

NiemanReports

October, 1959

Behemoths of Fleet Street

Donald J. Sterling, Jr.

Television and the Press

Barry Bingham
Malcolm Muggeridge

International Press Institute

Edward J. Walsh

Has the Press Lost Its Influence in Local Affairs?

Alvin J. Remmenga

Invasion of Privacy

Ignaz Rothenberg

Walter Lippmann at Seventy:

Text of his National Press Club Address

Reviews — Scrapbook — Nieman Notes

Nieman Reports

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown Providence, R. I.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, Iowa City; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Boston; Charlotte F. Robling, New Canaan, Conn.; Dwight E. Sargent, Portland, Me.; Kenneth Stewart, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, London; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 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. XIII., NO. 4

OCTOBER 1959

Behemoths of Fleet Street

By Donald J. Sterling, Jr.

An American newspaperman who looks at the British press is struck in the eye at once with big numbers. The British people are the most avid newspaper readers on earth.

Some 30,000,000 papers are sold daily in Britain, and more than 30,000,000 on Sundays. In a country with a population of 55,000,000, that means that practically every adult who is not either illiterate or locked up buys at least one paper every day—and this in spite of the fact that the British press is just about as thoroughly beset with competition from television, radio and periodicals as is the press of the United States.

This circulation is concentrated among a few newspapers to a degree wholly unknown in America. In the U.S. there is only one daily with a circulation of more than 1,000,000, and that is the New York *Daily News* at just over 2,000,000. Britain, on the other hand, has seven dailies in the million-plus class, led by two London giants, the *Daily Mirror* at 4,750,000 and the *Daily Express* with somewhat over 4,000,000. Between them the *Mirror* and *Express* sell nearly one-third of all the daily newspapers in Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Even these circulation behemoths are put in the shade by a weekly, the *News of the World*, whose publishers contest with those of *Pravda* for claim to the newspaper circulation championship of the world. *News of the World* puts out some 7,000,000 copies every Sunday, and at that is down from the peak of more than 8,000,000 it reached in World War II.

These giants plus the relatively tiny *London Times* and *Manchester Guardian* constitute a phenomenon as yet unknown in the United States—truly national newspapers of general content and appeal which circulate daily throughout the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The national newspaper in Britain has been a product of her cramped geography and close-packed population. The whole of the United Kingdom has only as much area as the state of Oregon, or of New York plus Pennsylvania. The country's longest dimension, from the southern shore of England to the northern tip of Scotland, is only 700 miles—about the distance from Portland to San Francisco, or from New York to Chicago.

The result is that one morning newspaper can be and is delivered overnight to all but the most remote doorsteps in the British Isles. To aid this process, several of the London morning papers print in Manchester, in the center of England, as well as in the southern city of London, and one or two of them also have a Scottish edition, printed in Glasgow.

The London morning papers are aided in their domination of the industry by the fact that London is both the political and business capital of the country—Britain's Washington and her New York rolled up into one. Being on the scene gives them a natural news advantage.

There is a provincial press, and in some respects a robust one, but in the face of its national opposition its ranks are thin. There are only a total of 150 daily and Sunday papers in the United Kingdom, and of these only 116 are based outside of London. On the other hand, the country has the quite respectable figure of 1300 weeklies to fill the demand for local rural news.

So much for the quantity of British journalism. It is almost trite, but still true, to say that its quality ranges between extremes considerably wider than those of the American press.

United States newspapers generally try to be all things to all men—to offer such a variety of content that the reader, no matter what his interests, will feel at least fairly well satisfied after he has read his paper. This is not the case in Britain. There social classes are far more rigidly defined, and newspapers consciously plan their content to appeal to one class or another.

British newspapermen and the British public both break down their press into two general categories, the "serious" and the "popular."

The "serious" papers include three of the national dailies, the *London Times* and *Daily Telegraph* and the *Manchester Guardian*, and a large proportion of the provincial morning papers. Their circulations are relatively tiny; the prestigious *Times* has about 255,000, the *Guardian* is just

(Continued on page 27)

A World Forum for Press Freedom

The IPI After Eight Years - Report on its Berlin Assembly

By Edward J. Walsh

Perhaps the most important factor emerging from the Eighth General Assembly of the International Press Institute in West Berlin in May was the growing stature of the organization as a world forum to which its members may take their grievances whenever and wherever the principles of a free press are impaled or imperilled.

In a sense, IPI is becoming more than a world forum. It is being looked to as a court of appeals, especially by independent editors in countries where open discussion is repressed or harrassed. This rising appellate aspect was highlighted when Leslie Hoffman, editor of the *Straits-Times*, flew to Berlin to ask for support for his paper and the Singapore press generally in the face of intimidating tactics from Lee Kuan Yew, leader of the Peoples Action Party, who has since become the first prime minister of an autonomous Singapore.

Acting on the appeal, the Assembly endorsed the decision of its executive board to send a "special observer" to Singapore to make a thorough investigation and report, and also passed a resolution condemning discrimination which would make a journalist anywhere unequal before the law.

The swelling international power of IPI was shown by the record-breaking attendance of some 230 journalists from 29 countries, meeting for frank consideration of common problems in a city where, as Dr. Urs Schwarz, IPI president, put it, the "activity of truly free newspapers faced the stuttering of an enslaved press."

Growing world strength was further pointed up by the fact that every Asian country where IPI has membership was represented; that five South Korean editors flew 10,000 miles to make a statement about freedom of the press in their country and to plead for admission to IPI; that Canada was represented for the first time; and that total membership has passed the thousand mark, with roughly 25 per cent of the members in attendance.

These and other factors represented an amazing advance since April, 1950, when it was announced that 16 editors of foreign newspapers from all parts of the world had been invited to the United States to discuss with leaders of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American Press Institute the desirability and possibility of forming a world press group to promote

Prof. Edward J. Walsh, head of the journalism department at Fordham University, was a delegate to the International Press Institute in Berlin in May. Before leaving he had arranged to do this report for *Nieman Reports*.

better understanding and to enhance the influence of the free press everywhere. The IPI was founded the following year.

Since that time the center of gravity, so to speak, of IPI shifted, first to Europe and now seems to be leaning towards Asia, whose editors, including 12 from Pakistan, took an energetic part in the Berlin discussions. The shift is reflected geographically in the present composition of the enlarged executive board: Europe 9; Asia 5; America 4; and Australia one apiece. Perhaps this shift may have influenced the decision to hold the 1960 Assembly in Tokyo. Asian interest should be further intensified by the Assembly's approval of a plan to set up an Asian center.

It was symbolic that the Assembly met in the ultra-modern Kongresshalle, only a few hundred yards from Brandenburger Tor, the historic gate that separates Free West Berlin from the Soviet-dominated East Sector. There delegates heard Mayor Willy Brandt extol the world's free press, which, he said, had made Berliners feel that they were never "isolated." Significantly, the Assembly gathered together only a few weeks after the release of an important IPI Survey on the control of the press in authoritarian countries.

The assembly dates—May 26, 27, 28—had been set long before Premier Khrushchev had issued his ultimatum that on May 27 he would hand over Russia's occupational responsibilities to East Germany. However, officials stuck to their original time schedule, which proved to be an attendance magnet rather than a deterrent. The atmosphere was reminiscent of the 1954 Assembly in Vienna when Russian troops were still in that city. The sense of expectancy was dissipated when Khrushchev failed to act on his threat, but the delegates felt that they had been "on the scene" at a time of world crisis.

Vigorous panel discussions gave the delegates vivid pictures of the condition of press freedom in South Africa, Austria, Ceylon, Turkey and Indonesia, and illuminated the fact that IPI in the past year had launched protests against restrictions in Hungary, Indonesia, Ceylon, France, Cyprus, Turkey and Australia, in several instances with good results. It might be noted here that an IPI Assembly heard for the first time from black Africa, when His Excellency Edward Okyere Asafu-Abjayce, High Commissioner for Ghana in the United Kingdom, spoke on the immediate future of Africa.

In the panel on Television and the Press, delegates from other countries were able to observe the force of American

self-criticism when Barry Bingham, editor-in-chief of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Times*, said that we have made television the scapegoat of our troubles. He said the American press is going through a period of "doubt, distress and self-examination" and added that its greatest danger lay in laziness and self-satisfaction. He stressed the need of better writing, tighter editing and more attractive display.

On the same panel, but from the other side of the world, Shinichiro Kudo, editor-in-chief of the mass circulation *Mainichi* of Tokyo, said television has made great strides in Japan but supports rather than undermines the press, and has increased the time spent on newspaper reading.

From Britain, brilliant Malcolm Muggeridge, former editor of *Punch*, in a humor-filled talk, said: "The thought occasionally occurs to me that, if the present obsession with television continues, the written word may become unnecessary, irrelevant and therefore obsolete. Mankind may develop square eyes, or, at any rate a single square eye in the middle of the forehead." He said that with all its terrific impact, television was little listened to, and concluded: "Thus it might be that the television cult will rescue journalism from the triviality and sensationalism which have so corrupted it in recent years. It might force journalism to return to an earlier, better tradition by, as it were, siphoning off the excrescences—the cheesecake, the gossip, the overplaying of news stories, to make a more dramatic effect—simply because of the happy chance that, in this field, television is unbeatable. I often think to myself that if the Christian gospels had first been presented to mankind on television, the founder of the Christian religion might well have become a television personality—but there would have been no Christianity. For that, the written gospels were necessary. There is that great, majestic, incomprehensible phrase: 'In the beginning was the word'—but it was a written word, not a televised or a telecast word."

In preparation for the television-press panel, the IPI Secretariat had prepared a comprehensive background report on the impact of television on advertising revenues and circulations, copies of which were distributed.

In the stimulating discussion on Editorial Planning of Newspapers, Sevellon Brown, editor of the *Providence Journal-Bulletin*, declared that intimate knowledge of a community should be the basic ingredient in forming editorial policy; that readership surveys usually cost more than they are worth; and that the editor who asks readers what they want and then patterns his paper accordingly is abdicating his responsibility. Mark Abrams of the London Press Exchange defended surveys, and E. DeCosta of the New Delhi *Eastern Economist* brought up the interesting question of what could be done to produce a new and

simpler type of newspaper for audiences just becoming literate.

More than 200 delegates, many accompanied by their wives, joined the eight-day post-assembly tour, which took them by special planes and trains and chartered buses to Hanover, Hamburg, Essen, Cologne, Bonn, Coblenz, a river boat trip up the Rhine to Assmanshausen, Wiesbaden, Munich, and a coach tour of upper Bavaria, including Oberammergau and Garmisch-Partenkirchen.

The political highlight of the tour was the reception by the Federal Government and talk by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer at the magnificent Petersberg, high over the Rhine just outside Cologne. However, tours of the Volkswagen Works, helicopter flights over the Ruhr Valley, a trip around Hamburg harbor, a visit to the publishing house of Axel Springer, provided a first-hand picture of the spectacular rebirth of West Germany in the past decade. Having had an afternoon's bus tour of East Berlin, the delegates were able to contrast the vitality of Free Germany with the desolate atmosphere of the Red-dominated region.

Arranged by the German section of IPI with the collaboration of West German newspaper, industrial and governmental groups, the tour was a masterpiece of German thoroughness and hospitality. The entire trip, including transportation, the best hotel accommodations, food and drinks, cost each delegate only \$30. Culture was not forgotten—visits to the Folkwang Museum, the Indian Art collection at Villa Hugel, the Cologne Cathedral, even choice seats for "The Marriage of Figaro" in Munich's lovely Cuvillies-Theatre were included. And special arrangements were made for shopping tours for the ladies.

Most of the score or more Americans who comprised the United States delegation under the leadership of Paul Block, Jr., publisher of the *Toledo Blade*, made the trip. Thrown into intimate contact with people from all over the world, they were, as Barry Bingham said, able to check each other's national as well as personal impressions. They found, too, as Paul Block pointed out, the idealism and good fellowship that are necessary foundation stones for greater understanding. All of the delegates seemed to feel, as Dr. Schwarz did, that the assembly and tour helped to create keener realization of common problems and to foster mutual goodwill.

To assess the Berlin Assembly and tour is difficult, but some things stand out. On the positive side, there were the emergence of the Asian delegation as a vigorous force in IPI; the dramatic decision to dispatch at once a special observer to Singapore; greater participation by more groups and individuals; keener discussion of common problems, both in the formal sessions and in informal meetings.

On the debit side, more than one American felt the Assembly would have gained greater prestige if it had granted the appeal of the South Korean delegation for formal recog-

dition of their national committee rather than simply admit individual editors until the executive board is satisfied that the Rhee government will respect the freedom of the press. There was evidence of sharp rivalry, even hostility, between the Indians and the Pakistanis. However, as Sevellon Brown so well said: "Anyone who belongs to any of the (too?) numerous American newspaper organizations knows how difficult it is to weld together a group of individualistic editors into an efficient organization, even when they share common nationality, language and problems. When an organization like IPI attempts to do the same with and for newsmen from all over the globe, the problem is immensely compounded. . . . Yet it seemed plain enough that IPI gradually is learning to cope with its special problems (they never will, of course, be conquered completely) and is growing perceptibly from year to year in strength and effectiveness."

Director E. J. B. Rose of the International Press Institute, makes the following comment, in a letter to Prof. Walsh:

"I am very interested to learn that there was American criticism of our Board's decision not to form a National

Committee in South Korea. I think that subsequent events have more than justified this decision if one considers what the establishing of a National Committee means.

"In effect, IPI is saying when it forms a National Committee that freedom of the press exists in the country concerned. This may have been the case in South Korea for several years until quite recently; but within the last twelve months it has been gravely threatened.

"You may ask why we still have National Committees in countries like Turkey and Indonesia. The reason is that when the Committees were formed there was freedom of the press in these countries and if we were to dissolve them now we should be withdrawing much needed support from our members there in their struggle. In admitting individual South Korean editors to membership we do give them the protection of IPI without deluding our members about the state of press freedom in their country.

"I have written at some length not with the wish in any way to influence what you have written in your admirable article, because I am sure nothing will be changed and it would be a pity if the viewpoint of some Americans were not given, but to explain to you how our minds work in this admittedly difficult matter."

Invasion of Privacy in the Codes of Journalists

By Ignaz Rothenberg

In many countries, the right to privacy in the press is defined by specific rules of ethics or codes of honor, issued by unions or other associations of journalists and based on principles similar to the guides for the conduct of attorneys or physicians. In the case of a violation, the guilty newspaperman may be called to account. Even where such written rules do not exist, certain moral traditions of journalism are strong enough to constitute an unwritten law for newspapermen.

In the United States, the "Canons of Journalism"—adopted by the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1923—declare (in article VI, 1): "A newspaper should not invade private rights or feeling without sure warrant of public right as distinguished from public curiosity." The next article makes clear that the Society of Editors is without the power to compel observance of those regulations, stating: "Lacking authority to enforce its Canons, the journalism here represented can but express the hope that delib-

erate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter public disapproval or yield to the influence of preponderant professional condemnation."

Yet enforcement of such rules is not the only way to prevent violations of privacy in the American press. Each individual editor can easily do it within his office by ordering the reporters to abstain from intrusions into privacy and by instructing the copy editors to withhold such material from publication. It is the right of the editor to lay down the policy of his newspaper and it is the duty of the staff to follow it.

In the journalistic codes of other countries, limitations and controls imposed on the press are more specific and comprehensive. The British National Union of Journalists, in its "Code of Professional Conduct," states: "In obtaining news or pictures, reporters and press photographers should do nothing that will cause pain or humiliation to innocent, bereaved or otherwise distressed persons. News, pictures and documents should be acquired by honest methods only." (art. XI).

Moreover, the performance of newspapers in Great

Ignaz Rothenberg is author of the book, *The Newspaper*, and of numerous periodical articles on journalism.

Britain is supervised by a body called the Press Council, which was set up a few years ago to keep a watch on the press, give its opinion on certain problems in journalism as they arise, and also to censure undesirable aspects of reporting and publishing the news. The Council consists of publishers, editors, reporters and laymen, and is regarded more as a moral than a reprimanding body.

The most extensive protection against invasions of privacy is offered in Sweden by the "Press Club" as the union of journalists is called. According to its rules of publication, except for smuggling cases no names should be published in criminal affairs if a conditional sentence is likely. Besides, when names are omitted no hint whatsoever should be given as to identify nor may reference be made to previous irrelevant or unimportant offenses in order to disparage the principals.

In Sweden there are also restrictions against the publication of the following situations:

Unconfirmed statements about persons named in connection with a criminal offense, or otherwise disparaged;

Suicide or an attempt at it, unless carried out under particularly sensational circumstances, or in connection with a criminal offense;

Moral offenses of a pathological nature, or if the offender is young, but such violations of the law may be reported if they lead to an arrest or are deemed dangerous in some way to the public.

There are a number of rules in Sweden concerning possibly embarrassing secret hearings and statements made to the police, to law courts or to health authorities. Publication is forbidden "until the person against whom accusations are made has been given an opportunity to explain." If they are published, moreover, "emphasis should not be laid, in headlines or other forms of newspaper make-up, on the profession, political or religious views, nationality or race of an accused person when not directly related to the offense." On the whole, the rules of Swedish journalism reflect to a considerable extent the news policy of the press on the European Continent.

The old 'Creed' of Chinese newspapermen is full of ancient wisdom. "Journalism is a sacred profession," it proclaims. "We firmly believe that we should be discreet, kind, considerate and tolerant towards others and that we should object . . . to exposing others' private affairs."

Such principles, defending the right to privacy, have not only been imposed by journalists upon themselves but also put into operation. Unions and other organizations of newspapermen in foreign countries possess a kind of jurisdiction and punish those who violate the code. Special boards, elected for this purpose, generally hear the cases and they may reprimand, fine, temporarily suspend and,

in severe instances, actually expel from their ranks those found guilty. Expulsion means the termination of the offender's employment with the newspaper, since he forfeits his press card without which he cannot work and which usually is issued by the union.

In France, the press card has even greater importance. By a decree of the government (Jan. 17, 1936) a special "Commission of Professional Journalists Identity Cards" was established to pass on their issue, renewal or cancellation. The Commission consists of 14 members: seven representatives of newspaper publishers and seven of professional journalists.

The South African Society of Journalists is empowered to mete out unusually effective punishment. The board that hears the case of an offending reporter has the right to order the action publicized in that newspaper and even in the rest of the country's press. Thus is the offender identified in all papers as a violator of the journalistic code.

Embarrassing or intimate matters are not discussed in open session before a court of law in many countries when both counsel for the prosecution and for the defense agree to the proceedings behind closed doors. Thus the press is kept in ignorance of what transpires. However, this is impossible in the lands practicing English law, for judicial procedure requires hearings open to the public at all times. This goes back to the infamous Star Chamber with its secret and tyrannical methods. Yet in the United Kingdom a simple way has been found to avoid publicity but not resort to secret hearings. Where a person may be embarrassed by publicity, the judge asks the press to withhold names. No newspaperman would dare disregard the court's wish.

In the United States, owing to the broad definition of press liberty, no such situation exists. An American judge would hardly advise anonymity since this might be interpreted as interference with the freedom of the press. Besides, it is questionable whether all court reporters would heed the advice of the judge and give up a news item which might be published in a competitive paper.

Also in countries where written codes are unknown, most newspapers have respect for privacy. When American journalists served on the Continent after World War II, they came to realize the cautious and merciful methods observed by the local press where private matters are concerned. American newspapermen were in charge of some German and Austrian dailies, which the government of the United States published during the occupation, and quickly adopted their policy on news.

For example, this is how the *Wiener Kurier*, the Austrian daily published by the U.S. occupation forces, reported the story of an elopement on March 24, 1954, without betraying identifying details. The verbal translation of the piece as carried in the paper follows:

SHE DOESN'T LOVE HIM ANY LONGER STUDENT SENTENCED FOR ELOPEMENT WITH 15-YEAR-OLD GIRL

Yesterday, a former medical student, 27, stood before a criminal court because he had eloped with Eleanor, a high school girl of 15, to Germany at the beginning of last year. After a few weeks both were seized by the police in Bavaria. She was sent to her parents in Vienna and the student chivalrously accompanied her.

In court, the young man contended that the idea of the elopement had, in fact, originated with the girl who had asked him for "protection." She, graceful and pretty, came up with quite a different version. It was he, she said, who talked her into the escape, but now she is very sorry about the matter because she doesn't love him any longer.

Thereupon counsel for the defense took from his portfolio a photograph of Eleanor which she sent to the student quite recently with the inscription "I love you." Deeply blushing, the girl retorted that it was at her friend's request that she mailed the picture to him.

A medical examination of Eleanor proved that the relations of the couple were purely Platonic. The judge gave him a suspended sentence of six weeks' imprisonment while the university had already expelled him before.

This was the complete story, written and printed under American supervision. At the same time, the report is a typical example of the way intrusions into privacy are avoided in the foreign press. With the exception of the girl's first name, everything is omitted that might lead to the identification of the couple. Thus one doesn't come to know the names of the court or of the judge, nor of the district attorney and the counsel for the defense. Not even the name of the girl's school is revealed, from which conclusions as to the part of the town where she lived could be drawn.

That charitable atmosphere of privacy means that no shadow is cast on the future of the girl and that her parents, already heartbroken by the misbehavior of the daughter, are spared a painful exposure. A child's prank has not grown into a publicized tragedy.

Has the story, by its kind treatment, lost human interest? On the contrary: it has gained by causing no undue harm. The newspapers in Austria were, of course, at liberty to publish any detail not included in the elopement report.

The practice of many dailies in the United States should not be dismissed as the mere blemish of American journalism. It is rather the residue of a rough age which still grip-

ped the New World when the Old Continent had already long basked in cultural achievements. Privacy was then an unknown luxury.

Many papers and magazines still defend the merciless completeness of their reports by proudly saying: "We bring the facts, all the facts." However, since human factors are involved, and public opinion, in growing degree, angrily reacts to violations of privacy by journalists, it may be hoped that the press will one day turn to anonymity in all reports which would harm people who are not newsworthy.

Indeed in the last decades, occasionally a change in news policy has been instituted by some newspapers as the result of publicity being given to an obvious abuse of press freedom. An example may be cited: When this writer criticized in the *American Mercury* (October, 1951) the identification of rape victims by the press, within a month the McClatchy newspapers in California (*Sacramento*, *Fresno*, and *Modesto-Bee*) announced, with reference to that article, in an editorial that in rape cases they would, "effective immediately, drop the names in such reports."

Other newspapers followed suit and gradually, by the end of 1952, the serious press had accepted anonymity when publishing stories on rape. Now only a comparative few, the sensational dailies, still list the names of assaulted women. Thus may public opinion have a healthy impact on the news policy of the press.

Louis Stark Fellowship for Harvard

The Louis Stark Memorial Fund announced September 20 the presentation of approximately \$30,000 to Harvard University to establish a fellowship in the field of labor reporting.

The co-chairmen of the Fund are Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois.

Louis Stark of the *New York Times* was the country's leading labor reporter for many years. He died on May 17, 1954. The Fund was established by fellow journalists and other friends with contributions from employers, labor unions, and individuals.

The fellowship will be called the "Louis Stark Fellowship" and is intended to supplement the Nieman Fellowships which are awarded to newsmen. The award of the Stark Fellowship will be made by the President and Fellows of Harvard College in the same manner as Nieman Fellowships, so far as appropriate and practicable.

Has The Press Lost Influence in Local Affairs?

By Alvin J. Remmenga

To an audience of perhaps 100 million urban Americans, the press is the principal source of news about the municipal government under which they live. The nation's daily newspapers are, in effect, more than 58 million bulletin boards on which are posted what editors believe to be the newsworthy activities affecting the urban community and its residents.

Displayed on the newspaper pages, too, but perhaps not so evident to the casual reader, is the power to sway the opinions and actions of both the general public and municipal officials.

This influence, sometimes advocated in vigorous crusades but more frequently contained in the day-to-day presentation of news and ideas, may at times be difficult to recognize. It may not always be intended, but it does exist.

How important is this influence in the American community of today? Is it used in the common interest of the entire city, or is it more often an outlet for the personal attitudes and ideals of the reporter or editor? How often do newspapers, as a source of information and explanation, meet the challenges posed by new urban problems and modern social conditions? How is the newspaper received by those it attempts to influence or inform? What is the role of the newspaper in urban America, and how has it changed as a participant in the political processes of the city? Or has it changed at all?

A nationwide survey, conducted as part of this study, indicated that all but three of 309 municipal officials, journalists, political scientists and readers believed that daily newspapers were major influences in the affairs of local government. The survey also revealed:

Daily newspapers are no longer considered the commanding voice they once were in the urban community. Sixty-eight per cent of those questioned said newspaper influence on municipal affairs had declined since 1940.

Expansion of the radio and television industries is chiefly responsible for the decline of newspaper influence. Nearly nine out of ten officials and editors who thought the daily newspaper had declined as an urban influence blamed the decrease on radio and television.

Alvin J. Remmenga began newspaper work with the Lincoln (Neb.) *Journal* in 1952, became acting city editor there in 1958. This article is a product of research while at Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, where, on graduation last June, he was awarded a Pulitzer Travelling Fellowship. He is now a copy editor on the Minneapolis *Star*.

Half the city officials, political scientists and readers believe newspapers would be more influential in municipal government if they were less sensational and more concerned about specific issues.

Daily newspapers deserve a scolding for the incompetence of their reporters of urban affairs. Fifty-seven per cent of the city officials and political scientists, most of them in cities where total daily newspaper circulation was less than 200,000, said municipal reporters were inexperienced, uninterested or uninformed on basic government procedures.

The importance of the daily newspaper to its readers is tied to the ability and desire on the part of the editors to inform through interesting, interpretive writing. Ninety per cent of those who believed newspaper influence had increased—most of them editors—said new concepts of reporting and news presentation were the responsible factors.

Another conclusion even more sharply delineated was that the role of the press in the urban community is not the same today as it was before World War II.

"A generation ago," recalled Scott Newhall, executive editor of the San Francisco (Calif.) *Chronicle*, "political pressure was exercised by direct orders from the editor to city hall. Today, news and editorial columns are used as a public voice and as the only means of pressure."

This changing role is part of a trend to more "community responsibility" on the part of the press, suggested Ernest W. Chard, managing editor of the Portland (Me.) *Press Herald-Express*.

"Consequently, newspapers can take credit less obviously for their influence," he noted. "They have fewer scalps at their belts but much stronger communities around them. They share their victories with the community."

But the methods of newspaper influence are not all that have changed in the past 20 years. Neither have the newspapers changed solely on their own initiative. Americans, themselves, are undergoing a sociological and technological revolution at a pace once thought impossible—a pace that could make the fantasy of Buck Rogers a reality within a decade.

The nation's population has grown by 40 million since 1940, with well over two-thirds of the 175 million Americans living in urban areas. Today, there are 39 million married couples in the United States, 37 per cent more than 20 years ago.

Perhaps the more significant ingredients of this 1959-style American revolt are the changing economic and educational standards.

Today, one out of every ten family heads is a college

graduate. Public school enrollments have increased 25 per cent in two decades, and taxpayers are footing a public education bill five times the 1940 total. Keeping the wolf from the door, moreover, is not quite as difficult today as it once was. Half the nation's household heads have an annual income above \$5,000. Five million of them earn more than \$10,000 each year.

In essence, education and new desires are providing fresh horizons for urban Americans; higher incomes and adventuresome spirits with time to roam are bringing those horizons within reach.

"It means," said a Chicago editor, "that the average family of today is becoming more engrossed in a world clogged with social and business activities, a world where there is much less time or interest for the daily newspaper. The family even speaks in terms of television, jet airplanes and earth satellites—phrases that weren't heard in 1940."

Thus, the newspapers—while reaching many of the same readers they did 20 years ago—are meeting the public on different terms.

Before World War II, the urban populace depended primarily on newspapers with a daily circulation of 42 million and 51 million radio sets for the news of the community. Today, there are an additional 104 million radios and 50 million television sets that not only provide another news source, but also take huge chunks of reader time once claimed by the newspapers.

Neither have the newspapers been stagnant during this period, however. Daily circulation has climbed 16 million since 1940, and a survey by the Newsprint Service Bureau showed the average daily newspaper in 39 cities had increased its size from 27 to 40 pages in 17 years.

Yet, newspapers today are faced with much stronger competition for the attention of the public, and not all the competition for an influential voice comes from other communication media.

"The importance of the role of newspapers," explained Charles B. Kopp, associate professor of journalism at the University of Georgia, "has been declining in proportion to the expansion of government, standardization and conservatism of newspapers and community life and the complacency and distractions of the masses."

What part do the daily newspapers play in municipal affairs?

William Randolph Hearst, Sr., who built a newspaper empire, in 1921 explained the role of newspapers with these words: "I rather think that the influence of the American press is on the whole declining . . . Newspapers do not form the opinion of the public; but if they are successful, they must express the opinion of the public."

Today, similar reasoning has led such editors as James E. Kuehn of the Rapid City (S.D.) *Journal* to question

whether newspapers have the power to exert significant influence on their readers.

"While I like to think that they have, I believe there is a question as to whether the press could start or stop a trend," he declared. "The mere fact it reflects what is happening, through its news columns, does not necessarily permit the press to take credit for what results."

There are, however, countless instances in which newspapers claim credit—and perhaps rightly so—for suggesting, encouraging and aiding constructive developments in municipal government.

In Boston, a reorganization and modernization of the city's tax department was completed last year after a vigorous news and editorial campaign by the *Globe*.

In Great Falls, Mont., a water bond issue, with only mild editorial support from the *Tribune*, was defeated; a year later, the project received overwhelming approval after a series of newspaper editorials and explanatory articles.

In Charlotte, N.C., an attempt by the Teamsters Union to organize the city police force folded after the *Observer* campaigned against the drive.

In Nashville, the *Tennessean* hired its own accountant in 1956 to examine city tax assessments, and the newspaper successfully brought about a fairer system of tax increase notifications.

In Pittsburgh, extensive fire prevention measures were instituted last year in the school system after the *Sun-Telegraph* published a series of articles listing fire hazards in every one of the 112 public elementary schools in the city.

Campaigns against crime and corruption in municipal government have won Pulitzer Prize recognition for newspapers in Columbus, Ga.; Indianapolis; St. Paul, Minn.; St. Louis; Atlanta; Miami; Waterbury, Conn.; and other cities throughout the nation.

Even in New York City—where six of nine city officials questioned said newspaper crusades rarely constituted a direct influence on municipal actions—one administrative officer added: "I have been impressed by the really good job that newspapers can do in bringing to the attention of city officials things they don't know or things they don't want to have the public realize they know."

While these examples may indicate the presence of influence, they seldom serve as accurate measuring sticks of the power of the press. That must depend on the individual newspaper and the role in which it is accepted by those who read it.

To the city official, the newspaper may be both a good and an evil, depending on current press-city relations and on what appeared in the last edition. To the political scientist, the newspapers are likely to appear as an interest group or the voice of interest groups such as the downtown businessmen. To the reader, the newspaper may be an intellectual necessity or merely a source of sports scores and

television schedules. The typical American editor may see himself as something of an embodiment of a community conscience.

A study conducted by Michigan State University in four communities indicated that the role of the press varied considerably from one city to the next even though many possible variables remained unchanged from city to city.

Despite these different viewpoints toward daily newspapers, the press is clearly a necessity to the processes of government in the urban American community. Every one of 51 adults interviewed in New York, Connecticut and New Jersey said that, for them, the local daily newspapers were the primary source of news about municipal affairs.

Surveys conducted during newspaper strikes last winter in New York City and Columbus, Ohio, also revealed that the wheels of municipal machinery turn slowly without newspaper publicity. Said Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., fire commissioner of New York City: "Without the press, we could not equal our present public education accomplishments even if our department were increased to twice its present size."

The fact that the business of publishing newspapers is a business that must cater to its customers provides the impetus for the strongest complaint of municipal officials against the press. The newspapers, said half of the 80 city officials surveyed, are continually looking for controversy—something that will interest the reader.

"I think newspapers often are suckers for the fellow who yells loud about something just to see his name in print," complained a city manager in Maine.

A minority of municipal leaders, on the other hand, recognized a conflict of interests between local government and the press. Said Eugene Lambert, mayor of Duluth, Minn.: "Unfortunately, what a government official would like a newspaper to do and what a good newspaper must do to build readership are not always compatible."

Half the city officials and three of every five political scientists said newspapers pursue their own political goals by adding to or subtracting from the personalities of officials and municipal institutions.

The readers agreed that news reports frequently appeared to be slanted, but most gave the practice their approval. Sixty per cent of the 51 readers said that when a newspaper used its news columns to praise or reprimand an individual or institution, the criticism appeared to be deserved.

"I know Robert Moses (New York City's construction coordinator and park commissioner) isn't quite as infallible as the newspapers make him out to be," said a New York City attorney, "but he does have a tremendous knack for getting things done." Newspapers, noted a New York legislator, "do not by themselves make or break a public

official, but few politicians can afford to ignore their influence."

One of the more discouraging trends of the press to the individuals surveyed was the declining number of daily newspapers. Today, the 1,750 dailies represent a decrease of 200 since the beginning of World War II. It has meant, said a third of those questioned, that many newspapers have lost a provocative appeal, both in the news columns and on the editorial pages.

"Newspapers today give more coverage, but they are less aggressive," said Floyd O. Flom, associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. "The monopoly status has taken away the incentive of competition for circulation."

Mayors in Rhode Island, Ohio and Wyoming agreed, and a Georgia newsman said: "Newspaper influence is declining because the trend to monopoly control in big newspapers means the single ownership is anxious not to offend either side in local government issues; the press in many city situations feels safer as part of the power structure of the community than as a critic of those in power."

Editors of newspapers in monopoly cities, however, dispute that reasoning.

An Iowa editor declared the combination of newspapers had ended "senseless competition," and Tom Pugh of the Peoria (Ill.) *Journal-Star*, said newspaper influence has increased "partly because of automatic unification of policy brought about by mergers, and partly because of increased attention to local governmental affairs."

"The greater attention to local government reporting," he added, "is due to a new social consciousness which can better operate under less competitive conditions which exist today."

While monopoly status has permitted many newspapers to expand their news coverage and to become—at least in theory—non-partisan reporters, Jay W. Jensen, head of the department of journalism at the University of Illinois, believes that municipal officials have learned to use this new "uncritical, passive objectivity" for their own advantage.

"In short, the press is viewed by government more as a public relations channel than as something to be feared, assuaged or listened to," he declared.

One-fifth of the city officials and political scientists even complained that this passion for objectivity had filtered into newspaper editorials.

"The newspaper's editorial staff refuses to take a stand on many important government matters," charged a Sioux City, Ia., official; and a Missouri mayor said, "Very rarely is there an editorial on local issues, and if there is, you usually can't tell which side the editor is on."

A study during the first week of April of 12 daily newspapers from the nation's largest cities indicated that mu-

nicipal officials might be entitled to more editorial attention. Of a total of 429 separate editorials, only 149—35%—were on local issues with most others on national or foreign subjects. This reflects, defended one editor, “a new public appetite for national and international news.” Many urban readers might also agree that it reflects the ease of ignoring conditions at home and shouting about the neighbor’s back yard.

Newspapers have also lost influence, said T. F. McDaniel, managing editor of the Emporia (Kan.) *Gazette*, because “the public is intrigued by newer media and they are a bit resentful that they have to cling to their newspapers” for news details and editorial opinions.

But what have radio and television done to the newspaper industry—and its influence—since World War II?

Many daily newspaper editors can point to increased circulation and agree with the reply of a Florida publisher that “it hasn’t hurt us.”

They would receive some support from Philip F. Griffin, chairman of the department of journalism at the University of California, who conceded that newspapers are probably less singularly effective in influencing attitudes than when they held a monopoly in the area of public informing.

Mr. Griffin added, however, that “it is possible that one means of persuasion reinforces another and that all of the instruments of public information have gained in persuasiveness.”

Most of the individuals surveyed, however, thought differently. Of 210 who believed the influence of newspapers had decreased in recent years, 87 per cent cited the expansion of the electronic media as one of the principal causes. Urban Americans, they agreed, are not only spending more time with the radio and television set for entertainment purposes, but more local news is being supplied by those media.

There were clear indications, however, that the public tends to take local television news in the same manner that it takes commercials—away from the set.

The 51 readers surveyed estimated they spent an average of 17.4 minutes with the daily newspaper but a daily average of two hours and 52 minutes with the television set. Yet, less than half the readers said they regularly watched a local newscast on television, and all reported that most of what they knew about their local government was learned from the newspapers.

While television has undoubtedly assumed an influential role as a pictorial and entertainment media in urban life concluded John L. Taylor, vice president of the Boston *Globe*, “the value of facts and figures in black and white, interestingly presented, has a lingering effect on the reader. He can refer to what he still can hold in his hand.”

Even more alarming to many press and government observers than the threat of TV addiction is the spread of a

new urban disease—public complacency about local government.

“The American people,” charged M. L. MacSpadden, mayor of Juneau, Alaska, “have let government get away from them.”

“Why not?” retorted a grocer in Newark, N.J. “The little man doesn’t have much of a chance against the big businessmen and the politicians that run the city.”

Many critics are quick to shift the blame for this feeling of despair and indifference on the communication media. After all, the press is the traditional guardian of the public’s right to know—and that role carries not only the responsibility to inform, but also to interest. But government officials must share part of the blame, Neil Plummer, director of the school of journalism at the University of Kentucky, pointed out.

“Government, at all levels, is fast losing the concept of responsibility to the people,” he said. “The vested interests of government resent efforts of the press to get access to information, and the steady criticism of the press by political leadership is taking its toll in public confidence in the press.”

But how influential are the newspapers to a municipal official? Are they of real significance? Or are they something to be collected along with the pile of complaints and suggestions in a drawer in the city clerk’s office?

The survey of 80 municipal officials indicated that newspapers have a greater direct influence in local government than many editors might believe.

Only one mayor dismissed the newspapers as an inconsequential influence, and 11 other city officials conceded the press was an influence in the community but not directly on them. Of the others, 18 said they considered or sounded out the views of newspapers or municipal reporters on all major issues, 28 said they did on most major issues and 22 said they considered the views of the press at infrequent intervals.

A Louisiana mayor explained, however, that the strength of newspapers as an influence is more democratic today than it was 20 years ago—but not as apparent.

“If an editor hopes to achieve success in a fair proportion of his causes, he must have some public support,” the official said. “That is why I often follow the advice of civic groups even though the newspapers may have advocated their proposal earlier. When the people come to me, I know the newspaper’s proposal carries some weight.”

The relative importance of newspapers also varies according to the size of the city and the type of political institution that exists. For example, said Dr. Charles R. Adrian, director of the Continuing Education Service at Michigan State University, “the political machine in Chicago undoubtedly makes the press less important than in a city with weak political organization such as Detroit.”

Newspaper influence, in addition, depends on how closely

municipal officials must rely on the individual voter for support at the polls. Three of every five city managers, who were not themselves elected officials, and most mayors in cities of more than a quarter million population, said newspapers were not a major direct influence in city government. On the other hand, elected officials of smaller cities indicated they paid much closer attention to the newspapers and what they said.

Yet, the majority of government leaders believed that newspapers produced more influence through distortions, omissions, condensations and coloration of the news than through direct editorial demands and suggestions. Fifty-four officials said most newspaper influence was expressed in this manner in the news columns, 20 said editorials were more influential and six said the influence of editorials and news columns was equal.

To the readers, a newspaper editorial still appears to be the primary source of press influence, but this is frequently an illusion.

Half the readers surveyed said they read at least one newspaper editorial with some frequency, and nearly all of these felt they were influenced by newspaper editorials. Yet, they admitted that—if they already had an opinion on the subject—their point of view generally coincided with that of the newspaper and an editorial rarely changed their mind.

The reader survey in New York City indicated, however, that the limited-circulation weekly newspapers can often claim a stronger influence in matters of municipal government than the large downtown dailies.

Collectively, these specialized papers have a wide audience and a discernible impact. The reason is that these community publications are usually aimed at a definite clientele in a suburb or neighborhood area of a core city, members of a particular ethnic group, a labor union, Negroes, Catholics or Jews. Since they emphasize the interests of these special groups, they are able to call specific candidates or issues to the attention of their readers and discuss them in terms of his interests.

In New York City, 16 of 18 persons who read both a large daily newspaper and either the *Greenwich Village Voice*, the *West Side News* or a labor newspaper, said they received most of the news of city government from the large daily but generally made up their minds on specific issues that affected them after reading the community or labor press.

The daily newspaper that reports a subject in a simple, thorough and objective manner, however, can exercise immeasurable influence both in the news and editorial columns.

"Thorough news coverage of government, plus editorials that take a stand, cannot help but carry influence," said Donald C. Urry, editorial page editor of the *Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette*. An Oklahoma journalism professor added: "If the

newspaper does not carry weight with its readers, the fault is in the superficial, once-over-lightly approach by the paper."

The problem—from a newspaper point of view—is internal, he said. Large metropolitan newspapers have the means to do this type of reporting, and the "small city dailies must provide time and adequate compensation for a skilled reporter who can also be a continuing student of municipal and county government."

F. J. Price, director of the school of journalism at Louisiana State University, put the problem in these words: "Serious as is the problem of access to information at higher levels of government and at some lower levels, it is my feeling that a lack of reportorial industry on the part of many papers is much more serious."

"When a new reporter comes to city hall," said a mayor of a Midwestern city of 150,000 population, "he has no idea at all how the city operates. After he spends a year or two learning, he goes on to something bigger and better. I feel like I'm in charge of a journalism school instead of a city."

Half the mayors and city managers surveyed believed that reporters should have better preparation or more interest in their work. Ten said reporters were sufficiently experienced but not interested in city government, and 28 said reporters were sufficiently interested but without adequate experience.

Charged the mayor of one of the largest cities in upstate New York: "Reporters have inadequate experience and background, and they are prejudiced in their reporting."

"With more drive by reporters," added a Tacoma, Wash., official, "a much better job could be done to keep the reading public informed."

Two-thirds of the 44 college instructors questioned said municipal government reporters were sufficiently interested but not adequately experienced for responsible city hall coverage. Six said reporters were experienced but not interested and eight said reporters had both sufficient interest and experience.

A political scientist at the University of Montana said reporters too often show "a tendency to wait for the news to come to them rather than to look for it," and a University of Vermont instructor said the reporter's instructions from his desk encouraged "inaccuracies and rather bland exaggerations.

What can newspapers do to improve the quality of municipal reporting?

One frequent suggestion was that editors ought to scrutinize their policies on hiring and assigning reporters. Karl A. Bosworth, associate professor of government at the University of Connecticut, suggested that newspapers "pick as municipal reporters people well trained in political science, probably to the Master of Arts level."

Another suggestion was that the academic training of a

reporter should not stop when he gets to city hall. A North Dakota city manager said that all government reporters should be sent to "refresher courses such as those given by Northwestern University to orient them or re-orient them in municipal government." Mayors in California, Alabama, Delaware, Colorado and Idaho made the same proposal.

Despite the many complaints of city officials against the newspapers and those of the press against government, however, many on both sides agreed that newspapers will become of more importance to both municipal officials and the taxpayers as the growing pains sharpen in urban areas.

Newspapers, said Elmer E. White, secretary of the Michigan Press Association, "are awakening to the challenge. They are spending more time and taking a deeper interest in local government so that they can do a better job of interpreting."

The Houston (Tex.) *Post*, for example, was cited by one mayor for its practice of assigning a competent reporter to a single public issue and permitting him time to devote to research, study and writing on that issue.

In Cincinnati, Brady Black, executive editor of the *Enquirer*, noted that "we do many more stories in depth than we formerly did and have a specialist reporting on such problems as expressways, slum clearance and transportation."

Last year, the *Enquirer* sponsored a public service program—Job of the City—to which it brought experts on municipal problems from throughout the country to meet with community leaders from the Cincinnati metropolitan area. The only objective, said Mr. Black, was to awaken public interest in municipal problems and to inform.

"The successful crusade of today," said an Indiana journalism professor, "rests on careful study and analysis, an attempt to enlist interested groups and a support of group action by adequate exposition and argument."

It means that daily newspapers no longer possess the singular influence they once did in municipal government. Their power today is dependent on the actions of their readers, and the strength of the power must depend on the ability of the newspapers to interest and inform the public.

The Non-Articulating Economists

By Henri Maurice Peyre

It is doubtful whether the most vital economic problem facing the United States in the next two decades will be found among the purely economic questions uppermost in the minds of most economists and students of business. The blight of most economics and business studies has been conventionality in thinking and routine acceptance of the state of things around us. A number of catch phrases and of euphemisms have become current substitutes for the exercise of imagination. The greatest service which a body concerned with the economic development of the country can render, is to jolt economic studies out of their complacency, to redefine the aims of economics and of American economy, in an age of plenty and of increased productivity, and to lure to such thinking and such a study a larger number of bold minds standing astride several sciences or disciplines and helping the study of our economy advance on the frontiers of economics, where fertile progress can best be achieved.

Economics has been taught far more widely in this country than in any other and has enjoyed financial assistance, and research and statistical help, undreamt of elsewhere. It has been presented to an increasing number of American undergraduates in a variety of courses; it has attracted many an able teacher on the campuses and many a researcher around the Foundations and the business firms. It has adopted many of the precise methods of science: accumula-

tion of data and of charts, searching analysis of facts and figures, claim to formulate laws and to forecast the future. But it has also tended to admit that most problems are nearly solved when the accumulation of quantitative data has been accomplished. It has distrusted the more intuitive spirits, able to cut through the tangle of facts and figures and to perceive the qualitative aspect of many economic problems, which are primarily human problems, hence fraught with unpredictability. It has thus failed to pioneer with boldness into new realms and to win the faith of the country as a whole in the work, however zealous, of economic experts.

It may well be asserted that, with the years 1956-1960, the first phase of the post-World War II era has come to an end. It has been an era of outstanding achievement, here and abroad, with which American economy and American statesmanship must be credited. A lull is now in the offing. The country is no longer certain that foreign help, the re-arming of allies or of neutrals, an ever increasing budget, the artificial creation of new demand and of new but often flimsy needs, the periodical increase of wages and of the price of steel or of automobiles, can solve most of the difficulties ahead. It is not easily soothed by quieting words and formulas of hollow optimism. Uneasiness is perceptible today and, if one may judge from listening to the young men who will be the leaders of tomorrow, that uneasiness

is likely to deepen. It will be reflected in the attitude of investors and speculators, and may entail consequences of some moment for the American economy.

There is no catchword in such matters. There is not *one* problem which subsumes all others, even less *one* magic solution which an ingenious mind can devise. The complexity of the economic issues in this country is of course too enormous to be susceptible of such gross simplification. But the problems—since they can be mentioned only in the plural—are all, ultimately, problems of men and of brains. No one can foretell in 1959 what the most urgent issue of our economy will be in 1969 or 1979. But one may safely say that we shall only perceive those issues, forecast them perhaps, take anticipatory steps and present them convincingly to the average citizen, if we have men of uncommon ability devoting themselves, without delay, to a more courageous and more independent study of economics than was the case between 1917 and 1937.

Such men exist in the country, but they are not being attracted strongly enough to the meditation of the vital questions facing American economics and American politics. Those who have the monopoly of these studies all seem to be of the same cast of mind. They have seldom come, as would be desirable, from related or even from parallel fields. They tend to think alike, to gather in seminars and committees where good fellowship prevails and where controversial issues are either eschewed or reduced to a pallid common denominator. The country needs writers on economics who would not be primarily economists, and who would probably thus prove better able to present economic issues in fairly simple and in attractive terms to the general public. Those men and women might well be students of history, of philosophy, of law, of literature. They would bring to the examination of economic conditions and issues the freshness of point of view and the independence of mind which marked the great economic thinkers of the past—who were seldom men of narrow specialization or men associated with the world of business. They would perhaps connect economic science with the whole man, that is with emotions, passions, tastes, inconsistencies, psychological and imaginative urges. They might be in a better position to realize (and to impart such a conviction to the public) that economics is in part moral in its purpose and that it must help men live more satisfactorily, which means, not by bread alone, but also with intensity and with the prospects for a better future and for a fuller life.

The men and women who should in years to come devote more of their attention to American economy in its national and international aspects should also be men who would know how to write. Much harm has been perpetrated by the "monstrous regiments of words," as they have been called, aligned by the anonymous authors of collective economic reports in Washington and elsewhere. Those reports

have in their turn to be translated into more concise, if not always less jargonical, English; or they find their dying way into the dustless drawers of glittering filing cabinets, and remain uninfluential. Yet more knowledge of the essential of economics, more appreciation of the magnitude and of the genuine beauty of industrial and business life in America is necessary today if the country is to face some issues with a minimum of competence and not to feel altogether estranged from a small band of technocrats appearing to rule its destinies. As in many other realms of American life, we have gravely suffered here from a breakdown in communication.

This breakdown is very serious in America, and just as serious in the perspective of America's position in the world today. The awkwardness with which business explains its purposes, its methods, its role in our society is taken by many not as naivety or ineptness, but as bordering on hypocrisy. The excessively and needlessly technical language used is looked at with suspicion by a growing portion of the public. The pompous generalities in which the comments on a recession or on a stock market scare are couched fail to carry conviction with even the most uncritical reader and they worsen the condition which their complacent optimism would disguise. It is imperative that greater mutual confidence be restored between the business and marketing firms and the public at large; that decisions which may contribute to a price increase to be passed on to the consumer be explained clearly and frankly through better public relations and with a little more deference to the buyers' opinions and mentality. It is easy for business to make light of the fact that practically all American fiction and drama since 1900 or since 1919 have either ignored the industrialist, the man of affairs, the banker, or have grossly caricatured him. Yet the power of literature, in this age of mass education and of papercover books, is enormous. Industry and trade do not want to subsidize literature and art; they do contribute heavily to university budgets, however; and they should not look unconcerned at the estrangement which separates from them many of the intellectuals in this country, among whom are also many of the political leaders, or of the advisers to the political leaders, of tomorrow.

This country cannot hope to solve its problems in a vacuum. It is today enmeshed in every network of difficulties arising in the five continents and on the seven seas. The most gratifying phenomenon of the age has probably been America's acceptance of its self-assumed and generous responsibilities to the rest of the free world. Yet gratitude, or even the sympathetic understanding of foreigners in Europe, the Middle East, Asia has not been won. Again, the fault lies with the lack of an adequate, eloquent, warm presentation of our aims and of the philosophy and the ethics underlying our technological development. American business, which is tantamount to saying, American life at

its most active, has proved woefully deficient in its occasional and half-hearted attempts at evolving a philosophy which would make it easier for foreigners to understand it, to respect it, to imitate its underlying principles, and not only its practice borrowed as an empty shell severed from its ethical and spiritual content. There is not a single weekly or monthly which persons abroad vitally interested in American economy may receive and read with profit. Their picture of America has to be formed in a second-hand fashion from articles on this country by Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen and Italians.

Half a century ago, Henry Adams declared that the most vital problem for his country was "for the American brain to catch up with American energy." The formula has not ceased to be valid. Too many economists treat the public as children who have to be flattered into buying ever more goods and to be treated to a shallow and systematic optimism, implying that industrial expansion will necessarily con-

tinue uninterrupted. The fundamental problem for American economy today is to rally the imaginative and the intellectual energy of its gifted citizens toward the issues which will arise. A great foundation could do far better than singling out a few issues—be they full employment, the war against inflation, productivity, export of capital and services, etc.—and setting another committee to work on it; enough moles have been produced by such mountains of papers and of figures. It could finance and maintain a paper such as the London *Economist*, non-technical and non-sectarian, broad, intelligent, lively and well written, which would inform many more American citizens of the present and future state of things in their country and abroad, and attract gifted minds to reflect on the problems of their generation and to pose them in new terms, which is the best way of drawing nearer to their solution.

Prof. Peyre is head of the French Department at Yale.

Television and the Press:

A provocative day's session of the IPI assembly in Berlin in May was on television and the press. Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Malcolm

Muggeridge, formerly editor of Punch, were among the speakers. Their talks are given here:

The Square Eye Vs The Written Word

By Malcolm Muggeridge

The thought occasionally occurs to me that if the present obsession with television and radio continues, the written word may become unnecessary, irrelevant and obsolete. Mankind may develop square eyes, or generate a single square eye in the center of the forehead. As what Prof. J. K. Galbraith has so aptly and ingeniously called "the Affluent Society" goes on developing, the increasing leisure thereby made available may be devoted more and more to watching television.

Over considerable areas of the world, print has already largely abolished thought. I do not see why viewing should not in its turn abolish print. However, unless and until this happens we have the two media existing side by side. I was going to add "in competition," but was pulled up by the thought that the masters of the printed word, the newspaper and magazine proprietors and publishers, have prudently insured themselves against television losses by going into business themselves whenever possible, thereby becoming also masters of the visual image.

In my own country, in England, this has recently happened. We used to have a monopoly in the hands of one of the most singular institutions ever to exist since the Holy Roman Empire. I refer, of course, to the British Broadcasting Corporation which may perhaps be described as

begotten by John Knox out of the Bank of England with the Fabian Society intervening. Now this organization—next, of course, to the monarchy—is most dear to me. The sentiment unhappily is not reciprocated. I have in fact been cast off, excommunicated with bell, book and candle, as unfit to contaminate its virtuous little screen. (None-theless I continue like a brain-washed communist to venerate my chastisers and to applaud the logic of my chastisement.) The only reason I mention these little incidents is to make the point that if we are talking of freedom of expression, television lends itself even better than newspapers to utter rigid control in the interest of orthodoxy and conformism. This should be kept in mind.

We have now as a matter of fact, in England, what is laughingly called Independent Television. This is presided over (at any rate nominally) by a former Permanent undersecretary of the Foreign Office, who is apparently always available for such posts as these. Now apart from this fortunate circumstance, the actual ownership of the Independent Television companies is much enmeshed with the ownership of newspapers. For instance that most famous of all newspapers, the *News of the World* (into whose offices I used enviously to peer when I was editor of *Punch*, thinking of all the scoutmasters on "serious charges" who

were going to be immortalized in its columns), has its slice; so have many others. The ones that haven't, like the Beaverbrook newspapers, are forced to solace themselves by complaining in the most high-minded manner imaginable of the large illicit profits of Independent Television and of the degrading character of its productions. Now in the United States, Australia and elsewhere in the free world, a similar situation prevails. Thus commercially speaking, there is no more competition between Television and Press than there is between *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*. (I mean of course, the magazines, not the philosophical concepts.)

Even so, there is no possible doubt that the two media, the visual image and the printed word, have profoundly influenced one another. Take the case of the evening newspaper. In London we have three, each priced twopence-happenny. The office toiler as he makes his way homewards, packed tight in buses and in underground trains, is increasingly disinclined to buy, let alone try to read, an evening newspaper, when on his arrival in the bosom of his family he will see on television the evening news for nothing. When I add that even Public Houses—as sacred in the English way of life as women's clubs are in the American—have suffered a like deprivation from the same cause, you will understand the magnitude of the threat. Morning newspapers are less afflicted. But they too have been forced to take account of the fact that news may well have lost its bloom of television by the time they print it, that prized features may have wilted because of some tedious discussion-programme the night before. That even the seemingly secured territory of the obituary has been invaded, leaving them only with editorials (which, as Sir David Eccles remarked the other day with some notoriety, “nobody reads”) and births, deaths and marriages, which can scarcely be regarded as circulation-builders or advertisement-winners.

What has been the reaction of the newspapers to this, from their point of view, very serious state of affairs? Oversimplifying, I'd list three.

First: attempting to go with the television tide by, for instance, using television personalities as columnists, and giving a massive coverage to television shows, to gossip and controversy about television.

Secondly: attempting to provide a rival attraction to television by neglecting news stories and concentrating on frivolous human interest themes—by, in other words, becoming a magazine.

Thirdly: attempting to meet the challenge by producing more of what television cannot by its nature produce or produce only inadequately, superficially and fleetingly; I mean comment, exposition, the search for the meaning and significance of the contemporary scene apart from its mere presentation.

My own preference, I hasten to say, is point 3, but before

going into that a little more fully, let me say a little word about 1 and 2. With regard to the journalistic exploitation of “televisioniana,” it's a rather barren pursuit. The television personality, in any other respect, is seldom interesting and is, happily, (with one or two notable exceptions) short-lived. When, in a very minor way, this fate befell me I found myself billed in newspapers as “a Television Personality.” A controversial figure, I wrote even more foolishly than usual as a consequence. The only noticeable result of this strained situation was that it became difficult for me to engage in clandestine pursuits—like adultery—for the very simple and cogent reason that in hotels and other resorts where adulterers consort one was immediately recognised, to the embarrassment of all concerned. You may consider that this is one of the few moral justifications for the invention of this terrible thing, television.

Nor, as a matter of fact, in my opinion, can newspapers sustain themselves by providing information about television, which in any case specialized magazines, in England and in America, exist to provide. The viewer views—and having viewed goes to bed—waking the next day to view again—and there is no slack to be taken up in that majestic process.

As for newspapers seeking to be more frivolous, inconsequential and fatuous than television, they will, it seems to me, always be beaten in that contest. As “escapism,” as the soporific, the little screen, making no demands on its addicts—requiring of them only an empty stare—will always win. Compared with it, even tabloids are as ponderous as Kant and even *Time* and *Der Spiegel* are as tough reading as *Hamlet*.

Then to the third point. Here I think there are some grounds for what our Foreign Minister, Selwyn Lloyd, is always describing as “reasoned optimism.” There is so much television *cannot* do, and so much that the printed word can and always will be able to do. With all its terrific impact, television is little *listened to*. During the time that I used to appear on it fairly regularly, I never had one single instance of anyone recalling a thing I had *said*. Television by its nature has to move on; it can mount useless discussions and interviews; but it cannot explain or expound. What, for instance, a brilliant British journalist like Alistair Cooke does in the way of presenting the American scene in the columns of the *Manchester Guardian*—with all his gifts, he cannot begin to do on television (or even on sound radio).

Thus, it might be that the television cult will rescue journalism from the triviality and sensationalisms which have so corrupted it in recent years. It might force journalism to return to an earlier and better tradition by siphoning off the excrescences, the cheesecake, the gossip, the melodramatic overplaying of news stories, simply because of the happy chance that, in this field, television is unbeatable.

Newspapers in Crisis

By Barry Bingham

The American press is currently going through a period of doubt, distress and self-examination. I have never noted so much concern about the future of printed journalism as I have heard at recent meetings of American editors and publishers.

I think this is a very healthy symptom. The greatest danger to the press is laziness and self-satisfaction. The act of soul-searching is good for an individual, and I think it is equally welcome for our profession. It serves to remind us that the press has a soul to be saved, as well as a pocketbook.

There is more reason for concern today than there was in earlier days, when publishers feared that radio might drive them out of business. Newspapers are dying at a rather alarming rate. Where there were 2,500 dailies in 1916, there are now only 1,750. Almost no dailies are being started.

Newsprint cost has risen, just since 1933, from \$41 to \$135 a ton. Salaries among unionized operators have tripled, while hours of work have been cut. Herbert Brucker, the highly responsible editor of the *Hartford Courant*, asks in an article in *The Saturday Review*:

Is the press writing its obituary? Will the cost squeeze continue its ravages until even those newspapers that enjoy a monopoly can no longer survive?

I do not believe the American press is dying—unless it decides to commit suicide. I think journalism is in the grip of a process that is painful to every human being: *the necessity to change*.

This alternation required in our old way of doing things is dictated in part by television. It is known that more American families now own a television set than take a newspaper. TV is a powerful competitor for the advertising dollar, for the attention of the public, and for the responsible task of informing the citizens of a free society. The fact that TV is performing the third function so poorly is no credit to the press, but a sign of failure among television executives who are too timid or too short-sighted to explore the full, powerful range of the new medium.

There are a few obviously superficial effects of TV competition. Most papers are carrying more pictures, and taking more care to display them effectively, in deference to the visual journalism that can be so strikingly presented on the TV screen. Some papers refused at first to carry TV schedules, or demanded space rates for them. Now they are universally used in newspapers, as a form of public service. Many papers carry columns of television reviews, which suffer by the fact that the shows discussed have al-

ready flashed by, to be seen no more, when the criticism is read. There are TV supplements in some papers, capitalizing on the personalities seen on the screen. But TV has not had the basic impact anticipated on American journalism, for two reasons: the failure of TV to exploit its own strength, and the slowness of journalism to take advantage of the new interests and the new reporting techniques the best TV programmes have developed.

Journalism is a basic need of our Twentieth Century society. As Herbert Brucker has said:

Journalism is bigger than ink and newsprint,
Its history is the history of man's strivings for ways
and means to learn what is going on the world.

In America we are confronted with a special dilemma. Our people have *more leisure* than any people who have ever lived anywhere before in history. Yet as they have acquired leisure they have found less time.

At the same time, there is greater need than ever before for the average citizen to be informed. He is expected to understand the meaning of a cabinet crisis in a distant land of which his grandfather never ever heard. Modern communications have brought a torrent of news pouring over the plain citizen's head. The *New Yorker Magazine* (which often says serious things with an air of light banter) has remarked that "America is on the verge of getting news-drunk."

The public has tried to absorb more information about events all over the world than it can carry. The result is giddiness, and an impulse to flee to the realms of simple entertainment. That is the point at which television is picking up strength, and the press is losing it.

I hear many editors and publishers admit that they should furnish their readers with more "hard" news, but excuse themselves by saying that they can't get people to read it. This is a signal admission of failure for any journalist to make.

It is a mistake to set a rigid barrier between serious news and entertainment. It is like saying that a pretty girl cannot have any brains. Serious news can be presented in such a way that it will be readable and understandable to the average newspaper buyer. Such writing has to be done by people of education, who have a thorough understanding of their subject, and should be so clear that it can be understood by a school boy, yet appreciated by a college professor.

Fortunately, the American press has more people of good education working in its offices than ever before. Many papers are developing specialists in various fields of increasing news value, men and women who can write of technical subjects in simple terms. The only trouble with this process is that it is not working fast enough, and not

penetrating deep enough into the field of the smaller papers.

Here I must again quote Herbert Brucker on a factor that is holding back the modernization of the press:

The newspaper business is operating with a technology that is 60 years old in a world in which invention and automation have taken over everything else. It is the relative inefficiency of printing methods that threatens to leave the newspaper behind in the race for survival.

That is the technical side of the problem. Newspapers have devoted less money to research than any other important industry, and they are suffering the effects of obsolescence. Still more importantly, the editorial side has failed to keep pace with a rapidly changing world.

Mr. Brucker has advice for journalists who want to meet the challenge of change. He believes every newspaper should start with these three steps:

1. Rethink its mission in today's world.
2. Modernize its editorial methods to match.
3. Revive the underlying moral purpose of journalism.

These reforms would be worthwhile, and indeed necessary, if a picture had never been flashed upon a television screen. In searching for a new pattern of performance, the press can use TV competition as a means of measuring its effectiveness.

Television has caused some surface changes in American life. People spend more time at home now, especially in the evening. Motion pictures are drawing fewer customers. Book sales are in a decline (though the rising cost of publishing hard-cover books must share in the blame).

Some people feared that television would build up a new race of demagogues, capable of mesmerizing the public by their performances before the cameras. Yet the most dangerous American demagogue of our time, Senator McCarthy, was destroyed by television! The most effective attack on McCarthy was made by television's Edward R. Murrow, who challenged the Senator before an audience far larger than any that would have read a written catalogue of his sins. And McCarthy himself gave his own reputation the *coup de grace* when he appeared before television cameras, with his henchmen at his side, during his trial by a Senate committee. His baleful countenance, his air of brutality and contempt, and his efforts to browbeat witnesses turned millions of Americans against him who had previously thought him a rough but dedicated fighter against Communism.

Television has its own built-in limitations. It is supported by commercial sponsors, whose interest is in reaching a

mass audience. They are concerned with not offending the viewer, rather than with trying to shape his taste, his ideas, or his political convictions.

The industry is ridden by a system of "ratings." These are figures compiled by self-styled experts on public opinion. They check a tiny portion of the television audience and report the proportion viewing each individual program. Their word has the power of life and death. If a program is not attracting a heavy proportion of viewers, it soon gets the axe from its sponsor. There is no effort to measure the quality of an audience. Quantity is the only factor that counts. This system sets a pattern of terrible monotony. If one Western programme gets a high "rating," all other sponsors want cowboy-and-Indian programs as well. Last year they were all competing for quiz shows, until the fad collapsed in a welter of scandal.

The press has lost to radio and television the first impact of a news event from a newspaper these days. But that is no excuse for the press to stop covering news. It is, on the contrary, an imperative for covering the news better, more fully, and in greater depth. *Newspapers must do what television cannot or does not do.*

Yet some journalists have not yet adjusted to this new order of things and continue to make up their front pages as though they were in frantic competition with a paper down the street that went out of business ten years ago. The need now is not for news "breaks." It is for *accurate, understandable, well-written news reports.*

Many journalists feared that people would not want to read about news events they had already seen take place on the television screen. This theory has been effectively blasted. The political conventions of 1932 kept people up almost all night watching developments on the screen; yet the next day they bought more papers than usual. They wanted to check their impressions in print, and to read what well-informed observers thought about the events they had witnessed. The same holds true for major sporting events, which television covers with great effectiveness.

There is a stronger need than ever before for editorial comment, which TV almost never attempts. Hurried readers need the opinion of writers who have read more widely than they have, and who have trained their minds to analyze and explain the news events.

Newspapers have received an unearned bonus in the timidity and lack of imagination of broadcasters. There are occasional serious programs of information on commercial television. But Edward R. Morrow, himself the most notable of U. S. television journalists, has complained that these programmes are huddled into what he calls the "intellectual ghetto" of Sunday afternoon. Not one of them has been given a choice spot on a weekday night, when the audience is at its peak.

The impact of television only serves to stress an already existing need for better writing on newspapers, tighter editing and a more attractive display of printed material.

The last point is important because of the visual impression made by TV. The modern newspaper must invite the eye of the reader. Pierre Lazareff of *France Soir* has told of a French Minister of Information who proposed that "all newspapers should appear with the same format, the same typography, without illustrations, and with one-column headlines only. They should report only those events likely to improve civic spirit."

This surprising formula caused Lazareff to ask: "And if they no longer have any readers?"

To which the minister replied with conviction: "That would be ideal."

The official had found one sure means of killing off the press. In order to maintain its health, the press needs to work hard in the opposite direction, toward a distinctive

and individual appearance, and toward the quality of style to which readers react positively without even knowing the style is there. Of course they must also try to cover the whole gamut of news, no matter how distasteful some of it may be to some government officials.

There are still readers who will plow through the densest jungle of type, but I fear they are a dying race. Younger readers simply have no will to force their way to the heart of so much darkness. It is absolutely essential for journalists to make their product more appealing, more magnetic, more enjoyable to younger readers. If we fail, we in America at least will be confronted in a few years by a generation that absorbs all its information through sounds and pictures.

That is to my mind the serious challenge to the press of our time, more ominous than the rising cost of production, more threatening by far than any competition television will ever offer. If we fail, the failure will be our own, not a triumph earned by a competitive medium.

Letters

Opus Dei in Spain

To the Editor:

I am certain of the high standards of competency and integrity of Nieman Fellows in the field of journalism. As statements about Opus Dei in your October *Nieman Reports* depart from these standards, I wish to call to your attention some facts about our Institute.

The article entitled "Censorship in Spain" by Peter Sand, a pseudonym, makes reference to Sr. Arias Salgado, the present Minister of Information in Spain, as a member of Opus Dei. This person does not belong nor has he ever belonged to our Institute. Moreover, no member of the Work participates in the management

of the censorship of the press in that country.

On the contrary, various members of the Institute have suffered the consequences of this censorship. Among them, the editor of *Diario Regional* of Valladolid, who a few months ago was forced to give up his position, a fact that was reported outside of Spain at that time.

Opus Dei is a Secular Institute of the Catholic Church, approved by the Holy See, whose ends and means are perfectly public and known not only by the ecclesiastical authorities but also by the civil authorities in all the dioceses and countries where the Institute works. Moreover, no member of Opus Dei makes any secret or mystery about the different pontifical documents which determine the nature, the spirit, and the ends, etc. of Opus Dei

and of other Secular Institutes. (Apostolic Constitution "Provida Mater Ecclesia" of February 2, 1947; Motu proprio "Primo Feliciter" of March 12, 1948; and the Instruction "Cum Sanctissimus" of March 19, 1948.) All of these documents are public and are within the reach of those who desire to consult and study them; and to be perfectly honest, it is advisable that any person be acquainted with these documents before daring to make judgments if he wishes to inform well.

I trust you may take the necessary steps so that your readers will be properly informed about our Institute.

(Very Rev.) IGNATIUS GRAMUNT
2132 Wyoming Ave. N.W.
Washington 8, D.C.
The Press-Enterprise, Riverside, California.
Aug. 5.

Walter Lippmann's Birthday Address To the National Press Club

I do not think that I need to tell you that standing on this famous platform I feel awkward and shy. I have never done anything like this before and I cannot altogether believe that it is happening to me.

What is more, I know that I cannot put into words how much this party means to me. On a day like this a man wants to have his heart warmed, and nothing does it so well as to be surrounded by his friends. And if he is a newspaper man, nothing is so sweet as the good opinion of his fellows. So, when I say thank you, please put yourselves in my place and you will know how I feel and what I would like to say.

When Pete Edson and Bill Lawrence invited me, they said that I should talk about the newspaper business. I shall do that. But I hasten to say that I do not feel old enough to inflict upon you my reminiscences, and that I do not feel inspired enough to prophesy what is going to be the shape of the newspaper business in the years to come. I would rather talk about the job of being a Washington correspondent today, about what it is that we are trying to do, and why it is necessary and important as well as interesting to make a life work of it.

The job has changed and developed and grown in my own lifetime, and if I had to sum up in one sentence what has happened, it would be that the Washington correspondent has had to teach himself to be not only a recorder of facts and a chronicler of events, but also—if I may put it that way—to be a writer of notes and essays in contemporary history. Nobody invented or consciously proposed this development of the newspaper business. It has been brought about gradually by trial and error in the course of a generation.

I think it is reasonably accurate to say that the turning point was the great depression of 1929, and the revolutions and the wars which followed it. Long before 1929 there were, of course, signed arti-

cles, essays, criticisms, columns of comment in prose and in verse, and all manner of expressions of personal opinion. But I think it is correct to say that the modern Washington correspondent, which of course includes news analysts and columnists, is a product of the world-wide depression and of the social upheaval which followed it, and of the imminence of war during the 1930s.

The unending series of emergencies and crises which followed the economic collapse of 1929 and the wars of our generation have given to what goes on in Washington and in foreign lands an urgent importance. After 1929, the Federal Government assumed a role in the life of every American and in the destiny of the world, which was radically new. The American people were not prepared for this role. The kind of journalism we practice today was born out of the needs of our age,—out of the need of our people to make momentous decisions about war and peace, decisions about the world-wide revolutions among the backward peoples, decisions about the consequences of the technological transformation of our own way of life right here in this country. The generation to which I belong has had to find its way through an uncharted wilderness. There was no book written before 1930, nor as a matter of fact has any been written since then, which is a full guide to the world we write about. We have all had to be explorers of a world that was unknown to us and of mighty events which were unforeseen.

The first presidential press conferences I attended were during the administration of Woodrow Wilson before this country became involved in the First World War. These press conferences were small, as a few of you may remember, so small that they were held in the President's own office with the correspondents standing about three or four deep around his desk. When the conference ended, the President would not leave the room but would sit back in his chair, and those who wanted

to do so would stay on a bit, asking him to clear up or amplify this or that piece of news.

The little group who stayed on consisted of those who were not concerned primarily with the raw news of announcements and statements in the formal press conference. The wire services would take care of them anyway. They were concerned with explaining and interpreting the news. They were the forerunners of the Washington correspondent today.

For these correspondents and their editors in the home offices were coming to realize from practical experience that the raw news as such, except when it has some direct and concrete personal or local significance, is to the newspaper readers for the most part inedible and indigestible. The raw news has, therefore, to be processed in order to make it intelligible. For if it is not intelligible, it will not be interesting. And if it is not interesting, it will not be read.

It goes without saying that in a democracy like ours it is an awful responsibility to undertake the processing of the raw news so as to make it intelligible and to reveal its significance. It is such a great responsibility, it lends itself so easily to all manner of shenanigans, that when I can bear to think about it, I console myself with the thought that we are only the first generation of newspapermen who have been assigned the job of informing a mass audience about a world that is in a period of such great, of such deep, of such rapid, and of such unprecedented change.

The newspaper correspondents of this generation have learned from practical experience that the old rule of thumb about reporters and editorial writers, about news and comment, does not fit—or rather, I should say, it oversimplifies—the nature of the newspaperman's work in the modern world.

The old rule is that reporters collect the news, which consists of facts, and that the editorial page then utters opinions ap-

proving or disapproving of these facts.

Before I criticize this rule, I must pay tribute to its enduring importance. It contains what we may call the Bill of Rights of the working newspaperman. It encourages not only the energetic reporting of facts. It encourages the honest search for the truth to which these facts belong. It imposes restraints upon owners and editors. It authorizes resistance, indeed in honor it calls for resistance, to the contamination of the news by special prejudices and by special interests.

It proclaims the corporate opposition of our whole profession to the prostitution of the press by political parties and by political, economic and ideological pressure groups, and by social climbers and by adventurers on the make.

But while the rule is an indispensable rallying point for maintaining the integrity of the press, the practical application of the rule cannot be carried out in a wooden and literal way. The distinction between reporting and interpreting has to be redefined if it is to fit the conditions of the modern age.

It is all very well to say that a reporter collects the news and that the news consists of facts. The truth is that in our world the facts are infinitely many, and that no reporter can collect them all, and that no newspaper could print them all—even if they were fit to print—and nobody could read them all.

We have to select some facts rather than others, and in doing that we are using not only our legs but our selective judgment of what is interesting or important or both.

What is more, the relevant facts often exist far away, and out of sight of any newspaperman, as for example the condition of the military balance of power in the world today. You cannot go and look at the balance of power, you have to deduce it and to calculate and appraise it. The relevant facts may occur in places that the reporter cannot visit as for example Red China—and then the facts have to be inferred and imagined from second-hand reports. The facts may lie in the past. Then they have to be recovered and reconstructed, as for example the story of how we got into our predicament in Berlin. The facts may lie inside the head of a public man which, like Mr.

Khrushchev's head, is not open to private inspection. The facts may lie in the moving tides of mass opinion, for example about the coming elections which are not easy to identify and to measure.

Under these conditions reporting is no longer what we thought of it in much simpler days. If we tried to print only the facts of what had happened—who did what and who said what—the news items would be like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle thrown in a heap upon the table. The unarranged pieces of raw news would not make a picture at all, and fitting them together so that they do make a picture, is the inescapable job of a Washington correspondent.

However, very quickly, I hasten to say, the analogy of the jigsaw puzzle breaks down. Indeed, like most analogies, it is rather dangerous. Our job is harder than it implies. In real life there is not, as there is in every jigsaw puzzle, one picture and one picture only into which all the pieces will eventually fit.

It is the totalitarian mind which thinks that there is one and only one picture. All the various brands of totalitarianism, violently as they differ among themselves, have this in common. Each holds that it has the key and pattern of history, that it knows the scheme of things, and that all that happens is foreseen and explained in its doctrine.

But to the liberal mind this claim—like any other human claim to omniscience—is presumptuous and it is false. Nobody knows that much. The future is not predetermined in any book that any man has written. The future is what men will make it, and about the present, in which the future is being prepared, we know something but not everything, and not nearly enough.

Being newspapermen in the American liberal tradition, the way we interpret the news is not by fitting the facts to a dogma. It is by proposing theories or hypotheses which are then tested by trial and error. We put forward the most plausible interpretation we can think of, the most plausible picture into which the raw news fits, and then we wait to see whether the later news fits into the interpretation. We do well if with only a little amendment, with only a minor change of the interpretation, the later

news fits into it. If the later events do not fit, if the later news knocks down the earlier story, there are two things to be done. One is to scrap the theory and the interpretation, which is what liberal, honest men do. The other is to distort or suppress the unmanageable piece of news.

I have been talking shop. I have been talking about the inwardness of the know-how of our job, and not about the practical problems which all of us wrestle with in our daily work.

Last summer while walking in the woods and on the mountains where I live I found myself daydreaming about how I would answer, about how I would explain and justify, the business of being opinionated and of airing opinions regularly several times a week.

Is it not absurd, I hear the critic saying, that anyone should think he knows enough to write so much about so many things? You write about foreign policy. Do you see the cables which pour into the State Department every day from all parts of the world? Do you attend the staff meetings of the Secretary of State and his advisers? Are you a member of the National Security Council? And what about all those other countries which you write about? Do you have the run of 10 Downing Street, and how do you listen in on the deliberations of the Presidium in the Kremlin?

Why don't you admit that you are an outsider and that you are, therefore, by definition an ignoramus?

How, then do you presume to interpret, much less to criticize and to disagree with, the policy of your own government, and for that matter of any other government?

And in internal affairs—are you really much better qualified to pontificate? No doubt there are fewer secrets here, and almost all politicians can be talked to. They can be asked the most embarrassing questions. And they will answer with varying degrees of candor and of guile. But if there are not so many secrets, you must admit that there are many mysteries. The greatest of all the mysteries is what the voters think, feel and want today, what they will think and feel and want on election day, and what they can be induced to think and feel and want by argument, by exhortation, by threats and

promises, and by the arts of manipulation and leadership.

Yet formidable as it is, in my daydream I have no trouble getting the better of this criticism, and you, my dear fellow, I tell the critic, you be careful. If you go on, you will be showing how ridiculous it is that we are a republic and that we live under a democratic system and anyone should be allowed to vote. You will be denouncing the principle of democracy itself, which asserts that the outsiders shall be sovereign over the insiders. For you will be showing that the people themselves, since they are ignoramuses because they are outsiders, are therefore incapable of governing themselves.

What is more, you will be proving that not even the insiders are qualified to govern them intelligently. For there are very few men—perhaps 40 at a maximum—who read, or at least are eligible to read, all the cables that pour into the State Department. And then, when you think about it, how many Senators, Representatives, Governors and Mayors—all of whom have very strong opinions about who should conduct our affairs—ever read these cables which you are talking about.

Do you not realize that about most of the affairs of the world we are all of us outsiders and ignoramuses, even the insiders who are at the seat of government? The Secretary of State is allowed to read every American document he is interested in. But how many of them does he read? Even if he reads the American documents, he cannot read the British and the Canadian, the French and the German, the Chinese and the Russian. Yet he has to make decisions in which the stakes may well be peace or war. And about these decisions the Congress which reads very few documents has to make decisions too.

Thus, in my daydream I reduce the needler to a condition of sufficient humility about the universal ignorance of mankind. Then I turn upon him, and with suitable eloquence declaim an apology for the existence of the Washington correspondent.

If the country is to be governed with the consent of the governed, then the governed must arrive at opinions about what

their governors want them to consent to. How do they do this?

They do it by hearing on the radio and reading in the newspapers what the corps of correspondents tell them is going on in Washington and in the country at large, and in the world. Here we perform an essential service. In some field of interest we make it our business to find out what is going on under the surface and beyond the horizon, to infer, to deduce, to imagine and to guess, what is going on inside, and what this meant yesterday, and what it could mean tomorrow.

In this we do what every sovereign citizen is supposed to do, but has not the time or the interest to do for himself. This is our job. It is no mean calling, and we have a right to be proud of it, and to be glad that it is our work.

Lippmann at 70

WALTER LIPPMANN AND HIS TIMES, edited by Marquis Childs and James Reston. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 246 pp. \$3.95.

Walter Lippman was 70 on Sept. 23. His column came out as usual. But also a book of appreciation of his 50 years contribution to American journalism and American thinking, by colleagues and competitors of Lippmann. Marquis Childs and James Reston thought of it and do the strategic opening and closing chapters. They are joined by ten others, George Kennan, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur Krock, Carl Binger, Reinhold Niebuhr, Allan Nevins, Iverach McDonald, Frank Moraes, Raymond Aron, Harry Ashmore.

Inclusion of Aron from France, Moraes from India and McDonald from England appropriately indicates Lippmann's place as a world figure.

The purpose of the book is appreciation and recognition of the incomparable position Lippman holds in journalism. The contributors vie in their respect and affection for the qualities that distinguish his newspaper columns and his philosophical books. His utter independence, his rare detachment, his matchless capacity

to understand, analyze and describe complex public issues—these distinguishing traits of our foremost political writer are eloquently set forth.

For those who have come to their own appreciation of Lippman through the years that he has been a household name, certain of the chapters are more rewarding than others.

Mark Childs opens with a most informing profile that makes one wish he had gone on to do a full biography. Kennan tells of Lippmann's early adventure with the *New Republic* when it was new. In this period he first dealt with the Russian revolution and American policy about it.

Allan Nevins tells of Lippmann's editorship of the *New York World* where Nevins himself was an associate. This is a bright bit of journalistic history, besides its insights into Lippmann's adaptation to the one newspaper job in his career.

Reston's is a very personal account of Lippmann's work habits and his life in Washington. The description of Lippmann's day is itself a revelation of the disciplined mind, and the man who has learned how to live and deal with the world, yet keep it at arm's length. Schlesinger, as historian of Lippmann's era, does a critical review of the positions the columnist has taken, in relation to the events of his time.

Krock's chapter relates personal journalism from the time of Greeley and Halstead, as a setting for Lippmann's role.

Aron, who writes political pieces in Paris, reminds us how unique to America is the columnist, for the very practical reason that only America is big enough for syndication. Paris and London papers expect to cover their countries from the capital and don't want their writers duplicated in their provincial competition. Aron says candidly that Lippmann has more freedom than a French writer to say all that he wishes on a subject. Moraes, writing from India, where he first met Lippmann says:

"It is his intellectual honesty and disinterested approach, combined with a basic concern for the people's good rather than for a government's survival or favor, which makes Lippmann a con-

spicuously respected political commentator in India."

Rheinhold Niebuhr, as a philosopher, finds points to argue on the premises of Lippmann's philosophy. But he concludes with emphasis on the political education Lippmann has contributed to the American people.

Ashmore recalls that Lippmann, in a talk to the Nieman Fellows, said he felt the responsibility of a columnist was to discuss public affairs in such perspective that his readers would not be too surprised by the news.

Ashmore finds Lippmann unique among journalists, for his "massive detachment." "Lippmann operates on the premise that a man who understands the past and views the present without passion, ought to be able to call the turn on the future. . . . It might be contended that all Lippmann really advocates is general enlightenment. . . . This concept has produced a style of writing admirably adapted to it. . . . He has been an apostle of excellence in an era of the common denominator, and it is, I think, a matter of more than my own professional concern that his tribe is decreasing."

This is a fine book to have. Its writers, in their appreciations of Lippmann's qualities, reveal their own feelings about the job of journalism, the principles that should guide it, the high calling it can be at its best.

This reader missed the story of Lippmann's analysis, with Charles Merz, of the American press performance on the early days of the Russian revolution, which was a strategic work that changed the pattern of American reporting on the Soviets. It would have been satisfying, too, to have a full chapter on his early association with Lincoln Steffens, that must have been a germinal experience. But one can't have everything in one book. The Lippmann book is a journalistic landmark, and a timely reminder that, as Arthur Schlesinger says, "His age stands deeply in his debt."

—LOUIS M. LYONS



Bibliography of Journalism

THE LITERATURE OF JOURNALISM. Compiled by Warren C. Price. University of Minnesota. 489. \$10.

This is a massive compendium of what has been written on journalism and by and about journalists. Just the listing of such works, with brief descriptions, makes a 489 page book and a big book, 9 by 6 pages. The index alone runs 54 pages.

It makes impressive documentation of the enormous development of journalism as an area of study, and a field for criticism, history and biography.

Its compiler is a professor of journalism, and certainly the professors of journalism have produced a great part of the titles herein listed, during the half century of such schools. It would be an interesting exploration to compare the character of their output with the books on and by the journalists of Britain, which has no parallel system of journalism schools.

It is 35 years since the publication of what Professor Price rates as the major bibliography in the field. This one was by a librarian, Carl L. Cannon of the New York Public Library. It may be significant that what was then a librarian's chore has now been taken over by a journalism professor. He is not of course the first in the field. In fact he says that his bibliography is in considerable part an expansion of *The Journalist's Bookshelf* by Professor Roland E. Wolseley of Syracuse University, which went through six editions from 1939 to 1955.

This is, in any case, the most comprehensive such listing. The field itself has expanded and subdivided, so that Professor Price finds he needs 13 divisions of his book lists. These include such headings as "Radio and Television," "Management of the Press," "Techniques of Journalism, including Textbooks," "Appraisals of the Press, Ethics of the Press and Law of the Press." Besides "History," and "Biography," Professor Price has a division on "Narratives and Anthologies." The area of "Journalism Education and Vocational Guidance" is the smallest, with a modest 36 listings.

Unlike Wolseley, Price has broadened his work even beyond the multicellular

growth of the subject. For he has explored such works as Sandburg's *Lincoln*, Partridge's *Main Currents in American Thought*, and Commager's *The American Mind*,—even the *Cambridge History of American Literature*—for their references to journalism and journalists. This suggests almost infinite dimensions. But he has stopped short of Dickens' *Eatons-will Gazette*, and other fancies of fiction.

The vast range of the book is undoubtedly matched by its value as reference to all who need often to find their way to sources in the field.

I found some difficulty with this, however, which I lay largely to the multiple divisions of the book.

The work of the great cartoonists, Low and Nast, come under "Biography." Low wrote his own. Albert Bigelow Paine wrote Nast's. But to find Herblock, I had to go to "Narratives and Anthologies." Similarly to find Fitzpatrick.

If one is going to divide journalism 13 ways, I would want one of them to be on cartoons and cartoonists; and most personal narratives would seem to come close enough to classifying as biography.

In such an attenuated bibliography, the index is the only safe place to look. Even with the elaborate index, I was a long time finding the great history of the *London Times*. The first five references, on the top line, which I took to be all the general references, proved to be something else. It was only because Professor Price in his own foreword mentions its great quality, that I persisted and eventually found it. Through a long search, I was convinced that *Your Newspaper*, a book by nine Nieman Fellows of 1946, was not included, because I could not find it listed under "Appraisals of the Press" where I thought it belonged, nor indexed under its title. But my wife, with more perseverance found it under "Techniques of Journalism" and indexed under the name of its editor, Leon Svirsky, which is fair enough, once you get on to the system. So I will not cavil at so vast an enterprise which is certainly the most complete guide anywhere to sources on journalism.

LOUIS M. LYONS.

The Voters' Choice in the Bay State

By John F. Kennedy

MASSACHUSETTS PEOPLE AND POLITICS, 1919-1933. By J. Joseph Hutchmacher. Illustrated. 328 pp. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. \$6.50.

By John F. Kennedy

Few books that have appeared in recent months have a more vivid historical backdrop than this. Trained at Harvard under Oscar Handlin and now a member of the History Department at Georgetown University, J. Joseph Hutchmacher explores in these pages the evolution of the modern Democratic coalition in Massachusetts. In its theme this book is an extension of Mr. Handlin's path-breaking *Boston's Immigrants*, which analyzed the social and political integration of new immigrants during the nineteenth century. The fluid nature of the new immigrant vote after 1919 and its gradual absorption into the Democratic party lie at the core of Mr. Hutchmacher's study.

As a work of political analysis the book is generally first-rate, as literature the study is curiously flat, and one-dimensional. To be sure, there is a temptation to overstate the surface throb and color of Massachusetts politics carried on in an arena that included James Curley, David I. Walsh, John F. Fitzgerald, Henry Cabot Lodge, Martin Lomasney, not to mention such leaders of thought from private life as Felix Frankfurter and A. Lawrence Lowell. Nevertheless, Mr. Hutchmacher's literary austerity, especially in his character sketches, does seem excessive and raises a barrier for many who might otherwise read this book.

Too often we think of the politics of the Twenties as a kind of modern Dark Age. All too easily our thoughts carve out the era between Inauguration Day 1921 and Inauguration Day 1933 as a period of total suspension in America's progress, during which a general torpor gripped the nation. A few critics will concede a small surge of emotion and activity in the election of 1928, but this election is generally cited as the exception. We forget that in many features Progressivism

was already blighted in 1917, whereas the New Deal was taking root in several states such as Wisconsin, New York and Massachusetts even in the early Twenties.

The book opens with the election of 1920 in Massachusetts, representing in its starkest form the "politics of post-war disillusion." Almost all of the newer immigrant groups—the Italians, the Greeks, the Armenians—as well as the Irish-Americans turned decisively against the Democratic party. The hopes of many small nations were dashed at the Paris peace table, and a powerful ethnic coalition expressed its protest. Warren G. Harding carried Massachusetts by 405,000 votes with Gov. James M. Cox receiving less than 30 per cent of the total Presidential vote in Massachusetts. The Democrats were also decisively defeated in the gubernatorial and Congressional vote.

Yet it illustrates the unusual alchemy of Massachusetts politics that within two years the Democrats increased their share of the two-party vote for Governor by nearly 15 per cent, and Senator Lodge was barely re-elected. Though the Democrats enjoyed only one major victory before 1928, there was thereafter vigorous two-party competition in the state. The Democratic coalition continued a slow cellular growth, while the Republican organization became more rigidified by its reliance on the traditional "escalator" which carried mostly figures of old Yankee stock.

The author describes very well the ebb and flow of the political tide in Massachusetts during the Nineteen Twenties and the slow erosion of the dominant Republican position. From this recital the author does not, however, attempt to draw a unified thesis, nor does he indicate very clearly the degree to which the economic changes in the commonwealth were responsible for political shifts. In general he places the emphasis on personal leadership, and particularly the remarkable success Al Smith enjoyed as a national candidate and the conservative David I. Walsh as a state candidate.

The year 1928 is the highpoint of the

book, since it gave to the Democrats of Massachusetts a new elan and a hero whose influence can still be felt in the environment and temper of Massachusetts politics today. Mr. Hutchmacher sees this as the pivotal point, since for the first time nationality interests, economic protests, reformist ambitions and personal ambitions were able to coalesce.

Though the 1928 campaign was disastrous for the Democrats nationally, it did mark the near completion of Democratic revolution in Massachusetts itself. Thereafter Republican factionalism became more extreme as the G. O. P. groped for new footing. Not until the G. O. P. itself adopted many of the appeals that had accompanied Democratic victory could the party again be sure of maintaining close two-party competition. At first the Old Guard G. O. P. organization was challenged by a new generation of more progressive politicians which included Leverett Saltonstall, Sinclair Weeks, Christian Herter and Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. The outline of a new Republicanism became perceptible at the very moment of the Democratic party's robust national sweep.

Twenty years later Dwight D. Eisenhower was able to draw away much of the immigrant vote and also a substantial proportion of the Irish-American vote. By then the shrewder Republican politicians recognized that issues alone could not win for them. They began dropping the older Yankee names gently overboard, and brought in the Fingolds, the Del Sestos and others.

The book is a fine case study of the ward politician. It shows the careful amalgam of organization, personal leadership and programmatic appeal by which a state could be transformed into a staging ground for vigorous two-party competition. The story of Massachusetts is the story really of any urban Eastern state.

Yet the struggle for status and power by the new immigrants had a special flavor in Massachusetts. Harvard, Beacon Hill and South Boston are almost contiguous. By using Massachusetts as his case study, the author throws a bright light on the development of the Democratic party in the North and illuminates how political life and action brought status, prestige and ultimately a sense of citi-

zenship to the "huddled masses" that made the long journey from Europe.

Though today the new immigrant factor in Massachusetts has declined and the influence of national issues has grown, no student of the techniques or folkways of politics should miss this book. I do not recommend it as a rule book for today's politician. It does, however, present a fine example of Machiavellian history.

Senator Kennedy, author of *Profiles in Courage*, represents the Bay State in Congress.

N. Y. *Times* Book Review, Sept. 20.

Line-up for 1960

CANDIDATES 1960. Edited by Eric Sevareid. Basic Books. N. Y. 369 pp. \$4.95.

The politicians whose names now look largest in the Presidential sweepstakes are presented in profile by eight political writers. First Eric Sevareid, in an essay on the Presidency and its demands, observes that the American people ordinarily don't know enough about a candidate until too late: he is already nominated. We are now better off than that by the fact of this book. Not as much better as if Sevareid had written it all himself, or if we had eight Sevareids to join the writing of it. It is uneven, but on the whole a worthwhile effort. Of course the impact on the electorate is tiny compared to what it would be if each of the newspapers served by these correspondents carried the whole series of profiles. Why they don't is one of the mysteries of American journalism, and one of its deficiencies that grows more serious as the crises of our time make it ever more vital that the Presidency be adequately filled.

All of these pieces are informing. Some of them are penetrating, some critical, some approach the true quality and insight of biography. The candidates fare better or worse, according to the talents and outlooks of the writers assigned to them.

Thus Stevenson is the subject of a criticism of his candidacies and campaigning

in Mary McGrory's pungent phrasing. Kennedy is handled with no-nonsense candor by Fletcher Knebel. But Humphrey and Symington are provided more rounded contours by Charles Bailey and Edward Morgan, who seem to enjoy their subjects more. Straight reporting has enough to disclose that is news of Nelson Rockefeller, at the hands of Don Irwin, and, at least to this reader, Lyndon Johnson's background is further illuminated by Robert Riggs.

Nixon is treated twice on the ground that he is "controversial." But one of the treatments by Frank Holeman is approximately a nominating speech. That puts a special burden on the other by Philip Potter, which would have done very well all by itself and is now handicapped by the inescapable duplication of facts between the two.

Finally, in a superfluous effort to insure against a surprise nomination, Arthur Sylvester valiantly explores the minor field, which nets vignettes of Gov. Meyer and Gov. Williams and some small talk about various other notables.

On the whole these profiles are easy reading and informing and fair and they make a palatable sample of the quality of some of the correspondents who are doing a workaday job of covering the Washington scene and the characters that enliven it.

LOUIS M. LYONS

Scrapbook

Newspaper Trusts

About a dozen British newspapers—the *Guardian* and the *Manchester Evening News* among them—either are now owned by trusts or have in their articles of association provisions having some of the effects of a trust deed in the management of the paper or the appointment of its editor. A pamphlet published to-day by P.E.P., "The Work of Newspaper Trusts" (3s 6d), describes the various arrangements which have been made, and discusses the bearing of trusts on the quality of newspapers. The discussion is inconclusive, and the pamphlet discreetly says that "it will be necessary to watch the performance of trusteeship over many more years before its success or failure can be measured." This caution should check the innocent belief of some

critics that the shortcomings of the press could be corrected simply by substituting trustees for share holders or proprietors. The quality of a newspaper depends on the character of the men in charge, not on the form of ownership. It is suggested in the pamphlet that a trust "cannot raise new capital." Not in ordinary shares, certainly. But why should a newspaper trust which has won a reputation for sound management meet with special difficulties in raising capital by a loan? It has not "a proprietor to finance it." But even proprietors have not bottomless purses.

(Manchester) *Guardian*, Aug. 24

Advantages of Press Trusts

Can press standards be raised if newspapers are operated under trusts, instead of being owned or controlled by single individuals?

The work of existing newspaper trusts in Britain is examined by a new P.E.P. pamphlet ("The Work of Newspaper Trusts," P.E.P., 16, Queen Anne's Gate, S.W.1. 3s. 6d.). There are now three "ownership trusts"—the *Daily News* Trust (which controls the *News Chronicle* and the *Star*); the Scott Trust (the *Manchester Guardian* and *Manchester Evening News*); and the *Observer* Trust.

Several other newspapers are operated under deeds of trust, or contain provisions in their articles of association affecting the character, policy or control of the paper.

The pamphlet concludes that trusts can have several advantages, particularly in that they can prevent power falling exclusively into the hands of one person. But much will depend on who the trustees are, and their relations with the editor.

The best trust may be one whose declared objects are quite vague, the pamphlet says. The details of the deeds are less important than "sensible trustees." The trust system cannot, therefore, guarantee good journalism or a successful newspaper. But it may, the pamphlet suggests, "perhaps make journalism more conscientiously studied and less of a scramble for circulation and finance."

London *Observer*, Aug. 23

State of Maine Man

Dwight Sargent Goes to the Trib

This morning I had a good visit with the just appointed editorial chief of the N. Y. *Herald Tribune*, Dwight Sargent of Portland, Maine.

He dropped in. This was not unusual. Dwight has been dropping in every so often ever since he was a Nieman Fellow, eight years ago. He always has a few things on his mind to remind me to do, to keep the world right side up.

Dwight has been tending to the job of keeping things right side up in Maine, directing the editorials of the three Portland newspapers.

When he finished his Nieman year at Harvard studying State government, Dwight told me he was going home with a few quite definite ideas for the government of Maine. He soon published a series of editorials entitled, "If I Were Governor."

But he didn't stop with one series. He kept at his points. One of them was to get rid of the outmoded September election. They have. Another was a four year term for governor. That has been voted. Another was a shorter ballot, and that has been accepted. There were other things, too, that got done as Dwight Sargent kept sawing wood on his editorials.

Under his direction, with the confidence and support of a modern management, the paper moved from stand-pat Republicanism to independence.

Sargent is a country boy and some people have smiled that that other country boy, Robert White, the *Trib's* new president, from Mexico, Mo., should have reached into Maine for his editor. But John Hay Whitney came back from England to have a hand in the choice too, and made the final decision after exploring the mind of Dwight Sargent in a searching interview which came after Whitney's agents had explored Sargent's background.

It is an interesting background. He is 42. He grew up in a small New Hampshire town and went to Colby College. Later he was one of the prime movers in establishing the Lovejoy Lectureship at Colby, and has helped select the dis-

tinguished editors who have annually filled that lectureship.

He was a prime mover in organizing the National Conference of Editorial Writers and the New England Society of Newspaper Editors.

A year ago he took a trip around the world because he thought a down-Maine editor ought to get out more and see for himself.

He's a tight-lipped Yankee, but behind that poker face a keen mind is ticking. It ticks in laconic phrase, often in humorous expression, and with an unendingly surprising stock of information on everything.

"Why do we say 'Down Maine' when it's up North?" someone was asking one day.

"Because it's down wind," said Sargent, with a glance up from his newspaper.

Dwight Sargent says there are three things a great newspaper must have:

1. A conscience.
2. Something to say.
3. Good writing.

I am sure he had occasion to say it recently to John Hay Whitney, new owner of the *Herald Tribune*, who himself was born in Ellsworth, Maine.

As to the good writing, Sargent has a little personal list of tired cliches that he will not tolerate in an editorial.

I asked him to list them for me.

"These" he says, "I consider some of the most horrifying:

It remains to be seen.

It would appear that.

This is as it should be.

A step in the right direction.

Trite but true.

Started the ball rolling.

Got off to an auspicious start.

Struck a blow for democracy.

The political pot is boiling."

And he added: "If another misguided soul tells me that New York's gain is Maine's loss, my list will be one cliché longer."

So the *Herald Tribune*, setting out on a new chapter under the ownership of

John Hay Whitney, has as editor and editorial chief two country editors, in their early forties, Robert White of Missouri and Dwight Sargent of Maine.

As I read the announcement that the down-Maine man is going to be the editorial page editor of the paper Horace Greeley founded, I remembered a sign on the road in the village of East Poultney, Vermont, that nearby that spot Horace Greeley had his first newspaper job.

Down the road a short piece in Poultney is the birthplace of George Jones, who was the main strength of the *New York Times* when it undertook the struggle that ended in freeing New York from the clutches of the Tweed Ring.

Those were country boys, who built the character of the greatest newspapers of their day.

Louis M. Lyons—WGBH Newscast
September 10

The Louis Stark Fellowship

It is especially gratifying to this newspaper to learn of the fellowship to be established at Harvard University through a grant by the Louis Stark Memorial Fund. And it is fitting indeed that it should be in the field of labor reporting.

Mr. Stark, who died five years ago, was chief labor reporter for the *Times* for almost thirty years and, for a few years before his death, was a member of the *Times* Editorial Board. With remarkable impartiality and accuracy he gave *Times* readers an exceptional degree of knowledge and understanding of current American labor developments. The fund, which has made the fellowship possible, was established by journalists and other friends, with contributions from employers, labor unions and individuals.

Co-chairmen of the fund, Labor Secretary Mitchell and Senator Paul H. Douglass, and its distinguished directors have wisely decided that the Stark Fellowship shall supplement the Nieman Fellowships for increasing the professional effectiveness of newspapermen. The awards will be made by the President and Fellows of Harvard University.

May the memory and example of Louis Stark inspire the Stark Fellows in all the years to come.

N. Y. *Times*, Sept. 22

Notes On The British Press (cont. from page 2)

now inching its chin over the 200,000 mark, and the *Telegraph*—the most similar of all in format and content to a good U.S. daily—has about 1,100,000. But their influence goes beyond mere numbers, for they are read by the people who run the country.

To generalize a bit, the serious papers are characterized by conservative makeup on full-sized (not tabloid) pages; careful and handsome typography and printing; relatively full attention to foreign and business news, and self-respecting emphasis in position and presentation on their own "leader" (editorial) pages.

To generalize about the "popular" papers is harder, since they run through a much wider range of quality and style. The *Mirror*, at present the leader in the circulation race, is a tabloid which usually supports the Labour party line and which is credited with having a knack for dramatizing—at times and when it wants to—difficult ideas in a simple and effective way. The *Express*, not far behind in the numbers race, uses full-sized pages to present the thoughts of the brilliant and erratic Lord Beaverbrook, the Canadian-born newspaper proprietor who now is Britain's leading editorial exponent of the point of view put this way in the *Express'* own slogan: "People who love Britain and the Empire have faith in the *Daily Express*."

The popular papers range from breezy to sensational in their approach to news. Their typography is gaudy, effective and intricate, often using a variety of type faces, mortised cuts and other devices which would drive an American composing room wild. The fact that they have comparatively few pages—seldom more than 20—and comparatively large copy desks undoubtedly helps in these pyrotechnics of layout.

Their writing is bright, and some almost supply sound effects as well by emphasizing certain words with bold face or capital letters, or both. (To get the idea, consider the difference between the sentences "She was naked" and "She was NAKED!")

Some of them go in for a transom-peeping, witness-kidnapping form of journalism which is supposed to have gone out of the United States with bathtub gin. But before an American visitor sniffs too loudly, he might remind himself that while it may not seem a very respectable branch of the trade, at least it cannot be practiced by sitting on one's dignity in front of a pastepot and a stack of handouts.

The national popular papers besides the *Mirror* and *Express* are, in descending order of circulation, the *Daily Mail*,

Daily Herald (official organ of the Labour party), *News-Chronicle* (which like the *Guardian* tends to be pro-Liberal), and *Daily Sketch* (the most sensational tabloid of them all).

One effect of the domination of the national popular papers in the morning field has been to give the provincial cities a number of impressively good "serious" morning papers of their own. They can compete successfully with the *Times* or *Guardian* (which is of course itself a provincial paper in the sense that it is not based in London). But if they were to try the "popular" game they would be trampled under by the big boys in London.

The afternoon provincial papers, on the other hand, are far more numerous and generally have larger circulations than their local morning competition. The trust which owns the *Guardian*, for example, also owns the Manchester *Evening News*, which outsells it 330,000 to 200,000 even against the competition of another evening paper. In Newcastle-on-Tyne the "serious" morning *Journal* sells 135,000 copies, while the *Evening Chronicle*, a rather uninteresting example of the "popular" species, has a 280,000 circulation in a smaller circulation area. Without evening "popular" competition from London, these provincial afternoon papers are almost all "popular" themselves.

A few of the national papers have Sunday editions as well, but for most British dailies the Sabbath is a day of rest. To fill the gap there are a number of Sunday weeklies, and to these the same generalizations of serious-v.-popular can be applied. *News of the World* editors print some sports, but they really think about just one thing—sex, culled from court proceedings and cheesecake stills. It has been selling for a century, and it still sells.

At the other end of the Sunday spectrum are the *Sunday Times* (formerly a Kemsley newspaper, recently bought by Canadian Roy Thomson, and absolutely no relation to the daily *Times*) and the *Observer*. These contain the Saturday night news, like any American Sunday paper, plus comments on the week's events, serialized books, and a wide and generally excellent collection of columns on the arts, books, sports, food-and-fashions, chess, bridge and business. To an apparently considerable degree they fill a role played in the United States by the weekly magazines, a form of publishing which does not flourish as lustily in Britain.

There may be comparatively few papers in Britain, by comparison with the United States, but those that there are

are strikingly individualistic in appearance and content. Britain has two national press services, but most dailies rewrite their stories freely and without apology.

The British reporter, too, feels relatively few inhibitions about inserting his own opinions—or at least the opinions of his editor—into his copy. The pitfalls of this need no elaboration here, but at its best it produces a far more interesting and readable story than the deadpan reporting to which United States newsmen usually confine themselves. Here are two examples of news stories—not editorials—both from 1959 editions of the London *Times*, by no means the most extreme practitioner of the art:

FROM OUR MEXICO CITY CORRESPONDENT

“What is a developed country? One that can shout abuse louder than the rest.” So a visiting journalist was heard to say; and it was certainly difficult, during the early stages of the United Nations session of the Economic and Social Council in Mexico, to avoid the impression that the delegates were small boys putting squibs under one another’s chairs. This pastime was deprecated by the United Kingdom, but during the debates both Russia and the United States produced so much weighted argument that it was finally the smaller countries that contributed the clearest and most measured statements on the chief topics of the meeting: the industrialization of underdeveloped countries, and freedom of information.

BONN, April 30—The mysterious bombing raid near the Grosse Knechtsand on April 21 promises to join the Marie Celeste as one of the great mysteries of the sea. . . . Herr Brauer, the burgomaster of Hamburg, has decided that the R.A.F. is responsible. “Only the British could have done it,” he is reported to have said.

As the R.A.F. has already issued five denials, exception has been taken to this, and the matter threatens to become an affair of honour. The embassy, wisely if weakly, will have nothing to do with it. The R.A.F., which collectively rather likes Herr Brauer, is commendably restraining itself. . . .

This may be according to the textbook on how to behave in a foreign land, but unless some explanation can be found for the 45 reported explosions, the Germans will go on believing that the R.A.F. has been up to it again.

Nearly all British journalists get their training for their work on the job. For one thing, college education still is a relative luxury in Britain, where only one-sixth as large a proportion of the population goes to college as in the United States. Most youngsters drop out of school at 15 or 16, and a boy headed for the newspaper business may well take his first job then. A common course of events is

to start on a weekly or small daily and move up to larger papers and more important jobs. London is a vortex which draws a great many, but living there is not every newsman’s cup of tea. As the deputy news editor (assistant city editor, in U.S. terminology) of the Cardiff *Western Mail* put it, “I think I could go to London, but I wouldn’t want to. It’s a two-ulcer job on a one-ulcer salary.”

Salaries are negotiated in London on a nationwide basis between the publishers and the newspaper unions, including the news staffs’. There is a standard agreement covering wages and working conditions, allowing for variations depending on the size of the individual paper. Some papers make extra provisions for their workers outside the contract, a notable example being the *Guardian*, which not only pays news workers a guinea a week (about \$3) above scale, but grants them four weeks vacation a year and an additional four weeks as a sort of sabbatical leave every four years.

While pay scales do vary, the one at the Edinburgh *Scotsman*, the second largest Scottish daily, with a circulation of 61,000, may be taken as an example. A beginner there, at age 16, earns £208 (\$585) a year. This is raised by annual stages until he reaches the maximum of £877 (\$2460) at age 28. Merit increases put many above that scale. To augment their incomes, a great many newsmen in provincial cities work as stringers for national papers on the side.

On the London *Times* a reporter may make about £1200 (\$3400) a year. A top reporting job on the *Express*, at the pinnacle of writing pay, might be worth £1800 (\$4600) a year.

These pay figures are on the low side of the general pattern in Britain, which is that pay over there tends to be somewhat more than half of what an American worker gets for the same job. Living costs are lower in Britain than in the United States, but proportionately probably not as low as the pay.

But the salary figure is not the whole story, at least for beginners. Lacking widespread college training, Britain has a rather elaborate system of apprenticeships and part-time higher education in many fields, including journalism. A youngster joining a paper at 16 will go through three or four years in which he works part time as a copy boy and cub reporter, and attends school part time at his employer’s expense, taking courses in such subjects as history, law and politics. Also, every beginner is taught shorthand, and a knowledge of it is a prerequisite for most newspaper jobs in Britain. Even Alastair Hetherington, editor of so intellectual a paper as the *Guardian*, when asked what he looks for in a prospective new newsroom hand, said he wants one who is “either a good reporter or a good shorthand writer, or preferably both.”

A British newspaperman is likely to spend his working

hours in a building which is antiquated and ramshackle by United States standards. One important reason, of course, is that in World War II and the postwar austerity period there was little or no money or material available for new publishing plants. Several are being built or planned now. The *Times*, for example, has just started a tricky four-year program of tearing down a good deal of its old rabbit-warren of offices and rebuilding a new plant on the same site, hopefully without disrupting its daily work.

Candor would have to add, however, that some of the antiquity of the equipment probably is due to the general British reluctance to shed old ways and familiar tools, and also to the resistance of the mechanical unions to new labor-displacing machinery.

News of the World, for example, which has to put out 7,000,000 copies every weekend, does it without mechanical bundling equipment in its mailing room. A mailer picks up each stack of about 25 papers, carries it several feet across the room, and sets it down on a sheet of wrapping paper. He lays another piece of paper on top of the bundle, ties a piece of twine around its width and another around its length, and shoves it onto a conveyor rack. Then he goes back for another bundle.

For another example, the Manchester *Guardian* hires a special train every night to send 55,000 copies of its 10 p.m. edition to London and the south of England, where its natural competition is the London *Times*' edition printed at 3:30 a.m., 5½ hours later. It could eliminate this gap by printing its London edition in London from photoengravings, using a telephoto device, tested as early as 1953, by which it could transmit pictures of six pages at once from Manchester to London, taking 18 minutes for the transmission. But the unions have refused to permit it, and now the *Guardian* management hopes the idea will be pioneered in the United States by the New York *Times* or some other paper, and then will seep back across the Atlantic.

(Those British papers which do print in more than one city universally do it by teletyping copy between the two plants and setting type in both cities, on linotypes. They have teletypesetting equipment but can not use it for this purpose.)

The difficulties of getting out large editions are eased for the mass-circulation journals by the fact that they are very small papers by American standards. The average British daily (non-tabloid) runs from 10 to 14 pages, and very few

are over 20. The *Sunday Express* has 24 pages, *News of the World* 16, and the *Sunday Times*, the country's fattest, flabbergasts Britain with 40 pages every Sunday.

This makes for tight news holes, of course, but not as tight as a 14-page American paper would be. British papers tend to hold their advertising content down to between 33 1/3 and 50 percent of the paper, and to charge correspondingly more for it. One provincial daily, for example, with a circulation of 190,000 charges a minimum of 45 shillings (\$6.30) a column inch for small display ads, and raises the rate to 50 shillings (\$7) for ads measuring more than 3 columns by 11 inches. *News of the World*, with its gigantic circulation, charges £37 (\$103) a column inch.

(Single copy circulation rates, incidentally, range from 2½ to 4 pence—about the same as 2½ to 4 cents.)

The use of small 7-point body type and the omission of a great many of the features of American papers also help save space for news. Many British papers run comic strips, for example, but few have more than four or five.

With all these apparent differences, a visiting American newspaperman is likely to find his British counterparts very similar in outlook, methods and problems to the men he left behind in the city room at home. At the *Times*' daily news conference, for instance, the talk ranges from Nyasaland to Wormwood Scrubs. But at the end comes this conversation, which surely must be universal:

"Well, I guess that will fill the paper."

"Yes, but will it be worth fourpence?"

Don Sterling was a Nieman Fellow in 1955-56. He spent 3½ months in the United Kingdom last spring as a correspondent sponsored by the *Oregon Journal*, of which he is assistant city editor, and by the Portland, Oregon, branch of the English-Speaking Union of the United States. As a framework for the trip he was the guest for a month of the staff of the London *Times*, and for periods of a week each of the Cardiff *Western Mail*, Manchester *Guardian*, Edinburgh *Scotsman* and Belfast *Telegraph*.

Note: Since Don Sterling wrote his article the Manchester *Guardian* has changed its name to *The Guardian*. Long a newspaper of national note and circulation, it found that its entire growth in the last ten years was outside the local Manchester area.

Packaged Pundits of America

From Patrick O'Donovan

The Columnist —

The syndicated American columnist on political affairs enjoys a stature, independence, status and sweep of circulation that is without parallel in the British press, where the Cassandra column in the London *Mirror* is almost unique. As close as the British press comes to our Lippmann-Childs-Alsoop-Fleeson production is to be seen in the pieces of the American correspondent of the (Manchester) *Guardian*, Alistair Cooke, and the (London) *Observer*, Patrick O'Donovan.

So in this piece, Mr. Donovan is describing an American journalistic phenomenon to his British readers.

Washington, March 14.—Whenever crisis comes and foreigners begin nervously to eye the rim of the political jungles of America in order to guess what is coming out, they are confronted by a group of men standing confident in the foreground.

These are the political columnists. They are often quoted as if they were public opinion, or as if they wrote as the rulers thought.

These columnists have no counterpart in the Western world. America has no national press, and many considerable cities are the monopoly of a single person or syndicate who produce both morning and evening papers. But the columnists, though almost always attached to a major newspaper in a great city, are syndicated across the country and often used in newspapers of an opinion diametrically opposed.

Because of their local character, American circulations are not only small by British standards, but they also make no attempt to reach any special group or class or educational level. The newspapers aim at satisfying everyone. They tend, therefore, to be more discreet, less enterprising, less entertaining and more responsible than the British press.

They cherish principles about not mixing news with comment. They have a contempt for style which they excoriate as "fine writing." Comment and opinion are

concentrated on the leading articles which, outside three or four cities, tend to be preoccupied with local affairs or else dotily opinionated or inadequate. And, anyway, they are not widely read.

In thousands of towns and cities, the balance, the element of national debate, the opinion formed by a close knowledge of the available facts, is supplied by the syndicated columnists. These privileged pamphleteers do not obey the rules. Theirs are personal performances. They display opinions; they speculate and prophesy. They permit themselves an elegance of phrase.

The writers are of many different sorts. There are wild ones like Fulton Lewis, Jr., who still cry "Communist" every time the industrial right wing of America does not get its way. There are sad ones like George Sokolsky who thinks that the mention of God stops every argument. There are nice ones like Harry Golden who writes about how marvellous America is—over and over and over again.

There are literary, labour, humourous and politely disguised erotic ones. There is even one, Robert Ruark, who has been bitten by Africa and is currently in Kenya writing like an embattled white settler.

But the most important write out of Washington. They tend to be carefully and expensively educated persons. They have the sort of passion for politics that a rare scholar has for Coptic needlework or Norman fonts. They tend to come from "privileged" backgrounds and some of them are aristocrats in any social spectrum.

They are richly paid and belong to the only possible club in Washington. They are assisted by secretaries and some by researchers, and they are greeted as splendid lions at almost any party they choose to attend.

They dine at the few significant embassies where they are expected to talk rather than ask questions. They lecture as savants at universities. They are privileged. Their power is a reality in America. They are the beneficiaries of the calculated leak (an enduring element in America where

Cabinet responsibility and party discipline do not obtain) of the anger of disappointed planners and of the willing talk of America's political theoreticians.

They are not a compact body. There is Drew Pearson. He operates a vengeful system of rewards and punishments. He is a genuine liberal and was once slugged by the late Senator McCarthy in the men's room of a women's club. His reportorial accuracy is often in question, his courage never; he has no inhibitions about printing anything.

Pearson's conception of journalism is one of power—cooperate or take the consequences. Among the cruelties and the crassness, he has written many things that needed to be said and nobody else chose to write.

There is Marquis Childs, who opposes the Administration but is respected by them. He is travelled, urbane and wise. He has a special quality of careful honesty. He is most interesting on foreign affairs where he insists that America should not expect to get all her own way. He is a man who searches for a civilized mode for the survival of the West, and entertains as feasible both Mr. Macmillan's initiative and the 1955 Eden plan.

There is David Lawrence, who writes as a rich man for the rich, a sort of literate and bewildered executive. He is a Bourbon conservative, against the Supreme Court, Central Government, Communism, and taxation, and is for the primitive virtues of self-reliance and suspicion. He finds American diplomatic triumphs to hail a little too often. He is consistent and intellectually honest.

There is Joseph Alsop, who is preoccupied with the nation's defense and with competitive rearmament. He describes himself as a Republican, but believes this Administration has risked the survival of America. His predictions are horrendous. Like Cassandra, he is seldom wholly believed. He is an elegant writer, widely read, arrogant, brave and feared.

Alsop is an influence rather than an authority. He nourishes splendid hatreds and contempts. He loves England, and grows livid when the British do not behave in a nineteenth-century manner ("stinks of defeat"). But he preaches the inescapability of the American hegemony of the West.

And there is Walter Lippmann, the wisest and the most important of them all. Any work of history that covers post-World War I history mentions him again and again, now as an adviser, now as a journalist. He had a hand in drafting President Wilson's 14 points. He is a pragmatist and an analyst.

Lippmann sits and thinks. He faces complicated facts and produces an arresting conclusion. State Department spokesmen, answering general questions in private, quite often say, "Did you read Lippmann on that?" He is suspicious of Dulles and distrustful of the Democratic process in foreign affairs. He stands for cold reason in international affairs and his influence is vast but impossible to define.

There are others, too, including reporters who are not syndicated, for here the press fulfils a constitutional function. America would not work without it. But the columnists, the dotty, the opinionated, the urbane and the wise, are truly involved in the mysterious process of policy creation in a democracy. You can disagree with them. You would be wrong to despise and mad to ignore them.—*Copyright.*—*Observer* (London)

Manchester No More

From tomorrow the *Manchester Guardian* drops Manchester from its title. The reasons must have been persuasive but it will take time to become accustomed to the change. The Editor, Alastair Hetherington, believes that the decision merely acknowledges that the paper now sells over the whole country. He tells me that two-thirds of the 183,000 circulation is outside Manchester and 38,000 in London and the Home Counties alone.

Mr. Alastair Hetherington was only thirty-six when he took over the editorship three years ago, a week before Suez. It was, in his own words, a "real do" to walk in to, and his anti-Government policy sent sales into a nosedive. The *Guardian* lost 16,000 copies in the Manchester area alone which it has never quite made up there, though it has more than won back the loss on the rest of the country. But no one quite got to the stage of throwing bricks through the *Guardian*

windows, as Mancunians did during the Boer War in protest against anti-jingo policy.

There are still three Scotts connected with the *Guardian*, all grandsons of the great C. P. Scott, probably its most celebrated editor. They are Laurence (chairman), Charles (personnel director) and Richard (diplomatic correspondent).

Laurence Scott shows the same sturdy independence as his illustrious grandfather. In the middle of the Suez crisis, as circulation was tumbling, he said to Hetherington: "If you believe in your policy stick to it and don't worry about the commercial consequences."

The *Guardian* still has a great reputation for discovering new talent. They receive some 150 letters of application a year from graduates and accept two.

—*Sunday Times* (London) Aug. 23

Wider Understanding In The U.S. Press

One swallow does not make a summer but a recent survey of the American daily press does demonstrate the fact that Canadian grievances are getting a better hearing than was at one time customary. If this were to develop into a continuous pattern, there would eventually come about a change for the better in this country's relationship with its big neighbor.

When President Eisenhower not long ago imposed statutory restrictions on oil imports, the muster of strength was, by usual standards, impressive. The *Boston Herald* said that the taking of such a step in the name of "national security" made little sense so far as Canada was concerned. The *Christian Science Monitor* used the same argument: "All the arguments for developing U. S. supplies as a defense measure apply equally to Canadian supplies. . . . It also slaps the United States' best customer in a very tender spot. Strange kind of defense." The line of the *Wall St. Journal* was identical,— "It would be ironic if real defense planning actually should suffer because these oil import controls alienated allies."

Then there was of course the broad economic argument. How can Americans sell abroad if they refuse to take foreign

goods in payment? This criticism was effectively employed by the *Toledo Blade*, the *Milwaukee Journal*, the *Detroit Free Press* and the *Washington Post* which made its point boldly:

For the United States to preach freer trade when it doesn't affect a politically powerful home industry, and practise flagrant protectionism when the interests of the strategically represented producer-state like Texas are involved is the worst kind of foreign policy. It is not only narrowly nationalistic but inconsistent.

Sumner Slichter, the Harvard economist, was also quoted with approval: "sordid politics" . . . "unwarranted economic aggression." The *Providence Journal* and the *Chicago Daily News* were also critical.

There is nothing conclusive in all this, but the point remains that the debate is no longer confined to the Canadian Government on the one hand and the U. S. State Department on the other, with the latter waving its hands feebly and saying it didn't enjoy seeing Canadians offended but what was it to do about it? The debate is moving out into the general arena of public opinion, and that is a healthy sign so far as Canada is concerned.—*Montreal Star*, April 7.

Fleet Street Veteran

No one would guess, so easy is the writing, so admirable the style, that the author of the article on Viscount Kemsley which appears on Page 8, is in his 94th year. It is nearly ten years since Mr. Hadley retired from the editorship of the *Sunday Times*, and though inevitably he has some of the physical frailties of great age, his mind is as alert as ever, and his interest in his old paper as great.

But W. W. Hadley is a remarkable man, with a record which must be unequalled in journalism. For more than 40 years his work was entirely in provincial newspapers, with notable editorships in Rochdale and Northampton. Then, at an age when some men would look forward to retirement, he threw up an important position—resisting all persuasion to stay on any terms he liked to name—to start

a fresh career in Fleet Street as a political writer.

Having succeeded in that, he began a third phase as Editor of the *Sunday Times*, a post he held for 18 years. He had the satisfaction of seeing the paper more than double its circulation.

Sunday Times (London) Aug. 23

Looking Back in Reverence

Litchfield's homage to Dr. Johnson

Lichfield Thursday

In three weeks' time "the most sober decent people in England"—no prize is given for guessing who attached that tag to Lichfield in 1776—will celebrate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Johnson. For the occasion there will be a great many backward glances towards the eighteenth century.

The corporation and the Johnson Society, mighty active body locally, are sharing as joint organisers in this labour of respect and honour, and for the week of September 13-20 Lichfield is certain that it is going to be full of pilgrims and tourists. To judge from the number of inquiries so far, the great lexicographer is going to be a considerable draw.

Wise and formidable

But, and this is the question that Lichfield has been asking for several months, what exactly will the visitors want to see? Can Johnson be brought into reach of the common man? The Johnson celebration is obviously more difficult to organise than, say, a Shakespeare festival. The doctor may look wise and formidable as he sits on his pedestal in the Market Square, but it is difficult to translate his wit and wisdom into popular, spectacular, jubilee terms.

The official and formal of the matter is easy enough. The Saturday of Birthday Week is traditionally the climax of the celebration and on that day Sir William Haley, the editor of the *Times*, accompanied by a civic party, will go to Stowe Pool to plant the fourth Johnson's Willow. This ceremony will take place with the kind permission of the South

Staffordshire Waterworks Company, the owners of the pool.

The new willow, a direct descendent of the tree under which Johnson used to sit and contemplate, replaces Willow No. 3, which had to be cut down fifteen months ago.

This ceremony will be followed in the evening by the traditional Johnson Society supper in the Guildhall, at which Sir John Wedgwood will assume the presidency. The menu for the meal—with steak and kidney pie and saddle of mutton (favourite Johnson dishes) as its prime attractions, is a close imitation of that of the society's first dinner, fifty years ago. The menu then said: "Ye Church Warden Pipe and Good Fellowship to follow" and the pattern still remains.

On the other days a concert of eighteenth-century music, a performance of "She Stoops to Conquer," a school pageant entitled "Dr. Johnson: This is Your Life," and a period costume ball at the Guildhall have been arranged.

Officially, it is hoped that there will be a strong eighteenth-century turnout at the ball, and the town clerk's department has been busy giving out the names and addresses of theatrical costumiers. It is sad to say that the Ministry of Housing and Local Government refused the council permission to spend money on medallions to mark the occasion for the town's younger children.

From a picturesque point of view, it is even sadder that the Chamber of Trade has had to trim down its original and ambitious plans for an eighteenth-century shopping week. The members began by discussing an idea for dressing—as long as it was consistent with hygiene—shop assistants in eighteenth-century costumes. One member, Councillor Halfpenny, suggests that they should make the Market Square look as it did in Johnson's day, with "coaches and pairs, a trough, and a horse or two about."

Profitable and popular

He was sure that this would be both profitable and popular. Money was going to be in the pockets of the visitors and it was up to the traders to extract it. If they really got down to making an imaginative appeal they could make their tills go "ringing and ringing and ringing."

Unfortunately, on grounds of finance and hygiene, and possibly because one or two shopkeepers might have found themselves faced with resignations from old and valued employees who refused to wear wig and knee breeches, the scheme has been abandoned.

Instead the traders will pay their respects to the doctor with shop-window poster displays and by distributing leaflets to shop assistants which give relevant information in case questions about the doctor's life are asked by customers from out of town. This gives rise to the thought of fascinating exchanges like "Some toothpaste, please, and can you tell me who was Topham Beauclerk?"

The Guardian, Aug. 28

James Hagerty

The Observer Profile

The press secretary to the President of the United States is to-day a great officer of State. He is news and history in his own right. He is, accordingly, a controversial figure. People who dislike the Eisenhower Administration have usually a similar feeling for the press secretary, because he is an accurate reflection of its complexion and character and because he is also largely responsible for its public image.

James C. Hagerty—invariably "Jim"—is the most powerful press officer in history. His power depends on the trust of the President, his own technical skill and on the importance of the role of the United States press.

The last has a part to play in the nation's life that is accepted as essentially dignified. It has been so since the foundation of the Republic. "It causes," as Alexis de Tocqueville once wrote, "political life to circulate through the vast territory. It rallies the interests of the community round certain principles, and draws up the creed of every party; for it affords a means of intercourse between those who hear and address each other without ever coming into contact."

The legislators in Washington do not condescend to the press and have no desire to ignore it, because (particularly in its Washington columnists) it has a strong intellectual content and an ability to sit

and think without reference to parties or personalities; it has a powerful influence on their thoughts and actions.

Co-operation with the press is a means of gathering support for a departmental appropriation or for re-election. Its responsibility arouses tolerance for unpopular measures in an electorate that would naturally prefer less expense and less government. It is a watchdog against corruption and against the professional inclination of the legislators to let sleeping dogs lie.

If it cannot fix elections, it has a positive and continuous effect on current policy. With the addition of television, it has become the fourth branch in the carefully compartmentalised American system of government, and it interacts upon the legislature and the executive as surely as they do on each other. Not even the judiciary is wholly free of its influence. It contains a number of intellectuals that are as good as any in American public or academic life.

This vital organ of American government depends for its access to the White House, which is certainly the most important source of news in America, almost wholly upon Hagerty. In addition, he has set the pattern for the public information services of the entire Administration.

Because of the essential importance of the American press and the strength of its continual demands and the marvelous way he meets them, his role cannot be compared with any individual's in Britain. He must act like the entire Government Front Bench at Question Time and the Palace Press Office almost every day of the year.

Jim Hagerty was born in 1909 and has a newspaperman for a father, a distinguished political correspondent who recently retired from the *New York Times*. Brought up in New York, Hagerty went to Columbia University and by 1934 was a staff member of the *Times*. He worked in Albany, which is the capital of New York State. He was an effective correspondent and his relaxations were those traditionally ascribed to pressmen. He was also an objective reporter and so was barely on speaking terms with the Governor, Tom Dewey, when the Governor chose him as press secretary to improve

his lamentable relations with the journalists.

In 1952, Dewey put his rough and experienced political organization at the disposal of Eisenhower. On the day after Eisenhower's election to the Presidency, Hagerty was sworn in as press secretary. To-day he is totally dedicated to the President whom he regards as both the nicest and the greatest man he has met. "You may work for the Associated Press: I work for a guy who happens to be President, if you can call the President of the United States a guy."

He is apt to compare the President with his father and his single-minded devotion has no thought of self in it. The President trusts him to-day probably more than any other surviving member of his "team."

Hagerty works a twelve-hour day, six days a week, in the crowded little rooms allowed the press staff in a wing of the White House. He dominates his staff, who falter and fumble in his absence. He has little social life and lives in a "colonial type" house in a prosperous suburb. He has a wife and two sons and will quit politics with Eisenhower. Then a rich job in industry is his for the hinting.

He holds two semi-formal press conferences a day in which the reporters crowd, standing, in his office. He has a swift and ferocious temper which he sometimes uses to discourage an awkward question: "Don't be a boy scout," or, "You know that's off limits." But he bears no grudge and plays no favourites.

He is liked. He knows the peculiarities of the thirty or so regulars who specialise in the White House. He is a master of the peripatetic campaign and provides brilliantly for the needs of the White House press when travelling with the President—telephones, typewriters, cabling machines, accommodation, news.

The photographing of a President recovering from a dangerous illness is as precisely planned as a court function in London. Hagerty has liberalized the Presidential press conference by allowing movie cameras and lights and recording machines. He did away with the old rule that only indirect quotes were permissible. He attends Cabinet meetings. (He was the only press officer to attend the Geneva summit as a fully accredited delegate.)

He has easy access to the President and

briefs him accurately before each press conference as to the likely questions. The President consults him as to the probable public reaction to contemplated measures. He supervises the hand-outs of other departments and when a Cabinet member commits a public *bêtise* it is Hagerty who advises on extrication.

He sometimes retains news to issue on dead days or when the President is on a golf course—perhaps to minimise a possible impression of idleness. He tends to offset news unfavourable to the Administration with a favourable item. He appropriates to the White House special triumphs like the first American Sputnik or the voyage of the submarine *Nautilus*. It is a continuous, conscious, campaign, arguably legitimate within the American tradition and almost inevitable with the development of the new science of mass persuasion. It will not stop with Hagerty.

But he does not control the press, even though a reporter must depend upon him for all the White House news. There are in America many loyal officials who will still select their reporter and talk—to justify themselves or to force the Government's hand or to serve America or to further some private purpose. He has drastically cut down such leakages since the turbulent days of the New Deal or of Truman's free-talking aides. But Hagerty remains in charge of the image of the President and it is no accident that it is so separate and so much more successful than the image of his party. He would have earned his peerage in England.

The correspondents who meet Hagerty in Europe will not see him at his best. He is no analyst, but a "hard news" man. His philosophy of practical politics is, "They slap us: we slap them." He is uneasy in foreign affairs and devotes himself to selling the President's performance rather than to the issues and their implications. But even when he is uneasy, competing with the smooth liquefaction and intelligently directed asides of the Foreign Office spokesmen, his authority, his single-mindedness, his bristling, barbed personality, still dominate. He has brought the cultivation of the relationship between the President and the mass media to a fine Machiavellian art. Whether such an art is wholly desirable is quite another question.—*Observer* (London) Aug. 30.

Why They Line Up to Emigrate from 'Paradise'

It's a Good Land with Fine Climate But Lacks Opportunity, Says Newsman

By Desmond Stone

Desmond Stone, formerly a New Zealand newsman, is a new member of the *Times-Union* staff.

Last week, writing of his experiences in coming to the United States, he told how New Zealanders "stand in line" for months to emigrate to America from the land described by author James Michener as "the nearest thing to Paradise on earth."

Stone was assistant editor of the *Southland Times* in Invercargill and first visited Rochester in 1956 while he was an associate Nieman Fellow in journalism at Harvard University.

More than any other American writer, James Michener, through his *Return to Paradise*, has left Americans with an impression of New Zealand as a South Pacific Shangri-La.

Several persons, since I wrote of my struggle to get here and of the many other New Zealanders standing in line to come, have asked me why I should want to leave what they take to be "the nearest thing to Paradise on earth."

Perhaps I should set the record straight: The majority of New Zealanders cannot conceive of any country in the world more blessed than their own.

Michener wrote: "I have known New Zealand in many weathers and I have served with its quiet men in most corners of the Pacific. I have never met people more deeply convinced that theirs is the one good land."

And it is a good land in many ways. The climate is generally temperate. The absence of extremes does away with the need both for central heating and for air conditioning.

There are no slums worth speaking about and most people live within easy distance of beaches and lakes.

Physically, the country is very beautiful, with all its scenery in small compass.

There is no illiteracy and all drugstore prescription and hospital costs are paid by the state.

The only unemployed are the unemployed, and every worker has abundant security. Life is a "rat race" for very few.

Why, then, is there a five-year waiting time for emigration to the U.S.A.?

Opportunity is the first and foremost reason. I talked four years ago to a New Zealander who had settled in San Francisco, though remaining an alien. I asked him if he had plans for returning to New Zealand.

"Perhaps when I retire," he said, "for New Zealand's a better place to die in than to live in."

There is some truth in this. Smallness restricts New Zealand in many ways. Large oceans hem it in, and human endeavor has narrower limits than in the United States. It is harder for a man to follow his star.

Yet there is more to it than this. Equality is more perfectly practiced in New Zealand than in almost any other country in the world.

Using the lowest common denominator, the state has divided the national cake into more or less exact slices, so that all persons stand on much the same level.

To the extent that every individual has an inalienable dignity, this is a wonderfully good thing.

But there are severe penalties, too. So complete an equality tends to deaden initiative. Merit does not get its just reward. Men cannot indulge the full bent of their ability.

Those New Zealanders on the waiting list for emigration are aware of this. They know that life is lived on more levels in the United States, that it has more challenge and variety, that a man can rise higher in his chosen career. He also can fall much lower.

Yet, that is the risk that is lessening as

federal economic controls spread and the tradition of individualism weakens.

I am probably speaking for other New Zealanders when I also say that I wanted to try life in a country where it is possible to be anonymous on the street.

New Zealand is essentially a nation of small towns where everybody knows everybody else. This is both a strength and a weakness. There is a deep sense of national identity and a fine unanimity of outlook in a time of crisis.

But small-town living is restrictive. The pressure to conform is strong and people grow afraid to be different, to be unconventional. In conforming, they tend to become hypocritical.

I have heard that Rochester has its provincial flavors. And this, for all I know, may be true by American urban standards. By New Zealand standards, however, it is a city where I can walk anonymously, free of small-town compulsions.

Materialism comes into the venture, too. Nowhere has life more of the little conveniences than in the United States. Nowhere have shops a greater abundance of goods.

My wife is planning to send home a small metal lunch box for her 7-year-old nephew. He will be the only boy at his school with such a box. Most children carry their lunches in paper bags.

I can wrap up my own reasons for emigrating—and they are probably the reasons of others—by telling an incident that occurred when I was considering changing from daily journalism to weekly magazine work. The newspaper had a new editor who was setting higher standards. Yet it still continued to publish stuff that was rubbish. I asked the editor why.

He told me he didn't like the stuff either. But the previous editor, he explained, had bought up all this poor material and the company, because it had paid for it, insisted that it be used so that it could get value for its money!

This, I felt, wouldn't happen in America.

Nieman Notes

1939

On August vacation in Britain, Totty and Louis Lyons enjoyed visits with the Walter Waggoners (1948) and the Murrey Marders (1950). Waggoner is in the London bureau of the *New York Times*, Marder, correspondent of the *Washington Post*, has his office in the building of the 152-year old *Manchester Guardian*, which changed its name this Summer to *The Guardian*, recognition of the fact that it has become more a national than a local newspaper.

Edwin A. Lahey covered President Eisenhower's tour for the Knight papers. His description of General DeGaulle in one story as "old banana nose" broke out a rash of letters to the *Boston Globe*, some protesting, others admiring his pungent phrase.

1940

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Edward Allen announced the marriage of their daughter, Abigail Catharine, to John E. Pereira, in Weymouth, Mass., September 5.

Mr. and Mrs. William B. Dickinson were Cambridge visitors in September, when their daughter Theresa entered Radcliffe College. Bill is managing editor of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*.

Carroll Kilpatrick covered Vice President Nixon's trip to Russia for the *Washington Post*. He reports an exhilarating experience but aggravated by the daily time-consuming ordeal of filing copy. Never any taxis. Just one clerk at the censor's office to handle the copy of a legion of correspondents, and no knowing when or whether the copy would get out. Peter Kumpa (1958) in Moscow for the *Baltimore Sun* offered the cold comfort that the regular correspondents there sometimes get their stories back from the censor in an hour and sometimes two days.

A second generation author, Hodding Carter III has a new book out, *The South Strikes Back*, on the segregation-integration issue of the past few years. The numerals distinguish him from his father, Hodding Carter, Jr., Greenville, Mississippi, editor, publisher and author.

Volta Torrey, editor of the *Technology Review*, is editing an Atlantic Science Series of books to be published by the Atlantic Monthly Press "to help adults keep up with children." Herbert C. Yahraes (1944) is doing one of them on Genetics.

1942

On sabbatical from the University of Michigan, Professor Kenneth Stewart is spending the year as research associate at the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford. His assignment is to work on a study of the United Nations as a communications system, directed by Wilbur Schramm.

1943

William A. Townes has been appointed managing editor of the *Los Angeles Examiner*, moving from Baltimore where he has been managing editor of the *News-Post*.

1945

David Botter left *Look Magazine*, where was assistant managing editor, to start this fall term at Northwestern University as professor of journalism. His earlier newspaper work was on the *Dallas News*, as local reporter, state political writer and later Washington correspondent.

A.B. (Bud) Guthrie, Jr., is revealed to his friends as Alfred Bertram Guthrie on the wedding announcement of his son of the same name, in July, to Margaret Ann Marlow, at Helena, Montana, where Bud writes and serves on the State Board of Education when he isn't in Hollywood turning his books into movies.

1946

Ben Yablonky starts this fall on a new appointment as professor of journalism at the University of Michigan. In moving from New York University, he joins an old colleague, Kenneth Stewart, professor in the same department at Ann Arbor.

Cary Robertson, Sunday editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, was a discus-

sion leader on a panel of the American Association of Sunday and Feature Editors, held in Boston, September 27-October 1. John P. Kelly, (1959) new Sunday editor of the *Atlantic Journal-Constitution*, attended the convention.

1948

George Weller, Rome correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, covered President Eisenhower's European tour.

1949

Alan Barth is back on the editorial page of the *Washington Post* after a year's leave as guest lecturer in the government department of the University of California. Julius Duscha, (1956) who filled in on editorials while Barth was away, has started a new assignment, doing news features. One of his first pieces was on Senator Wayne Morse while Morse was stalling off the adjournment of Congress.

Christopher Rand has finished a tour of several months in the Middle East for the *New Yorker*, where the first of his articles have begun to appear. Chris had luncheon with the Nieman Fellows October 5, on a visit to his sophomore son, Richard. His eldest son, Temple, after graduation from University of California, has gone out to Iran on a Fulbright fellowship, as a preparation for newspaper work.

1950

Murrey Marder, London correspondent of the *Washington Post*, covered the Geneva conference of foreign ministers.

John McCormally is now associate editor of the *Hutchinson (Kansas) News-Herald*. And he and his wife are announcing the birth of their first daughter, Mary Sue, after five sons.

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent of the *Cowles papers* was injured in an automobile accident August 31 while on a vacation visit in Des Moines. He is in the Veterans Hospital at Des Moines where he faces the prospect of several weeks hospitalization.

1951

The New York *Herald Tribune* in September announced the appointment of **Dwight E. Sargent** as its editorial page editor. He is moving to New York in October from Portland, Maine, where he has directed the editorial page of the three Gannett papers in Portland.

1952

John L. Steele, chief Washington correspondent of *Time-Life*, covered President Eisenhower's European trip.

1953

Harry Press (1956) remains city editor of the combined papers, and **Mary Ellen Leary** (1946) continues as associate editor.

With the merger in San Francisco of the Scripps-Howard *News* with the Hearst *Call-Bulletin*, **William Steif** became assistant managing editor in charge of features. He had been political editor on the *News*.

1954

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* sent **Richard Dudman** of its Washington bureau to Laos with the United Nations fact-finding commission. He was looking forward to a visit there with **Stanley Kar-**

now, 1958) covering Southeast Asia from Hongkong for *Time-Life*.

P.S. On Sept. 30, Dudman writes:

"I just got back from a couple of weeks in Laos where I guess I wrote myself out of a story. Reports of battles have been greatly exaggerated. I was one of the five reporters whose downgrading of the so-called battle of San Teu caused the Laotian government to suspend reporters' trips to front areas."

1955

Henry Shapiro, Moscow correspondent of the United Press, accompanied Khrushchev on his American tour.

Princeton University Press is publishing a book by **Selig S. Harrison** on India, under the title: *The Most Dangerous Decades*. Now associate editor of the *New Republic*, Harrison was Associated Press correspondent in India, 1951-54.

1956

Desmond Stone joined the staff of the Rochester (N.Y.) *Times-Union* this summer, moving up from Invercargill, New Zealand where he was literary editor and leader writer on the *Southland Times*. In Rochester he joins the staff of his Nieman colleague, City Editor **John Dougherty**.

1957

Harold Liston is back in Bloomington, Ill., where he was the city editor of the *Pantagraph* when the Associated Press lured him away to Chicago. But he liked the country air and community relations of the *Pantagraph* too much to stay long away. Now he has a more flexible assignment, generally furthering the Community Betterment program that Editor Henry Clay Tate launched for the region in 1946, in cooperation with the University of Illinois.

1958

Peter Kumpa started a new assignment in Moscow, as correspondent of the *Baltimore Sun*, in time to cover Vice-President Nixon's Russian tour.

Thomas G. Wicker joined the editorial staff of the Nashville *Tennessean* as associate editor in August, moving from Winston-Salem where he had served as reporter, editorial writer and, for a year, as Washington correspondent.

1959

Evans Clinchy joined the staff of Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., in July. The organization was established by the Ford Foundation for studies in education. Clinchy had specialized in education reporting on the Hartford *Times*.