagination and initiative, than she will be if she relies on the static security bred of fear and conformity.

Fearless innovation, always checked by the rein of sharp, uncowed criticism, has made our society what it is—materially and spiritually. We are accustomed to sticking our necks out. Others, in fear of the chopping block, have drawn theirs in. We have relied on free and constructive criticism (in the process of which we have necessarily tolerated some ill-meant and destructive criticism) to keep our little, remediable mistakes from becoming large, irretrievable mistakes, such as the ones Hitler was permitted to make by his circle of sycophants.

If the ultra security-minded—and the demagogues—succeed in pressing us into the ever-narrowing corridors of conformity, the initiative, intelligence and vitality that have placed us where we now stand in the race of nations will wither away. We will endlessly be buying the in-

ferior mousetrap, because men who orate eloquently about free enterprise in automobiles are afraid of free enterprise in ideas. Not to be dismissed lightly is the testament of Woodrow Wilson: "I believe in democracy because it releases the energy of every human being."

When security, spelled c-o-n-f-o-r-m-i-t-y, succeeds in putting vital lobes of the brain of America in a state of deep freeze, on that day the arm and leg muscles which so excite the awe of the primitives will cease to function effectively. Our one advantage against the Russians, even on the material level—capacity for technological progress—will be wiped out, and we will be facing them on terms of their own choosing, a brute test of strength between massed men, a contest they will always win because God and geopolitics have given them the numerically superior populations. And in the battle for the minds of men at home, where we now offer freedom and more bread, we will no longer be able to offer freedom, and we will even lose a great deal of our margin in bread—which, after all, as much as a margin in atom bombs and electronic gun-sights, is a product of the release of the intellectual energies of every human being.

In sum, I am fairly sure—though not dogmatically certain—that we can control Communism in this country without sacrificing our fundamental liberties. But I *know* that we cannot control Communism if we do sacrifice our fundamental liberties. In these circumstances, the little that must be taken on faith we shall have to take on faith, else give up the struggle to preserve the values that are dear to us before we begin it.

I have not sought to relate these problems in any particular way to the profession I am working in. I have omitted the press and its role because I think that unless

the principle is accepted, the instrumentalities mean nothing. Also because I feel that liberty is indivisible.

It is true the press—many segments of it at any rate—does not always live by this axiom. The bell never seems, to many newspapers, to be tolling for them unless some government agency tries to sit on a legitimate news story or unless somebody proposes that newsboys be covered into the child labor amendment. Even in matters in which freedom of the press as we all understand it, is directly at issue—not all people in my profession are whole-souled in their application of a cherished principle. For instance, I feel sure far more numerous denunciatory newspaper editorials would have appeared had the Supreme court ruled against (instead of for) the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* in the anti-trust case bearing on its advertising policy, than did appear when Senator McCarthy hauled Editor Wechsler before his committee and sought to intimidate him.

And if editors were well-schooled in the dictum of John Donne, I do not think the poll of American Society of Newspaper Editors' membership at the annual meeting in Washington this year would have found 32 editors voting that Sen. McCarthy's activities had accomplished more good than harm—even though 45 editors did vote that they had accomplished more harm than good.

Many newspapers have showed a single-minded, single-standard devotion to the principle they all proclaim (the principle, not of their freedom to publish, but of the people's right to know.) Others have lagged or failed. In so far as that is true, the press as a whole has not developed what its readers are entitled to ask of it—a firm leadership, within the limits of its power and influence—in the fight to keep our fundamental liberties untrammelled.

The Verbalizations of a News Event

by Howard Boone Jacobson

The Korean truce has become a fact, but the bitter meetings which were held in the stark serenity of the U.N.'s monumental General Assembly hall and in the barren huts of Panmunjon will not be forgotten so easily. More than two years of political and diplomatic wrangling in history's longest truce talks has produced a mountainous assortment of verbal documentation by our press. Some specimens of this should cause the fourth estate concern.

A purposeful examination of the handling of one incident in this drawn out event—namely the controversial prisoner exchange compromise plan introduced at the last winter session in the U.N. by the Indian delegation—illustrates some questionable interpretative reporting practices employed by our newsgatherers.

Consider the judgments the press laid upon India and its key U.N. representative, V. K. Krishna Menon, after

he introduced his plan for prisoner-of-war exchange—a resolution whose essence was accepted by the General Assembly in a compromise plan December 1, 1952, although it had been rejected previously by Russia and China but approved by the United States.

The New York *Post* approached the man and the event this way in a feature article it published several weeks later: "But this association with the West made Menon very uneasy. It became his settled conviction that Peiping's rejection was partly based on the mistaken notion that India had been taken into camp by the Western powers. . . . Perhaps it was a desire to redress the balance with the Communists that caused Menon a few days after the passage of his resolution to voice some sharp criticism of American policy in Korea."

Months later George Sokolsky in his syndicated column

said: "The Indian resolution was opposed by Soviet Russia and Soviet China although India must be regarded as having favored both these countries. It was accepted by the United States to which India is antagonistic. The probability is that the Indian resolution was a trick to bind the United States while leaving Russia free to pursue her own course."

Actually, these allegations were unfounded and oversimplified. India's associations with both East and West were a matter of fact and record. In April, 1951, in an interview by Norman Cousins of the *Saturday Review*, Prime Minister Nehru said: "Repeatedly we have in the U.N. or elsewhere voted or encouraged a certain policy which was liked by some nations, disliked by others, and vice versa. We do not understand or, rather, we do understand but we do not wish to adopt a policy or be against a country merely for the sake of being against that country. That is not judging the merits of a particular question, but rather largely on the basis of being against a particular country or group of countries."

Mr. Sokolsky was referring in his column to the fact that India has favored U. N. recognition for the present government of China. From this followed the inference that India "favored" Russia and China. India either had to be for our bloc or against us. Thus Mr. Sokolsky's positive remark about India's "antagonism."

Nehru further clarified his country's point about recognition: "May I go back and remind you of the past phase of history? After the Soviet Revolution in Russia the Soviet Union had tremendous problems and difficulties. It was amazing that it survived. Now, I think that a very wrong step was taken then by trying to suppress the Soviet Union, cut it off, isolate it, and have a so-called *cordon solitaire* around it. That failed but it resulted in one thing: it turned the Soviet Union into a bitter opponent of Western countries; and the memory of that isolation survives in Russia. It will be a very dangerous thing to repeat that experiment in China, more dangerous even than it was then because conditions are different. If we force China into a kind of isolation, cut it off from the great part of the world, the consequence of that to the rest of the world will not be good. China will suffer, of course, but the world is so constituted that the rest of the world would suffer as well."

The worst press performance in misrepresenting India came in handling a radio interview by Krishna Menon with college journalists in Philadelphia. Mr. Menon stated: "It was unfortunate that the bombing (of the Yalu River power plant) came at a tragic time when we were on the point of reaching an agreement that would have ended the Korean war." (This was a few days after India's resolution was approved.)

This remark gave birth to a number of statements out

of context which had Menon charging that the U. S. had *sabotaged* the Korean peace effort he sponsored.

A Washington *Post's* editorial had this to say: "Actually, there is considerable suspicion that the Communists have been deliberately leading the Indians on—if, indeed, there has been any contact at all . . . Mr. Menon is apparently not daunted by his verbal trouncing in the U. N. at the hands of Andrei Vishinsky; indeed, he apparently is trying to make up or honey up to the Russians. We hope that Mr. Menon did not speak for his government, for his sentiments were far from the 'sort of neutrality' that India professes. They were, in fact, almost the straight Communist line."

Apparently the U. S. State Department thought that this expression by an American newspaper had such validity in its original form that it could serve as a form of protest to India indicating its annoyance with Mr. Menon's thoughts. Former Ambassador Chester Bowles was asked to register a mild complaint to the Indian government using this same newspaper evaluation as a reflection of 'true' public opinion in this country on the Menon issue. How the State Department could single out this personal, projective misrepresentation as an honest map of the existent territory is not easily understood, in the light of India's position on 'neutrality'.

In his discussion with Mr. Cousins, Nehru stated: "The word neutrality, of course, is not a correct word to describe our policy. Normally neutrality can only be used as opposed to belligerents in time of war. In time of peace the question does not arise—unless one is always thinking in terms of war. Our policy is simply this: we wish to judge every issue on its merits and the circumstances then prevailing, then decide what we consider best in terms of world peace or other objectives."

Shortly thereafter an editorial appeared in the *New York Times* which asserted with mild authority that Nehru had made the "sabotage" statement and then positively concluded that he was bitter and "was left stranded and unhappy on Western shores."

The *Times* declared that Nehru made "unjust and even ridiculous charges against the United States." Actually to state that the Yalu River bombing hurt the Korean peace talks seems not so absurd. Even though it appeared to be a tactical move on the part of a military force, from the viewpoint of this diplomat who had labored hard to bring about a degree of peace, it did come "at a tragic time when we were at a point of reaching an agreement."

The editorial writer further stated that an irreconcilable difference exists between Eastern and Western thought that would make a compromise agreement impossible. If this kind of metaphysics did exist, what was Krishna Menon doing with a compromise solution which the U. N.

accepted almost unanimously? From this newspaper's statement, it appeared that only partisans had a place in the U.N. It seems unfortunate that the *New York Times* admitted into print this either/or, non-compromising attitude as its editorial observation of how the U. N. operates and makes decisions.

Menon's prominence in the news brought him the usual American news feature treatment in personality stories. He was startled at the tumultuous assortment of 'nonsense' questions which were asked by newspaper people following his sudden notoriety. To an Indian such issues as his food habits, his ulcer, his bachelorhood or his teetotaling habits seemed to have little bearing on his peace proposal or on the reader's understanding of his point of view.

Mr. Churchill implied a similar sentiment not so long ago before he left for England after his short vacation in Nassau. He said he had passed a pleasant time, been swimming, got some sun, rested, and he sincerely thanked the press for giving him the opportunity and privilege of advising the public of these important happenings.

These feeble attempts at humanization as well as the prejudiced editorial selection of pictures in some newspapers

—which seemed to favor group shots of Menon with the members of the Russian delegation—reduced this complex personality to a quick identification, emphasizing the apparent similarities to Communist tactics but ignoring the subtle differences. Thus the press sought to fit Menon into categories for easy reader digestion.

Few of the press, Menon has assured this writer, attempted to check the facts of the Korean issue with him, even though his accessibility was well known. Is it any wonder then that the interpretative reporting about the man and the event give cause for some urgent consideration of many of our 'reliable' newsgathering methods?

What occurred? Statement upon statement—erroneous or unverified—led to description by inferential terms and abstract generalizations, which eventually produced some unkind actions, and a false-to-fact portrayal of the man.

Such reporting habits succeeded only in creating for the Indian representative an uncomplimentary and confused attitude about our editorial methods and in disseminating a divergent amount of unqualified material for reader consumption.

Howard Boone Jacobson is on the journalism faculty at the University of Bridgeport.

Editorial Pages and Writers

by Michael Bradshaw

What we have in the editorial page today, I think, is the survival of a tradition which has been adapted to new circumstances and, more or less, to new purposes. With some conspicuous exceptions, publishers and editors aren't as directly engaged in politics as many of them used to be. And when it comes to measuring dollars, I don't know that anyone has any idea of what the editorial page contributes to advertising or circulation revenues.

But because the tradition is strong that newspapers must be dedicated to the public service and because publishers are human beings who cannot live by bread alone but must express their opinions, the editorial page remains that part of even our most massive newspaper which stamps it with individuality. More time and thought and, in many cases, more money is devoted to its content than to any other page in the paper.

As for any decline in the influence of the editorial page, I shudder to think what the responsibility must have been if it was ever greater. In the 1950 election our voters elected an independent congressman, the only man elected as such in Congress who was openly labeled "the *Blade* candidate," over the opposition of both political parties; and re-elected a Common Pleas judge, whom we supported, over the curiously combined opposition of the

Bar Association and the CIO. Last fall in our local contests 10 Republicans, 7 Democrats, and 1 Independent were elected, all of whom had the *Blade's* endorsement.

And though we suffer our defeats, too, the political influence of our independent newspaper in our independent community is so strong that we are not so much concerned with the power of the press as with our responsibility to use it wisely.

Turning now to the function of the editorial page, we say on the *Blade* that it serves as the conscience of a newspaper.

In this country we take great pride in our free press, considering it essential to our democratic processes. But what is a newspaper to be free for? Simply to make money, as does every other kind of business? Simply to disseminate information? Or isn't it obligated to expose corruption, to advance good causes, to serve the best interests of the people?

Where this obligation is accepted, the editorial page becomes the instrument through which a newspaper seeks to influence public opinion in what its publisher and editors, its reporters and deskmen consider to be the right direction.

To do this effectively, it seems to me, a newspaper must work at that task steadily and consistently, not be forever jumping from one crusade to another. After all, a newspaper, like an individual, only has so many basic ideals and principles. But by applying them to various situations as they arise, a newspaper can indoctrinate its readers with its own beliefs and obtain their acceptance in the community.

We do not like it if the people of Toledo ask what stand the *Blade* is going to take on a sharp, given issue. If we have done our work well and made our principles known, they should know how we will apply them to any particular problem.

And so when a storm of controversy breaks out over the admission of Negroes to public housing projects where segregation had been practiced, it is not so much what we say that will calm the furor and lead to the right solution. It is what we have been saying on our editorial page for years which counts when such a crisis comes. If we haven't helped create in our community a live-and-let-live atmosphere in which people of all races and creeds can get along peacefully together, the most powerful editorial ever written won't save the day when the need is greatest.

What gives a newspaper the greatest trouble when it tries to use the editorial page to serve the public interest, of course, are those questions to which there are no clear-cut answers.

Our board of education is submitting two tax levies to our voters in the November election, for a building program and operations which would yield \$11,000,000 additionally over the next five years.

Naturally, the *Blade* being a family journal, favors good schools and their adequate support. I don't suppose that it has ever opposed a school levy. But we have had a lot of them in recent years, including one for a building program which we and the voters were given to understand would meet our present needs. But the school board, given all the money it asked, ran out of funds before that program was completed and now says that it was hopelessly inadequate all along.

Some of our school levies have passed by narrow squeaks and the editorial stand taken by the *Blade* may well determine whether our schools will or won't get the \$11,000,000. And we have got to think long and hard about it, because we want to be fair to our children and to our taxpayers, too.

The problem of how a newspaper is to serve the public interest through its editorial page has been vastly complicated in recent years by the trend to the single ownership of newspaper or newspapers in many cities. Where competition exists, a newspaper is freer to take one side

or the other in political, economic, or social matters. But where it alone serves all the people, its obligation to be right is tremendous.

In our case, we feel that that obligation would almost force the *Blade* to be independent politically, even if that wasn't our personal preference. But we carry it even further than that. Our paper, which is not aligned with either party, is not aligned with any civic faction, social set, or economic interest. Our test of any proposal, be it sponsored by businessmen or labor leaders, City Council or the School Board, the Rotarians or the AA's, is whether we think it will best serve the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

Thus, unavoidably, the editorial page has become the arbiter of community affairs in many of our single ownership cities. When Democrats and Republicans have at each other, it is our responsibility to say which party has offered the better candidates—to choose between them.

But the same thing happens in a less measurable way in other civic controversies. If the Chamber of Commerce and the CIO get into a hassle, if the milk drivers strike for higher wages, if the judge of our Domestic Relations Court insists that a building for the Child Study Institute, and his chambers, should cost a million dollars and the real estate board contends that \$750,000 will be enough, we are supposed to weigh the arguments and say which side is right. The newspaper is to be the referee.

Thus, out of sheer necessity, we have been forced to the conclusion that it is the function of an independent newspaper to be impartial, to be objective, to be pragmatic.

Like all good newspapers nowadays—but it was not ever thus—we present both sides of controversies in our news columns so that the readers can use their own judgment in coming to an informed opinion. And having made this possible for our readers, we think it is only reasonable to expect our editors and editorial writers to do likewise and take all the facts and the arguments for both sides into account in reaching their decisions.

But though I think the prime purpose of the editorial page is to serve as the conscience of a newspaper, I wish professors of journalism could help us teach young editorial writers that it has another. And that other purpose is to make the newspaper more readable, more salable, if you please.

So often at our morning editorial conference I find that one of our editorial writers wants to write about the latest political crisis in Italy; and another wants to write about the forthcoming election in West Germany; and the third wants to write about the negotiations between India and Pakistan. And they all want to write about Senator McCarthy each morning.

All of which is well and good, in moderation. International problems are of tremendous importance in this atomic age. But our readers are never going to find out what our solutions are, if we have any, because they won't read our page if we give them nothing but problems, problems, problems day after day after day!

What the editorial page should be, I think, is a sort of cross-section of the rest of the newspaper. Not that it won't deal for the most part with the serious subjects. But there should be some women's stuff, some sports stuff, some entertainment stuff, some human interest stuff, and, above all else, some humor occasionally. But just try to get the newcomer to the editorial sanctum to relax and take it easy, to choose the minor problems for the most part and let the big ones wait, to write about what the people of Toledo are talking about and not what the *New York Times* is saying, to take themselves a little less seriously. It's practically impossible.

That is another reason why I rather doubt that the editorial page had more influence in the good old days. Certainly, if we want to exert more influence nowadays, we need to attract more readers by varying our editorial fare to suit an infinite variety of interests and tastes. The thunderers of yore, in many cases, did little else but thunder.

Because the editorial writer is to be the interpreter of all kinds of affairs to all sorts of people, the first requirement is that he be a well-rounded man himself.

He should be well read and well informed, and on those papers which have their editorial writers specialize in different fields he may have to qualify as an expert in something. We don't use that system on the *Blade*, because we feel that the expert is apt to become stuffy on his speciality. However, we don't object to an editorial

writer learning as much as he wants to about any subject (we have two Ph.D's on our staff), provided he doesn't let his learning get in the way of what he is trying to tell our readers.

If I were teaching journalism to students who might become editorial writers, I would drill form into them so well that they'd never forget it. I would require an outline for every piece, so that I would know that they knew what they were going to say before they tried to say it. And after they had done the best they could with unity, coherence, emphasis, and logic, I would have them polish up the phrases for freshness, clarity, and readability.

A common fault with editorial writers, though, is that they read as well as write too much. The editorial writer should have that same experience with practical affairs which reporters get as they knock about a city, rub shoulders with all kinds of people, and learn how the world is really run.

The editorial writer, along with his liberal education and practical knowledge, should have a broad understanding of people. This is desirable for day by day editorial writing, the run-of-the-mill stuff, if it is to hold their interest. But it is most essential on those occasions when, with the chips down, a newspaper feels impelled to influence public opinion in what it conceives to be the right direction on crucial issues.

For to write with power, one must write with passion; and to stir the public emotionally into civic action, one must understand and appeal to the strongest motivations of men and women.

Michael Bradshaw is editor of the *Toledo Blade*. This is from an address to the Association for Education in Journalism at East Lansing, Michigan, August 26.

Tips to Kibitzers of the Press

by Arthur C. Barschdorf

No private business man in America has more people telling him how to run his affairs than the publisher of a newspaper. Every reader—the professor, the politician, the barber, the steelworker—is a critic. It is rightly so. But many who sound off pet ideas of what a newspaper should be take no time to find out what a newspaper really is.

Collectively, the critics have made the LOCAL newspaper—where lies the danger of an irresponsible press—a public utility, not a public servant.

"To be sure," said Henry R. Luce, editor-in-chief of *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune*, "you (the publisher) are not beholden to a public utilities commission. No! You are subject only to the vested interests of every pressure group in town from the Ladies Aid Society to the Whiffenpoofs. . . . You have to give publicity to all the 'good' things."

Is this chronicling in the community life with sensitivity and perception? Is this a response to the American desire for self-improvement? The answer to both questions obviously is no.

But are the great majority of readers concerned? Yes, they are concerned—if the crossword puzzle is omitted. Many a publisher learns from telephone calls and letters that the puzzle was not in the newspaper; few, if any, remind him that a city council meeting was not reported.

What weak publisher, then, de-emphasizes the "sure" circulation builders like the crossword puzzle, horoscope and advice to the lovelorn to concentrate that much more money, manpower, time and space on improving reporting and editing?

More informed criticism of journalism, less gripes and complaints of the curio-extras in the newspaper, is needed to keep the daily press democratically sound. The critics, often from their ignorance of newspapers, tell what is wrong with them. Publishers who most deserve criticism know that most attacks on them are ignorant, and they seize on this excuse to reject all criticism, wholesome or not.

The Hutchins Commission, in 1946, offered criticism that was both scholarly and searching. In 1947, nine Nieman Fellows, better acquainted professionally with the press, but perhaps utopian in their approach, gave their analysis of the daily press. Publishers in general looked with disdain on both sets of critics.

Newspapers, nevertheless, have improved and will continue to improve from these and other forces at work. The process, if too slow, can be speeded by readers in two ways: (1) They can stop buying bad newspapers; (2) they can

pour a greater aggregate of knowledgeable criticism on the bad publisher.

Readers are not likely to stop buying bad newspapers, particularly in smaller cities where publishers have a virtual captive audience. The cost of setting up and operating a competing newspaper is prohibitive. Thus, informed criticism, directed against the monopoly newspaper, is the logical way to bring about necessary press improvement.

Newspaper critics should know, first of all, that the newspaper plight nationally is not as desperate as the more capacious make it out to be. Many small papers perform their public chores with integrity and fair play. In New Britain, Conn., the *Herald* draws from Democrats and Republicans the compliment: "It can be believed." Taciturn Vermonters tell a visitor the *Rutland Herald* is a "pretty good newspaper." In Santa Rosa, Calif., citizens look to the *Press-Democrat* for leadership in community affairs.

The bias of the *Chicago Tribune*, *New York Post*, *Washington Times-Herald* is not typical of the nation's press. These newspapers do reflect, however, the diverse approach of certain types of newspapers toward problems of the day. Those like the *Tribune* follow a philosophy of propagandizing the publisher's views in some of the news columns. A crusading spirit guides newspapers like the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Some newspapers like the *New York Mirror* sensationalize the day's minor as well as major developments. Others like the *New York Times* concern themselves with recording and interpreting the events of contemporary history. Most of the smaller newspapers are a little bit of each.

One task they all perform—the feeding of a public appetite. The bill of fare, represented by each edition, is where quality separates good from bad publishers.

Criticism of the press reached a tremendous volume during the 1952 presidential campaign. Political bias was the major charge. It has not been, nor is it likely to be, proved or disproved by a survey because of the problem in measuring such subtleties as the day-by-day news value of various campaign stories in various regions and the choice of words and size of headlines.

"Maybe the press was unfair and maybe it wasn't," said James S. Pope, executive editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Times*. "But it couldn't have been as unfair as the disputants have been dishonest in pontificating on it."

He asserts his feelings with good reason. His newspaper investigated a statement signed by 60 noted American authors, indicting the press in general for Republican bias. The *Courier-Journal* (which supported Stevenson) found that only six or seven of the authors had even scanned a

Arthur C. Barschdorf has just returned to the Hammond (Ind.) *Times* after completing a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard.

relatively few newspapers to arrive at the judgment of the press so widely publicized.

Readers should watch attempts by politicians and, perhaps unwitting, intellectuals to make the daily press a major campaign issue by labelling it one-party. From this could come an ignorant public demand that could lead to press regulation.

"Freedom of speech and press is close to the central meaning of liberty," warned the Hutchins Commission.

Some publishers, undoubtedly, interpret freedom of the press as freedom of irresponsibility. Fortunately, they are a minority. Carl E. Lindstrom, managing editor of the *Hartford Times*, finds a rise of newspaper conscience throughout the country as publishers are "humbled by the responsibility" of being the major channel of information for thousands of people.

Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic opponent of President Eisenhower last fall, criticized an aspect of the daily press that has caused great concern to all responsible newspapermen. He said:

"I suppose the last fifteen or twenty years have seen some progress in the newspaper field, as elsewhere, in the elevation of function, but I can't believe the rate of advance is as great as it should have been, and I'm not at all encouraged to believe the press (always with notable exceptions) is doing anything like the job that needs to be done in these troubled and complex times."

He thought one reason was the "alarming drift toward concentration and monopoly in the number and ownership of newspapers."

"Effective social criticism by newspapers, as by individuals, requires variety and independence," he said. "These have declined frighteningly in the last few years and have held back, if not actually off-set, the progressive elements in the picture."

Competitive newspapers provide diversification but not necessarily a better product for the reader.

"A monopoly newspaper can afford not to balloon a trivial three-hour scoop into a sensational headline story," said John Cowles, publisher of the two Minneapolis newspapers. "It can afford to be accurate and responsible; a competitive newspaper often cannot."

Financial security contributes to the kind of independence that has made great newspapers in Louisville, Kansas City and Minneapolis, and exceptionally good ones in Providence, Akron and St. Paul.

Maybe, the best newspaper town in the nation for the readers is Washington, Ind., where the competing Republican and Democratic dailies have about the same circulation, 4,8000. This rural center, however, will continue to be a great exception until publishing costs are greatly lessened. Readers must strive for the improvement of the monopoly newspaper to give all America a free and responsible press.

The decline in diversity of editorial opinion and news interpretation is a small community and not a big city problem for the readers. Competitive newspapers exist in all but one city of more than 500,000. This city, Minneapolis, has monopoly papers considered among the best in the country. In 934 cities and towns—788 of them under 50,000 population—there is no competing newspaper. Only 13 communities under 50,000 have newspaper competition on a hometown scale. Only 15 of the 119 cities in the 50,000-100,000 class have competition. In cities above 100,000 and under 500,000 population, those having newspaper competition are almost double—46-24—those that don't. But many of the monopoly products are among the best newspapers.

Monopoly ownership breeds a problem of bias which drew this comment from Roger Tubby, press secretary to Harry S. Truman in his last months as president:

"It seems to me that if the press, generically speaking, is to help keep democracy strong, it must achieve a greater measure of fairness. . . . If the press becomes more partisan (politically) I'm afraid it not only will lose respect but eventually face demands for legislation and perhaps passage of legislation making fair play mandatory."

Press coverage has improved most, ironically, in the field of government affairs. In the past 20 years, the press corps in Washington, D.C., where the bulk of government news originates, has increased from 363 American newspaper and press service correspondents to 705 today. Among these are experts in news of foreign relations, labor, legislation, commerce, every important activity in which the government is engaged.

A total of 361 American daily newspapers in 254 communities now are represented in the national capital. In 1932, 298 dailies in 201 cities were represented. Thirty-eight press services now provide general and specialized news coverage where only 15 operated in 1932. The three major wire services have more than doubled their Washington staffs in 20 years. The Associated Press has 86 staff members as compared with 39 in 1932. United Press has 63 compared with 19; International News Service 36 compared with 14.

Political partisanship draws the most criticism of newspapers, but other types of bias also are condemned. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said organized labor is getting better, but still far from fair, treatment in the daily press. He pointed to the "tendency of newspapers to follow the business line in dealing with issues like the Taft-Hartley law and the American Medical Association in discussing the problem of health care."

His criticism is valid. But it is not wholly supported by the general public which has watched organized labor maturing to its own responsibilities only in very recent years.

Mr. Meany does not note the creation of labor reporters by press services and an increasing number of newspapers.

This group of labor specialists is making an effort to report labor fairly, accurately and sympathetically.

With nearly 1,800 daily newspapers circulating to almost 54,000,000 readers, nearly everyone in America who can read is reading all or part of a newspaper every day. Collectively, they comprise a tremendous potential of informed criticism.

They should know some of the conditions under which newspapers must operate to stay in business. For instance, only about three pages of the 24 pages in an average-size newspaper are devoted to general news. Approximately 14½ pages are made up in advertising. Three pages go for sports and women's news; one page for comics; another page for editorials, voice of the people letters and personal columns; and about one-and-a-half pages for special articles like medical, marriage and housing advice, radio and television schedules, puzzles, cartoons, and curio-entertainment features like horoscopes.

Reader education like that undertaken by the Winston Salem, N. C. newspapers is a good idea on which other papers can expand. W. K. Hoyt, publisher of the *Journal* and *Twin City Sentinel*, utilized the front page of the Sunday *Journal-Sentinel* feature section to present a frank outline of his policies, practices and problems. The article said, in part:

"The *Journal* and *Sentinel* are only moderate-sized, yet last year, it cost something like \$3 million to publish these papers. Publishing costs explain why nine out of ten towns are served by only one publisher."

Arthur H. Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, like Mr. Hoyt, accepts criticisms with grace and a heeding ear. The entire group of 1952-53 Nieman Fellows spent the greater part of an evening in the Sulzberger office criticizing little things about the *Times*. He offered no alibis, admitted mistakes the paper had made, defended it when it was right, and listened closely to suggestions.

He resists the compulsion to be satisfied with his product as long as readers are buying it. John S. Knight, publisher of newspapers in Chicago, Detroit, Miami and Akron, will never write of the *Times* as he did of the death of the *New York Sun*: "It kept a cash register where its editorial heart belonged."

Leading editors and publishers who worry most about the press performing a responsible job find good signs. Mr. Pope noted that the "day-in and day-out job of informing today's readers has gathered depth and substance since the nostalgic days" of the 1920's and 30's.

His publisher, Mark Ethridge, added:

"Professional standards have risen sharply in my own time. There is more internal criticism, as reflected in the Associated Press Managing Editors' meetings and the AP log; in the American Society of Newspaper Editors; in

the Nieman critiques and the American Press Institute. The calibre of reporting and writing has vastly improved also. . . . A few brilliant drunks may have written more colorfully but the day-to-day story is more ably told today."

The American Newspaper Guild and schools of journalism have, as Alan Barth, editorial writer of the *Washington Post*, expressed it, "contributed fresh strength and vitality to the American Press in the past quarter of a century."

The Guild, in improving wages and working conditions of newspapermen, has made their jobs respectable as a career. This improvement has had far-reaching benefits to the newspapers in the calibre of men attracted to newspaper jobs and the quality of work they do.

A richer background is provided by such programs as Nieman, Reid, Ford and Council of Foreign Relations fellowships. The experience of a year of study at universities like Harvard and Princeton or abroad is shared later with other newspapermen.

Stimulus for good newspaper performance comes also from annual honors like Pulitzer prizes, Broun and George Polk Memorial awards, and the Albert and Mary Lasker awards. All are national in scope and prestige. In addition, scores of other awards are given on local levels by Guild units, press clubs and business organizations.

Scholarships set up by Guild locals, newspapers and business firms encourage young people of high calibre to seek newspaper careers.

The generally unsympathetic treatment given Charles Wilson in his efforts to qualify for secretary of defense belie the big business philosophy attributed to newspapers by the sound-offs.

Newspapers have been a vital part of Western society since 1620 when the first printed news told the people of Amsterdam that Frederick, head of the Protestant union and king of Bohemia, was defeated at Weissenberg by the Hapsburgs. Way back in 1641, political parties in England recognized the value of "newsbooks," as they were called, to carry on political controversy and to influence public opinion.

Perhaps, the real problem of modern-day newspapers arose nearly a century ago when Charles Dana of the *New York Sun* found the secret of popular journalism lay in appealing to emotions of the masses rather than their intellects.

Papers like Dana's *Sun*, which sought more to entertain than to inform, manifested the rapid pace and tension of urban life.

With tension being absorbed more and more by television, motoring and other leisure time pursuits, it is time that the readers put the newspapers back in the news business where they belong.

The printed word, when it is believed, has enduring strength. The Bible is eloquent proof.

McCarthy and the Press

Senator McCarthy's grilling of James A. Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, has now been reviewed by a distinguished committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Of the 11 members, all agree that the hearing should have been public instead of initially secret, but only four agree that it infringed upon freedom of the press.

Since the committee as a whole is unable to reach a judgment on the key issue, it says that "it is the responsibility of every editor to read the transcript and decide for himself."

The position of the *Post-Dispatch*, based on such a reading of the transcript, has been previously expressed. As we said on May 11, "the purpose of the hearing was to try to silence critics of McCarthyism," and as we said on May 7, such a purpose "poses a threat for all the American press."

An accurate appraisal of McCarthy's tactics in this instance does not depend on whether Mr. Wechsler was in fact intimidated, any more than a holdup is to be judged by its success or failure. Nor does it depend on the degree to which the constitutional rights of a free press were infringed. If they were infringed at all, a protest is called for.

It seems to us plain from the testimony that McCarthy was not really interested in Mr. Wechsler as an ex-Communist author of books. He was calling Mr. Wechsler to account for the personnel and editorial policies of his newspaper, which has been sharply critical of McCarthy.

Does a United States Senator have the constitutional right thus to subject the press to inquisition as to its views and opinions? The historical summary cited by the ASNE committee's minority, headed by J. Russell Wiggins of the *Washington Post*, gives a clear answer in the negative.

As Mr. Wiggins points out, the Supreme Court has held that Congress has no power to do by investigation what it is forbidden to do by law. The First Amendment to the Constitution says Congress "shall make no law . . . abridging freedom of speech or of the press." Interpreting this amendment, the Supreme Court has said that Congress is likewise forbidden "through the harassment of hearings, investigations, reports and subpoena (to)

hold a club over speech and over the press."

On this principle, the ASNE minority concluded that "the noblest Senator that ever lived cannot interrogate the meanest editor that ever existed, under the auspices of government power, without putting in jeopardy the people's right to a free press."

Mr. Wechsler's case is illuminated by another one in which neither Communism nor McCarthyism was involved. In 1936 Frank C. Waldrop, then a reporter for the *Washington Herald*, was haled before a congressional committee to answer for an article he had written about its chairman. Mr. Waldrop refused to answer any questions, on the ground that Congress did not have the right to ask them. The congressional committee avoided a court test by canceling Mr. Waldrop's subpoena. The American Newspaper Publishers Association strongly supported Mr. Waldrop as "upholding the traditions of American journalism."

Mr. Wechsler, knowing the penalty of silence these days, chose to answer the questions of his inquisitor. But that did not make the inquisition constitutional. In our view, it should be protested by the press just as vigorously as the previous one was protested in 1936.

—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*,
Aug. 16.

Is McCarthy Slipping?

Apparently the statement of four respected editors that Senator McCarthy's action in the Wechsler case constituted "a peril to American freedom" has got under the Senator's none-too-tender skin. The four were part of an eleven-man panel named by the American Society of Newspaper Editors to determine whether Mr. McCarthy's questioning last spring of James A. Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*, involved a threat to freedom of the press. One of the four who decided in the affirmative—an opinion which this newspaper shares—was the chairman of the panel, J. Russell Wiggins, managing editor of the *Washington Post*.

Senator McCarthy now, in effect, calls on the A. S. N. E. to investigate Mr. Wiggins. At least he asks the association to

inquire into "the extent" to which Mr. Wiggins has "endangered freedom of the press" by attacking such self-proclaimed patriots as Senator McCarthy. It is hard to believe that the Senator is serious about his suggestion. If he isn't serious, his little joke is not very funny and is merely another crude McCarthy attempt to divert attention. If he is serious, he only shows once again how ignorant he is of what freedom of the press really means. The truth is that Senator McCarthy sounds a bit flustered. The evidence accumulates that he no longer has his old sure demagogic touch—that he is, in fact, slipping.

—N. Y. *Times*, Aug. 19.

Press Mail Subsidies

To the Editor of the *New York Times*:

I suggest that Postmaster General Summerfield check the cost of subsidizing the mail of Senator McCarthy. The Senator is scraping the bottom of the barrel for issues. He therefore puts under his indictment three papers: the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Daily Worker*, and challenges their mail subsidies.

In demagogic fashion he places the Communists' *Daily Worker* in juxtaposition with the *Washington Post* and the *Wall Street Journal*, hoping thereby to smear with communism two reputable journals which have been critical of him and his works.

Traditionally we have always aided our free press with mail subsidies, but the new panjandrum of our Senate wants only a press that conforms to his views. Criticism makes him mad. Of course a small principle like equal protection of the laws means naught to him.

We could not constitutionally grant rights to newspapers generally and deny them to McCarthy's pet aversion; namely, the *Washington Post*. Assuredly there is more enlightenment in the *Washington Post* than in the McCarthy diatribes sent through the mails gratis.

Emanuel Celler.

Scarsdale, N. Y., Aug. 23, 1953.

—N. Y. *Times*, Aug. 27.

The Listener, May 14, 1953.

The Menace to Free Journalism in America

by Mary McCarthy

'The voice of dissent must be heard,' Henry Ford is said to have written in his will. To many people abroad—and some in America also—the old millionaire's injunction will have a quavery, antique sound, like some tinny, aged, Model-T Ford on the streamlined highway of American conformity. Reading in its newspapers of Congressional investigations, Europe today shakes in its boots for us. Opposition, it is believed, has been silenced in this republic. Americans live sweating in a blanket of fear. Nobody dares speak out against current tendencies; each man is in terror of his neighbor or of the occupant of the next desk. There is a one-party press, reinforced by radio, television, and movies. If any man speaks out, he is a hero, risking martyrdom for his ideas. The country, by and large, consists of a mass of docile slaves and a few such heroes and stalwarts whose words ring out in the silence.

European View

I need not add details to this picture, which is doubtless a familiar one. We Americans do not have to read the foreign press to be aware of the likeness in which we are cast: we see it reflected in the eyes of foreign visitors, who begin to look at us curiously whenever we criticise America, as though to say, 'Are you not afraid to speak openly?' If we continue to express our opinions, we are set down as peculiar, not typical, in short, as un-American. The European view of the American oppositionist coincides, in other words, with the view of the Un-American Committee.

Unfortunately, things are not as simple as our sympathisers believe. If by dissent you mean communism or fellow-travelling, then it is quite true that it is dangerous to dissent in America today. Even, to have been a communist or an organisational fellow-traveller at some time in the past is dangerous, especially if you teach in a college or work for a government agency or for the movies or the radio—dangerous, that is, unless you have recanted in public. But when people today, in America as

well as abroad, say that the voice of opposition has been silenced over here, they are not referring to communists or fellow-travellers. They mean that old-fashioned liberal opinion is afraid to make itself heard.

This is false, and anyone who believes it is in no position to understand the current American situation or the nature of American conformity. This myth itself is a product of stereotyped thinking, the special stereotype of conventional liberalism. The idea of a tiny, courageous minority reduced to whispering its thoughts is very congenial to the present-day liberal mind, which likes to think of itself as beleaguered, surrounded, without friends or allies, brave and yet timorous—for of course it has to be timorous, since it is the voice of the little people everywhere. A person who is not fearful is not regarded as a true liberal in America today; not to be fearful when fear is in the air is really rather undemocratic. Well-to-do liberals gather in expensive apartments to eat heavy meals and drink cognac and commiserate with each other on the atmosphere of fear. To show just the right degree of well-modulated anxiety about current trends is a democratic ceremonial. Satire, contempt, and anger strike the wrong note; they suggest that the speaker is not properly fearful of the consequences of free speaking. The hero of the liberal magazines is always described, virtuously, as an 'outspoken critic' of something or other, as though to be a silent critic were the normal state of man. Conventional liberals and the magazines that represent them share the flattering belief that they are alone in expressing the opinions they hold, opinions which are being voiced, in fact, from the pulpits of churches, from radio and television round-tables, from the colleges and the judiciary; and, above all, in multitudinous editorials from the enlightened magazine press.

Take the question of Senator McCarthy. No respectable magazine in America supports McCarthy's activities. He has been criticized by *Time*, by *The New Yorker*, by the liberal fortnightly *The Reporter*,

by the liberal weeklies, *The Nation* and *The New Republic*, by the Jesuit weekly *America*, by the lay Catholic weekly *Commonweal*, by *The Christian Science Monitor*, not to mention the big conservative newspapers and the monthly magazines. It may well be argued that this criticism is not effective. The point is, however, that it has been made repeatedly, and particularly in the weekly magazines that traditionally correct and analyse the news issuing from the daily press.

The weekly magazines in America have always specialised in dissent. This might be socialist, progressive, populist, or it might, as in recent years with *The Nation* and *The New Republic*, merely express a certain fretfulness with the way things were going. Humour, in the old weekly magazines like the original *Life* and *Judge*, was a kind of dissent, even if a mechanical or feeble one—it gave another view of life and made a butt of the topical. *The New Yorker*, in its cartoons and editorials, belongs in this line. It campaigned for world-government and against noise in the Grand Central Station; it deflates advertising slogans and speaks, in a tone of humorous protest, for the shrunken individualist inside the business suit. This is the perennial dissent of the middle-class married man against the world of things and women—the world of *New Yorker* advertising. In its curious way, even *Time* is a dissenting magazine: its distortion of normal syntax reveals this, and its angular treatment of the news, which generally appears in its pages in a twisted, ductile state, like a Modigliani woman. The quest for novel presentation in *Time* involves a rejection of the ordinary ways of looking at events; the idea of the news behind the news, implies a notion of otherness behind the mere visible. *Time*, at bottom, is a magazine of cranks and fanatics coated with success: a recent long article proving that Gnosticism was responsible for the last ten centuries of troubles illustrated the point well. *Newsweek*, in its turn, was a dissent from *Time*—another slanting, in a more conservative direction, a different inside story. *The Reporter*, a fortnightly, is

a cross between *Time* and *The Nation*.

This characteristic of the weekly magazines becomes more evident if you compare them to the monthly magazines, *Harper's* and the *Atlantic*, on the one hand, and to the sober daily press, the *New York Times*, and the *Herald Tribune*, on the other. In the monthly magazines and in the sober press everything is normal and orderly and decently representative, if dull. The weekly magazines are all aberrant; they style news and opinion to achieve a certain standard derangement of reality.

Sense of Mechanical Repetition

If dissent, then, is vented weekly, in one form or another, in the leading American magazines, what is lacking? Why does the belief persist that criticism is being stifled in this country? The truth, at its simplest, I think, is that people, not just liberal intellectuals, but ordinary liberal people, teachers, doctors, lawyers, and so on, are more restless at seeing their own opinions mirrored week after week in the journals that are written for them. What they object to is not lack of agreement with their own political conclusions but the sense of mechanical repetition that drones from those familiar pages. Many liberal people during the presidential campaign, for example, actually preferred to read the press of the opposition, not just to find out what the extreme right was saying but in the hope of reading something they had not read before. What they are missing today is not political virtue but political thought.

Take the case of Senator McCarthy again. Here is a man who has been prominently displayed on the public stage for the past four years. He has excited loathing as well as partisanship, but in all the criticism that has been published of him only two recent articles have appeared—one in *Commentary*, one in *The New Leader*—that have tried to examine him seriously either as a man or a phenomenon. The *New York Times*, I am told, declined to review McCarthy's own book, *McCarthyism*, on the ground that it might spread his ideas. But of course his 'ideas' are in full circulation, while no real ideas about him—what sort of man this is, what forces him, what forces in respectable society are behind him, how these forces can be countered—are discussed in the very magazines

that oppose him. McCarthy's apologists insist that most of his attackers do not know a thing about him. That is true, though there is a great deal of information available, much of it on public record, not only about him but about his associates and sponsors. But the liberal magazines, old and new, prefer to treat him as a nightmare and thereby heighten the helpless terror of their readers, who have already been conditioned to pure masochism as a substitute for thought in politics.

Or take Senator Taft. Sporadic glimpses have been offered of him, some of them very revealing. But the political evolution of this curious and contradictory man has never been traced, and no magazine seems to exist today that is capable of fostering in its reader more than flickering interest in what Senator Taft is really like. This sort of elementary interest, a humanistic curiosity, is dying, even among readers; they are ceasing to remember what such an interest was. Take the McCarran Act. It has been the target of many 'fine editorials', but when the French crew of the *Liberté* was refused shore leave, no magazine editor was moved to send a reporter down to the docks to get the kind of human-interest story that the old-fashioned crusading editor would have commissioned as a matter of course. The whole subject of Europe, similarly, has fallen into neglect, except for those 'zones' in which American and Soviet interests publicly collide. American magazines print almost nothing from European magazines, and curiosity as to what Europeans are writing and thinking (except about America) is very sparse.

Only business men, apparently—to judge by the magazine racks—still retain the rudiments of curiosity about the world around them. *Fortune*, the expensive Luce magazine for big business, is one of the rare places where you can read articles treating some phenomenon in detail (how a certain factory works or discoveries-in-hormones). Unfortunately, *Fortune's* articles mostly read like publicity brochures. That worship of fact and homely inquisitiveness that legend attributes to the American character seems to be disappearing in a growingly ideologised world. The Luce publications profit from the absence of true reporting by hiring men of

talent to produce clever arrangements of synthetic or plastic 'facts'. *Life* purports to give a picture of ordinary life, which is really a series of carefully contrived, posed stills that proffer a depthless intimacy, like the advertisements showing a society hostess at home. And *Time* satisfies its readers' craving for reality by creating a pseudo-reality, the pretended inside knowledge I have mentioned, which is really a kind of processing of facts garnered by researchers and interwoven with the opinions of *Time's* editors. And, aside from the slanting given a story on principle, the *Time* method itself, with its division of labor and anonymity, makes accuracy difficult. *Time's* account of an event is often bewilderingly different from the experience of anyone who was present on the scene.

The liberal weeklies, in the old days, attempted to furnish their readers with the true histories of events that were falsified by the 'bought' press. Today, the liberal magazines, imagining themselves under fire, are mainly concerned with security. An anxiety not to give aid and comfort to the enemy drives them to suppress, like military censors, any facts or ideas that might tend to support the enemy's side. This means, in practice, that they will hire hack writers in preference to writers of independent habits; the hack writer does not object to having his pieces cut and rewritten, and by his very nature he is docile to the editor's demands. The story the editor wishes him to write is already formed in his mind before he undertakes his research. And the growing practice of editorial 'collaboration' in magazines of all kinds, that is, of mapping out the stories with the author or reporter before sending him out into the field, ensures conformity at its source. The editor master-minds the story and the author becomes his instrument—the organ-pipe for the editor at the console.

When people complain of the absence of dissent in contemporary journalism what they have been noticing is this. Dissidence, in the old sense of a radical political disagreement with the whole of society, is not an important factor today. The Socialist Party and the various Marxist splinter-groups have not been suppressed by the majority; they have been absorbed

by it. The non-communist left, of which so much used to be heard only a few years ago, has silently melted away; most of its members have relinquished either the belief in a democratic socialism or the hope of achieving it in any discernible future. American prosperity has silenced economic protest. The real dissidence of our period in America is the activity of thought itself, rebelling against the constraints of *idées reçues* and platitudes. Facts, in so far as they are obstinately real, have become dissident also, that is, positively rebellious against the editorial strictures imposed on them.

And the greatest menace to free journalism in America today is not Senator McCarthy or Representative Velde—whatever may be said of them in other connections. It is the conceptualised picture of the reader that governs our present-day journalism like some unseen autocrat. The reader, in this view, is a person stupider than the editor, whom the editor both fears and patronises. He plays the same role the child plays in the American home and school, the role of an inferior being who must nevertheless be propitiated. 'What our readers will take' is the watchword of every magazine, right, left, or centre, of small or large circulation. When an article today is adulterated, this is not done out of respect for the editor's prejudices (which might at least give us an individualistic and eccentric journalism), but in deference to the reader's averageness and supposed stupidity. The fear of giving offence to some hypothetical dolt and the fear of creating a misunderstanding have replaced the fear of advertisers' reprisals. In this sense, indeed, we have a one-party press, a press ruled by the unseen reader. This sovereign cannot be dislodged, like a living politician, because he is a mere construct. He is more powerful than any senator because he includes every senator in himself by definition. And this picture of the reader is a truly undemocratic one, for when the editor of a magazine accepts it he denies the premise of equality, the only premise on which free communication between human beings can be carried on.

—*Third Programme*

N. Y. Times, July 15.

Report on Speeches Queried

Criteria of Newsworthiness Discussed in Connection With Reporting

To the Editor of the *New York Times*:

If I may, without seeming unappreciative of the notice the *Times* has taken of recent expressions of opinion on my part, I should like to raise the question of the standards by which you select from addresses you report the parts you consider "newsworthy."

On July 7 I addressed a group at the Catholic Center of New York University on the subject of academic freedom. In a forty-minute analysis I never so much as alluded to Senator McCarthy. Two *New York* evening newspapers (one only in an early edition) took notice of what I said. One of them, heading its report "Inconsistency Charged to Critics of Probes," ran almost a full column of direct quotations bearing out the headline. The other ran a report on the talk entitled "Priest Backs College Probes." It so happens that both these papers found my observations on the subject of academic freedom and the current investigations by the Velde and Jenner committees to their liking.

At the end of the talk someone asked what I thought of Senator McCarthy. After explaining that he was investigating subversives in education, I offhandedly, in a summary way, expressed my opinion of the Senator's anti-communism.

Remarks Reduced

Much to my surprise the *Times* for July 8 ran a short report of my talk headed "McCarthy Attacked by Catholic Editor." The story highly compressed my answer to a question. It reduced to a single sentence the remarks on which one of the evening papers had run a full column, that is, the remarks embodying the substance of what I had to say. It so happens that what I said on the subject of academic freedom was not much to the *Times'* liking, whereas what I said offhandedly about Senator McCarthy was. The latter was headlined and much more fully reported in your pages.

The same thing happened to me again, exactly a week later, when I addressed Colgate University's Foreign Policy Conference on "Civil Liberties and the Commu-

nist Threat." I went to a good deal of trouble, if I may say so, to examine into the ways in which ten or a dozen of our traditional civil liberties have stood up under what many call the present anti-Communist "hysteria." I found, to my great satisfaction, that our courts have been maintaining these liberties intact. I did take exception to a couple of things Mr. McCarthy had done in his subcommittee—as examples of the kind of conduct on his part which, in my opinion, opens him to serious criticism. I cited, for example, his "investigation" of the editor of the *New York Post*.

Questions Raised

Again, to my surprise—though not so much, because I was beginning to catch on—the *Times* for July 15 took notice of my Colgate address under the heading "McCarthy Group Assailed." Again the *Times* seemed to be hypnotized by criticism of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, this time to a point where it omitted mention of my topic altogether. Another morning paper here, also very anti-McCarthy, headed its dispatch more mildly: "Catholic Editor Chides McCarthy." It also let its readers know that I did not think our traditional civil liberties were actually being taken away from us, but that I did recognize the serious problem of "uncivil repressions."

The odd thing about this latter experience was that the *New York Post*, which makes a career out of lambasting Senator McCarthy, gave a more balanced report of what I said at Colgate than, in my opinion, either of our two outstanding morning papers.

These recent experiences have raised in my mind two questions which should, I think, be of some concern to the journalistic profession. Is a newspaper justified—having regard to its relations with its readers—in reporting only or at wholly disproportionate length the remarks of a speaker which happen to coincide with its own editorial positions. In other words, is it reporting what speakers say or only the reflections of its own views it can find in what speakers say?

Secondly, has not a newspaper some ob-

ligation (to the speaker himself) to give a fairly balanced account of what he said—assuming, as I believe we may in these cases, that major portions of his talk consisted of evaluations of public issues in which a large proportion of its readers would be interested?

Picking Up Mention

Frankly, I am puzzled. I am perfectly ready to have quoted anything I say in public. But it looks as if things have reached a stage where one cannot make even passing mention of Senator McCarthy without having even such a reputable paper as the *Times* pitch onto such remarks to the almost total exclusion of whatever else one says.

I also think the question of "souping up" of headlines calls for self-examination on the part of editors.

In addition to the question of journalistic integrity involved, this kind of reporting, in my opinion, is self-defeating. I for one am strongly tempted to omit public criticism of Mr. McCarthy in the future because I do not want to continue to distract reporters or editors from opinions I wish to express on other subjects that seem to me of equal or even greater importance.

Surely Senator McCarthy should not be allowed to monopolize our attention when there are today so many other issues to be discussed and decided. If the Senator is guilty of publicity-seeking, as the *Times* very likely thinks he is, he seems to me to be getting a good deal of gratuitous cooperation from anti-McCarthy publications, including, I fear, the *Times*.

If the excuse for highlighting criticism of the Senator in reporting talks on all allied subjects is that he is "newsworthy," then I believe the criteria of newsworthiness have become too closely identified with a newspaper's editorial predilections and need some revision.

(Rev.) Robert C. Hartnett, S. J.,
Editor in Chief, *America*.

New York, July 19, 1953.

[The New York *Times* agrees with Father Hartnett that a newspaper has "some obligation to give a fairly balanced account" of what a speaker says and the *Times* strives to carry out that obligation. It therefore regrets that in the cases he mentions it fell short of the obligation because of incomplete reporting and editing. The *Times* rejects, however, the implica-

tion that this reporting was in any way connected with its editorial position. As we believe our readers are well aware, this

never has been and is not the *Times* way of presenting the news.—Editor the *Times*.]

Wall St. Journal, July 29,

Senator McCarthy and the Press

This is an editorial about two speeches and the manner of their reporting by the press. The speaker was not a national figure but the subject on which he spoke was a national issue. It seems to us there is a lesson, and a rather sad one, in the story.

On two recent occasions Father Robert Hartnett, editor of the Catholic publication *America*, spoke on academic freedom and civil rights. Among other things, he criticized as inconsistent many of those who themselves criticize the Congressional investigations into subversives in education, and he spoke reassuringly of the way our traditional civil liberties have stood up, with the protection of the courts, under what is sometimes called the anti-Communist "hysteria."

In the first speech Senator McCarthy was not mentioned at all. After the talk, Father Hartnett was asked his opinion of the Senator and he then expressed some criticism of the Senator's methods. The next day Father Hartnett's address was reported in some eastern newspapers under headlines the gist of which was "McCarthy Attacked By Catholic Priest." Some reports were fuller than others, but by and large the emphasis both in headline and story was on the McCarthy criticism and not on that part which was the main theme of his remarks.

In the second speech Senator McCarthy was mentioned by name and criticized, but only in passing. The main theme again was Father Hartnett's general satisfaction with the preservation of our civil liberties. Yet again the substance of the headlines was "McCarthy Group Assailed."

All this has brought a protest from Father Hartnett. We think his protest is well taken. He says:

"Frankly, I am puzzled. . . . It looks as if things have reached a stage where one cannot make even passing mention of Senator McCarthy without having a reputable

newspaper pitch onto such remarks to the almost total exclusion of whatever else one says. . . .

"This kind of reporting, in my opinion, is self-defeating. I for one am strongly tempted to omit public criticism of Mr. McCarthy in the future because I do not want to continue to distract reporters or editors from opinions I wish to express on other subjects that seem to me of equal or even greater importance.

"Surely Senator McCarthy should not be allowed to monopolize our attention when there are today so many other issues to be discussed and decided."

Now what Senator McCarthy does or says is often news, frequently front page news. Often what other people say about him is also news. It is proper for newspapermen to report this news; it is also proper for their editors and other commentators to lambaste Senator McCarthy when they dislike what he does. But the experience of Father Hartnett reflects something more than a concern with reporting legitimate news.

What happened in this case was that the press was so hypnotized by the name of Senator McCarthy that once it had been mentioned, however casually and in whatever connection, that mention was seized upon and blown up beyond any sensible proportions.

Father Hartnett is not the only observer of this phenomenon, or its only victim. It is not at all uncommon to see stories on front pages of newspapers, particularly in the eastern states, which would hardly have been worth printing at all except for some tie-in with Senator McCarthy. In important stories about other matters any suggestion of a McCarthy "angle" almost certainly ends up in the headline and lead of the story.

Many writers and commentators cannot do a piece on any subject, however remote from Mr. McCarthy, without dragging in

some gratuitous comment, pro or con, on the Senator. It's almost a compulsion neurosis.

It's no wonder that our foreign friends think we have gone mad and given sober acceptance to the idea of an American ready to be taken over by a Senator from Wisconsin. In this country only the naively unrealistic believe such hokum; we live

here, we know the country and we are injured to the screamings of political battles. Abroad, it looks and sounds like hysteria.

Yet, in all truth, we are all victims too. Like any other neurosis this obsession with Senator McCarthy saps other energies and distorts perspective. And that is one distortion for which we the press, and not Senator McCarthy, are responsible.

Denver Post, July 23

Dismay in Appleton

Senator Joe McCarthy this week has accused New York's venerable Senator Lehman of "attempted character assassination" directed at McCarthy's two famed "junketeering gumshoes," Cohn and Schine. Joe is a fine one to talk like that. His adventures in mud-slinging have besmirched so many admirable people's reputations that even Joe's own friends can't stand him any more.

Back in Senator McCarthy's home town of Appleton, Wis., the local newspaper, the *Appleton Post-Crescent*, has long supported its boy Joe and defended him against charges that he smeared people in order to promote his own career. But when McCarthy recently attacked in his best character-knifing manner the new president of Harvard University, that was going too far even for the *Post-Crescent*. President Nathan Marsh Pusey lived in Appleton the past nine years, serving as president of Lawrence college, which is located there. The Wisconsin paper says everyone in Appleton knows Pusey "for his integrity, his devotion to American ideals, his exemplary personal life and his leadership in the liberal arts movement that is just as important in fighting Communism as McCarthy's exposure."

When Senator Joe pounced on Pusey as "a rabid anti anti-Communist," the hometown paper noted "dismay among Dr. Pusey's friends and associates, many of whom have been strong supporters of McCarthy, and are known to have contributed to his campaign funds."

Maybe McCarthy doesn't care what the *Post-Crescent* thinks of him now. He has acquired new friends around the country, including perhaps more fulsome contributors to his campaign funds. But McCar-

thy's new friends and supporters might note what his old one thinks of him and has tactics now.

Continues the *Post-Crescent*: "In stating that 'I do not think Dr. Pusey is or has been a member of the Communist party,' McCarthy used a gutter-type approach. He could have referred as correctly to pope or president. It is an insult not only to Dr. Pusey but to all who know him and are proud to call his friend . . . McCarthy is running way out of bounds."

This admission of disillusionment from last fall's vigorous believers in Holy Joe should be well noted, especially by the Texas millionaires who are reported so enchanted with the Wisconsin senator that they want to build him up to the nation on television this fall. Their day of disenchantment is bound to come, too. They could spare themselves the pains of future remorse if they would wise up now before they unleash their Frankenstein monster on the country.

As for Senator Lehman and Dr. Pusey, we suspect New York and Harvard are more proud of them than ever, and more confident that they are well chosen for their high offices.

Of Mice and Men, Including a Lady

In the expectation (if not the hope) that J. B. Matthews would be with the Senate Investigation subcommittee for a rather longer spell, we hunted up our favorite section of Mr. Matthews's interrogation of Robert M. Hutchins, then Chancellor of the University of Chicago, under

the auspices of the Broyles Commission in Illinois in 1949. The passage is too good to pass by, even if Mr. Matthews has "resigned," and so we reprint the exchange from Walter Gellhorn's *The States and Subversion* (Cornell University Press), which, incidentally, offers other bits as delightful. And now—

Mr. Matthews: "I notice on the American Sponsoring Committee (for the World Congress of Peace, Paris, April 20-23, 1949) the name of a Dr. Maude Slye. Is Dr. Maude Slye on the faculty of the University of Chicago? Is she listed in the current directory?"

Chancellor Hutchins: "You recall, I think, that she is listed as 'Emeritus.'"

Mr. Matthews: "That is correct."

Chancellor Hutchins: "Dr. Slye retired many years ago after confining her attention for a considerable number of years exclusively to mice." (Laughter.)

Mr. Matthews: "Dr. Maude Slye was an Associate Professor Emeritus—this is the latest obtainable directory."

Chancellor Hutchins: "'Emeritus' means retired."

Mr. Matthews: "On pension?"

Chancellor Hutchins: "Oh, yes." *

Mr. Matthews: "And has at least the prestige of the University of Chicago to some degree associated with her name, inasmuch as she is carried in the directory of the University?"

Chancellor Hutchins: "I don't see how we can deny the fact that she has been all her life a member of the faculty of the university. She was one of the most distinguished specialists in cancer we have seen in our time."

Mr. Matthews: "Is it the policy of the University of Chicago to ignore such affiliations on the part of a faculty member?"

Chancellor Hutchins: "As I indicated, Dr. Slye's associations were confined on our campus to mice. She could not, I think, have done any particular harm to any of our students even if she had been so minded. To answer your question, however, I am not aware that Dr. Slye has ever joined any club that advocated the overthrow of the government by violence."

Mr. Matthews: "May I ask if in your educational theory there is not such a thing as indoctrination by example?"

Chancellor Hutchins: "Of mice?" (Laughter.)

—St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, July 14.

San Francisco Chronicle, July 5.

On Banning Books

BETWEEN THE LINES

With Joseph Henry Jackson

Coming at an excellent time—in the same week as America's Independence Day—is a declaration in which the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association joins with the American Book Publishers Council.

In essence this 1953 declaration underlines a pat question: What is becoming of our independence?

Independence is another word for freedom—an older-fashioned word, maybe, but a good and vigorous one.

The specific freedom to which these organizations refer is the freedom of the independent American to read what he pleases and make up his own mind about it.

Two main points in this declaration: "The freedom to read is essential to democracy." And: "We trust Americans to recognize propaganda and to reject obscenity."

There you have some sound commonsense, and of a kind that's been lacking in recent months.

Yet what these groups and persons are doing—the book-listeners and the book-banners and those of their persuasion—is in effect saying, "We do not trust the American people. We do not believe they know what is good for them. And we believe further that somebody has to tell Americans what's good for them and what's bad. Americans, in fact, are just too stupid to know!" And always the corollary: "But we know! We will tell the rest of you!"

How do you like being patted on the head and told that you're a poor weak-minded, spineless dullard, too stupid to know propaganda or obscenity when you see it?

A lot of people are not liking it. In fact, a great many people are getting pretty tired of being told that they must be protected from themselves, which is to say that they can't be trusted to know either Communist propaganda or dirt when they see it.

As the Library Association and the

Book Publishers Council put it: "Such attempts rest on a denial of the fundamental premise of democracy: That the ordinary citizen, by exercising his judgment, will accept the good and reject the bad."

Now, of course, there are the counter-arguments. World Communism is a menace—true enough. Obscenity is bad for people, especially the young—true again.

In America, however, we have courts. That is our American way. Do those who wish to ban this and censor that, according to their own ideas, despise the courts? Don't they believe in the American way?

If they do, then what about seeing to it that the courts take care of such books as come under the existing laws? Does anyone believe our judges are all crypto-Communists? Are our juries all made up of people who secretly cherish a passion for filthy pictures?

I doubt it. For that matter, are our young people as weak-minded as this excessive solicitude seems to suggest?

I doubt that too. I've seen a lot of them. Today's younger generation seems to me a heads-up, smart, well-informed lot of boys and girls, and—if it comes to that—a good deal less likely to be led by the nose than most. I'd put my money on them any time. I'd bet on them to recognize and reject propaganda, or to spot obscenity and turn away from it, just as fast as those who are making such handsome careers out of telling us all that we're so stupid we all need taking care of.

There another interesting point here.

Did you ever hear anyone say "Yes! That book had better be banned, because if it isn't banned then I might read it, and it might be very damaging to me!"

I never did. It's always somebody else that has to be protected. It's that other fellow, the "man in the street," that has to be watched over. Well, poppycock! The "man in the street" is America. If he isn't, then we've certainly made a big mistake

somewhere. I'd love to hear Will Rogers, if he were alive today, on just this subject. There, if you like, was a commonsense, honorable man who put his faith in the "man in the street," the good, average American.

He was right, too, as so many others have been who believed you could always trust the American people to use horse-sense.

No, it won't do. Consider one more quotation from the Library Association's statement, concurred in by the Book Publishers Council. It's the best of all answers to those who make careers of going about viewing with alarm and pointing out dangers, until they've succeeded (temporarily only, you may be sure) in scaring a good part of the American people into plain silliness. Here's how that answer reads: "Freedom itself is a dangerous way of life, but it is ours."

Yes. And it's time that people shook their heads and looked around them and came to. It is high time that Americans who respect themselves and their fellow-Americans, next time somebody warns, "Oh, but you mustn't read this or that! You see, you haven't good sense, and it might hurt you!" replied in the soundest of all American ways, "Oh yeah? So I can't think for myself? So I'm a dope? who says so?"

One-Man Censorship

In Youngstown, Ohio, last winter a zealous police chief embarked on a "clean-up" campaign of the city's newsstands and attempted through threat of arrest to stop the sale of certain books and magazines he deemed obscene. No court order was involved; the forbidden items were simply those which the police authorities decided came under a Youngstown ordinance banning sale of publications of an "obscene or immoral nature." The police chief was, in effect, setting himself up as a personal censor to decide in advance what the citizens of Youngstown should or should not read.

The question of protecting the public from obscenity without infringing on freedom is usually a touchy one, and is not always easy for courts to decide. But in this case Judge Charles J. McNamee of the United States District Court in Cleveland made an important distinction. Without discussing the books themselves,

he said the Youngstown ordinance was valid but that the action of the police officer was not. The latter had no authority "to determine with finality" whether or not the books were obscene or immoral. He could make an arrest if he thought the ordinance had been violated, but the decision was up to the courts. Judge McNamee continued:

"The judicial office has no higher function to serve than the restraint of official arbitrariness. Arbitrary power inspired by good motives, no less than that animated by evil intent, is an attack upon the supremacy of the law. . . . It is vital in the interest of public morality that the laws against obscenity be vigorously enforced. But if a free society is to endure its primary obligation is to protect its 'government of laws' from all intrusions of arbitrary power."

The McNamee decision is a healthy and useful one. The court's comments underline one of the great distinctions between our type of democratic society and the totalitarian—or police—state. Judge McNamee's ruling does not give license to obscenity, but it does re-emphasize the essential freedom of the citizen under our government of law.

—N. Y. Times, Aug. 14.

Trial By Newspaper

The occasional conflict of two basic American rights—fair trial and a free press—has long disturbed thoughtful lawyers and newspapermen. The intensely competitive quest for news—stimulated by the desire of the general public to read the news and, sometimes, by the desire of police, attorneys and even judges for personal publicity—has too often threatened the administration of justice by prejudicing a case through distorted presentation in newspapers before it has ever come to trial.

While the practice of American newspapers in this respect may have improved over the years, there is still no doubt that it could stand improvement. So could the practice of those officers of the court who are prone to issue statements, make sensational pronouncements and otherwise cater to the willingness of some newspapers (and radio commentators) to infringe a fundamental human right for the sake of a "good story."

A voluntary code to apply to both sides

has just been proposed by a special committee of the New York County Lawyers Association. Among its twelve points to end the "law of the jungle" in reporting court trials are these: the press should refrain from trying to persuade a judge and jury how a case should be decided; should not publish advance stories of expected testimony; should not seek out the attitude of individual jurors after a verdict; attorneys should not state in advance what they expect to prove, nor should they criticize judge and jury during a trial, and law-enforcement officers should not give out advance statements concerning confessions until proof of the latter has been received in evidence.

The proposed code would be entirely voluntary in nature, and in our opinion this would be far the best way to accomplish its objectives. We agree with Edwin

M. Otterbourg, president of the association, that lawyers and journalists should develop "a cooperative program" rather than let solutions be sought through legislative fiat or judicial decree.

Freedom of the press implies an obligation of responsibility on the part of the press. It is the individual newspaper and not the judiciary that ought to shoulder the responsibility of deciding, within the limits of national security, what it will or will not publish in court cases, and no newspaper can dodge its individual responsibility for good taste and fair play. The clash between free press and free trial is not inevitable if a sense of fairness and of restraint is coupled with recognition both of the public's right to factual information and of the individual's right to impartial justice.

—N. Y. Times, Aug. 26.

Dubious Case for a Code on the Reporting of Trials

The New York County Lawyers Association has drafted a "code on fair trial and free press" and proposes its voluntary acceptance by bench, bar and the profession of journalism.

In its behalf, Edwin M. Otterbourg, president of the association, alleges that justice has suffered through the present journalistic practices of reporting court trials; in such reporting, he says, "the law of the jungle prevails." It is his expressed belief that in the absence of regulation "the way soon will be opened for unfair trials on the one hand and for unbridled license on the other."

With no intention to defend the conduct of all reporters—or for that matter, all defense attorneys or prosecutors—in all criminal trials, we humbly suggest that the learned lawyer's observation may be slightly askew. At any rate, it differs from ours. In long and somewhat intimate association with such matters, we have never known press coverage of a trial to run sufficiently wild to warp justice or approach license.

From time to time a reporter may, in truth, allow his zeal to run away with his sense of propriety, or an enthusiastic head-writer may generate excessive voltage in a phrase, but these are sporadic and iso-

lated occurrences, inhibited by countless deterrents.

To begin with, most newspapers are responsible newspapers, directed by responsible editors. In the interests of responsibility and fairness, they hew close to the line of objectivity, and even were they inclined not to, would be persuaded by the laws of libel and the power of the courts to fine and imprison for contempt.

It is our belief that no such code as suggested by the New York association of lawyers is demanded, and that if such a code were adopted it could not be enforced and would be ignored by the same newspapermen—and lawyers—who disdain present codes whether written or unwritten.

In particular, we disagree with the philosophy or realism of at least half of the dozen principles the proponents would incorporate in their code. We feel that no editor in his right mind would ever attempt to influence a Judge in imposing sentence. We believe that under certain conditions the reporting of a criminal's confession, when made, is a public service and duty; more than once in recent history, a reporter's canvassing of a jury after its verdict was entered has helped undo grave injustice; the gagging of an attorney during the course of a trial in which he appears seems extreme and hard to justify.

And from another viewpoint, there appear certain obvious impediments to any code provision that would let a trial Judge, or a committee of attorneys, or even a committee of editors tell a news editor addicted to such headlines that one of his products was unacceptable because "sensational."

With all deference to the New York association of lawyers, we reject its fear that "an aroused public opinion" may soon hobble the press with restrictive legislation. We put our faith in the First Amendment and in the sense of responsibility and decency manifested by the great majority of the American press.

—San Francisco *Chronicle*,
Aug. 26.

Mr. Stevenson Reports

Adlai E. Stevenson came back to the United States yesterday after a six-months' trip that had carried him round the world, through thirty countries. It is not on record that during all those crowded months when he was subject to the temptation to rash and impetuous speech at every turn, he ever said a thing that did not help his country, or anything that could embarrass the Eisenhower Administration. This was the achievement, not of an adroit politician, but of an understanding mind and heart.

During this "hard and remorseless, though very gratifying, journey," as he called it, Mr. Stevenson talked "with everyone from cobblers to kings." He came back convinced that we have been winning the cold war and that "the danger of world war has diminished, at least for the present." He did not find abroad a complete understanding of America. He had to report that "our prestige and moral influence have declined." He felt compelled to say some things that perhaps we would rather not have heard. For example:

But in detail the reflection of America is blurred and distorted. There is an impression that we are inflexible and erratic; that faith in cooperation is being replaced by belief in unilateral action—a readiness to go it alone. It is hard for them to reconcile our view of the danger with a cut in our defense build-up. There is an impression that

"trade, not aid," is becoming no aid and no trade. Book burning, purges and invasions of executive responsibility have obscured the bright image of America; and when we give the impression that we are scared and freedom of speech and freedom of expression are on the defensive in the United States, we put the United States on the defensive.

In spite of all this he doubts that "anything has been lost that cannot be regained." He made it clear that he would help President Eisenhower to carry out in international affairs the policies in which both men believe. In everything he gave dignity to his role of leader of the loyal opposition—that is, an opposition committed to the basic American ideals.

—N. Y. *Times*, Aug. 21.

foreign lands and among foreign peoples, and in the world of foreign affairs generally.

Again my thanks . . . for your trust and for your *Reports*.

John M. Anspacher

Competition in Ideas

Gentlemen:

I have read with great excitement "The Historical Pattern of Press Freedom" by Frederick S. Siebert. I wonder if he has not minimized in the development of press freedom, the concept of necessary competition in ideas and the relation of that concept to the loss of 1000 dailies and 2500 weeklies in the last few decades.

I do not believe it is an answer to point to the development of national magazines since such organs do not deal with the problems which are imbedded in the roots of democracy, and unless the democratic process flourishes in our small towns and villages, a nationally informed and critical public will not be able to perpetuate the values of press freedom.

Morris L. Ernst

Wilton, N. H.
April 11, 1953

To the Editor:

Like Dr. Bachrach [Letter, *Nieman Reports*, April 1953], I am interested in the question of the concentration camps being prepared for use in this country. The lack of material in the press is certainly striking, and Mr. Marder's confession of ignorance only makes it the more so.

Nevertheless, the New York *Compass*, which unfortunately had to cease publication for economic reasons last autumn, did cover the story quite thoroughly last summer in two articles by Charles A. Allen, Jr. I am enclosing one of these, the only one I clipped.

Mr. Allen also had an article shortly after in the British socialist weekly, *The New Statesman & Nation*, which I am likewise enclosing. I should think that this is brief enough to reprint if you think your readers generally would be interested in the subject. I understand that Mr. Allen is now at work on a larger study of the whole problem, but whether he will be able to get it published and disseminated is, of course, another question.

Letters

Biggest

To the Editor:

Nieman Reports seems to have the biggest circulation in the United States. I was in Washington last week and I suppose every other newspaperman I ran across spoke to me about having seen my speech in the *Reports*. I have also got a good many letters here.

I wonder if you have any spare copies? If you do I would like to buy about a dozen of them.

Mark Ethridge

Ideas Today

Sirs:

My apologies for having let this lapse, and my gratitude for trusting me so.

I must say that for a newspaperman temporarily engaged in helping to make a little news, instead of reporting it, I find the *Reports* especially stimulating. Reading each issue keeps me closely in touch not simply with the newspaper people, but with the ideas in newspapering today, and that's what's important.

Further, of course, I am interested always in efforts to make clear and understandable to the American people the intricacies (and believe me, they are frequently very hard to follow) of the ways in which the U. S. is conducting itself in

This whole affair might be made the starting point for a useful discussion of the role which a genuinely strong left-wing press might play in this country. Isn't it so that the absence of more than a handful of very small left-wing papers is a source of grave weakness to the press as a whole? And shouldn't the newspaper profession

—as distinct from the newspaper owners—be actively interested in encouraging the expansion (and improvement) of the left-wing press?

Paul M. Sweezy,
Co-editor, *Monthly Review*,
66 Barrow St., NYC 14

An Ideal to Be Sought

To the Editor:

In the aftermath of the 1952 national elections a movement grew to study the fairness of newspaper coverage of the campaign. This arose, in part, from the claim of the Stevensonites that Republican papers were very much in the majority and that General Eisenhower not only got most of the editorial page support but also the breaks in news page display and coverage. There were a number of suggestions for an impartial study, and Sigma Delta Chi offered to sponsor one.

That was in late November.

Since then, according to *Editor & Publisher* (3-21-53), interest has waned—in fact, “every one seems to have other things to think about.”

This raises the question: “what is there better for newspapermen to think about than fairness?” At the same time, there is the problem of measuring fairness—even by distinguished newspapermen—and, more important, the problem of making those who have been unfair understand what all the talk is about.

A lot of persons who should know better have been criticizing the press for lack of objectivity. The critics should read what Christ said in the Sermon on the Mount about the mote and the beam, although it is doubtful if they will see the application.

The fact is that in the business of newspapering, objectivity is an ideal to be sought but to be obtained only with the greatest of luck. The newspaperman who attains true objectivity should play the Irish Sweepstakes three times in a row; he has a fortune awaiting him. Naturally, the editorial and news pages are separated, but they are not isolated and there must be some slop over of intent or desire.

Coloration in the best newspapers is kept to the absolute human minimum. In the not-so-good newspapers, coloration is encouraged to one degree or another.

Thus, any study of press fairness in the

1952 presidential campaign (or any contest of importance) can be made only when a multitude of variables are evaluated—and the evaluation will probably raise more problems than it can solve.

The 1952 campaign was not conducted in a vacuum. Nor were the publishers, editors and reporters angels.

But this much is certain: those who were unfair—with certain exceptions—knew that they were being unfair. If the great body of responsible newspapermen continues to emphasize that the unfairness is evident and detested, more good should be done than if individuals were singled out for censure. Conscience needs stimulation to bring reform.

As for the exceptions, not much can be done about them. They are the men and women who, either through indoctrination or self-hypnosis, are ready to swear that black is white or war is peace. Some of them, like embezzlers, will be with us always. And a number of them do not write for the *Daily Worker*.

The idea of the press examining itself is attractive—for a while. Unfortunately, such self-examination will bring a host of mischief-making volunteers who would rather confuse than help, and damage than confuse. . . .

Ted Long, Editorial Writer
Salt Lake Tribune.

Nieman Notes

1939

Colby College has appointed Irving Dilliard, editorial page editor of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Elijah Lovejoy lecturer and looks forward to his lecture at a college convocation November 5. This is the second annual Lovejoy lectureship by Colby, to signalize the heritage of a free press. The first Lovejoy lecture was given

last year by James A. Pope, executive editor of the Louisville papers.

At a recent meeting of the John McLane Clark Memorial Fund, Inc., it was voted to have David Bradley proceed on a compilation of John's writings for a memorial volume, and to give Dartmouth College a prize fund of \$50 a year for that senior who writes the best final examination in the Great Issues course, and who best demonstrates an understanding and appreciation of John Clark's ideals. John helped set up the Great Issues course at his alma mater just before he bought the Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle*, now published by his widow, Rhoda Clark.

Osborn Zuber reports that his daughter, Jan, who was six when he held a Nieman Fellowship in the first Nieman group, is now a senior at Agnes Scott College in Georgia, looking forward to her 21st birthday in December. Long an editorial writer on the Birmingham papers, Zuber is now on the staff of the Small Defense Plants Administration. He served in Washington in the second World War and returned during the Korean War.

Edwin A. Lahey had a clear beat on Martin Durkin's resignation from the cabinet, for the Chicago *Daily News* and the papers its syndicate serves. This is nothing new with Ed Lahey. He had a beat on Senator Taft's prescription for the 1952 Republican campaign that Taft got Eisenhower to accept at their famous Morningside Heights breakfast. Ed always had the inside on any big stories concerning the late Phil Murray as president of the C.I.O.

1941

On Sunday, September 27, Edward R. Murrow's TV program, “See it Now” was devoted to Germany and included an interview with High Commissioner James B. Conant by Alexander Kendrick, CBS correspondent in Vienna.

Arthur Eggleston has got mislaid since his return from Germany where he served as consultant on the German press under the occupation administration. Attempts to reach him have turned up two wrong Arthur Egglestons in journalism around New York. A subscription to *Nieman Reports* will be given for information leading to the right Arthur Eggleston.

1942

Kenneth N. Stewart spent a considerable part of his Summer vacation from his journalism professorship at the University of Michigan in shaping up a session on America's stake in information and communications at the Fourth National Conference of the U. S. Commission for UNESCO. It was held at the University of Minnesota, September 15-17. Prof. Stewart presided.

Edward M. Miller, assistant managing editor of the Portland *Oregonian*, and Mrs. Miller, both took a trans-continental trip to Cambridge in July when their first grandchild was born (a girl) to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Rein. Mrs. Rein was graduated the year before from Wellesley, her mother's alma mater also. Rein finished graduate work at M. I. T. this summer and took his family back to Oregon. Through the good neighbor offices of Mrs. Miller, the Rein apartment was inherited by a Nieman Fellow of this year.

1943

Edward J. Donohoe recently was named assistant managing editor of the *Scranton Times*. He will continue as city editor in conjunction with his new assignment.

Prof. Arthur B. Musgrave, on a sabbatical year from the University of Massachusetts, is spending part of it in advanced journalism studies at University of Minnesota. His wife, Barbara, was also taking courses there this Summer. But they planned to take the children on a trip to the West Coast before getting back to Amherst.

1945

A. B. Guthrie, Jr., who has done much of his writing (*The Big Sky*, *The Way West*) on a mountain ranch near Choteau, Montana, has now moved back from Kentucky to his native State for year round. On October 1 he was moving his family into a house they have bought at 520 Third Avenue, North, Great Falls, Montana.

1946

Charlotte (Fitzhenry) Robling, now the mother of two children, is putting her fellowship studies in city planning to work in Darien, Conn. She ran for the city planning board this Fall on the Democratic ticket. There aren't enough Democrats to go around in Darien, as Charlotte

knew from her vigorous leadership of the Volunteers for Stevenson there. But her candidacy gave her a chance to perform some public education on what Darien needs in planning.

Arthur Hepner joined the Public Affairs Department of CBS in September to work on documentaries, educational programs and special events. He has just finished a book on Walter Reuther for Houghton-Mifflin publishing.

Irene and James Batal made an overnight visit to Cambridge in late September after return from six months in Egypt where Batal had a research assignment for the American Anthropological Association.

Leon Svirsky, one of the editors of the *Scientific American*, reports his son Peter starting his sophomore year at Swarthmore (he was valedictorian of Chappaqua High School, class of 1952), and his daughter Marcia was graduated at Pratt Institute this year and is now a textile designer in New York.

1947

Gilbert W. Stewart wound up six years as an information officer with the United States Mission to the United Nations this Fall to join the information service of the TVA, which is headed by his old Nieman colleague, Paul L. Evans. This ought to make a good team and good company, down in Knoxville.

1948

Lois Sager Foxhall reports from Memphis, Texas, that she has a family of two children and a third on the way, but still hopes to write.

George Weller writes from the Rome Bureau of the *Chicago Daily News*:

"I was rooming for a week this Summer with Leigh White (1943) in Egypt, picking up stories on Naguib. Leigh has two books on Naguib in the works and probably knows more about Egypt than any other Western correspondent today.

"Charlotte and I are back in Rome, working busily. I've just sold a piece to the *Satevepost* on the relations between China and Russia as allies."

Carl Larsen, assistant city editor of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, has resigned to join the Chicago editorial bureau of *Time Magazine*. Mr. Larsen was managing editor of the London and Paris editions of *Stars and*

Stripes during the second World War, then United Press correspondent in Stockholm until he joined the *Chicago Sun* in 1947.

1949

Elmer L. Holland, Jr., sends the following item from the editorial department of the *Birmingham News*:

"Read a pretty good Dixie joke the other day: Country fellow staggers into town with a jug of mountain dew, meets up with a stranger and asks him to take a drink. Fellow refuses. Country feller points a rifle at him and says, drink. Guy does. Then guy says, 'God, that's awful stuff!' Says the country feller; 'Ain't it, though—now you hold the gun on me while I take a drink.'"

C. Delbert Willis was appointed city editor of the *Fort Worth Press* in September. He had been State editor for the past three years. Willis was a reporter on the *Press* for ten years until the Second World War. He had a rugged war experience that won him a captaincy and cost him a leg and a half. After three years of hospitalization, he learned to operate on new legs during a year as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, then returned to the *Press* where his editing and feature writing have won him numerous awards the past few years. He started as office boy at \$3 a week on the *Press* in 1933 and has been with the same paper ever since, with time out for his war service.

1950

Clark Mollenhoff whose crusading against secrecy in government won him Sigma Delta Chi's award for Washington correspondence last Spring, carried the issue back to his native Iowa this Summer. In a speech to the Iowa Radio Press Association at Iowa State College, Sept. 12, he said that persistent "follow through" by newspapermen is the most effective answer to secrecy in government. An article by Mollenhoff will appear in the next issue of *Nieman Reports*. He serves in the Washington bureau of the *Cowles papers*.

John McCormally, writing politics and editorials on the *Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald*, had a part in breaking the Wes Roberts scandal that cost the Republican National Committee a chairman. An illness in June put him on a diet with slender-

izing results which his wife approves. But their chief concern is the family problem created by the opening up in Hutchinson this Summer of the first TV station in Kansas.

The Claremont (N. H.) *Eagle* announced this Summer that managing editor **Melvin S. Wax** has been appointed assistant publisher, to have charge of all departments and relieve Mrs. John McL. Clark of the close details of the paper's operations.

1951

Virginius Dabney, who takes a gradualist position in his Richmond *Times-Dispatch* on most Southern institutions, recently took a strong stand against having hominy grits served him whenever he breakfasted in what he called "the cotton states." For this deviation, he was all but read out of the South. The final assault came from that unreconstructed Georgia editor, **Sylvan Meyer** of the Gainesville *Times* who suggested that Dabney's unfortunate location in Richmond made him "a near Yankee."

Alice and **Angus Thuermer** send fascinating accounts of setting up housekeeping in Bombay (where Angus is vice consul) during the worst monsoon in 73 years—70 inches of rain in two months. From Alice's last long letter, here are three paragraphs:

"The UP man here, John Hlavacek, has been having quite a big time covering Tensing. He arranged Tensing's series of articles on the Everest climb. John said UP called from London, very anxious that he get something for them even though Hunt and Hillary were tied up with contracts. They authorized him to offer Tensing \$1,000 for his story. Tensing, who must have learned a lot on the top of Everest, wanted four times as much. So the UP said OK. John went up to Calcutta to get the story and while there got a wire from the London office saying they wanted the story to be 'more Hemingway than whambo.' Evidently they decided it was because they came through with a bonus big enough to pay for John's new baby.

"We now get the international air edi-

tion of the New York *Times*, which fills a big gap. Our neighbor across the hall is Homi Taleyarkan, a youngish man who is a member of the Bombay state legislature. He keeps bringing us articles of his. Among them was one on his trip to America two years ago. May I quote from one section: "The average American daily in any city is from 40 to 60 pages; it has several editions and the Sunday edition is at least three to four times the size of the daily. Sensational news more often than not captures the headlines in most papers. Rape and murder stories find prominent headlines. Mr. Taleyarkan, though he was very sympathetically reported throughout, found that the Indian standard of reporting was more accurate and proficient than the American. For instance, he found hardly one single reporter of the many who interviewed him, knowing shorthand. There is hardly any news about India in American papers and what little there is, is hardly ever accurate."

"We've met Frank Moraes, editor of the *Times* of India, several times. He keeps accusing us of thinking like Americans, which I suppose we do. I certainly don't ever want to think like an Indian—they have never learned that a straight line is the shortest distance, etc."

Corinne and **Bob Eddy** finished their new house and got their lively family of four children moved into it this Summer. They started it as a convalescent hobby for Bob after his long siege in a hospital the year before. "It's a joyful thing and I don't regret the thousands of hours we've put into the planning and supervising and decorating," Bob writes. But he looked forward to putting away his paint brushes and getting to writing. "I've had so many writing ideas while painting that I simply must get them out of my system." A key man on the St. Paul *Pioneer Press* copy desk, Bob anticipates taking on some outside reporting this year, saying he feels better than he has in a dozen years.

Dwight Sargent, editor of the Portland *Press Herald*, is president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, which is holding a three day annual session in Bos-

ton and Cambridge, Oct. 15-17. The afternoon of the 16th will be spent at Harvard, where President Nathan M. Pusey will greet the conference and Prof. Sumner H. Slichter and Prof. John H. Williams will discuss questions of inflation and national fiscal policy. Theodore Morrison and Prof. Arthur Sutherland will criticize a group of editorial pages submitted for their analysis. That evening the conference will be guests of the Nieman Foundation at a dinner at the Boston Harvard Club and hear Federal Judge Charles Wyzanski and Edward A. Weeks, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*. A number of former Nieman Fellows will be back in Cambridge as members of the conference.

After a couple of years on assignment in Israel for the New York *Times*, **Dana A. Schmidt** was moved home to the Washington Bureau this Fall under the new bureau management of James B. Reston.

1952

John L. Steele, who covered the 1952 Presidential campaign for the United Press, accepted a nice offer from *Time*, Inc., to move over to their Washington bureau, in July.

1953

The United Press Washington Bureau has moved **Robert E. Lee** up onto the Hill to cover the Senate. Lee for several years was the special reporter on labor on the national scene.

Two Albuquerque *Journal* staff men were spending a day off in Santa Fe when New Mexico's penitentiary riot erupted. Photographer George Kew heard the alarm on his car radio, sped to **Mel Mencher**, *Journal* Santa Fe bureau man, and took him to the prison. Bob Brown also was on the scene and took charge of sidelights. Mr. Kew boasts about the speed of his Jaguar and now the police are credulous after the instant appearance of the out-of-town newsmen.

Mencher has been named chief of the Santa Fe bureau. (E & P, 7/25/53)

Keyes Beech got back to Japan for the Chicago *Daily News* in time to write the background to the armistice in Korea.

A Nieman Institute and Reunion of former Nieman Fellows is scheduled for Cambridge, June 24-25-26, 1954