

NiemanReports

March 1967

***There is Something
About the Printed Word***

By Vermont Royster

***What the IPI Is,
and Is Doing***

By Barry Bingham

***The Newspaper
In Transition***

By William B. Dickinson

***Fair Trial
and Free Press***

By the ANPA

NiemanReports

VOL. XXI, NO. 1

MARCH 1967

 Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

Editorial Board of the Society of Nieman Fellows

 Robert W. Brown
 Rock Hill Evening Herald

 Millard C. Browne
 Buffalo News

 William B. Dickinson
 Philadelphia Bulletin

 Tillman Durdin
 New York Times

 Roy M. Fisher
 Chicago Daily News

 Robert B. Frazier
 Eugene Register-Guard

 Thomas H. Griffith
 Time, Inc.

 Rebecca Gross
 Lock Haven Express

 C. Ray Jenkins
 Alabama Journal

 John Strohmeier
 Bethlehem Globe-Times

 E. J. Paxton, Jr.
 Paducah Sun-Democrat

 Harry T. Montgomery
 Associated Press

 Sylvan Meyer
 Gainesville Daily Times

 Robert Lasch
 St. Louis Post-Dispatch

 Edwin A. Lahey
 Knight Newspapers

 Smith Hempstone, Jr.
 Washington Star

 Published quarterly by the Society of Nieman Fellows from
 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138. Sub-
 scription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston,
 Massachusetts.

What the IPI Is, and Is Doing

By Barry Bingham

The International Press Institute is an organization which is accurately described by its title.

It is truly international. More than 50 countries are represented on its roster. The members all are editors and publishers, who finance the regular program of IPI through their fees and contributions.

There is no government support whatever in IPI. It is an

organization of, by and for the press.

Its membership is now at its highest point, 1,522 at latest count. More than 300 of these members are Asian journalists, and the number is steadily increasing.

What brings these professional people together in a common endeavor? The unifying bond is a belief in the concept of press freedom.

Since a free press is the essence of IPI, journalists of all nations are not allowed to join. Those whose governments control newspaper operations, through whatever method or device, are not eligible.

There is another concept, however, which is also a vital force within the International Press Institute. Its members do not regard press freedom as their personal possession, a business asset which they might carry on their backs along with the value of their presses and their office furnishings.

IPI sees press freedom as the right of readers in all parts of the world to be freely and fully informed. A right which amounted to nothing more than a special privilege for the small class of journalists would not be a major cause, or one worthy of general support.

Press freedom as a precious possession of the whole mass of newspaper readers, by contrast, is a cause to stir men's hearts. It is to this interpretation that our membership is dedicated.

The International Press Institute was founded in 1950. Its organizers were newsmen from America, Europe and Asia, who saw need for a joint effort of understanding and improvement.

Those were the days when the effects of the second World War were still keenly felt in all fields. Normal communication between journalists and between the peoples of their countries had been disrupted by the long conflict. New, difficult, and deeply serious problems had emerged. It behooved responsible journalists to seek a better knowledge of each other's national problems, so as to interpret them more intelligibly to their readers.

So the IPI came into being, utilizing a feeling of fellowship among journalists for a much broader purpose.

Since that time, annual assemblies with large attendance have been held in the following cities: Paris (twice); London (twice); Vienna, Copenhagen, Zurich, Amsterdam, Washington, Berlin, Tokyo, Tel Aviv and Stockholm. This year it meets in New Delhi, a most suitable venue because of the important role Indian journalists have always played in the organization.

The heart of the IPI operation is in Zurich. There it maintains a headquarters and a small but highly competent professional staff. The director is Per Mosen, a Norwegian journalist, diplomat and linguist. There is an executive board of 20 members, each from a different country.

From Zurich are issued a number of publications. These

(Continued on page 22)

There is Something about the Printed Word

By Vermont Royster

I might as well confess right off to a certain nervousness this morning.

For one thing, all I know about circulation is that somebody must read my paper because every morning I get letters from people who are mad at us. Some of them even demand that I cancel their subscription forthwith, which I forthwith do. The circulation sales people have to run pretty fast to keep ahead of me.

For another thing, the ABCs of advertising are as mysterious to me as the New Math. A friend once called me to ask about ad rates, and I borrowed a rate card thinking I could give him a quick answer on the phone. In two minutes I had him transferred to Ted Callis, and went back to something simple—like the foreign balance of payments.

But what makes me especially nervous is that I have to talk about newspapering in a city where newspapering seems to be a very hazardous occupation. A New Yorker can't tell until he gets up in the morning what papers he can read on the subway. Some mornings there aren't any at all, the Powers-that-be having decreed a holiday. But then the subways may not be running either . . . so you come out even.

All the same, it is fun for me to talk about newspapers. I've been mixed up with them, man and boy, for forty years, which means that I've gotten to the age where I can't talk shop without reminiscing a bit. But if you'll have a little patience, maybe out of the reminiscing will come a thought or two about the present . . . and the future . . . of this ever changing business.

I got into this business because it seemed to me, as a small boy, it had a lot of magic in it. I can remember sitting on the front steps in Raleigh, North Carolina, waiting for the afternoon paper to arrive so I could read the funny papers.

My mother would grab the paper eagerly because she wanted to read the social columns to see who had got married or died, or maybe to read the continued story. My father would usually bring home another copy so he would have one to read about the doings of the Raleigh ball club or about what that fool Coolidge was doing in Washington.

So I thought to myself; "Something that comes into a house and makes it exciting in this fashion must be a wonderful business to be in." And so, it was the glamour of the thing that I suppose first attracted me to it.

Of course, in those days the newspaper had no real competition. The movies were there but they didn't talk. Radio was just beginning and television was undreamed of. And we lived in a much, much simpler world.

All that, now, is gone with the wind. I think the change first really impressed me some years ago at the time of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth. That was the first spectacular event that television had to deal with. You'll remember that the networks flew films across the ocean; and we let our two young girls stay up very late that night in order to see this event.

So there we sat and watched the coronation ceremony from beginning to end and this new medium took us right into the great hall as if we had seats among the lords and the mighty.

I thought to myself, "I'm in the wrong business. I am too late. What can we do in the newspaper business to compete with this spectacular instrument".

So I went to bed that night, thoughtful and discouraged.

When I went down to breakfast the next morning I looked for my copy of the New York Times, which was usually by my place at table. When I couldn't find it, I went wandering

out to the front of the house and there was my then 16-year-old daughter with the Times spread out on the living room floor. She was reading the story about the coronation.

The Times, in its usual fashion, had devoted about four solid pages of type to this story, including pictures, side-bars, and a play-by-play account of everything we had seen the night before.

To the best of my knowledge this is the first time my daughter had ever even looked at the New York Times. Yet there she was, deeply immersed in reading this story of the event which she had already seen on television.

When I went off to work that morning, I was still thoughtful . . . but in a very cheerful frame of mind about this newspaper business.

It made me realize that there is something about the printed word which is different and fundamental in its utility and its appeal. What we see with our own eyes, in person or on television, can be more dramatic than any written account. But it is also fleeting. It cannot be repeated or paused over at each person's own pace and according to his own interest. The printed word, happily, is not going to be banished by electronics.

But I also realized something else. The newspaper was going to have to change, because the newspaper of the world of my childhood was not going to survive in the new world.

Let me state a simple thesis, which should be of as much interest to you as advertisers as it is to me as an editor.

In my opinion, journalism today is in the throes of a great upheaval, a revolution which is comparable to what happened with the invention of the Morse telegraph and the old linotype machine.

Any time that a social organism or institution is in one of these periods of upheaval it prevents a great many pitfalls. Inevitably, some of the species will falter and die, as many once great publications have faltered and died in the past decade.

But also, such periods in the history of peoples and institutions become the greatest periods of opportunity. And it is really the opportunities that I think we ought to look at.

But first, let me say just a word about the nature of this revolution. One aspect of it is the technological revolution, of which television is probably just the beginning. Before long we will see new methods of printing, of gathering and handling news, of distributing it to the reader.

Yet there is more to it than technology. It is also a social revolution. In this country people don't stay put any more. Communities shrivel and others spring up overnight where none were before. This accounts for a lot of deaths in the newspaper business. It also, though we are apt to forget it, accounts for a lot of births in the newspaper business. The net result is that for all the wailing at the wall the total readership of newspapers and like periodicals is greater than it ever was.

Another part of the social revolution is the rising educational level of our readers. Dr. George Gallup has some figures on this which are quite startling; the number of high school and college graduates has risen in amazing proportions.

Still, this is only part of the education story. We have been upgrading our readers, and our readers have been upgrading themselves, quite apart from their formal schooling. Most of our readers today, even if they only graduated from high school, are better informed and more aware of what goes on in the world than those who were just high school graduates 25 or 50 years ago.

Now I would agree that the average high school graduate may not understand the balance of payments. But he has certainly heard about it. He knows that it exists and that it is a problem. He probably would like to know more about it if somebody could explain it to him in such a way that he could understand it.

So it is with most other things. Even the disturbances and riots which we have been having with the young people about Vietnam, unhappy though they be, are in a sense testimony to this fact.

Well, what is the role of printed journalism in this new world? How do we cope with it?

I don't profess to have all the answers, but I do know one thing. We can't cope by doing things in the same old way. What is the point, the day after a national election, in a newspaper story that tells the reader no more than that Mr. So-and-So was reelected President of the United States? Anybody that is interested already knows that.

But if all the answers aren't evident, perhaps some will be suggested by a few case histories. I hope you will forgive me if I begin with one I know most about.

When I first came to work for The Wall Street Journal in 1936 its circulation was around 35,000. Today it has passed the million mark, although I suppose I can't boast about it until you fellows get through auditing the books. We publish in seven places . . . soon to be eight . . . and offer the same paper to the reader in Portland, Maine, and Portland, Oregon.

I confess this record of growth often surprises me. But the reasons for it interest me, since we have long violated most of the so-called rules of the trade. No pictures. No comic strips. No crossword puzzles. No big headlines. An old-fashioned make-up. And, in the opinion of a great many people, an old-fashioned editorial page viewpoint.

Of course a part of this growth can be attributed to the growth of business in this country, to the growth of interest in the stock market. Yet if these were the only factors our growth would have been only about half of what it has been in fact.

In any event, we have thousands of readers who don't fit any stereotype of the Wall Street Journal reader. They include young people, housewives, small farmers and shopkeepers, blue-collar workers, as well as bankers, lawyers, doctors and

that businessman trying to get ahead who make up most of our readers. My daily mail is a fascinating cross-section of America.

One part of our basic appeal, naturally, is that we focus on a particular aspect of American life, its economic aspect, and that we provide useful information that cannot be obtained anywhere else as quickly and conveniently.

But again that isn't the whole of the story. We also write about politics, international affairs, sociology, sports, books, theater, art and architecture, religion, education and . . . now and then . . . sex. None of these subjects, including business, are unique with us.

One thing that is unique is our use of the technological revolution. Without a full use of technology we could not print and distribute a million copies a day all over the country. We have also, by luck or otherwise, been in step with the sociological revolution.

For example, when that businessman from Portland, Maine, visits in Portland, Oregon, he can find a familiar newspaper that he is accustomed to reading. When a young executive is transferred from New York City to a middle-western town he need not feel, thanks to *The Wall Street Journal*, that he has less access to important business and political news than his counterpart back in the New York office. Thus has technology, by making the paper available everywhere, contributed to our success.

So has this rising educational level. It is surprising how many people there are in how many small communities around the country who have a large interest in public affairs—political, social and cultural—than their small-town newspaper, however good in its realm, can satisfy. This gap can be filled to some extent by the weeklies the advantage of *The Wall Street Journal* is that it arrives daily.

I have a deep suspicion that one reason for our success is that we treat these readers seriously, as serious, intelligent people. One of our most popular features is the front-page news summary which tries to give the busy reader a comprehensive survey of the world's news without fluff, without "dressing it up" or overdramatizing it. We take this job seriously, not something to be done once-over-lightly . . . curiously enough, it takes a lot of man hours to be brief.

Yet along with this conciseness and brevity we do not hesitate to devote a thousand or two thousand words to a story when we think it takes that much to tell it. Here again, but in a different way, we are treating the reader seriously. We are doing the same thing when we devote an editorial to monetary policy.

It might seem at first glance that we are using a different approach with our little sister publication, *The National Observer*. At any rate, at first glance very few people in the business thought much of it. Here, for example, we do run pictures, crossword puzzles and other curiosa. And here we are aiming at a less obviously specialized audience.

But the difference is deceptive. The point is that on *The National Observer* we take our pictures and our crossword puzzles seriously; neither are haphazard. When the *Observer* devotes a full page to the young poets, or a three column front page story to education or crime, it assumes that the reader is interested enough to read a full report and doesn't want to be written down to.

Maybe you haven't glanced at the *Observer* lately. But a lot of people have. From a low point in circulation of a round hundred and fifty thousand . . . and believe me that seemed awful low at the time . . . its circulation today is half a million, and growing.

There is, I suppose, a bit of chauvinism in thus dwelling on my own publications. But the principles involved here are applicable elsewhere.

I don't think it is any accident that here in New York City the *Daily Mirror* with more than a million circulation disappeared from view. Or that the two so-called "entertaining" afternoon newspapers couldn't make it. Or that the newspaper which has survived all the cities crises most successfully is the one often describing as the dullest newspaper in the country. *The New York Times* may be duller than television but it provides what television cannot. If you live in New York try getting along without it.

I don't think it is any accident, either, that the magazine successes today are not *Collier's* or *American* but *Newsweek*, *Time*, *U.S. News and World Report*. Fault any of them as you will, they fill a gap left by the electronic picture tube.

But what of other less national publications? Well, I notice that the *Los Angeles Times* pulled itself out of the doldrums and has become the current success story by abandoning its older habits and trying to fill the gap as a serious newspaper for its huge metropolitan area.

Meanwhile, in that same area, a number of small newspapers are thriving by filling the information gap in their own communities which the *Los Angeles Times* can't fill. The trick is the same. If you're running a newspaper in Riverside, California, your job is not to compete with TV on entertainment or with *The Wall Street Journal* on world affairs but to take the affairs of Riverside seriously. If you don't nobody else will.

If I had to hazard a guess about the pattern of newspapers a generation hence, I would guess that it would be a three-fold pattern. There's a place for a national daily like *The Wall Street Journal*, or national weeklies like *Newsweek*, *Time* and *The National Observer*. There's a place for large regional papers, although possibly only one to a region. And there's a place in every community for a newspaper that does the community job no one else can do.

But this is crystal ball gazing. And, of course, I have no way of knowing which individuals within the species will survive and which will perish. There is no magic formula.

But of one thing I am thoroughly convinced. Whether it is

on the national, regional or local level the old style newspaper—throw it in with a shovel, spice it up with sensation and fill in the gaps with funny papers—that type of newspaper is doomed. But whether on the national, regional or local level—the hunger for information packaged in manageable and understandable fashion is immense.

Television has killed the one. But paradoxically, it is increasing the demand for the other. Seeing the game on TV whets your appetite for reading about it, and understanding what actually happened and why.

But if we in the business are going to help the reader understand what happened and why, there will be some demands on us.

For one thing, the demand is increasingly for a sharper and more perceptive type of reporting than we were traditionally brought up in from the days of Ben Hecht and *The Front Page*. More facts, more pertinent facts, less rhetoric. In short, more understanding reporting, whether the subject is the balance of payments, the Vietnamese war, the doings at City Hall or Saturday's football game.

This puts more demand on the kind of people we recruit for the newspaper business. The happy-go-lucky, whiskey drinking reporter is simply no good when you hand him the Medicare bill and say, "here, read this and tell our readers what it means here in Paducah."

Even in purely local news it's becoming no longer enough to just tell the readers the school board voted a consolidation plan. The local TV and radio station will tell the public that much before the newspaper can hit the street. The newspaper must explain the plan, analyze its effect and help the readers make a judgment.

On *The Wall Street Journal* we had a happy misfortune in this regard. We have always been faced with the problem of being an extra paper for most of our readers: That is, even in the days before TV most of our readers would know on Wednesday morning who was elected President before they read *The Wall Street Journal*. Hence, we were forced to reach further than the spot news, to start right out looking deeper into the meaning of the election in terms of both politics and government policy.

Today, more and more newspapers are learning to do the same thing. The result is that, although there are still many mediocre newspapers around the country, the number of good ones is increasing. All in all, they are better reported, edited and printed than in the days of my youth.

I know there are still some people in our business—as in yours—who say that most people have no interest in the kind of reporting and editing it takes to put out a good newspaper. They think the effort doesn't "pay off" in the cash drawer.

Perhaps so, although I don't happen to believe it . . . and I notice that the good newspapers which treat their readers seriously also happen to be the best business ventures.

But today the semi-literate people, the ones not interested in the world around them or incapable of understanding it, offer no real market for much of any kind of newspaper. Radio and TV can provide them with all they need. But by the same token they provide very little market for most of the products of industry, save only the cheapest of the bare essentials. And that other part of the population—numbering now in the many millions—does have this hunger for more and better information. The proof of it is written in the circulation figures. And among these people the journalistic opportunities are immense for those who find the key.

It is true enough that some of us in this business are failing, as the obituary columns in *Editor and Publisher* testify. But it is also true that many of us are succeeding.

And while I'm afraid that the failures will be more, I believe that others will grow fat, happy and prosperous because in meeting the needs of their readers they will provide a marketplace for your wares.

They will also, not so incidentally, offer wonderful places for good newspapermen to work. I almost wish I were 20 years younger.

Mr. Royster is editor of the *Wall Street Journal*. He is a former president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers and the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and won a Pulitzer prize for editorial writing in 1953. These remarks were made at the Annual Meeting of the Audit Bureau of Circulations in New York.

Fair Trial and Free Press

By the ANPA

Following are excerpts from the report of a special committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association on free press and fair trial.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association has devoted nearly two years to a study of a free press and fair trial and from this major research project have come certain conclusions. Among them are:

There is no real conflict between the First Amendment guaranteeing a free press and the Sixth Amendment which guarantees a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury.

The presumption of some members of the Bar that pretrial news is intrinsically prejudicial is based on conjecture and not on fact.

To fulfill its function, a free press requires not only freedom to print without prior restraint but also free and uninhibited access to information that should be public.

There are grave inherent dangers to the public in the restriction or censorship at the source of news, among them secret arrest and ultimately secret trial.

The press is a positive influence in assuring fair trial.

The press has a responsibility to allay public fears and dispel rumors by the disclosure of fact.

No rare and isolated case should serve as cause for censorship and violation of constitutional guarantees.

Rules of court and other orders which restrict the release of information by law enforcement officers are an unwarranted judicial invasion of the executive branch of government.

There can be no codes or covenants which compromise the principles of the Constitution.

The people's right to a free press, which inherently embodies the right of the people to know, is one of our most fundamental rights, and neither the press nor the Bar has the right to sit down and bargain it away.

This last conclusion is central to all the others, pointed and pertinent though they be to the matter involved. The ines-

capable conclusion is that the press must be ever vigilant in its opposition to anything that threatens freedom of the press.

The American press remains as devoted to the principles of fair trial as it is to a free press, and its insistence that justice be neither clouded nor cloaked in secrecy at any stage is to assure that those principles are maintained.

It is obvious that the First and Sixth Amendments are so inter-related and so dependent, one upon the other, that modification or dilution of either on the fallacious premise that such action would strengthen the other would, in itself, represent a betrayal of the intent of the framers of the Constitution.

There is no conflict between a free press and a fair trial, and those who seek to sway the public with such a contention do a disservice to the people and to the cause of American freedom.

Some segments of the American Bar appear to have begun their discussions of the free press-fair trial question with the assumption that pretrial reporting of facts in criminal matters is itself prejudicial to a defendant. This is a presumption for which no concrete proof is advanced. There are cases cited, of course, in which it is believed that a defendant's rights are imperiled by "pretrial publicity." But this is simply a conjecture—and not a fact. Indeed, in bringing such charges of prejudice in pre-trial reporting, the Bar is not only indicting but convicting without clear evidence that such is true.

There should be no assumption that an objective juror must be an ignorant juror, and it is not only a faulty but a dangerous assumption that an over-riding prejudice comes from printed truth. To assume such would be to consign a community to a sterility of information. The public must have the right to make informed judgments about crime in a community, about its law enforcement and its courts. This cannot be done if there is a denial of information which the people need to make such judgments.

On numerous occasions the press has ferreted out the necessary evidence to prove a defendant's innocence. Often, too,

the right of citizens has been protected by newspaper disclosure of improper methods used by newspaper disinvestigation. These safeguards for defendants cannot be assured if the freedom of the press established by the Constitution is replaced by censorship or restrictions upon full reporting.

It is quite clear that freedom of the press means the right to gather, to print, and to circulate information. Any judicial restraint of that right at any point constitutes a prior governmental restraint on publication. It is, in fact, censorship at the source when judges, by court order, prohibit law enforcement officers of the public from providing information to the public.

Newspapers, of course, should not abuse their right to publish without prior restraint. Nor should they shirk their responsibilities.

Secrecy at the source endangers justice and the general welfare of the public. Thus it is evident that there can be no agreement by the American press that would even indicate acceptance of any imposition of rules or restrictions upon law enforcement officers which would have the effect of curtailing access by newspapers to truthful information by police or public records pertaining to the commission of crime in any community.

In the reporting of crime news the press cannot submit to any restrictions which would deprive the accused, as well as the public, of the right to full and unfettered dissemination of the truth. As the eyes and ears of the public, the newspaper is, in truth, a watchdog. In the free functioning of its responsibility, it is the duty of the press to see that a defendant is properly treated and fairly tried. To assume that alleged abuses in the treatment of crime news are always to the detriment of the accused is a false assumption and history proves as much. . . .

It is pertinent at this point to cite the words of the third man in the free-press-fair-trial discussion. That man is the defendant himself, and here are the words of a convict, Hugh Dillon, writing in the Southern Michigan prison publication. "As distasteful as adverse publicity may be," he said, "it is better to be spotlighted momentarily than abused in darkness."

Newspapers cannot agree to restrictions which would force them to abdicate or even hamper their responsibility to the public to put fact before rumor. The public interest will be best served by fair and accurate crime news coverage which helps protect the public and the accused from the dangers stemming from excesses in the past on the part of some lawyers and some segments of the press.

Moreover, it is imperative that the public be informed of facts about crime if law enforcement agencies and courts are to enjoy the confidence and respect of the public. As in all functions of government, the proper administration of justice is ultimately up to the people, and it is the responsible

press which provides the facts on which an informed public can make judgments and act intelligently.

In a study covering a ten-year period from 1955 it was shown that American newspapers devoted only 3 per cent of their space to crime news. In that same period of time, the crime rate in America increased by 73 per cent. This increase in crime is of real and vital concern to the law-abiding citizens of the country, and this concern cannot be eased by concealment but only by the bright glare of truth in reporting. Indeed, there is ample evidence that publicity is a deterrent to crime while concealment fosters its growth. Thus, rather than the curtailing of crime news reporting, it would indeed seem that more such reporting is needed in a day when crime is increasing by alarming proportions.

Even granted that in rare and isolated cases pre-trial reporting may be a factor in creating an over-riding prejudice in potential jurors, there are procedural remedies present to provide effective safeguards. Such procedural safeguards include change of venue, change of venire, continuance, severance, voir dire, blue-ribbon juries, isolation of the jury, instructions, retrial, appeal, and habeas corpus. Our studies indicate that these remedies are fully adequate to protect the rights of a defendant.

Yet the point which still must be made is that the American public's right to a free press should not be jeopardized by judges attempting to impose restrictions on all criminal matters because of the rare and isolated case.

To this committee it is inconceivable that such drastic restrictions as censorship at the source of news should be imposed upon the entire American democratic system because of possible prejudice in a rare case.

The committee states that it is a matter of public concern when court orders place restrictions on law enforcement officers in the release of information. Such action could easily lead to judicial domination of the executive branch of government, and may well be an invasion which would threaten the historically honored separation of powers and responsibilities.

In the early stages of the study the most often recommended course for the press by the Bar was the adoption of codes of conduct. Such a course must be rejected. From a practical standpoint any such codes would be without value because there is no way to enforce them. An individual newspaper may set its own policy or guidelines; any application of specific conduct must remain the sole responsibility of the independent and individual newspaper.

This committee recognizes the practicality at times of certain procedural restrictions regarding newsmen's activities within a courtroom. It recognizes that there are such things as limitations of space in the coverage of major news events or criminal trials of unusual public interest, and that such solutions as pooling of reporters and photographers may be necessary. Such procedural guides have been accepted by major

news organizations and are available if necessary.

In respect to suggested restrictions by bar associations on their own members, this committee feels that this is a matter of decision for the bar itself.

The American press has demonstrated its devotion to the cause of fair trial as it has to the cause of a free press.

This committee, therefore, cannot recommend any covenants of control or restrictions on the accurate reporting of criminal matters, or anything that would impair such reporting.

The committee does recommend that the press stand at any time ready to discuss these problems with any appropriate individuals or groups. Indeed, such positive action can be a far greater force for the cause of justice and the general welfare of the people than the negative force of restrictions on basic freedoms. But there can be no agreement on the part of the American press to dilute its responsibility, or to circumvent the basic rights and provisions of the Constitution. To agree to any of these things would be a mockery of the guarantee made to the people of this Republic by its founding fathers.

The freedom of the press is a fundamental right and it cannot be abridged. The press shares with the bench, bar and law enforcement officials the responsibility for preservation

of the American liberties embodied in the First and Sixth Amendments.

Members of the special committee which prepared the ANPA report are D. Tennant Bryan, chairman; Otis Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times; Jack R. Howard, president of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, New York City; W. D. Maxwell, first vice president and editor of the Chicago Tribune; Paul Miller, president of Gannett Newspapers, Rochester, N.Y.; Benjamin M. McKelway, vice president and editorial chairman of the Washington Star; Sam Regan, executive news editor of the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer and Raleigh Times; Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal; Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times; Robert L. Taylor, president and publisher of the Philadelphia Bulletin; Louis A. Weil, Jr., publisher and editor of the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, and Robert M. White II, president and editor of the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger.

Counsel for the committee was Arthur B. Hanson, general counsel for the American Newspaper Publishers Assn., and William J. Butler Jr., associate counsel, Hanson, Cobb, O'Brien & Tucker, Washington.

The Flow of News Between Asia and the West

By John Hohenberg

In the summer and fall of 1965, several hundred correspondents for foreign news organizations were hard at work in Asian trouble centers. They covered the intensified war in Vietnam, the three-week war between India and Pakistan, the fateful Indonesian uprising in which hundreds of thousands were killed, and a series of incidents along the Chinese Communist frontier. Japan and the Philippines were of interest primarily as communications centers, as was Hong Kong. But comparatively little was heard of Taiwan, Thailand, Burma and smaller countries.

Despite all adverse factors, it is fair to say that the flow of news between the principal nations of Asia and the west—and particularly the United States—was greater at that period than at any time since World War II and that the corps of correspondents was better. But the state of public enlightenment in the West about the most important Asian affairs was still very dim. It was popular in the United States to say that the American public was the best informed in the world of Asian affairs; actually, it would have been more truthful to call the American public the least poorly informed.

What accounted for the low state of public comprehension and comparatively good work of the correspondents as a whole? Many factors, ranging from public education to political leadership, were responsible; certainly, the mass media bore their fair share of blame. For the truth was that the flow of the news from east to west was based primarily on war coverage by hordes of correspondents who came in by jet plane, and for the most part never stayed very long. Actually, there were comparatively few foreign correspondents permanently stationed in Asia except from the Big Three Western wire services—Associated Press, United Press International and Reuters; a handful of American, British, European and Japanese papers, and a scattering of others. Agence France- Presse, the Deutsche Press Agentur and Kyodo, the Japanese agency, were building up their services. For the

Communist world, Tass and the New China News Agency came in wherever they found a welcome.

For the vast majority of the Western press, the wire services continued to serve as the work horses and also brought world news to Asia. Of the great newspapers of the West, the New York Times, still had the largest number of correspondents in Asia, although both the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post were pressing the old champion hard. The Chicago Daily News was trying to improve its limited file but one of the greatest, the New York Herald Tribune foreign service, was making its last dying gasp.

Of the individual American newspapers with more than a long representative in Asia, the Baltimore Sun, Christian Science Monitor and Wall Street Journal covered certain areas in depth and such newcomers as the Copley Press were getting established. In both numbers and enterprise, the Time-Life service was outstanding among the weeklies but Newsweek now and then was able to come up with a sensation and U.S. News and World Report, with two or three correspondents, could provide meaningful interpretations of events. McGraw-Hill and Fairchild had specialised business and financial coverage of Asian news, but for daily business reports Reuters Comtelburo was hard to beat.

Occasionally, a waspish intellectual would challenge the seeming dominance of the Americans by pointing out that individual correspondents of the Times of London, the Guardian, the Economist, Figaro, Le Monde, the Neue Zürcher Zeitung and others frequently did more significant work. There was undoubted truth in this point of view, but for sheer volume the Americans could scarcely be beaten. In the matter of influence of public opinion at home, however, it was obvious that few Americans could compete with publications like the London Sunday Times or the Economist. Despite the excellence of a number of individuals working for American news organizations, the United States was too large and served by too many diverse sources of news for

any one to obtain dominance. The New York Times came the closest as a publication of national importance.

Because of the mass of American correspondence (large for Asia, but outside Vietnam probably one-third that for Europe), it was made the subject of particular analysis. In all, 91 representatives of American news organizations, who seemed to meet the definition of a permanently assigned foreign correspondent, answered detailed questionnaires during the summer of 1964. About a dozen others were on the list for questionnaire and depth interviews in major cities between Tokyo and New Delhi, but were not included because they were on home leave or otherwise unavailable.

This was not a census of foreign correspondents in the area, although it came close to the total of permanently assigned Americans, their foreign counterparts who worked for American news organizations, permanent stringers or other replacements for full-timers on leave, and local correspondents with major responsibilities. The only omissions were locals with technical jobs, or those who did not want to answer a questionnaire or be interviewed for their own reasons.

Those who participated in the questionnaire analysis of their work included 75 Americans, three each from Japan, Korea and British Commonwealth countries, two each from the Philippines and India, another Commonwealth nation, and one each from France, Lebanon and Nationalist China. Their average age was 38.5 years. They had served in the area for an average of 20.34 months in the post they held at the time of the survey. Except for nine correspondents who were either locals in fixed positions or permanent stringers, the rest had put in an average of 7.81 years overseas. They had been journalists for an average of 14.95 years.

They represented 15 American newspapers or newspaper groups, three weekly news magazines, two business news organizations, two magazines of general circulation, two American wire services and three radio-television networks. Four regional chiefs and numerous bureau chiefs were included, although many of the latter ran a bureau with one local or perhaps two at the most. There were also two photographic area managers who acted as correspondents when they were in the field.

While all except nine correspondents claimed an acquaintance with one language other than English, there were relatively few accomplished linguists in the group except for those who had been born abroad.

European languages predominated. Not many Americans had been able to become proficient in Japanese, Chinese, or Russian and only one had a nodding acquaintance with Hindi and Urdu. The linguistic talent among the correspondents was centered largely on Asian correspondents who worked for American news organizations represented in the survey. As one American explained it, "We are shifted around too frequently to make a serious effort to learn a

language for which we will have little use later. No American news organization is going to take the trouble to train us in languages for an assignment of only short duration. Only the government would have the money to support such a project."

Of the 39 newspaper and wire service correspondents who estimated the average size of their dispatches, not all filed daily; however, the average length of their dispatches came to 600 to 690 words. Of the six radio-television correspondents who estimated their daily contribution five, said they transmitted 45 second voice casts daily and one transmitted a 90-second voicecast. Of ten news weekly correspondents who estimated the average size of their dispatches, the average came to 1,120 to 1,540 words in a normal week. For a cover story, of course, the wordage could go to 10,000 words or more.

While it was difficult for correspondents for American news organizations to say precisely what their travels had been for a 12-month period preceding July-August 1964, this was their best recollection:

Eight correspondents had 6-10 months' travel away from their base, ranging from 75,000 to 100,000 miles or more.

Eighteen correspondents had 3-6 months' travel away from their base, ranging from 25,000 to 75,000 miles.

Forty-five correspondents had at least three months' travel away from their base, up to about 25,000 miles.

Ten travelled within the country to which they had been assigned and ten others reported no travel.

In an analysis of obstacles that separated correspondents from their sources in Asia, the respondents named the language barrier and general suspicion and mistrust as their worst enemies. In the responses these were the main obstacles listed in order: Language barrier, 22; suspicion and mistrust, 17; local customs (meaning Japanese press clubs), 7; geography, 4; communications, 4; other causes, 13 (including 10 who protested their inability to visit Red China). Ten made no reply and 14 reported they had found no obstacles. Only one correspondent charged that United States embassy personnel had blocked him off from his sources.

The correspondents leaned heavily to spot news as their primary interest in Asia, for it was listed by 43 out of the 91. Of the rest 33 specialized in analysis, five in features and 10 were interested in general news of all kinds. Their primary subjects were as follows: politics, 24; military (the Vietnam War), 18; Red China, 17; cold war in general, 7; business and finance, 7; general subjects, 4; news of dominant leaders and cultural news, 1 each, and no choice, 12. As second choices, there was little change, so that a summary of both first and second choices showed that the three top interests of the 91 correspondents in Asia were politics, the Vietnamese War and Red China. Nearly all of them reported that it was difficult to "sell" their editors on any other aspect of news from Asia, and this was even more true in Europe than it

was in England or the United States.

Most of the correspondents were satisfied with the use that was made of their material, although news magazine correspondents were not particularly pleased with the average 20 to 25 per cent use of their file. The only complaint of substance, however, came from a magazine special who had run into bad luck and seen nothing used for an entire year. It was a rare case. While 36 correspondents had no suggestions for improving the use made of their material, others thought that editors should give more space to foreign news generally and Asian news in particular, make a greater effort to publish or broadcast news analysis, and do less rewriting of dispatches. Four hard-shelled correspondents suggested that better informed editors would help.

The 91 correspondents saw considerable room for improvement in the coverage of the United States in the Asian press. In response to a question about the adequacy with which the United States was reported in the press of their host country, 11 said it was excellent, 18, good; 38, fair; 14, poor, and 10 made no comment. Thirty-four correspondents thought the coverage of the United States was improving in the Asian press, 10 others didn't, 18 detected no change and 29 had no comment. The principal reasons given for a relatively poor American image in the Asian press were lack of interest in the United States, lack of knowledge about the United States, the political orientation of the Asian press, sensationalism, lack of professional competence among some Asians, lack of space, and an anti-American policy of some governments. Those who noted that the United States had a relatively good press in certain countries attributed it to the strength of American ties in those lands and the professional competence of the press.

This was the response which the correspondents made to a question which asked them to specify the general areas in which they had detected distortions or gaps in the reporting of the United States in the Asian press: reporting of United States racial tensions, 11; partisan approach, 10; inability to understand the American political and social system, 9; too much reporting from Washington and too little elsewhere, 6, and scattering of other reasons. However, in spite of their objections, the correspondents concluded that the press (all media) for the most part was generally favourable to the United States in a number of Asian countries. In the responses to this question, 40 said yes, 21 said yes with qualifications, only 7 said no and 13 made no comment.

(A questionnaire submitted primarily to Japanese and Indian correspondents in Washington unanimously concluded that, with the exception of Vietnam, Asian lands in general were underreported in the American press and that, in a large section of the mass media, they were almost ignored. Primarily, the correspondents blamed lack of interest and lack of knowledge.)

If the survey established anything at all, it was that the

correspondents for the most part liked their work and wanted to continue to report from Asia. Moreover, it appeared that many of them displayed a considerable difference in their personal and professional attitudes towards Asia and the Asians generally. Personally, many were charmed; professionally, they concentrated on adverse trends in war and politics on the Asian mainland that had become almost standard fare for the American newspapers that were interested in news from Asia. While the British and European correspondents were far fewer in number, the Times of London maintaining only two correspondents at the time of the survey from Tokyo and New Delhi, their correspondence was not as limited. They appeared to have more liberty to write whatever they believed it was important for people at home to know, and with the exception of the wire services their style was more relaxed. There wasn't as much insistence on the "God-how-the-wind-blew" type of beginning.

A kindred survey of what was published in leading American and Asian newspapers during the summer of 1964 shed further light on the rather limited nature of the news flow—something that could also be said of most of the British and European press. It was a time of rising tension in Asia. The war in Vietnam was approaching the point of escalation. In Tokyo, the Philippines tried unsuccessfully to end the feud between giant Indonesia and tiny Malaysia. The United States was shipping arms to Thailand. And in India, gripped by its worst food shortage since its independence, there was renewed concern over hostile Pakistani moves in the Kashmir area. From the Himalayan ramparts, where Chinese Communist soldiers threatened the Indian subcontinent, to the Korean peninsula, where student rioters tried in vain to overthrow the government of the Republic of Korea, peace seemed a far-off prospect.

A survey of the news published during that period between June 15-21, July 13-19 and August 17-23 inclusive showed that the New York Times devoted a daily average of 4.2 columns to Asian affairs out of its daily average of 18.27 columns given over entirely to radioed or cabled foreign news. The Los Angeles Times, for the same three-week test period, published 3.3 columns of Asian news on the average out of its daily average foreign news space of 9.4 columns. The Christian Science Monitor's averages were two columns of Asian news out of a daily total of 10.1 columns for foreign news; the Washington Post, 1.8 columns out of 7; the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 1.26 columns out of 3.65; the Chicago Daily News, .95 of a column out of 3.76; the Philadelphia Inquirer, .9 of a column out of 3.5 columns.

These newspapers were selected as representative of the American press in its coverage of Asian affairs, but it could not include all major papers with foreign services or even all major papers. There was a limit to what could be attempted by two people, with two assistants working part-time. It

was admittedly the lowest time of the year for the publication of Asian news because of the passage of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 during the June week of the test period, the nomination of Barry Goldwater for president by the Republican National Convention during the July week, and the preoccupation with the coming nomination of President Johnson by the Democrats during the August week. However, it was hoped that these events might show a livelier appreciation of the value of American news in the Asian press than had been anticipated. The test weeks were chosen well in advance.

An expression of the results in terms of percentages gave an even clearer indication of the priorities for Asian news among some of the American press leaders. The New York Times, for example, devoted 22 per cent of its live news space (excluding financial, sports, women's, amusements, etc.) to foreign news during the test period and gave more than 23 per cent of that to Asian news. The Los Angeles Times averages were 15 per cent of its live news space for foreign news, and 35 per cent of that for Asian news; the Washington Post, 12 per cent and 25 per cent; the Christian Science Monitor, 37 per cent, and 19 per cent; the Chicago Daily News, 10 per cent and 25 per cent; the St. Louis Post Dispatch, 9.2 per cent, and 34 per cent and the Philadelphia Inquirer, 8 per cent and 26 per cent.

All except two of the American newspapers in the survey used their own foreign correspondents as the major source of foreign news, including news of Asia. The New York Times filled 85 per cent of its foreign news space with the work of its own correspondents, the Christian Science Monitor, 77 per cent; the Chicago Daily News, 55 per cent; the Los Angeles Times, 47 per cent; the Washington Post, 31 per cent. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Philadelphia Inquirer, without regular foreign staffs of their own, used only 8 per cent and 2 per cent respectively of foreign news from their roving staff people. The next largest source of foreign news, on the average, was the Associated Press, running as high as 43 per cent of the foreign news space of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. United Press International, Reuters and the syndicates of newspapers with foreign news staffs followed, sometimes not necessarily in that order.

If there was anything at all remarkable about the American performance, it was the extent to which the Los Angeles Times, a newcomer to the field of foreign news reporting by staff correspondents, had devoted its efforts to improving its coverage of the world in general and Asia in particular. The Washington Post, similarly, had made considerable progress in improving its foreign service. There were, of course, either newspapers with enduring interests in foreign news coverage and small staff of correspondents, but none with as much scope as the leaders and such specialized newspapers as the Christian Science Monitor. From the performance of other first-rate newspapers without foreign staffs

of their own, there was reason to suspect that the American press was not overly excited about Asian news at that particular time. There were only about a score of regularly assigned correspondents in Saigon—the leading world date-line in the American press. (Today there are more than 500.) In any event, nobody was within reach of the New York Times anywhere in the West, even if it was publishing decidedly less foreign news than it had a decade before.

No comparison, of course, could be made between the American press and the newspapers with far fewer pages that were published in Asian countries. While the largest Japanese newspapers had three times the circulation of the largest American newspaper, the Japanese reader had to absorb his news from compact pages. For the 1964 test period, the live news space of the Japanese "Big Three"—Asahi Shimbun, Mainichi Shimbun and Yomiuri Shimbun—was roughly the same as that of the Christian Science Monitor. The leading newspapers of Southeast Asia and India were slightly larger as far as space for live news was concerned. But all the Asian papers were edited far more closely than most of the leading American papers. They were as watchful of space as, for example, the New York Daily News, probably the most tightly edited paper in the United States—and the circulation leader.

The results of the study of the Japanese press leaders indicated that Japanese newspapers featured domestic affairs just as heavily as did the American newspapers, if not more so, and seemed relatively unexcited about the big domestic news in the United States. It was a period when the United Nations Trade Conference was under way in Geneva, when the marathon disarmament conference was still dragging along, when Japan was preparing for its successful presentation of the Olympic Games and absorbing the shock of the Niigata earthquake.

The morning editions of Asahi Shimbun ran 21.6 columns a day of live news on the average during the test period, with 5.57 columns devoted to foreign news and 2 columns of that given over to news of the United States. (Japanese columns are expressed in terms of New York Times columns here, with no extra allowance made for the compactness of Japanese characters over English words.) The morning editions of Mainichi Shimbun averaged 25.37 columns of live news space, with 4.3 columns of foreign news and .95 of a column of United States news. The morning edition of Yomiuri Shimbun averaged 24.16 columns of live news space with 2.87 columns of foreign news and .56 of a column of United States news. In both Mainichi and Yomiuri there was more news of Europe and Asia respectively than there was of the United States—and the American dispatches included both foreign and domestic news. It was a time when no Japanese news organization had assigned a permanent correspondent to Vietnam—a situation that was to change sharply with the escalation of the war.

Expressed in terms of percentages, Asahi devoted 26 per cent of its live news space to foreign news and divided this as follows: United States news, 37 per cent; Asian 26 per cent; European, 30 per cent. Mainichi gave only 17 per cent of its live news space to foreign news, divided as follows: United States news, 21 per cent; Asian news, 25 per cent; European news, 46 per cent. Yomiuri devoted 22 per cent of its live news space to foreign news, divided as follows: United States news, 19 per cent; Asian news, 34 per cent; European news, 39 per cent. The dominant morning editions, referred to here, set the pattern for both the slimmer afternoons and the rest of the Japanese press as well.

Just as was the case with leading American newspapers, the Japanese took most of their foreign news from their own correspondents. For most of them, the Associated Press was the next largest source, although there were interesting variations during the test period. The morning editions of Asahi Shimbun used 60 per cent of its own correspondents' work in its foreign news space, 11 per cent, AP; 4.3 per cent AFP; 4 per cent, Reuters'; 3 per cent, UPI, and a scattering for the remainder. In the afternoon editions, the percentage of own correspondents' usage was even higher and both Reuters and AP had 9.5 per cent of the total foreign news space. For Mainichi Shimbun, 70 per cent of the foreign news space in the morning editions went to its own correspondents, with 10 per cent to UPI, 3.9 per cent, AFP; 2.5 per cent; AP, 2.1 per cent, Reuters and the rest scattered. In Mainichi's afternoon editions, their own correspondents' percentage was the same, with 9.5 per cent for UPI, 7.5 per cent for AFP, 6 per cent for AP, and the rest scattered. For Yomiuri Shimbun's morning editions, 54.6 per cent of its foreign news came from its own correspondents, 18.3 per cent from AP, 6.2 per cent from UPI, 2.6 per cent Reuters and 1.4 per cent AFP. Yomiuri's afternoon editions reflected an even greater dominance of AP usage, 52 per cent for own correspondents and 22 per cent for AP. Kyodo's use was largest in the afternoon editions but in no case exceeded 6 per cent.

The western wire service editors argued that Japanese correspondents often rewrote the agency dispatches which, in some cases, was true. They also rewrote from dispatches of client newspapers in the West. As one Japanese foreign editor said, "I do not care where my correspondents get their raw material, as long as what they write is seen through Japanese eyes." But it is also true that some Japanese correspondents were as energetic and original as their Western competitors and often more numerous abroad than any except the Americans. Regardless of where they obtained their news, the survey established without any doubt whatever their primacy as major sources of Japanese news about the United States. The wire services weren't even close, as far as the "Big Three" were concerned. What the Japanese correspondents wrote was prominently published and carried weight, not only with their editors, but with their enormous

reading public. The relative obscurity in which they worked in such Western capitals as Washington, London and Paris was a testimonial to the blindness of most western policy makers, who often devoted more time to the Dutch or the Danes than they did to the Japanese and then complained over the difficulties of reaching the Japanese public.

The press of Southeast Asia, which had no correspondents in the United States or Europe except when there were visits of heads of State, naturally depended on the wire services for most foreign news. In the Philippines it was to be expected that the Associated Press would supply much of the news of the United States, along with United Press International, the New York Times Foreign Service and other syndicates. For the most part, this was what happened. But a newspaper that was critical of American policy such as the powerful Manila Times or the Manila Chronicle, resorted to use the Agence France-Presse for a more astringent view of the United States now and then. Even though the AP topped AFP by 3-1 or more, the needling process was worth watching.

Outside the Philippines, in Hongkong and Malaysia, the press leaders divided rather sharply between those with British and American orientation. Thus the South China Morning Post in Hong Kong and the Straits Time in Kuala Lumpur both used more Reuters than anything else while the Hong Kong Tiger Standard leaned heavily on both AP and UPI, as well as pages of American comics. A paper like the Tiger Standard devoted 44 per cent of its live news space to foreign news and gave 20 per cent of that over to American news. Probably the largest volume of American news in the Far East, on a percentage basis, was published in the Philippines Herald, which gave 24.4 per cent of its live news space to foreign news and gave over 46 per cent of that to news of the United States.

In India, the United States was seen very largely through the eyes of the few Indian correspondents in Washington—all notable for their hard work and their independence—and the Reuters dispatches made available through the Press Trust of India. The Associated Press, made available through the then infant United News of India, was given barely minimal use on some papers and was not printed at all by others. AFP and the Deutsche Press Agentur also were available, but UPI was not. This, however, did not mean that the Indian press received a generally unfriendly interpretation of American events: in 1964, for the most part, the special correspondence seemed relatively favourable. If an Indian editor wanted to shift to a sharper view of American policies, he could use AFP and sometimes did so.

The Indian press gave its readers a much broader view of the world than they had any right to expect from newspapers so handicapped by lack of space and funds for foreign coverage. The Indian Express, for example, published 31.5 columns of live news daily on the average, gave 5.68 col-

umns to foreign affairs and 1.23 columns of that total to American news. The Hindustan Times, and the Statesman, with less live news space, gave almost as much to foreign news and allotted one column each day on the average to news of the United States. The Times of India, with an average live news total of 32.6 columns daily, published 6.66 columns of foreign news and devoted 1.3 columns of that to United States news.

It was in the Indian language press that the bottom dropped out of foreign news in general and United States news in particular. The large Bengali daily, Ananda Bazar Patrika, for example, gave its readers an average of 1.4 columns of foreign news a day and .13 of a column a day of American news, which is just about the kind of performance one would expect of a purely local American daily. It was scant wonder that the readers of such a press, either in India or the United States, had the dimmest notion of what was going on in the world. If anything, the Americans had a distinct advantage, for they could turn to the well-edited news magazines or flip on radio or television if the newspapers failed them. The Indians did not receive a comparable volume of news from All-India Radio, where there was no tradition then of five-minute newscasts on the hour, and television was only a dream of a future Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi.

Thus, from Japan to the Indian sub-continent, the individual foreign correspondents appeared to be the strongest

force for explaining the West to the public at large. Whatever was true of the United States also applied—in greater or lesser degree—to Great Britain and to European Nations, depending on the newspaper and the Asian nation that was considered.

While the Asian press had comparatively little space in which to work, their impact was probably greater than that of their more numerous American colleagues on their respective publics. But with few exceptions, neither the American nor the Asian correspondents could hope to develop a broad-gauged assessment of the country to which they were assigned; except for the events of the day, newspaper space was too limited for lengthy foreign expositions and local news was of obviously greater importance in general.

The magazines of news and comment had an undoubted advantage over the daily press in developing meaningful interpretations of foreign affairs, but they were seldom willing to exercise it. As for television, potentially the most influential of all, it did not seem to realize its own strength. In the United States and Japan, particularly, news was a poor second to entertainment and a riot of advertising.

Mr. Hohenberg, of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, adapted this study from his forthcoming book, "Between Two Worlds" for the International Press Institute Assembly at New Delhi.

The Press Conference

By Morris L. Ernst

On April 25th two dramatic events occurred in our Republic. A meteor was reported in our skies. It was reported ad nauseam as if our planet had never seen a meteor before. Nonsense. The study of meteors started in 1833. At one place in one year 200,000 meteors were noted in North America alone. From January to July for the whole night an hourly meteor average is at least six or seven. Telescopic meteors enter the earth's atmosphere at the rate of one hundred million per day. A meteor is a casual phenomenon to be reported but not with hysteria.

The other meteoric event of April 25th is of historical importance but unmentioned by our mass media, even though our bored reporters saw it, heard it, but were so blase or historically uninformed as not to recognize its true significance.

For decades we have had a game called a *Press Conference*. High officials had been seduced into this fraudulent spectacle. The Presidential press conference is an indignity enjoyed as a bit of artistry by Roosevelt and Kennedy, but suffered by Truman and endured by Eisenhower. Johnson has properly appraised the fraudulent elements of the press conference. He senses that it is a dishonorable national game.

Everyone knows, except for rare occasions, that no question is asked in order to get knowledge. Answers have all been made available by the Press Secretaries to the official used as a goat. The planting of questions by the goat-President, Governor, Mayor or Cabinet Minister, is taken for granted. The purpose of this vaudeville act is to catch the "goat" off base. Thus at times the public gets a dirty headline in a quest which is not directed toward knowledge.

In England, the House of Commons has a question period. The questions are writ-

ten in advance and printed the very next day in Hansard, the counterpart of our Congressional Record. The enquirer thus is careful about his query, because, being recorded, his wisdom and good faith can be appraised. In our culture there is no record which permits the evaluation of the enquiring reporter. No wonder our press resents a chief executive who does not encourage the use of the press "game." Johnson talks to groups of reporters to convey knowledge and not as a stunt for headlines. Thus when he meets reporters even on a stroll on the White House lawn, honorable discourse takes place. Hats off to LBJ. Although his avoidance of the press conference game of "Catch Him Off Base" is resented by those who sell papers it is approved by sober thoughtful citizens.

And so on April 25th Mayor Lindsay held the first honorable press conference in our culture. Still more spectacular is the fact that the conference was held with scores of representatives of a heretofore disregarded sector of the press—our great Weeklies. These are the 60 informing agencies of our city that do not cater primarily to orgy and murder to sell papers. They are the only source of knowledge for a million citizens who want to be informed about local problems. The weeklies are coming into their own, even for advertisers, despite the "silence treatment" given them by all our city wide mass media on April 26th. The questions presented to our Mayor were sober and answered by the Mayor or his Cabinet. The Mayor should not know the answers to every local question.

When I helped prepare for President Eisenhower a Press Conference with questions in advance, leaders of our press promptly rushed to Washington to avoid such an honorable conference. They need a "game" to sell papers. In fact, one of the early questions presented to Ike was "why not give our surplus butter to India?" Any president who knew the answer is probably unfit to hold the office. The answer was known to the Secretary of Agriculture—"do you want to destroy the economy of Denmark whose main export is butter to India?"

Lindsay's press meteor went by unnoted in the remaining daily press of our city. But watch its growth. The weeklies will build and grow from April 25, 1966. It is

not impossible that our few remaining dailies may be forced to follow this First Amendment Press Conference meteor of April 25, 1966.

The Villager can be justly proud. It was one of the leaders in this revolution in the flow of knowledge from executive to citizens. Many reporters who have a high skill in getting heat instead of light, will have to learn new techniques, in fact, new ideals for a free press in an open society.

It is high time the 60 weeklies in our city organize to accept these novel and exciting logistics for the spread of news.

The meteor in the sky of April 25th will not be a public concern even next week, but the thoughtful press conference for weeklies has started on a path of light enduring for years after the tail of the heavenly meteor has faded away.

I congratulate the sobriety of the weekly editors who handed in more than 40 questions in writing to the Mayor before he approached the podium in that beautiful Chamber at our historic City Hall.

Thus at long last will our people be informed of problems they can comprehend. Thus, government may become meaningful to our citizens. Thus we will once more witness the involvement of people in their government, no longer limited by the glibness encouraged by citywide media dealing of necessity with mammoth problems, understood by only a few experts.

Mr. Ernst, of Greenbaum, Wolff and Ernst, lawyers in New York City, wrote this for his column, "I have a concern . . ." in *The Villager*, Greenwich Village, New York.

The Newspaper in Transition

By William B. Dickinson

Consider for a moment the continuing battle, not of our choosing, in which we are locked with the lawyers. In this past year, the infighting has become more deadly. We all owe a debt to Hu Blonk, chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee, and his committeemen, for a year of tireless, painstaking, enthusiastic work which, while it has not won the battle for us, at least has kept us undefeated.

This is a struggle in which we must give ground.

The First Amendment, guaranteeing a free press, and the Sixth Amendment, guaranteeing fair trial, have coexisted since 1790. Only in the last few years have lawyers—mostly defense lawyers—unilaterally decided that the two are on a collision course which may imperil justice.

They prate, among other things, about the British system and how wonderful it is. Yet such British authorities as Lord Shawcross and Lord Dilhorne, both former attorneys-general, are leading a fight for reform of British justice, exactly because they believe too many of the guilty are escaping punishment.

These two men pointed out in a recent British Broadcasting Company discussion that almost half of the alleged criminals who are tried by juries in Britain are acquitted—yet they believe that better than eight out of ten who are prosecuted are in fact guilty.

They say that the “game” of criminal defense—and “game” is their word, not mine—is being played under such rigid legal rules of evidence that truth and justice are being lost.

If the British newspapers were not so hamstrung in their pretrial coverage would the public have allowed these outrages?

As Lord Shawcross says, “What we have got to realize is that for a guilty man to get off is just as much an affront to justice as for an innocent man to be convicted.”

Within a few weeks, there will be introduced in Parliament a Criminal Justice Bill which would provide for majority jury verdicts, and would bar from jury service persons with serious

criminal records. Increasing intimidation of jurors is said to be a main reason for these proposals. This, mind you, in England.

Isn't it ironic that, while England's leading jurists seek ways of protecting the public from criminals, a vociferous minority of our own lawyers seek more restrictive rules governing the conduct of both law enforcement authorities and the press? Can it be that they seek only to further their own interests?

American newspapers—with a few glaring exceptions in the past—have not, and do not, seek to influence the course of justice.

We must not yield one inch in our determination to defend the free, open forum which the press provides, and the right of the people to information. We leave it to the lawyers to determine their own ethical standards—and we must determine our own.

We must retain the power of free judgment willed to us by sage men who, when this nation was born, deliberated gravely on how to keep it free, and then wrote the First Amendment as the primary article of the Bill of Rights.

If news our readers need is being denied them, we must get that news, and we must print it—and we must be willing, if necessary, to take the consequences.

We must keep our standards high—bravely high.

Two hundred years before Christ, Polybius wrote:

“There is no witness so dreadful, no accuser so terrible as the conscience that dwells in the heart of every man.”

Editors have consciences. We do not need lawyers to supply them.

We have problems—and perils—even more challenging than those posed by a minority of lawyers.

Newspapers are, I believe, in a period of transition—a transition forced upon us by several developments—and while most of us know where we've been, a lot of us haven't thought enough about where we're going.

In the American past, newspapers have played several roles. At the start, most of them were journals of political opinion, with a bit of chit-chat about people and things tossed in. Once established, the more important of them upheld the status quo and warned against change. But change came!

At the turn of the century, newspapers played a major role in educating the "huddled masses, yearning to breathe free."

And in the 'twenties, Hearst and others developed what Ian Fleming might have called the "kiss kiss, bang bang" newspaper. It was mighty successful for a time. It made old style newspapers look stodgy—but many readers still wanted the facts.

Then came radio—and barely twenty years behind radio, came television. These media have preferred, in the main, to amuse and bemuse, but they also brought a speed of communication the press cannot match. Gone is the newspaper's prerogative, so long held, of being first with the spot news. Most of us have, at long last, accepted the fact that the cry, "extra, extra" is as out of date as the village well.

Next, and only recently, came two more important developments—the population explosion and the education explosion. I do not believe we have fully realized what these two explosions mean to us and our newspapers.

You all know the statistics:

—Twenty years ago only one in three high school graduates went on to college. Now more than half do, and the rate is rising.

—So is the number of the highly educated. Ninety per cent of all the scholars and scientists who have ever lived are alive and working today—and their reports of their discoveries are pouring from the copying machines and presses far faster than any editor can hope to read and understand them.

—Within about five years, half the people of the United States will be under twenty-five. So the American newspaper now must seek to report to a swiftly changing audience—an increasingly youthful, well educated and highly sophisticated readership—on a swiftly changing world. Of course we are in a period of transition. We are searching, consciously or unconsciously, for a new role. I think, when we have finally shuffled off the "kiss kiss, bang bang" tradition, we will find that our new role is one of thoughtful analysis, synthesis, and explanation—not one of just giving the facts.

Don Quixote cried out: "Facts are the enemy of truth." And Henry James spoke of "the fatal futility of fact." Ernest Hemingway, when asked by an Idaho high school boy how he got started writing, replied: "I always wanted to write. I worked on the school paper, and my first jobs were writing. After I finished high school I went to Kansas City and worked on a paper. It was regular newspaper work: Who shot whom? Who broke into what? Where? When? How? But never Why, not really Why."

He was saying, of course, that he found it possible to touch

more of essential truth in writing fiction than as a reporter of fact. Examining most newspapers today, and examining the output of our news services, one might not say, with Hemingway, "never . . . really why." But one would, I think, have to say, "Seldom why."

We fill most of the columns of our newspapers with spot news—much of it trivial to the point of absurdity. We deluge our readers with undigested facts. We report the events—and we do it especially well if they are dramatic—and we overlook the causes and the consequences of those events. We cover the violence in the streets, but not the conditions that are responsible for that violence. We cover the wars, but not the threats to peace.

Partly we act this way because we are conditioned by long habit, because our staffs are set up to do it this way. We have become accustomed to covering certain beats: police and fire, the city hall, the courts, the Chamber of Commerce, and so on. We are not yet accustomed to covering the new beats, the very people who are transforming our world—the scientists, the physicians, the economists, the engineers, the architects, the educators, and management elite, the planners, the thinkers.

It is not governments, not even in the police states, that are changing our world. Yet we still spend enormous effort and use enormous space to cover, rather superficially, every fact and figure of our governments and of the governments of other countries, at every level.

I think we must redefine the meaning of news. We must somehow take a broader view, see events and people in a larger sense, paint with our words and pictures on a wider canvas. The challenge to us is that of increasing man's understanding of man. I do not underestimate the enormity of this task. We shall not move easily and straightly toward our goal.

But perhaps this is just as well. We do not want to march alone. We must move slowly, with fits and starts and, no doubt, a few wrong turnings, because newspaper readers are creatures of habit, too, and we must not, as we struggle into our new role, too much disturb them.

Cecil King, when asked how he had built the London Daily Mirror to the world's largest circulation, replied that it was done "by not giving a damn about anybody over thirty." I don't think we can adopt that attitude—not just yet. But change we must, and fairly rapidly, much more swiftly in the next ten years than in the last decade.

How, exactly, shall we move? Certainly we shall greatly reduce the emphasis we now place on coverage of spot news. How much spot news is there, any way, on a given day, that is really new and important to our readers? Could it not be compressed into a page or even less, leaving us far more space to devote to background, to interpretation, to explanation?

I do not mean that we can serve the nuclear physicist as

"The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" does, or the surgeon as does the journal called "Surgery." But I do mean that we can provide for the specialists, whose numbers are so rapidly increasing, a balanced account and analysis of the information they need outside their own fields—while at the same time providing for our non-specialist readers an overall insight into and understanding of the changing world in which they live.

The latter is the more important function. In a democracy, the voters—and they are our readers—have increasingly difficult decisions to make as science becomes a dominant institution in our national life. Eric Larrabee in a recent article in *Commentary Magazine* points out that our government now is spending twice as much on research and development as it does on public works—and more on high energy physics than on cancer research. "Science," he says bluntly, "is too important to be left to the scientists."

There is no scientific way of deciding how much of the gross national product should be devoted to scientific research. There is no way of deciding how that figure, whatever it is, should be divided, say, between going to the moon and ending poverty and hunger.

Yet, as Larrabee says, these decisions must be made—and there is only the political way of making them.

I quote him again: ". . . Though politicians and voters may know little and care less whether a Fixed Field Alternating Gradient Synchrotron should or should not be built, they are going to make such decisions with increasing frequency." It will be the newspapers' duty, I believe, to provide our readers with the information—handled clearly and understandably—they need to reach intelligent decisions on just such problems.

To do so, I think it is plain that we require a new breed of journalist, the specialist—the highly paid specialist. This new kind of newspaperman will deal with the advances in science, in medicine, in education, the planning problems of urban civilization and government, the problems of the poor and the rich, the white and the nonwhite, the sick and the well.

We are going to have to forget the cliché long favored by city editors and press association bureau chiefs that any good district reporter can cover any story. It hasn't been true for years—and it will be less true in the years ahead.

We will need experts to provide the in-depth articles we must have regarding our culture heroes, our important people and influential events. Some of these experts we will develop

on our own staffs; others we will seek outside our newspapers because of their special knowledge.

A major concern in the future—as now—will be to find the men and women who can do the jobs that must be done. I think that very soon most of us will be actively recruiting—as only a few do now—among the top graduates of our colleges.

And we will place much more emphasis on training our staff people. We will encourage them to continue their educations, with attendance at American Press Institute seminars, with Nieman and other fellowships, and we will support them financially as they take advantage of the funds and scholarships, now proliferating, which are available for such training. An excellent list of these appears, by the way, in this year's report of the Personnel Committee.

We will hire with an eye to the future, weighing not only the applicant's ability to handle the immediate job, but also his possibilities for coping with bigger assignments to come. We will ask, "Can he—or she—think? Can he—or she—learn?"

As we move further through this period of transition, as we begin to fit more comfortably into our even more responsible and demanding new role—the role of increasing man's understanding of man—I predict that we will find ourselves less often the targets of petty and annoying criticism.

It is not the careful and thorough analysis and explanation of the news that gets us into trouble. It is the slambang reportage of the moment, done and printed in a fast fading tradition, that blurs our image.

As we increase our concentration on explaining the news, as fully and completely as we can, to our readers, we will get increasing cooperation from those who also have a pressing need to educate, to explain why.

This transition, I say again, is not an easy one to make—but it must be made. These are difficult days for newspapers and for newspapermen. There are those who are counting us out. But our forward path, I think, is clearly marked.

If we can move, with all deliberate speed and with reasonable smoothness—if we can change with our greatly changing world—then our greatest days lie just ahead.

Mr. Dickinson is managing editor of *The Evening and Sunday Bulletin*, Philadelphia, and past President of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. This talk was given at the Annual Convention of APME at San Diego, November 16, 1966.

After Prison, No Bitterness

By Mochtar Lubis

This is a specially happy day for me and my wife to be here with you.

It was five years ago that I attended the IPI General Assembly in Tel Aviv. And during those past years I saw from inside my prison in Djakarta and Madiun the freedom of the press in Indonesia being whittled down, piece by piece until ultimately it vanished completely.

I came out of prison without any feeling of bitterness, of anger, of hatred or vengeance. I found out very quickly in prison that to nurse feelings of anger, hatred and vengeance meant only one thing: you will destroy your own soul. So if I dwell briefly upon the past, it is only with one purpose: to learn from it our needs for the future.

History during the past years in my country once again proved how true it is that freedom of the press is really the cornerstone for all other democratic freedoms.

Once the freedom of the press is vanquished, once a free press is silenced, then all the destructive forces in a society would be loosened upon a defenseless people, and will grow unchecked, beyond control of the people itself. Personality cult, ambitions for unlimited power, the thirst for self-glorification in the name of a nation or even of continents and races, corruption, mismanagement and maladministration of a whole country, even the decay of moral values—all these grow profusely, and rapidly eat into the body politic and body social of a whole nation.

They twist the minds of those in power, and demoralize the suffering masses.

This we have seen happen in Indonesia. Together with the loss of the freedom of the press, were also lost other democratic rights; a freely elected representative body, the clear separation between the legislative, judiciary and executive powers, our basic human rights, and at last our own human dignity.

However, resistance against it did grow within the hearts of more and more people. Despite massive propaganda, de-

spite a cowed press which no longer was able to exercise its true function, the flame of freedom in the heart of our people could not be vanquished.

So, when the Communists struck in the morning of October 1, 1965, reaction and resistance against them came quickly. It came not only from the army, but also from the masses of the people.

General Suharto through quick, decisive and courageous actions quickly overcame the Communist military strength. The defeat of the Communists was really the key to the great changes now taking place in Indonesia. New social and political forces have emerged today in Indonesia, composed of the students, the young intellectuals, the young generation of our people and the armed forces of Indonesia. They want a clean break with the past. No more of those high sounding but empty slogans, no more of the hypocrisy, no more xenophobia and foreign adventures which had done us the greatest harm, no more of this suppression of democratic rights and basic human rights.

They want a new order built on the respect for the rule of law, respect for democratic rights of the people, respect for justice for the people. They want education, job opportunities, homes, clothing, health care, and other concrete and practical things which matter so much in our daily life. The forces of the new order in Indonesia further want to see Indonesia follow a sane foreign policy. They want to see Indonesia occupy her rightful position in the society of nations in our world, and to shoulder her responsibilities for peace and close international understanding and cooperation.

We have so much to do in Indonesia. Our new leaders must begin today literally from scratch. The economic and financial problems are enormous. The political problems are no less difficult. Our new leaders realize that the greatest contribution Indonesia could make today to our world community is by putting our own household in order.

And I am happy to be able to say to you, that General

Suharto and Adam Malik realize the importance of the role of a free and responsible press for the tasks to be done in Indonesia. They have in the past months repeatedly urged the Indonesian press to act as the conscience of the people, and to criticize the Government as sharply as they want to, when they have legitimate cause to do so. The press today is just beginning to recover from the long nightmare of the past years.

I came out of prison with my faith in the essentialness of the freedom of the press strengthened more than ever. I truly believe we could build in our country a free and responsible press. To build the freedom of the press also means to build democracy. There are many people who doubt that the process of economic development and modernization in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and South America could be done on a democratic basis. I question this thesis.

We must admit that in our world today, there is not a single nation or a group of nations strong and rich enough to give such a vast aid to the developing countries, which would enable them to make the transition from economic underdevelopment to modernization a painless process. And yet this transition must be made, and be made as quickly as possible. It is at this stage that many of the leaders in Asia and Africa lose their patience and wisdom. They lost their insight into the new awareness of freedom, the many new thoughts and attitudes which grow within their own people after freedom, and the many new drives and forces which seem to pull their nation apart into various directions.

They took the most easy way out. They tried to use force and coercion. They suppressed newspapers, they jailed journalists, and even killed journalists, like the murder of our esteemed colleague Kamel Mrowa in Lebanon as reported in IPI Report. I urge the IPI General Assembly to take a stand against this murder.

But the new Asian and African dictatorships or authoritarian rules also labour under the same handicaps as their democratic predecessors. If not more so. They lack the necessary efficient administration to carry out their economic plans, and in the end, because of the absence of some measure of free public opinion as a result of the suppression of the freedom of the press, and also the absence of parliamentary control elected freely by the people, the chaos and corruption which grew under such dictatorial regimes are even worse than they were during the short democratic periods. And worse, to hide their own failures, they easily embark upon dangerous foreign adventures, threatening international peace.

In any country, to make democracy work, a certain measure of political sophistication is needed, lots of patience and wisdom, especially on the part of the leaders themselves. I cannot believe that democracy is not suited to the present condi-

tions in Asia and Africa or even South America. In fact, what has happened was that democracy has not been practiced wisely in many of these countries, with a very few exceptions. Failures are always blamed on the democratic system, and not on the leaders responsible for these failures.

Democracy may take various forms and techniques to exercise it. It may start in its simple form based on free village elections. I do not believe you must become a Communist or that you must ally yourself with the Communists to be a progressive, to be a revolutionary, if all these mean that you want to love your people and want to see social and economic justice done to them, and you want to see they live in freedom and human dignity.

There are certain things which our developing nations must do ourselves, and which could never be done by any amount of foreign aid however big it is. We must organize an efficient and honest administration. A clean and stable government is essential for progress. A free press must be guaranteed. The Government must be formed through democratic procedures. The national leaders themselves must set an example of a good and clean personal life and of high integrity, because in our countries the people still tend to take as their supreme example the personal behaviour of their leaders.

We seriously must endeavour to make our people understand the values of freedom, of democracy, of human dignity, by establishing a progressing welfare in their daily life, food, clothing, education, better health, job opportunities, homes, better social security, etc. All these must be extended to the largest numbers of the people, or at least serious efforts into this direction should be done. During the past years in prison I have come to realize that a man, however humble and poor, is entitled to his dignity as Man. I consciously pursue the ideal of all men as being of one family, regardless of their own colour, race, or religion. I have become fully convinced that Mankind can only survive when nations grow into an integrated family of nations.

Every nation has something of value to contribute for the common good of the whole world; be it in the form of some of its own traditional values, wealth of natural resources, or its cultural values, or its technical and scientific wealth. The machine tools produced in the industrial nations, the sitar music of India, or the flute of West Java in Indonesia, give their own particular contribution to the enrichment of human life. A free and responsible press has a very important role to play to bring close understanding and cooperation and mutual appreciation between the peoples of our world.

We must educate our peoples to pierce through the misleading and confusing old labels of capitalism, imperialism, communism, East and West, etc.; and we must also be able to rid ourselves from the false images created by some new labels like the new emerging forces, and the old-established forces. These labels have become imprecise and misleading,

as our world today could no longer be divided into neat separate boxes.

Some of the "capitalist" countries guarantee a far greater social security to their workers than the Communist countries, where the workers have lost all their rights. A free and responsible press should, I think, play a large role in the traffic of ideas and information, in this pursuit for an international solidarity based on freedom and human dignity for the enrichment of Man's spiritual and material life. I do truly believe that only a free and responsible press can bring clarity in our minds about the problems facing us in our own countries, and also make our people be more aware of other people's problems.

In conclusion, allow me to thank you. I felt humbled by

the faith you put in the justness of my cause, and at the same time I feel singularly blessed to have tasted the warmth of such a generous international compassion, comradeship, brotherhood. I also want to mention here the Ramon Mag-saysay Award Foundation, the Amnesty International, and so many other individuals throughout the world who had sent to me and my family their words of comfort, of trust and encouragement during my stay in prison.

Mr. Lubis is the publisher of the Indonesia Raya. He was jailed in 1956 after a newspaper crusade against government corruption and was released last May. This talk was given at the New Delhi IPI Assembly in November.

What the IPI Is, and Is Doing

(Continued from page 2)

include a monthly bulletin with editions published in English, French, German and Japanese. IPI manuals have become standard equipment for journalists bent on improving their professional skills. A recent publication is a study of the new West German press laws, of interest in all countries which seek a proper system of both protection and responsibility for newspapers.

A notable activity of IPI has been a system of seminars, bringing together groups of journalists from a pair of countries which have particular problems of understanding.

There were 10 such meetings between French and German newsmen. When the Saar plebiscite took place, in an atmosphere of calm and order, the Belgian administrator gave full credit to the restraint of the German and French press in dealing with this explosive issue. These were journalists who had been sitting together in IPI seminars, talking out their differences and their antagonisms. Their readers were the beneficiaries.

A very successful bi-lateral meeting took place between journalists of the United States and Canada, two nations which are near neighbors but which do not always understand each other any better for their closeness. Similar useful discussions have occurred for example, between Greek and Turkish, and British and German journalists.

Many other conferences have been held on more specific professional problems, such as the flow of the news between countries and continents, and the coverage of special types

of news such as crime, science, and women's activities.

The moral force of IPI has been employed in some instances in which press standards were seriously threatened. The effort has not always succeeded, of course. A good example can be cited, however, at the time when the government of Turkey instituted harsh controls and began throwing journalists in jail for dissenting views. IPI marshalled worldwide disapproval, which did not go unheeded in Ankara. When the government which menaced the press was overthrown, its successor asked IPI to draft a press code which all papers adopted, and to advise on a revision of the press laws.

The activities of IPI in Asia and Africa have been particularly noteworthy. These special programs have been generously supported by the Ford, Rockefeller and Asia Foundations.

In Africa, the focus has been on the training of journalists in professional skills, men and women from the newly independent nations. This has been done in intensive seminar courses in both East and West Africa. By the end of this year, nearly 200 people will thus have been equipped for new responsibilities.

An extensive program of staff training for newsmen in Asia began in 1960. It continues to flourish vigorously. First under the direction of Tarzie Vittachi, it is now led by Amitabha Chowdhury, who makes his headquarters in Manila but ranges over a wide area.

Traveling experts have worked directly with staff members in their own newsrooms, helping to sharpen their professional competence. Seminars and workshops have drawn together groups in various places. The effort always has been to bring out the full potential of Asian newsmen and of Asian newspapers, never to impose on them any set of standards from without.

A most encouraging event has been the development of independent press institutes in Asia, affiliated with IPI but founded and operated on their own resources. The first of these national institutes arose in India in 1963. It continues under the capable leadership of Chanchal Sarkar. Similar groups were formed in Korea and the Philippines in 1964. Most recently, Chinese-language newspapers in several Asian countries have formed their own association, based on Hong Kong.

IPI continually works for self-improvement and mutual assistance among journalists of many nations. It may be said

that our motives are selfish, since well-edited, attractively presented newspapers tend to be prosperous and influential.

Improved standards of press performance, however, benefit many, many others besides ourselves. They are a service to the general public, who require the information derived from a free press in order to exercise intelligent self-government.

There have been times when newspapers have been accused, with some degree of justice, of helping to foment wars. The professional efforts of IPI work in the opposite direction: toward a peace based on deeper knowledge and fuller understanding between peoples.

Mr. Bingham, Editor and Publisher of The Courier-Journal and The Louisville Times, has been the Chairman of the International Press Institute for the past two years. This annual report was made at the New Delhi meeting of the IPI in November.

**Price Waterhouse Foundation
To Sponsor Two More Nieman Fellows**

The Price Waterhouse Foundation has announced that it will sponsor a Nieman Fellowship for a business and financial writer for the academic years 1967-68 and 1968-69. Newspapermen seeking these awards must file the regular application provided by the Nieman office at 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, and be chosen by the Nieman Selection Committee appointed annually by Harvard University.

Pretty Soon Now, Grover Hall

A number of readers have expressed interest in the announcement that on January 1, Grover Cleveland Hall, Jr., the old Alabama fire-eater, will take over the day-by-day management of these columns.

My thought today is not to bid any farewells, for my own farewell from this page will come when they lay me in the grave. It is rather to introduce Mr. Hall, and to extend him a welcome to the Richmond community.

The successor to these gladiatorial columns is a tough and wiry welter-weight, maybe five-feet-eight, with the parboiled eye of a fighter pilot. Thirty years of Alabama politics have left his face marked by a permanent incredulity. He emerged from his nonage about the time Tom Heflin was being shuffled off the stage, and held his box seat through the days of Bankheads, Blacks, Boykins, Hills, Big Jim Folsom, George Wallace, and at last Lurleen. These experiences might have led a lesser man into permanent misanthropy; they have merely strengthened Mr. Hall's pre-natal conviction that there ain't no good in men. Or at least not much.

As editor of "Grandma," as the Montgomery *Advertiser* is generally known, Mr. Hall has turned out some of the most un-grandmotherly prose ever known to man. He writes with the fluid grace of an Irish bartender swinging a bung-starter. All this stems from the Mencken-Pegler school of literary composition, which holds it a poor fight indeed if it ends with a single stuffed shirt still on his feet.

The story has not been widely told, but our Alabama

friend probably is as responsible as any other man for bringing an end to the long dark night of Prohibition in Oklahoma. This came about nine years ago, when Mr. Hall journeyed to Oklahoma City for the annual consistory of the National Conference of Editorial Writers. The Sooner State was then legally as dry as the Sahara sands; in point of fact, it was almost as damp as the Bowery on Saturday night. In the hypocritical nature of things, however, it never was considered couth to mention the conflict between appearance and reality. But on his return to Montgomery, Mr. Hall delivered himself of a richly descriptive account of the booze that flowed through the Skirvin Hotel. His piece was widely reprinted in the Oklahoma press. The following year, right-thinking people began to mount a serious campaign for repeal, and in time Oklahoma became officially and respectably wet.

In making the remove from one Confederate capital to another, Mr. Hall will bring with him a full satchel of sound Whig convictions, a zest for the human comedy, and a lively curiosity about the life and times of our city. He is looking forward to January. Readers of this page, we know, will welcome him aboard.

This was the editorial welcome given the new editor of the Richmond News Leader last December by James J. Kilpatrick. **Mr. Kilpatrick** retired from the News Leader to devote full time to his syndicated column.

*Book Review***Two Studies of Press and Bar**By **John M. Harrison**

JUSTICE AND THE PRESS. By John Lofton. Boston: Beacon Press. 462 pp. \$5.95

FREE PRESS AND FAIR TRIAL. By Donald M. Gillmor. Washington: Public Affairs Press. 254 pp. \$6.00.

Simultaneous publication of these two studies of the relationship between the press and the courts in the United States is a happy coincidence. To a controversy inundated by a steady flow of heated comment, John Lofton and Donald Gillmor bring a needed and welcome balance and perspective.

Either book would have been a valuable contribution to the literature dealing with how the provisions of the First and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution are to be reconciled. Together they provide, if not the final word, a sizable beachhead from which press and bar should be able to launch a search for answers to this pervasive problem.

Every newsman and lawyer should read both. If one must choose between them, the Lofton volume is the better buy. Not only is it 200 pages longer and a nickel cheaper, but its perspective is wider. It offers such other bonuses as appendices that include many of the documents relevant to the controversy and a bibliography of heroic proportions. (The complete text of Justice Clark's opinion in the Sheppard case is, incidentally, included in both books.)

John Lofton is an editorial writer for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and a member of the South Carolina bar. He holds an M.A. degree in history and has studied sociology and social institutions on a fellowship at Stanford. All of this comprehensive background—in journalism, the law, history, and sociology—makes its contribution to *Justice and the Press*.

Lofton approaches the problem historically, reaching back into the beginnings of trial procedure in Greece and Rome. He reminds us that popular interest in crime is not new and that any survey of "journalistic treatment of crime will show that many of today's press practices are no modern phenomenon." His account of some of the more striking instances of this treatment—ranging back over two centuries—amply documents his contention.

How the impact of this phenomenon has grown recently is examined carefully by the author. He is unsparing in his criticism of press performance in many instances. But Lofton is not one to saddle the press with all the blame. He examines

with equal care the role played by prosecutors, police, and even some judges in creating situations in which it is difficult, if not impossible, to assure the accused a fair trial. With equal thoroughness, he points out the many ways in which the press has helped prevent injustice—by restraining overzealous law enforcement officers, by digging up new evidence, by helping identify the real culprit.

"The press is actually intended as one of the many checks against injustice," Lofton writes. "It is not an intruder in the process of justice, as is sometimes suggested. Its effect, however, is good or bad, depending on the quality of its performance."

How assure that the quality of performance achieves the proper level? That is the question which has been at the root of this controversy all along. Lofton looks at each of the proposals that have been made and concludes that "analysis of each type of proposed legal curb shows why none of them is in keeping with the American concept of a free press as an observer and critic of government." This includes the British system, based on contempt power of its judges (which Gillmor also emphatically rejects). Lofton argues convincingly that "in the United States the application of the British rule on contempt by publication would probably hamper the public spirited impulses of the press and at the same time fail to prevent trial by newspaper."

The author of *Justice and the Press* sees the best hope for solution of the problem in the press itself. He writes:

The most promising possibility for reform is in the exercise of leadership by responsible newspapers which recognize the existence of the problem—papers like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, and others. The wire services, such as the *Associated Press* and *United Press International*—which have not been any more attentive to the rights of the accused than the average newspaper—could bring about great improvement by reassuring their practices and by establishing more careful criteria for the reporting of criminal cases.

Specifically, Lofton suggests the need to raise the calibre of crime reporters as a first step toward improving the quality of crime reporting. "Indeed," he declares, "one of the essential preconditions for upgrading the machinery of criminal justice is better reporting and comment by the press. But all of these contributions are devalued if the press unwittingly helps to bring about the conviction of the innocent."

This argument provides the springboard for what is actually John Lofton's major contribution to the free press-fair trial controversy. For he finds the real source of the problem in public attitudes toward the whole system of administering justice—attitudes which militate against justice for accused persons. He summarizes these attitudes in this paragraph:

The rationalization . . . is that crime is the willful act of a free moral agent, or, put less philosophically, a sin—for which outraged society must exact payment in the form of punishment. This concept serves more readily to provide targets for the community's frustrated aggressiveness than does the modern idea that crime is often the product of factors beyond the control of the offender. Thus, despite the findings of modern psychology which contradict the notion of voluntary perversity, the old idea, with some modifications, continues to dominate the public mind and contemporary criminal jurisprudence.

These attitudes, Lofton contends, are both reflected in and encouraged by the press. They help explain many of the grosser abuses of the rights of the accused by the news media—the prominent play given to confessions, the references to the accused's past criminal record, and other details which probably will not even be admissible as evidence during the trial. They fan the public's demand for vengeance, as opposed to justice. Thus, a vicious circle is set up, with the press acting as both conductor and generator.

How is this circle to be broken? Lofton's answer is contained in this statement:

The press, when it recognizes its responsibilities, is as essential to truth and justice as are the courts. Most of the deficiencies described in this book were reported in the press. Yet if the press is completely free, it will not always be fair, just as officers of the law will not always be fair, especially if they are completely free of observation by the press. Editors and lawyers must realize that they both hold a public trust and cannot be guided by business motives alone or personal motives alone. To the extent that the press and the bar tolerate injustice, they are both neglecting their trust. Their privileged position under the Constitution obligates them to render more conscientious service to the Bill of Rights than the public demands.

It is a brilliant clarification of the problem. And, admittedly, a difficult one to implement. For it reminds the press that it has obligations and responsibilities beyond

what it wants"—a fact which much of the press would rather not be confronted with.

Free Press and Fair Trial covers much of the same ground gone over in *Justice and the Press*. The author, a professor of journalism at Minnesota and a former newspaperman, confines himself to the more contemporary aspects of the problem. He takes off from the Sheppard case and gives only incidental attention to its earlier history.

Gillmor's position in most of the major areas of controversy is the same as Lofton's. He suggests that the media undoubtedly have been guilty of gross violations of the rights of individuals accused of crimes, while emphasizing that they at least as often help protect the innocent. With Lofton, he rejects application of the British system here, along with other curbs on the press which have been proposed. His examination of these proposals is especially thorough.

Not unexpectedly, since he is deeply involved in communications research as coordinator of graduate studies at Minnesota, Gillmor turns for answers to the researchers. He gives greater credence than it seems to many to deserve to the contention of some knee-jerk apologists for the press that no direct relationship between publicity and jury verdicts has been established. This is one area in which he thinks new research might be meaningful.

Surely no one will argue that such studies as those proposed by the Brookings Institution and Columbia University should be rejected. Some may wonder, however, if even the most thorough study ever can elicit reliable information about what goes on in a juror's mind—especially what specific experiences and impressions influenced the decision at which he and his fellow jurors arrived in any given case.

The great value of these books is, of course, that they approach in a rational manner a controversy too often discussed in polemical terms. Both do make specific suggestions, based on dispassionate analyses. Between them, Lofton and Gillmor certainly provide more light than has been shed in this area by most of what has previously been written about it.

Mr. Harrison is professor of journalism at The Pennsylvania State University and a former Nieman Fellow.

Nieman Notes

1939

Irving Dilliard, Ferris Professor, at Princeton University, spent August through November 1966 on a world trip, with his wife, a month as faculty chairman of the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, Salzburg, Austria, and then was an American specialist on a State Department grant in India, Japan and Korea.

Edwin Lahey was succeeded by Robert S. Boyd as chief of the Washington Bureau of Knight Newspapers on January 1 after 40 years of reporting. Mr. Lahey continues as chief correspondent of the Knight Newspapers.

1942

Neil Davis, editor and publisher of the Lee County Bulletin (Auburn, Alabama), was recently appointed by President Johnson to the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

Robert Lasch, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was appointed by Columbia University as one of the forty jurors for the 1967 Pulitzer prizes in journalism.

1950

Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Washington Bureau of Cowles Newspapers, is the author of *The Pentagon* which G. P. Putnam's Sons published in February.

1953

John Strohmeyer, vice-president and editor of the Bethlehem (Pennsylvania) Globe-Times, has been elected to the board of trustees at Moravian College.

1958

William McIlwain, editor of *Newsday*, was appointed by Columbia University as one of the forty jurors for the 1967 Pulitzer prizes in journalism.

1959

Wallace Turner, chief of San Francisco bureau of *The New York Times*, is the author of *The Mormon Establishment* recently published by Houghton Mifflin.

1962

Ian Menzies, morning managing editor of *The Boston Globe*, has been appointed to the APME General News Study Committee.

1964

Roy Reed, formerly southern regional correspondent for the *New York Times*, was recently assigned to its Washington bureau.

1965

Smith Hempstone, former Chicago Daily News correspondent in Africa and Latin America, has been named European correspondent for the *Washington Star*.

Kyoichi Moringa, formerly staff writer for *Mainichi Shimbun* (Tokyo), was appointed its Bureau Chief in Vienna to cover Eastern Europe.

1966

Jack Bass became Columbia, South Carolina bureau chief for the *Charlotte* (North Carolina) *Observer* in November.

Nieman Selection Committee 1967-68

Harvard University has appointed its Selection Committee for Nieman Fellowships for 1967-68. They are:

Creed C. Black, managing editor, Chicago Daily News.

Robert W. Chandler, president and editor, Bend, Ore., Bulletin.

Robert Lasch, editorial page editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Theodore R. Sizer, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

William M. Pinkerton, News Officer, Harvard University.

Dwight E. Sargent, Curator of Nieman Fellowships.

Applications from newsmen for the Fellowships will be received until April 1. The committee will award about twelve Fellowships for the academic year opening in September.

The Nieman Fellowships provide for one year of residence and background study for newsmen on leave from their jobs. Applicants must have at least three years of news experience and be under 40.

This will be the 30th annual group of Nieman Fellows at Harvard. The Fellowships were established in 1938 under a bequest from Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the Milwaukee Journal.