

# NiemanReports

April, 1962

## Reporter in the Deep South

John H. Herbers

The Trouble With Sunday Papers

William A. Hachten

The Security Dilemma

Clark R. Mollenhoff

The Built-in Bias of the Press

Robert Fulford

Press Report from Kenya

Charles A. A. Hayes

Public Opinion Under Dictatorship in  
Nicaragua

Marvin Alisky

Northern Press on the South

John H. Nelson  
Gene Roberts, Jr.  
John A. Hamilton

Also

*The Technique of Journalism*, by Carl E. Lindstrom; *The Functions of the Press*, by Houstoun Waring; *The Job of the AP*, by Frank Starzel; *Documentation Without Charges*, by A. Gayle Waldrop; *Reviews; Nieman Notes.*

# NiemanReports

VOL. XVI, NO. 2

APRIL 1962

Published quarterly from 44 Holyoke House, Cambridge 38, Mass. Subscription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.

Nieman Reports is published by the Nieman Alumni Council: Piers Anderton, New York City; Barry Brown, Providence, R. I.; Norman A. Cherniss, Riverside, Calif.; John L. Dougherty, Rochester; Thomas H. Griffith, New York City; A. B. Guthrie, Jr., Great Falls, Mont.; John M. Harrison, University Park, Pa.; Weldon James, Louisville, Ky.; William G. Lambert, Portland, Ore.; Francis P. Locke, Dayton, O.; Joseph Loftus, Washington, D. C.; Frederick W. Maguire, Columbus, O.; W. F. McIlwain, Garden City, N. Y.; Harry T. Montgomery, New York City; Frederick W. Pillsbury, Philadelphia; Charlotte F. Robling, Evanston, Ill.; Dwight E. Sargent, New York City; Kenneth Stewart, Stanford, Calif.; John Strohmeyer, Bethlehem, Pa.; Walter H. Waggoner, New York City; Melvin S. Wax, San Francisco; Lawrence G. Weiss, Denver, Colo.; Louis M. Lyons, Cambridge, Chairman.

## The Security Dilemma

By Clark R. Mollenhoff

The Cold War and the huge forty-billion-dollar military budgets have created new problems for the press and for our American Democracy. As the diplomatic tensions increase and as the military spending moves into the fifty-billion-a-year range a better understanding of the government information problems becomes vital.

The trial of John Peter Zenger in 1735 established the basic principle that the truth of published information can be a good defense in a criminal libel action. The acquittal of Zenger in the Colonial period has been followed by numerous court decisions that have established the right of a free press to print the truth about government officials and government operations.

Today it is unlikely that any responsible public official would deny the right of the press to print the truth, and to engage in fair comment on the facts reported. However, there are two developments in our recent history that could create major obstacles to the free press. They are developments that materially interfere with the ability of the press to obtain the truth on important government operations.

The size and complexity of a government with a ninety-billion dollar annual budget is so overwhelming that it is doubtful if it is understood by those who created it. Certainly there are few, if any, in the press corps who have the background, the time, and the space to engage in a penetrating analysis of the total federal budget picture. In general, we are forced to rely on close examination of a few

parts of the total budget and only hope that the picture presented is fairly representative.

The task of presenting a true picture of federal government operations is complicated further by the great secrecy blanket created in the name of national security. The use of the national security classifications—"confidential," "secret," and "top secret"—involves a wide range of government agencies including the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission.

When Defense Department spending devours more than half of the total budget, the press is certain to have considerable difficulty in living up to its responsibility in a democratic society—the responsibility of keeping the public intelligently informed on major problems.

We are caught in what many feel could be the deadly dilemma of democracy. The question is raised:

How can the United States erect effective secrecy barriers to protect national security, and at the same time keep the public informed within the meaning of true democracy?

Concern on this issue has been expressed by former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

In his "farewell address" on January 18, President Eisenhower spoke of the need for an "alert and knowledgeable citizenry" to combat a military-industrial complex he felt "could endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

"In the councils of government," President Eisenhower warned, "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

In a talk before the National Association of Broadcasters on May 8, President Kennedy explored the problem of reconciling security and democracy. He concluded:

"If we are once again to preserve our civilization it will be because of our freedom and not in spite of it . . . for the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticize, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depends largely upon communications."

Many of our Presidents and other officials have been torn over the difficulty of balancing freedom and reasonable security.

This is a problem that does not exist in the Soviet Union where the State is supreme and informing the public is of little concern. Many ask if it is possible for the open society of our democracy to survive in a competition with a closed society. There are fears expressed that both public and private publications in the U.S. are making facts available that are of great value to the Soviet Union. Some question the publication of such items as road maps or city maps. Others are gravely concerned that the Russians are learning vital information from the U.S. Patent Office or from a wide

(Continued on page 35)

# The Reporter in the Deep South

By John Herbers

In *Absalom, Absalom!*, one of William Faulkner's great Gothic novels of Yoknapatawpha county, Quentin Compson goes to Harvard and is questioned endlessly by his Canadian roommate and others: "Tell about the South. What's it like there? Why do they live there? Why do they live at all?" Young Compson has some trouble describing the incredible state of affairs back home.

That was 1910. Today, Yoknapatawpha county, after being left alone for more than 80 years, is undergoing rather drastic, externally wrought changes. Telling about it can be fraught with difficulty, if not for the novelist, for the journalist who must live there.

I have found some curiosity among newspapermen about how racial news is covered in the Deep South. Implied in the questioning is this: what strange set of circumstances shapes news coming from the South and how do we know some of it is not being suppressed?

It would be no overstatement to say the Deep South is a unique region and the reporter responsible for writing about it for both local and external consumption undergoes a unique experience. Circumstances do shape his copy but usually not in the way the uninitiated might suspect.

My purpose here is to explain some of the problems involved and the framework in which the reporter must function. To do so, I must confine myself to Mississippi, still the hard core of the Deep South, and to my point of view as a wire service reporter. In doing so, however, the problems—shared to some degree by all reporters in the region—can be presented in acute form.

It is necessary first to give a brief description of social and political conditions. There is running through the South what is commonly called the black belt. Its characteristics include an agrarian economy, a large Negro population and ultra conservative opinion in economic and social matters on the part of its white leadership. Virtually the same climate of opinion exists in all black belt counties whether they be in North Carolina, Tennessee or Alabama.

The difference in Mississippi is that these counties cover almost the entire state and there is no large urban area or extensive coastline to mitigate the black belt influence such

---

All of John Herbers' 13 years as a newspaperman have been in Mississippi, the last ten with the UPI bureau in Jackson, the capital. He became bureau manager in 1953, State manager in 1959. Born in Memphis, his education was at Tampa University and Emory University, Georgia, and as a Nieman Fellow at Harvard last year.

as exists in, say, Louisiana or Georgia. Black belt thinking has permeated all facets of public life and it dominates civic and business leadership of Jackson, the capitol and largest city, as well as most other larger communities in the state.

Neither the federal government nor civil rights organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People chose to press for equal rights for Negroes in the hard core areas of segregation until changes had been made in the border states. For six years following the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision, Mississippi was an anxious spectator while the federal courts slowly brought about integration in some areas of life in surrounding states. With each decision and with each racial incident white opposition to any change in the status of the Negro hardened. The moderates were neutralized.

Thus, in 1961, when the civil rights front moved into Mississippi in the form of freedom rides, Justice Department intervention in voting, numerous federal court lawsuits and demonstrations by local Negroes, the resistance was something like dragging an angry tom cat by his tail across a thick carpet.

It would take several columns to describe adequately the climate of opinion existing in the white community at this time. It will do here to state that news reporters are not the most popular people around. The least of the problems for the reporter, however, are the threat of being mauled in places like McComb, and procedural difficulties. A few examples will suffice.

We cover Mississippi from Jackson with a five-man UPI bureau. It is customary to maintain part-time correspondents in most areas of the state to protect us on breaking news. Usually these people work for newspapers or radio stations and are an integral part of their community. The average community is engaged in an all-out drive for industry to stem population losses and bring in much-needed prosperity. More than almost anything else its Chamber of Commerce does not want the name of the town associated with racial strife. As a result we are not likely to be tipped on a story with a racial angle by anyone in the community. (This is not true, generally, in counties where a daily newspaper is published, but they are few and far between.)

Instead, it is likely to come from a Negro leader and usually it has come to him by a devious route. One day last summer an NAACP leader in Jackson called in a report that a plantation hand in a remote county had

been lynched by his landlord and his sheriff. He said the report had come from Chicago from a relative of the victim. John Garcia, a staff reporter, spent several hours on the telephone trying to find out what had happened, but no one would claim any knowledge of the alleged incident. The sheriff went so far as to say he had seen the youth who was reported dead "hanging around town" that very morning. But when he was pressed for more information he spouted profanity and ungrammatical denials. Garcia moved a brief story on the basis of what the NAACP leader and the sheriff had said. In it, he cleaned up the sheriff's speech except for one phrase with bad grammar, perhaps to retain some degree of realism. This prompted a call from a client editor who complained that he knew the sheriff to be a college graduate and we were slanting the news by making him appear illiterate.

It was not until later in the day that we found out what the story really was. We sent a staff reporter, Ted Smith, to the scene, 100 miles away. He found that the young man in question was in jail and had been there for three days charged with assault and battery on his landlord.

The defendant's mother told Smith she saw her son severely beaten, without provocation, by the sheriff and the landlord and he had been taken to a hospital for treatment before being jailed. At the jail, Smith found the youth had been questioned by an FBI agent. But the sheriff would not let Smith interview him and sent Smith away from the jail. By this time people around town were beginning to grumble about UPI "stirring up trouble" and Smith left town under threat.

The FBI reported it found no ground for entering the case and its findings were not disclosed. The story probably rated no more than two paragraphs on the national wires, although we carried the details locally. One news bureau was spent and frustrated.

Southern police usually are cordial to newspapermen. Jackson police were during the freedom rides last summer. Recently, they used police dogs to break up a crowd of Negroes who were protesting segregation of the state fair. Several were chased for blocks, and one bystander, who had nothing to do with the demonstration, was bitten on the leg. A reporter went to the hospital to interview him. Everything was fine, it seemed. The city had bought him a new pair of pants and the mayor, Allen Thompson, had sent his apologies. This seemed nice of the mayor and it was included in the story.

But it had no sooner appeared than the telephone started ringing. One call was from Chief Detective M. B. Pierce to Bureau Manager Cliff Sessions. He said the mayor was upset by the story. He had offered no apologies and owed none. The man should have moved if he did not want to be bitten. We stood accused of irresponsible reporting.

When the Interstate Commerce Commission order

against segregated travel facilities went into effect Nov. 1, UPI checked several cities to see what they would do about it. Most planned to continue segregation but the mayors of Winona and Grenada said they would comply with the ICC order. But they had not reckoned with Citizens Council leaders who leaped into action as soon as the story appeared. The mayor of Winona explained he thought he had been talking to an ICC agent rather than to a reporter. The mayor of Grenada said in a formal statement he was misquoted, and the Chamber of Commerce and city council adopted resolutions condemning "false" news reports, all of which was carried in full in the Grenada *Sentinel-Star* without explanation. I wrote a personal letter to Publisher Joe Lee:

It was perfectly clear that when the Citizens Council people put the screws on your mayor, then came the statements of denial, resolutions, etc. It doesn't matter to us what they do about the bus stations in Grenada, but it is news that has to be covered. And I sure resent being used as a scapegoat for a public official who is forced to back down from his prearranged plan.

Lee agreed and printed the letter in full on page one. We never heard from the mayor.

Usually we don't come out smelling as sweet. In one city we were harassed by the newspaper and both radio stations for reporting some behind-the-scene developments that did not fit the official version of what happened.

These are not isolated incidents. Everyone is emotionally involved. Persons who never before paid attention to news coverage have suddenly become experts on how the delicate subject should be handled. For a long time we were told that the activities and statements of integration leaders were not news because they did not have enough following to give them substance. That is seldom heard now. Most complaints concern the way the news is worded. For example, when Memphis integrated three schools we relayed this abbreviated version on the state radio wire:

(Memphis, Tennessee)—Thirteen children ended more than a century of school integration in Memphis today.

They romped and played with their white classmates then left for home half an hour early.

The children were accompanied from the schools by their parents and whisked away in automobiles about 2:30 this afternoon. The white students were dismissed at the regular 3 o'clock time.

A policeman reported earlier that he saw two Negro girls skipping rope with some white youngsters at one of the three schools integrated. A Negro boy was seen running hand in hand with a new-found white friend at another school.



The whites and Negroes ate at the same tables in the cafeteria and put away their dirty dishes together.

There was none of the bloodshed and violence that erupted at Little Rock and New Orleans when schools were integrated.

This prompted an "official protest" from a subscriber. "Why can't you report the facts without romancing the Negro race?"

The reporter begins to feel he is in a strait jacket. While he may not acknowledge criticism as justified, he may find himself writing without direction. He is inclined to turn out dead-pan copy when interpretive reporting may be in order.

Newspapers, by and large, understand the problems involved and the reporter's need for freedom. There is considerable sensitivity to the fact that newspapers outside the South frequently play down racial strife in their own cities and play it up under a Southern dateline. There is a feeling that every incident is played nationally. Actually, the great bulk of that reported never goes beyond the state wires. There simply is not room, and probably no demand, for all of it on the trunk wires.

This leads to another problem. We feel a responsibility to report this type of news in some detail. It is used by subscribers, and it is felt that justice is more apt to prevail in the light of publicity. In doing so, however, we load our wires with it and the energy of the news staff is consumed in tracking it down. Taken in large doses it can be pretty dreary stuff. Some days more than half the stories on the wire pertain either directly or indirectly to the race issue.

Dealing with the subject day in and day out the reporter may acquire a strange sense of imbalance. He may become preoccupied by this one issue and find himself a stranger to the larger, more important events in the world today, a provincial fellow.

There is, I believe, a need for a new approach in reporting the kind of social change that is going on in the South today. Certainly dead-pan rendering of facts is not helping to bridge the gap of misunderstanding that exists between races and groups involved. Why does the Main Street banker persist in thinking all integration leaders are wild-eyed Godless radicals saturated by Communism, when many of them are deeply religious and in many ways conservative; why do some liberals always categorize all white segregationists as irresponsible, insensitive lawbreakers, when frequently they are acting in conviction out of a lifetime of conditioning to their "way of life?" Why, unless there has been some breakdown in communi-

cations, whether through mass media or otherwise. It cannot all be attributed to blind prejudice.

Obviously, there is a limit to what wire services can do under the most favorable circumstances. Most newspapers seem content to continue under the old formulas. Last summer, during trial of a lawsuit for admission of a Negro to the University of Mississippi, an unusual opportunity presented itself for conveying some of the deeper meaning involved. The trial was conducted in a federal courtroom under a giant mural painted in the 1930's by a WPA artist. It was meant to depict rebuilding of the South but within the stereotyped framework of the Old South—forward-looking whites working and planning in front of a large columned building with magnolia trees and a steamboat in the background, while Negroes, segregated, pick cotton or strum a banjo.

The scene below was different—a well-dressed Negro youth on the stand asking for admission to Ole Miss, an outrageous request if placed in juxtaposition with the mural, and vice versa; a dark-skinned woman lawyer with a Grecian profile demanding, and getting, a court instruction on the correct pronunciation of "Negro" for benefit of the white attorneys; a gesticulating state attorney with a Tidewater Virginia accent deploying an array of dilatory tactics.

Those two scenes told a lot about the way things are and the way people think they are, about the past and about the future. We moved a story on it. It wasn't a great piece but it was a fresh approach and it told more than any story of the trite testimony in the trial. It drew compliments from other journalists, but that was as far as it got. I had a hard time finding it in print.

Most newspapers from outside the region have played the Southern integration story from the point of view that it—the court-ordered change—is morally right, the law of the land and inevitable. Obviously, the wire services cannot do this and they should not be asked to any more than they should be asked to write from the point of view of the Main Street banker who looks on freedom riders as the lawbreakers, considers state segregation laws superior to U.S. Supreme Court rulings and looks forward to the day when the courts will return to William Graham and *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. Wire services can and should maintain a vigilant watch for any violation of individual or group freedoms guaranteed to all citizens of the United States and report the truth as nearly as it can be ascertained. Finding and reporting the truth has become a good deal more difficult than it used to be, and it probably will become worse before it's better. There is a need, as never before, for highly competent, skeptical reporters who can, if nothing else, keep the record straight.

# The Trouble with Sunday Papers

By William A. Hachten

The U.S. Sunday paper—in sheer bulk, the world's largest—goes into about 48 million American homes each week.

In the last generation, it has doubled its number of pages and added colorgravure magazines and myriad new features on television, travel, and home and leisure activities. Bulging with ads, the percentage of advertising in Sunday papers has jumped from 33.7 per cent in 1941 to 57.1 per cent in 1959 for the 150 major Sunday papers analyzed by Media Records, Inc.

Yet, despite its obvious prosperity, the Sunday paper is not an unqualified success. The basic Sunday formula, developed during the Hearst-Pulitzer rivalry of the 1890's, appears somewhat threadbare today. Still the Sunday edition of a local daily with colored comics and various magazine supplements tossed in, it fails to satisfy a good number of its more discriminating readers.

This may be because the Sunday paper is less of a newspaper today than it was 20 years ago. Now, it seems more concerned with diverting than informing.

If such is the case, there may well be a need for national Sunday papers which try to emphasize the news and commentary that most of the 563 local U.S. Sunday papers fail to provide. That, at any rate, seems to be the reasoning behind the *Wall Street Journal's* new venture into Sunday journalism, *The National Observer*.

Patterned after Britain's two successful high-brow national Sundays, *The Observer* and *Sunday Times*, it may help break U.S. Sunday journalism out of its time-worn mold the way the *Wall Street Journal* has broken new ground in daily newspaper publication. It will be a publishing venture worth watching in 1962.

The success of the Sunday edition of the New York *Times*, with about 500,000 circulation outside of New York City, seems to indicate that there's a demand for a more intelligent and comprehensive effort to report and interpret the news than most Sunday papers provide. Yet the *Times* as a national Sunday paper is handicapped by its sheer size: delivery costs are high and some areas of the country don't receive the paper until midweek or later. To offset its high costs, the *Times* recently raised its out-of-town Sunday price from 35 to 50 cents. In its present format with so much local news and advertising, it can hardly afford to serve much more than the greater New York area.

The New York *Times* is planning to move into the national newspaper picture itself late in 1962 with a daily, but not Sunday, edition to be published in Los Angeles and distributed throughout the western states.

Two excellent models for a U.S. national Sunday paper, such as *The National Observer*, are provided by Britain's *The Observer* and the *Sunday Times*. These two papers have continued to prosper during the rise of British television and while the more popular and sensational Sunday press is diminishing in Britain. Slim (30 to 40 pages), intelligently and ably written, these papers are uncompromisingly intelligent and informed in their approach. Besides signed articles and interpretive stories on major news events, there is excellent critical comment on the arts, and attention is given to sports, business and finance, chess, and gardening. There is no popularizing, no talking down, no oversimplification. Yet the circulations of the *Sunday Times* and *The Observer* have increased fourfold since 1937.

The American Sunday paper, mainly because it's still a Sunday edition of a daily newspaper with distribution restricted to a metropolitan or regional area, falls considerably short of the intellectual standards of these two British papers.

This writer took a long look at U.S. Sunday newspapers while doing a doctoral dissertation at the University of Minnesota.\*

It was mainly a content analysis of 13 major Sunday papers: New York *Times*, New York *Herald Tribune*, Chicago *Tribune*, Los Angeles *Times*, St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, Portland *Oregonian*, Baltimore *Sun*, Louisville *Courier-Journal*, Milwaukee *Sentinel*, Minneapolis *Tribune*, Detroit *News*, Denver *Post* and New Orleans *Times-Picayune*. This wasn't a random sample but was a fairly good cross-section of the 60 (of a total 563) Sunday editions that have over 200,000 circulation. For the years 1939, 1944, 1949, 1954, and 1959, three Sunday issues for each paper were analyzed according to format and various kinds of news and features content.

The numerous changes and new emphases found in the 13 Sunday papers raise questions about where the papers

\*William A. Hachten, "The Metropolitan Sunday Newspaper in the United States: A study of Trends in Content and Practices," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1960.

are headed. Many fine things were found in these bulkiest of newspapers (the sample averaged 243.4 numbered pages in 1959), but there were also some disturbing tendencies detected.

First, the most distressing finding was that the Sunday newspaper is less of a newspaper today than it was in 1939. The average paper in the sample carried 1988.7 inches of "general news" in 1939 as compared with the 1959 average of only 1954.7 inches of "general news" as the term was defined in the study.

However, if figured on a percentage basis, then the general news actually dropped about 50 per cent between 1939 and 1959 because Sunday newspapers doubled in size during that time.

In 1939, 11.6 per cent of the average Sunday paper was general news; in 1959, only 6.5 per cent was general news. So, during this period when the average Sunday paper went from 110.9 numbered pages to 243.4 pages, none of the newly acquired space was given to general news. Instead, it went into advertising and features.

It can be argued, of course, that there is just so much hard news that breaks over Saturday and that this is adequately covered on Sunday. Also, it is said that Sunday papers already publish more news than most people read anyway.

Nevertheless, the criticism stands: quantitatively, the Sunday paper is less of a newspaper. Instead of giving their increased space to television and leisure-time features, editors and publishers could have given more space to background and interpretive articles (this type of article was included in the term "general news") that give perspective and understanding to the week's news.

In short, the Sunday papers are giving more space today to telling people how to spend their leisure time and less space to explaining what's happening in the dangerous world we live in.

A second finding was that the Sunday paper seems to provide less cultural leadership than it did a generation ago. Sunday papers have long been the urban citizen's principal source of news and comment on cultural events: new plays, musical programs, art shows, lectures, and new books. Yet, the study found that column inches devoted to three kinds of serious arts—books, serious music, and art—declined from an average of 391.5 inches per issue in 1939 to 376.9 inches in 1959.

However, for the three popular entertainment media—movies, television, and radio—the coverage per issue for all three almost doubled from 1939 to 1959. A partial explanation may be that increased space for features seems to follow on the heels of increases in similar types of advertising. This might explain the great expansion of travel and resort "news" found in Sunday papers today.

Unfortunately, a city's cultural events—the art shows,

musical programs, and so on—bring in little advertising revenue. Yet, in a number of cities where Sunday newspapers do give excellent coverage to local cultural events as in, say, Minneapolis, there is a rich and successful cultural life.

Another criticism is that the Sunday newspaper has become rather innocuous and bland because it tries to appeal to all readers, potential and actual. By trying to provide something for everyone, it manages to bore a good many readers, particularly the more discriminating persons in positions of leadership in business, government, and education. Two of the most successful Sunday papers, the *New York Times* and the *New York Sunday News*, are interesting and stimulating because they are edited for specific audiences. They don't expect to please everyone.

Across the nation, there is a dreary sameness about most Sunday newspapers. The usual formula seems to require that Sunday papers from Boston to Los Angeles must include the following: a main news section; a sports section; an entertainment section on movies, television, and radio; a locally edited tabloid magazine; a syndicated tabloid magazine like *This Week* or *Parade*; colored comics; a combined feature section on gardening, homes, travel, and hobbies; and a section of business, real estate, and classified advertising. The combinations of sections may vary somewhat, but most Sunday papers conform closely to this pattern. Moreover, the intellectual level of this coverage varies little from paper to paper.

This blandness is even more apparent in the syndicated Sunday magazines, *This Week*, *American Weekly*, *Parade*, and *Family Weekly*. Distributed in all parts of the United States, it is essential that each magazine not offend any of its distributing newspapers. Consequently, they avoid controversy and any topics, however newsworthy, that might be unpopular in certain regions.

One of the big four, the *American Weekly*, has been doing so badly of late, that on January 7, 1962, it dropped back from distribution in 32 Sunday papers to only the nine Hearst Sunday papers and the Chicago *American*, a former Hearst property.

Indeed, the magazine influence on Sunday papers seems to be of somewhat dubious value. The study found that the papers in the sample now average three tabloid-size magazine sections. Moreover, much of the content of features is similar to that found in the newsstand women's magazines. A good deal more space is given now to home and family activities, gardening, self-improvement, and do-it-yourself ideas. It's not that there isn't interest in such features. The criticism is that the quality of the material is often too low. And in some cases, there's too much of it—to the exclusion of legitimate news.

Another finding was that the Sunday papers have gone overboard for television. This competing medium gets

far more attention these days than the old Sunday papers ever gave to movies and radio. The 13 papers studied increased their editorial coverage of television from an average of 124.4 column inches per issue in 1954 way up to 424.4 in 1959. This has been done mainly by the introduction of a new Sunday paper ingredient—the tabloid or sometimes pocket-sized television magazine section. Complete logs of the coming week's programs, feature stories on popular television personalities and programs, and gossip columns by syndicated writers are the usual elements of these magazines. The one thing they usually lack is objective and discerning criticism of a medium much in need of criticism. Unfortunately, there is only one TV critic like Jack Gould of the *New York Times*.

This headlong rush to put out television magazines that has characterized Sunday papers in recent years is seen as an effort to compete with the successful newsstand television magazines for advertising revenue. This and the fact that Sunday readers do watch a lot of television are probably sound reasons for publishing television supplements. The criticism is mainly directed at *how* they are written and edited, particularly in view of the rising swell

of criticism and dissatisfaction directed toward television in the last several years.

Another finding was that the Sunday paper continues to suffer from a sort of unplanned growth. Pressures of increased display and classified advertising, new features on travel, television, the home and leisure have pushed the metropolitan Sunday paper out at the seams until it has often become unwieldy and indigestible. And yet they're still getting bigger.

The traditional U.S. Sunday paper, then, seems to have reached an impasse of sorts. By trying to satisfy all its readers, it has failed to serve adequately an important minority of its more discriminating readers. At the same time, metropolitan Sunday papers have expanded so much that they are difficult to handle and often unrewarding to read.

The Sunday newspapers in the United States have created a situation in which new and more imaginative kinds of weekend publications are called for. The need for a national Sunday paper seems to be there. The question is whether the daily newspaper industry is adaptable and resourceful enough to provide it.

## The Job of the A. P.

By Frank J. Starzel

The Associated Press delivers its news to more than seven thousand users in all parts of the world. Its dispatches are transmitted at high speed to newspapers, television and radio stations, news magazines and other publications. At every minute of the day and night, this news is printed or broadcast immediately upon receipt. An error cannot be overtaken before publication; the members and subscribers depend entirely or mostly upon us as their sources of world-wide information.

The fact that our dispatches will be given immediate, widespread circulation greatly increases our responsibility. We cannot fail to exercise all practical precautions. The possibilities for mistakes are enormous and inevitably some occur. Considering the hazards involved, against the background of obstacles and impediments, the number of errors is gratifyingly small. But when error does occur, its gravity is actually intensified because of the splendid record achieved normally.

It is our invariable practice to acknowledge promptly and forthrightly any consequential error in our news report. We explain the circumstances which might have been

responsible for the misinformation. This policy sometimes amazes individuals engaged in other types of enterprise. We deem it important to maintenance of public confidence.

Naturally, this candor exposes us to sharpshooting from all types and sorts including but not limited to pressure groups, self-seekers, comedians, publicity hounds, extremists, and even some well-meaning people.

It is a tradition of the American press—and I use the term to embrace all forms of mass communications—to give its critics a platform. The privilege is often abused, but the purpose is sound. Distributing information is a public trust; the press should and must be ready to receive brickbats. For example:

We reported the statement of a government official who wasn't there but decided that our man on the scene thousands of miles away was wrong. (Incidentally, our man in Nigeria wasn't wrong about the 1,000 students demonstrating over that unfortunate postcard incident; he was on the scene and he verified his own estimate.)

We gave wide publicity to the general's (Van Fleet's) apology to the ambassador (Stevenson) for what he said in that speech in Florida. We also reported the general's statement that he was quoted "out of context," even though he acknowledged having been completely misinformed about the facts.

---

Frank J. Starzel is general manager of the Associated Press. This is from a talk to the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Nov. 13, 1961.



We in the Associated Press have always invited criticism and appraisal of our product. Several hundred editors from all parts of the country will gather in Dallas this week for the sole purpose of telling our executives, in specifics and generalities, about our failures and deficiencies. . . . We believe in the process because this is a constructive, professional critique which contributes substantially to improvement of news coverage techniques and practices.

We are also subjected to frequent attacks that have no constructive base whatever. There are outbursts designed to attract attention to the critic, to vent his spleen against some segment of the press or against an individual reporter or editor, to advance some particular bit of his own axe-grinding, or to confuse the issue and the public.

The highly emotional content of issues confronting us adds fuel to this fire of intemperance. There are some who can find Communistic leanings in anyone who writes something distasteful or opposed to the critic's views. Some self-styled liberals sing a song of reactionary control over reporters.

I should not leave you with the impression that we are staggering under the blows of the self-appointed experts, pundits and assorted others who seem perennially to be campaigning for the office of editor. It represents a small minority, but there is ample evidence that the public largely knows the appropriate discount percentage to apply to their statements.

I want to sketch for you briefly one case history of such a situation. The Associated Press established a bureau in Moscow more than 10 years before the United States government resumed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1933. Our correspondents were prohibited by law from using or even carrying their passports. Their passports were always deposited at Riga, Latvia, before they entered Russia.

They worked under great handicaps and in personal discomfort. No one labored under any illusion that they were reporting the full story because they were operating under severe governmental restrictions, including rigid censorship. Yet they produced admirably. They reported about political, military, social, economic, scientific, industrial and cultural matters.

Until the Soviet-U.S. honeymoon ended shortly after World War II, this Moscow arrangement was accepted. But when the icy winds of the Cold War began to blow, the attitude changed. We were accused of playing the Communist game. Overlooked was the fact that these reporters were sending out solid news, insofar as they could, about developments within Russia.

This sort of haranguing went on for years. Suddenly the

Russians sent Sputnik I into space and, as suddenly, the anvil chorus changed its key. "Why?" went the critical question, "wasn't the public informed about Russia's scientific and technological progress?" Well, the fact was that, despite the blanket of secrecy in Russia, Moscow correspondents had been reporting on events and developments which clearly foreshadowed what was ahead. Some of the copy was quite precise as to what the Russian scientists were doing. We didn't have the date in advance but the Sputnik launching should have been no surprise.

Sputnik sent Western nations into a tizzy because too many people, in high places and low, simply had not wanted to believe what they read and heard about Russian advances in many fields.

I sense that our omniscient critics are about to present a 180-degree turn and I suspect some of them will be the same individuals who blamed news reporters for the surprise of Sputnik. I have begun to hear voices alleging that the crises in Berlin, in Laos, in Viet Nam and elsewhere are largely due to inadequate or distorted reporting. We aren't giving attention to the West's responsibility or, they say, at least partial responsibility, for the impasse in the relations with the Soviet. Presumably we are intensifying the Cold War spirit by reporting about walls on the East-West Berlin border, gas attacks, shooting of would-be refugees and the like, which happen to be facts!

The answer to all this is quite simple. The newsman and the news organization are convenient whipping boys when things go wrong or the facts are not as an interested partisan might wish them to be. We live in an era of gigantic pressure movements—for good or evil—and this has become part and parcel of the democratic process.

Reporting the result of a baseball or football game is easy. Complex world situations do not come to such clear-cut, black-and-white conclusions. There are wheels-within-wheels always and gray tones. All must be reported—at the risk of incurring the displeasure of those whose motto is "you're either for us or against us."

We are quite content to leave to others the categorical conclusions, over-simplified appraisals and sweeping statements. We proceed with confidence that the system of factual reporting is sound. We will continue to clarify matters to the best of our ability when we can. We will continue to avoid reporting what we do not know to be a fact except on authority of someone who should or claims to know. We will not bow to pressure tactics or be deflected from our course by baseless criticism. We are not interested in winning popularity contests but neither shall we revel in any assumed omniscience. We will continue to be reporters of the news, and we think there is no higher calling.

# Press Report from Kenya

By Charles A. A. Hayes

Mr. Henry Morgenthau III, on his recent visit here, suggested that you might be interested in receiving a report on the situation in which the press finds itself in Kenya, where political pressure groups are at least threatening measures against Press Freedom in the future and doing much to make the work of journalists difficult in the present.

You may know the background to the present political situation, especially since I understood it was Mr. Morgenthau's intention to rebroadcast through Brandeis University radio certain talks recorded by the Kenya Broadcasting Service in 1961. They were accompanied by a political analysis, designed to put your listeners a little more in the complete picture.

First, to go back in history a little, you will recall that Jomo Kenyatta and six companions were jailed in 1953 after having been convicted of having some part in or managing the illegal secret terrorist society called Mau Mau. Those convicted had all been members of the Kenya African Union, which itself was proscribed in 1953, when it was said by the Kenya Government to be supporting Mau Mau.

Whilst Jomo Kenyatta was still serving his seven-year sentence, the nationalist movement continued to grow and to take in tribes not particularly active in this field prior to the advent of the Mau Mau movement, which itself was confined to the Kikuyu people.

By 1958, when the violence of Mau Mau had been brought under control, Kenyatta was hailed by some non-Kikuyu as "the first nationalist." Criticism of his continued restriction, in a small outpost in our northern desert area, increased and his name became the rallying-point for all African politics in Kenya. Europeans, with longer memories of the many African deaths and economic destruction caused by Mau Mau, were generally against the idea of his being released.

They feared a recrudescence of the terrorist movement and retaliatory action against their race, who have set up both businesses and a competent agricultural industry in the little country. But, as the African demand grew, it was clearly impossible to resist, especially since the more moderate leaders joined in and promised that Jomo Kenyatta was no longer a security risk.

The Kenya African National Union—Kanu—formed on a broad front which cut across tribal areas—was organized

in 1960, but gave rise to fears amongst the non-Kikuyu peoples that domination was sought by that land-hungry tribe in government and in land ownership.

A splinter group was formed, called the Kenya African Democratic Union—Kadu—and quickly attracted many of the peoples outside the one and one-quarter million Kikuyu. Both parties continued to demand Kenyatta's release and acknowledged him as the great Kenya leader.

In March, 1961, the National Union won the general elections, but refused to take office unless Jomo Kenyatta were released immediately and unconditionally. After weeks of toing-and-froing came the surprise: the Democratic Union agreed to form a government, and was strengthened in the Legislative Council by members nominated by the Governor.

The country was split into near-warring political camps. There were charges of "imperialist stooges" made by Kanu against Kadu; nevertheless, in August, 1961, Kadu secured Kenyatta's release to his home in the Kikuyu farming district of Kiambu and a few weeks later, he was completely free, to move anywhere and to re-enter politics.

In October, 1961, he joined Kanu and became its President. Kadu immediately rejected his leadership.

In such a situation, the independent press came under pressure. Most of the African-owned newspapers which had flourished before the outbreak of the State of Emergency in 1952 were nothing more than political sheets and were not concerned with presenting the news without bias. Most had been banned in 1952 and others which were founded in the subsequent years of the Emergency worked under some stress.

In general, the European-owned press was hostile to the nationalist cause, as were its readers. It was left to my group (of which the major-shareholder is the Aga Khan) to begin printing news of the African political scene in 1959, when the Nation Series company was founded. But today, with the country still fearful but convinced of the inevitability of African control of Kenya and with already an African majority government at its helm, every English-language paper has been accused of being pro-Kanu, pro-Kadu, anti-Kanu, anti-Kadu, but always "imperialist." It is, in fact, the time when the African-owned press is being rebuilt and such charges come naturally as sales-promotion techniques.

Yet behind the clamor is a very deep-seated desire to secure control of the press and there seems little doubt that Jomo Kenyatta himself is particularly resentful of criticism, even though it is not expressed in any newspaper's editorial columns. He and his party have been taking steps to let it be known that they regard such opposing views, if printed, as deliberately directed against Kanu and inspired by enmity.

It is a natural enough consequence of the country having

---

Charles A. A. Hayes is director and managing editor of East African Newspapers in Nairobi, Kenya

been split; but it becomes dangerous to Kanu when that organization itself becomes riven down the middle by internecine fights for power and control. Kanu is in process of being taken over by the "Old Guard" which went to jail, in fact, and they do not relish publicity for what is happening inside the party until they secure that control.

Recently, when rumors were rife that certain leaders—like Kanu Secretary General Tom Mboya, Jomo Kenyatta himself, Kadu's Ronald Ngala (Leader of Government Business) and his deputy Masinde Muliro—went in danger of their lives, a Kanu leader who appealed for a clean-up inside the party was almost expelled. He spoke of threats and intimidation, of Kanuman spying upon Kanuman; other reports told of the infiltration of communist money from Red China and later from Russia and other Iron-Curtain countries, for use by Kanu. Kadu is completely free of any such sources of finance.

The Kanu leader, Onyango Ayodo, was put on the mat in front of an executive council meeting of the party and castigated. President Jomo Kenyatta issued a warning that any other member of the party who dared to criticize the party in the press would indeed be expelled. It is, again, natural enough when a leader is trying to hold a warring party together—but it presages a growing enmity towards the press as an institution.

Accordingly, I have been endeavoring to form a guild of editors, as a first step towards securing some statutory freedoms for the press when our independence constitution comes to be written, perhaps in March this year, following the talks with the Colonial Office in London. For the first time, it seems, it would be possible for the press as a whole to make approaches to the political leaders and to "educate" them in the role of the press in an independent country not governed by totalitarianism. I understood from Mr. Morgenthau that this is a sector in which you have a particular interest.

We had a visit some weeks ago from Jim Rose, of

the International Press Institute, Zurich. He was depressingly clear-sighted about the dangers already extant in Africa towards the independent press and spoke of East Africa as being the last in which complete freedom still existed.

He suggested that courses for African journalists should be started in both East and West Africa, in order that they might get the feel of the profession and train as future editors.

Half the trouble, as he soon learned, is that not enough attention has been given in East Africa generally to the problem of training the man who wants to study the newspaper business. Whilst Kenya has some 850 African students in the United States and a few of them are taking journalism, in these territories—where small advertising revenue and high production costs mean small editorial budgets—there is nothing like the time and man-power availability to allow full training schemes for African recruits to the profession.

There is no faculty of journalism in the East African University nor indeed facilities in the night-schools the government has been able to set up, so that students must be part of a newspaper setup—which is probably the best school, but difficult to achieve on a large enough scale when newspapers have to compete with salary grades offered in commerce and government to those who have achieved mere secondary school status.

It was for this set of reasons that IPI has decided to take action, spark off a course, for 24 students from the six territories of East and Central Africa, in October this year and endeavor to follow with another year. We have excellent material in African journalists and trainees working in this group; the trouble is there just aren't enough of them.

If, therefore, you ever hear of bursaries or full grants for short-term training in the United States, I am sure the Guild of Editors would be very interested to learn of them.

Nairobi, Jan. 12.

# Public Opinion Under Dictatorship In Nicaragua

By Marvin Alisky

A reporter or pollster who interviews a man in the street or a housewife in a community center in the United States usually meets with friendly understanding, or at worst, the abruptness of someone in a hurry. But the interviewer in Nicaragua meets with suspicion for two reasons. First, the dictatorship discourages criticism of public affairs and jails political opponents. And secondly, except for token radio station polling, Nicaraguans are not accustomed to being surveyed.

Is the stranger asking questions to get me on the tax rolls? Is he an informer? So thinks a Nicaraguan to himself and often remains silent, until prodded by an interviewer trained to gather information under such conditions.

President Luis Somoza and his brother, General Anastasio Somoza Jr., who jointly run Nicaragua, inherited their dictatorship from their father, Anastasio Sr., who was assassinated in 1956. When Rafael Trujillo Jr. failed to hang onto his slain father's Dominican Republic in 1961, his ouster left Nicaragua the only dictatorship in Latin American history to be handed down from father to son successfully.

Hoping to avoid a Castro-like revolution, the Somozas during the past three years have allowed token democratic appendages to the dictatorial regime. For example, one opposition newspaper, *La Prensa* of Managua, is permitted to function, but the remaining newspapers are either owned by the Somozas or restricted to the point of ineffectiveness.

Another showcase the Somozas use to court a favorable image in the United States is the journalism school I organized in 1960 with a Smith-Mundt grant. It is still open. The thirty-five students of this school carried out a public opinion poll during the summer of 1960, the first and only such survey ever permitted in Nicaragua.

When the students were being instructed in polling techniques, an official from the Ministry of the Interior came to the meetings. Ministry approval for the survey came only after we promised to withhold the results we obtained for more than one year before making them public at home or abroad.

The Minister of the Interior himself sent a warning

**Marvin Alisky** has written for *Nieman Reports* on Cuban newspapers, Mexican radio and U.S. television. He is chairman of the Mass Communications Department of Arizona State University. This paper, in expanded form, was scheduled for presentation before the Rocky Mountain Council on Latin American Studies, April 12, in Phoenix.

that "political controversy was not to be initiated." He was assured that we hoped only to measure the amount of optimism and pessimism of a cross-section of adults in the capital city of Managua.

Our original questionnaire had the twenty-one questions used in the UNESCO survey of 1948 in Australia, Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Mexico, Norway, and the United States. But the Interior Ministry rejected six of the questions. In its final form, our questionnaire contained fifteen questions.

During July, 1960, 412 interviews in various sectors of Managua were completed satisfactorily out of more than 500 attempted. Various interviews which did not conform to the pre-controlled proportioning of the sample by sex, age, and socio-economic levels were eliminated.

Portions of the article "National Stereotypes and Foreign Contacts" by Erich Reigrotski and Nels Anderson from the winter 1959-60 *Public Opinion Quarterly* were translated into Spanish and explained to the students. Every facet of phrasing questions so as not to suggest the answer was explained to each interviewer. Sessions were held to coach each interviewer in how to approach interviewees, what tone of voice to be used for reading the questions aloud, and hints for putting the respondent at ease.

Population characteristics, as determined by the Nicaraguan census office, for the city of Managua, whose population in 1960 totaled 200,000, gave us this cross-section:

Sex:		
	Men 44%,	Women 56%
Age:		
	20 to 29	38.8%
	30 to 39	46.0%
	40 & over	14.2%
	Undetermined	1.0%
Education:		
	Primary	49.3%
	Secondary	16.5%
	College	4.2%
	No schooling	27.2%
	Undetermined	2.8%
Socio-economic:		
	Well-to-do	1.1%
	Middle Class	7.9%
	Workers	39.0%
	Very poor	53.0%



The data were obtained from those normally at home during the daytime and an attempt was made to survey those not normally home during the day at nighttime, but the latter procedure proved to be unworkable, as pollsters could not gain admittance after dark. Therefore, our student researchers filled in the cross-section by interviewing men in the street, in stores, in cafes.

Fourteen of the questions directly related to the survey. In addition, a warmup question established rapport: "Within six months, do you believe that the cost of living will increase, decrease, or remain more or less as it is now?"

In measuring fatalistic views, our key phrase was "human nature," as suggested by the aforementioned 1948 UNESCO survey, for this phrase translates with ease into Spanish and provokes the same patterns of response in various countries, according to William Buchanan and Hadley Cantril in *How Nations See Each Other* (University of Illinois Press, 1953).

"Do you believe that human nature can be changed?" (Cree usted que la naturaleza humana pueda cambiarse?) In the 1948 UNESCO survey, 32 per cent of the Mexicans said it was possible to change human nature. In our 1960 survey, 30 per cent of the Nicaraguans felt the same way. Of all of our tabulations, this datum for Nicaraguans came closest to matching the earlier Mexican survey.

No truly fatalistic pattern by age, sex, or socio-economic status revealed itself. The "yes" answers to that basic question were scattered among men and women, youths and oldsters, rich, middle class, and poor. Does living in a dictatorship make a cross-section of the population fatalistic? Apparently.

Of those Nicaraguans who did believe that human nature could be changed, almost two-thirds felt that such a change would happen, whereas less than one-third felt such a change to be possible but improbable, and four per cent of those who believed human nature can be changed did not know if such a change were probable or improbable.

In response to the question "Do you believe that our Nicaraguan characteristics are mainly born to us, or are they due to the way we are brought up?" more than one third of the respondents—39 per cent—thought national characteristics to be inborn. Compare this with the 1948 UNESCO survey, in which 28 per cent of the Mexicans and only 15 per cent of us United States citizens believed similarly.

Of prime importance, of course, was the question "Do you believe that it will be possible for all countries to live together at peace with each other?"

Here we found more than one-fifth of the respondents—22 per cent—answering "Don't know." Less than one third—32 per cent—believe such peace is possible, and 46 per cent think such a lofty goal impossible.

In analyzing the various tabulations, I found little correlation of age or sex or wealth to optimism or pessimism among Nicaraguans. Again, does a dictatorship encourage pessimism fairly evenly among a cross-section of the people? Many news reporters and political scientists make this assumption about the Somoza dictatorship, but for the first time, we were actually measuring such pessimism.

We carefully checked self estimates as to socio-economic class by inquiring if the family had a telephone, an automobile, a radio, servants, if the family owned or rented the house, the name of the last school the respondent attended, what was his or her terminal year of formal education.

When one student interviewer came back with several "don't know" answers in one sector of town, he was immediately reassigned to another task not connected with this public opinion poll and a substitute reporter sent to that neighborhood. This substitution of personnel did not affect the number of "don't know" answers to any extent, satisfying us that the field work was being carried out as planned. After all the returns were in, we found each sector of Managua yielding similar patterns, except for the extremes in neighborhoods, the worst slums and the elite district.

Despite the suspicions of the Somoza government, only one student interviewer quit before the survey was completed, expressing fear. He reported that a policeman had followed him on his rounds. But eleven interviewers reported no official interference, only reluctance and suspicion on the part of the rank and file Nicaraguans until they comprehended exactly what the survey was all about. We concluded that the poll was truly educational, not only from the standpoint of what we learned about Nicaraguan opinions, but also that many Managuans are now acquainted with polls and will be more receptive to reporters and interviewers in the future, should conditions permit further surveys.

In summary, perhaps for the first time in a Latin American dictatorship, reporters using social science methodology found out something of what the people really do think, rather than what some official says they think, or what some visiting columnist rashly reports after talking to a few English-speaking upper class "natives" in a cocktail lounge.

As of 1960, 32 per cent of the Managuans think nations can live in peace, 46 per cent think not, and 22 per cent don't know. We were not permitted by the Nicaraguan government to ask Managuans what they thought of Americans. Many, however, volunteered unflattering remarks about both the United States and Russia, but often praise for Castro. Even with the 1962 OAS action possibly changing that picture, one may safely assume that at present a widespread discontent surges among those living under the Somoza regime.

# The Built-In Bias of the Press

By Robert Fulford

A few years ago I had to go to a small Ontario city to interview a man who worked on the daily paper there. I had never visited this city or its newspaper, and I was astonished by what I found. The building in which the paper was published turned out to be modern and cheerful. The equipment was all quite recent and included the most ingenious devices for such things as photo reproduction and news communication. The editorial and business staffs were generally young, and the atmosphere in which they worked was that of a brisk, up-to-date business enterprise.

This astonished me because it was utterly unrelated to the newspaper which issued from those premises. Judging by the newspaper itself, I had expected the plant to be located in a building erected around 1900. I had imagined that the editorial staff wrote all their copy in longhand, that the business office consisted of an old man with a quill pen sitting on a high stool, and that the paper itself was cranked out on an ancient flatbed press.

Because certainly this is what a reading of that paper would indicate. Intellectually, it was living in the 1940s; socially, in the 1920s; and typographically, around 1900. Its editorial page writers obviously believed themselves to be committing an act of daring when they suggested labor unions were a good thing. Its make-up editor obviously regarded himself as a courageous fool when he adopted typographic devices which were elsewhere the commonplaces of 1935. Its cultural pages apparently regarded it as dangerous to admit the possible permanence of music which was composed in Vienna in 1900 or paintings which were produced in Paris in 1910.

Since the time I saw it, this Victorian product, turned out in a modern setting, has seemed to me a symbol of Canadian daily papers. There are 100 of them, of course, and no generalization covers them all; but I think it fair to say that if a foreigner, having never visited Canada, were to spend a few weeks reading all of our papers he would emerge with a picture of a country which is dull, smug, and provincial. This is not the Canada I know; but it is the Canada which our press reflects.

My own observation is that there is no Canadian com-

---

Robert Fulford of the *Toronto Daily Star* does a daily book column and a weekly column on art. He is also well known for his broadcasts and contributions to magazines of Canada. He gave this paper before the Winter Conference of the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs in Toronto, Feb. 17.

munity which is as dull as the newspapers which it reads. In general, I believe, English-Canadian newspapers follow rather than lead their readers, and I want to explore the possible reasons for this. Some of them are built-in tendencies of the press everywhere, tendencies which should be resisted; others are peculiar to Canadian communities. Now, my own feelings about newspapers are a mixture of pride and dissatisfaction, of love and hate. I have some intimate associations with newspapers. My great-grandfather edited copy in New York and in London, Ontario; my father was a newspaperman all his life; I started to work on a Toronto paper when I was seventeen; my wife and both her parents were reporters or editors. I read newspapers incessantly—newspapers from Canada, from England, from the United States. I sometimes pick up newspapers in languages I will never read, like Yiddish or Dutch, just to admire their typography or their illustrations. When I speak of daily newspapers I speak out of love; I can't imagine a world without them.

But I can imagine a Canada in which newspapers will play a more valuable role in the activities of the community. "The community" I take here to mean not Metropolitan Toronto or the City of Saskatoon but the larger community, defined as a body of men and women with common interests and aspirations.

In all the most obvious ways, newspapers serve their communities admirably. Charities couldn't exist without the pressure of daily newspapers; and building drives, like those for universities, regularly use the daily papers to create the proper climate for the extraction of money from the reluctant rich. The externals of politics and business are, I believe, fairly well covered and certainly our political system could not exist without the papers.

But in the less obvious ways, Canadian newspapers give less service than they could. One of the central reasons for this is the built-in bias of the press, a bias which has nothing to do with party political loyalty. The structure of the press and the character of the men who staff the newspapers both force the press to lean in one direction, and only the most persistent and vigorous opposition can offset this.

The bias I refer to is in the direction of Authority, and in this case Authority means anything which is organized, which has a name, and which gives speeches. This bias is by now so natural and so much a characteristic of the press that it is rarely even mentioned. The bias may be

towards industry, trade unions, department stores, governments, or cultural institutions.

In covering the news in all these fields the press tends—to what I believe is a harmful degree—to take its cues from established Authority. Because of the way newspapers are put out, both the news columns and the minds of the newspapermen are dominated by articulate opinion. On the most basic level it is much easier to cover a speech or re-write a publicity release than to do a dozen interviews. It is much easier to accept conventional wisdom than to challenge it. And what is easier soon becomes what is natural; and this is the pattern of newspapers.

Murray Kempton, the New York *Post* columnist, recently pointed out that one reason for this bias in American newspapers is the fact that journalists get their early training as police reporters. On the police beat you naturally look to Authority—the sergeant of detectives—for all the facts. You don't expect the criminal to have an opinion. This respect for Authority begins as an unfortunate necessity, develops into a habit, and ends by becoming a part of the reporter's personality. When he becomes an editor or a publisher, he becomes part of Authority himself, and this only increases his affection and respect for those people with titles, offices and press agents.

In a lecture at Queen's University seven years ago, Professor Frank Underhill complained of the quality of Canadian newspapers and said they will be improved "only by further advances in the professionalization of journalism." He pointed out that in his lifetime the press in Canada had not gone through anything like the advance in professionalization which had transformed the federal civil service. Since then, the place of the newspaperman in the community has been changing gradually, and certain advances, of the kind Professor Underhill may have in mind, have indeed been made. More newspapermen are now college graduates, and soon it may be all but impossible to find a young reporter without a degree of some kind. At the same time, newspapers have seen the need for specialization, and while it is still uncommon it is no longer unheard-of for a Canadian newspaper to employ a first-class science writer, a drama critic of some distinction, or a Soviet affairs specialist. This, too, can be called professionalization. In the same period, through the activities of the American Newspaper Guild, salaries have greatly increased, to the point where a Toronto reporter now earns more than about ninety per cent of Canadian taxpayers. But if these things have in some ways broadened the outlook of the newspapers, they have also helped in other ways to narrow it. In a country dominated by its middle class, where all our important institutions reflect a middle-class point of view, the newspaperman is now pre-eminently a middle-class citizen. His attitude is not far from that of

the dead-centre suburbanite: That is, again, an attitude which looks to organizations to sustain it.

One of my favorite examples of the attitude this produces is the treatment of the automobile in Canadian newspapers in the last ten years. All around us, an important battle has been fought between the motor car and the pedestrian on one level and, on another level, between the super-highway and the public transportation system. It is my own opinion that in this case the middle-class has fought the lower class and has won. But whether you agree with that or not, it would be hard to deny that this battle has been fought. It was one of the most spectacular social facts of the 1950s. Yet as I read the newspapers during that period I rarely saw this reported or commented on. The reason is that many people speak for the private automobile side of the question; and until recently very few people spoke for the other side; therefore, no contest. The newspapers were unable to report the anti-automobile view because that view was not organized and articulated.

In the same field, another development of the 1950s impressed me as significant. The North American newspapers I read during the last decade acquiesced in the development of the Detroit automobile. The auto makers were able to create a climate in which it was possible to produce, and sell in large numbers, monstrous machines which were frequently as dangerous as they were inefficient. It is true, of course, that the influence of newspapers in this regard was not nearly as great as that of automobile advertising itself. But to the extent that the newspapers refused for some years to criticize the Detroit cars, and frequently helped to publicize them, the newspapers were of assistance to the auto makers. Again, the auto makers were organized; consumers were not. It is too facile to say that this happened because automobile companies advertise. It would have happened, I think, whether they advertised or not, simply as a result of the newspapers' tendency to adjust to organized opinion and to the status quo in whatever field they cover.

If it is natural for middle-class newspapermen to react in this way, then it is equally natural for them to become deeply and personally involved with the politicians and other officials they see regularly. This tendency has produced a special kind of newspaperman. An example is the sports writer who becomes so involved in friendship and professional association with the people he covers that he adopts their point of view entirely.

This is a tendency which is not limited to sports writers. Some years ago I worked with a reporter who had covered politics for a good many years. He knew more politicians than anyone else on our paper, and he was widely respected by both the politicians and his colleagues. But in the several years I knew him he did not write one story which would cause any discomfort to a politician. He

simply covered the public meetings, and after a while he grew to be on such intimate terms with his subjects that he could no more attack them than he could criticize his children in public. Sometimes, when his politician friends were on the point of making mistakes, he would actually pass them notes containing his advice, so that they could avoid doing anything which would be embarrassing to report.

This friend of mine adopted without question the standards and opinions of those he was covering rather than investigating and challenging them. He was following a general tendency to its logical conclusion. Newspapers, which are rightly proud to be, as they say, "part of the community," sometimes grow so close to the community's dominant public values that they resemble house organs of official opinion. Because it is the easiest way, they adopt the standards of the community rather than try to shape them. This tendency is found in its most critical form in newspapers whose executives are deeply involved in public community activities, ranging from universities to football teams and from hospitals to television stations. It doesn't much matter whether the publisher has taken up these activities for pleasure, for money, or for the greater good of the humanity. In any case his presence on a board of directors inhibits or distorts the newspaper's coverage of the activities which those directors direct. Newspaper publishers are usually proud of these activities, but the reporters and editors who work for them are acutely aware that a certain amount of shame is involved too.

These are some of the reasons why newspapers tend to report and comment within the generally accepted public terms of reference. Politics, in the newspapers, means party politics. Culture means what the National Ballet Guild is doing. Social welfare means the annual report of the city welfare department. Labor means strikes and threatened strikes. This policy of concentrating on official action affects newspapers' judgment of what is news. For most papers and press services, the main news consists of shooting and voting, and secondary news consists of official statements. This leads to a kind of narrowness which chokes off news and comment on a large part of humanity. A newspaper, I think, should be a report and a comment on what the world is doing, not on what its elected officials are saying.

Consider the treatment of social welfare issues in our newspapers. Except in rare cases, it is handled either by political writers, who report on how it looks from parliament or city hall, or by feature writers, who manage to deal with the human beings involved but who are expected to glide easily from a story about starving children to a nice light piece about interior decoration. The country crawls with newspapermen who specialize in reporting on various political assemblies. But it has few or none who

are competent to give an expert opinion on pensions, health insurance, mothers' allowances, and other aspects of social welfare. It seems to me that a change in pension legislation or educational subsidies can mean more to many of us than a rumor of a change in the federal cabinet. Yet the social changes will receive in our newspapers a good deal less comment and explanation, and what there is will not be written by experts. When a newspaper is troubled by the amount of money spent on welfare, or by the apparent holes in our welfare programs, it simply demands that the government call a royal commission. That settles the matter.

Or consider an entirely different field, equally important to our sense of community: the arts. To many newspapers, both here and abroad, the whole field of culture remains a hopeless enigma. In most newspapers, literature and the arts are given a few meagre columns of material produced by writers who are usually even duller than those who write the editorials. This is not because of a lack of talent but because of an attitude toward the arts which was outdated long ago. The attitude is one of quiet respect for a rather dull old aunt. Newspapers believe that the arts are a habit of the well-to-do. There may have been some truth to this a few decades ago, but it has very little relevance now. The arts themselves have changed radically, as new forms like films and jazz have been admitted, reluctantly, to the higher reaches of culture. At the same time, as paperback books and LP records have drastically altered the means of distributing culture, and as secondary and higher education have become more widely available, the audience for the arts has grown enormously and radically altered its character. Thus the product, the marketing and the market have all changed. Only the newspapers have remained the same in their basic attitudes.

Again, this is not because of some congenital hostility to intellectuals but because of the unresisted built-in bias of the press. Certain Canadian newspapers are capable, as they have often demonstrated, of approaching a subject of importance in a fairly sophisticated way—parliamentary politics, for instance, or military strategy. But when the same newspapers turn their attention to fields outside voting and shooting, they lose interest. Even the vaguest brush with the subject will convince anyone that television is now a vital shaping force in our lives. Yet television in the newspapers of this country is often treated as if it were no more important than burlesque—that is, with a combination of gossip and uninformed comment. If a political writer brought to his subject the off-handed attitude of the typical Canadian TV reporter he would find himself back on the police beat within a week.

The American conservative writer William F. Buckley recently remarked that in this period a leading intellectual



can be much more important than even the greatest industrialist. As an example he said that the economist J. K. Galbraith would probably have a greater effect on the United States than the president of General Motors. I believe this to be true, and increasingly so, as various irresistible forces, like technology, push us towards new forms of society. Now how many Canadians, reading their newspapers, have ever learned what J. K. Galbraith is up to? How many have been told what it was that John Dewey did that led to such radical changes in education? In the 1950s the Canadian newspaper reader was told just what happened every time a government fell in France—because that was politics, and obviously important. But in the same period he was not told what Jean-Paul Sartre was saying and doing—because that was philosophy, and not interesting. Yet in the long run, or maybe even the short, the ramifications of Sartre's activities might be more important than those of a cabinet shuffle.

The citizens of a community, who indirectly employ the newspapermen among them, have a right to expect that newspapermen will be more conscious of what is happening around them than the average citizen can be. This is, after all, the newspaperman's profession: Not to know what is happening is probably the only real crime he can commit. But in some fields, it appears to me, the people who work on newspapers lag behind the general community. In the last decade, as we have been remaking and enormously expanding several Canadian cities, architecture has become a more and more important factor in our lives. My own experience suggests that the community as a whole has come gradually to understand this fact, but the newspapers have barely heard of it. Most newspapers employ an art critic of some sort, usually on a part-time basis, but there is no newspaper in English-speaking Canada, so far as I know, which has anyone assigned to write seriously about the crucial developments in architecture.

In answer to these complaints, newspapermen can argue that many readers aren't much interested in the complexities of residential architecture or the intricacies of recent economic thought. But then, as it happens, the newspapers are full of things that interest few people anyway, from obscure editorials on water levels to incoherent articles on provincial politics. It seems to me that for many people—enough people to make up a fair percentage of newspaper readers—those fields I have mentioned can be made just as interesting as freight rates; maybe more so.

Some of these shortcomings are known all too well to newspapermen, but there is one problem which we find hard to recognize and even harder to understand. This is the frequent breakdown in communications between newspaperman and reader. The newspaper is primarily a medium of communication, and it should be as direct a

medium as possible. Yet every newspaperman has had the unsettling experience of meeting an apparently attentive reader who has misunderstood what he has read, or has somehow managed to avoid grasping the central point of a major issue. In the papers major stories are sometimes hinted at first, then blown up to flare headline size, then dropped to minor headline size, then eliminated entirely. The result is that readers can easily be left wondering whatever happened to the Suez Canal, or how the controversy about report cards actually came out, or what, in the end, really did happen during the Commonwealth conference at Accra. It seems likely to me that readers are often left without a coherent view of an important event, even when they have followed it fairly closely and even when there is a coherent view to be had.

Confronted with the fact of non-communication, and with the blanks in coverage, newspapermen can fall back easily on their inherent difficulties. We can cite the near-impossibility of getting out a paper every day, we can tell how the news on some days seems to push the editor around, we can plead lack of space, time, and talent. These are all pleasant rationalizations—that is, evidences of self-satisfaction. Smugness of this kind is natural for all of us—civil servants, TV repairmen, university professors, newspapermen, all of us. But it seems to me that newspapermen, in their present situation, have more chance of getting away with it than anyone else. Civil servants must read about themselves in the newspapers every day, TV repairmen must face their customers in person, and university professors must confront their inadequacies at the end of every term. Newspapermen, however, are given much more opportunity to let their smugness grow. We are unchecked, except by each other, and we do not indulge frequently in rigorous professional criticism. Nor is there much chance of an increase in the number of competing newspapers. Then how can the community hope for newspapers which will be of greater benefit to the citizens?

A. J. Liebling suggested, in a magazine article in 1947, that the United States might eventually see the creation of a new kind of newspaper. This newspaper would be run not for the publisher's profit or pleasure but for the common good. It would be endowed, like a university, and for the same reason—that it was essential to the health of the community.

"I think," Liebling wrote, "that a good newspaper is as truly an educational institution as a college, so I don't see why it should have to take its survival on attracting advertisers of ball-point pens and tickets to Hollywood peep shows." In a wonderful burst of optimism, Liebling said: "I believe that labor unions, citizens' organizations, and possibly political parties yet unborn are going to back daily papers. These will represent definite undisguised points of view, and will serve as controls on the large profit-

making papers expressing definite, ill-disguised points of view."

That was fifteen years ago, and nothing has happened since to justify Liebling's optimism. No new endowed papers have appeared, no citizens' groups or political parties have started dailies, and the adventures of labor unions in newspaper publishing have ended in disaster. At the same time, mergers have so reduced the number of newspapers in the United States that Liebling believes the day is not far off when an American city with competing daily papers will be as rare as one with competing telephone systems.

This leaves us with the newspapers we have, and we can either live with them as they are or find ways to improve them. I believe that within the newspaper business itself there is a profound current of discontent, and that this is leading to important changes. Newspapers have seen the need for better writers and editors, and unions have helped them to see the need to pay the salaries which a better class of employees demands. Newspapers, confronted with television, have also slowly come to see the need to provide something more than the facts; the background of a story is more important now than it has been in the past, and in their different ways the three Toronto papers, for instance, have made vigorous efforts in this direction. But a newspaper, like any other institution, can only serve its community if the community responds to it intelligently.

Obviously, the number of people who buy a paper constitute the main response, and there is nothing discouraging in the circulation figures of those papers—here, in England, and in the United States—which have tried to present broader and more searching material to their readers.

Beyond circulation figures, however, a community can respond to its newspaper in forceful and effective ways. The late Albert Camus was pointing in this direction when he proposed a sort of anti-newspaper: a paper to come out every day, after all the others have been published, comparing and criticizing their various accounts of the day's

news. It seems hardly likely that such an institution could be established; after all, who would pay for it? But Camus' central idea—that there should be some form of check on the press—is still useful.

In this connection I would like to make two proposals. The first is a general one: that more people in the professional and academic communities take a serious interest in the newspapers which are helping to shape the larger community in which we all live, and that they indicate this interest in public. If a newspaper can criticize the president of a university, as it does, then why can't the university president criticize the newspaper? The fact that most editors shriek like wounded bears when anyone suggests they are less than perfect should deter only the faint-hearted.

My second proposal is more specific. In Toronto one organization we cherish is called the Association of Women Electors. The members of this group make it their business to scrutinize carefully the activities of municipal government and occasionally to make recommendations for new legislation. These intelligent, admirable women attend the council meetings, make careful notes, report back to their members, and in general keep a critical eye on the activities of the politicians. Now it seems to me that newspapers in their way are as important as local councils: they do at least as much to create the tone of the community and shape its mood. I think it would be very helpful if similar citizens' groups were to appoint themselves to scrutinize the press. It would make all of us pretty uncomfortable at times, but I think we could stand it. A similar organization or committee might function on a national scale, perhaps as part of a larger group. In this way criticism of the press would be rooted in the community rather than limited to occasional magazine articles or TV shows or conferences. The press badly needs disinterested criticism. It is my hope, as a newspaperman and as a reader of newspapers and as a citizen, that we can develop a new critical response to newspapers and in which our great daily papers can be viewed at least as critically as they themselves view the rest of the world.

# The Technique of Journalism

By Carl E. Lindstrom

To the argument of editors vis-a-vis journalism schools that a job candidate need only be a liberal arts graduate, my answer is that merely to be educated is not enough.

A liberal arts education is not enough for the newspaper man. He must be a technician particularly in this technical age when institutions dedicated to the humanities, journalism being one of them, cannot be satisfied to do and die but must every shining day and hour know how to reason why and face the answers.

No journalism school graduate should accept the facile clichés with which publishers and editors load the life raft as newspapers go under: monopoly newspapers are better than competitive ones; self-regulation of newspapers would be a threat to freedom of the press; entertainment is one of the primary functions of a newspaper. I know a good many journalism graduates who don't accept these easy answers.

I do not quite understand what editors mean when they tell journalism schools: Do not teach techniques; we'll teach them techniques when they go to work in the news room. If they mean that in the news room they will be taught the conventional practices which have brought newspapers to their present monopolistic, out-moded, strangled practices, I'm quite sure that is the very thing that will be done. But whether it should be done either in the news room or the journalism school is quite another matter. Those things should be taught nowhere and editors themselves should be shown how to get rid of them.

But technique is precisely what the journalism schools should teach; not headline writing, not format or layout work, not camera technicalities, not story structure—and certainly students should not be taught how to run that greatest single roadblock to newspaper progress, the linotype machine—if any school is still teaching type-setting, which I greatly doubt, in spite of the rumors.

But techniques yes! The technique of overcoming the lag between the broadcast and the printed account; the technique of comprehensible and communicative writing; the technique—yes, the science—of asking questions (where would the lawyer or the pollster be without it); the technique of the interview (to the psychiatrist that, too, is a science); the technique of critical writing (Oh, that one might lift dramatic, musical and art criticism from its

Slough of Despond!); the technique of investigative procedure; not to forget the elementary technique of grammar and spelling which I'm afraid journalism schools are going to have to undertake since there is no place for them in any curriculum from the paper-cutting primary grades to graduate schools; the technique of enough law to understand such civil rights as the right of privacy, free speech, assembly and petition and that the Constitution does not include what publishers seem to think the most precious right of all—the right to go out of business.

By all means, teach technique—the new techniques that our young hopeful will have to have if newspapers are to be turned back to Editor Redivivus.

Journalism schools have the obligation to make journalism a profession. Newspapers will never make it so if the attitude of editors depopulates journalism colleges by demanding “liberal arts” without inquiring what is meant by liberal arts. The professional newspaperman should be trained to focus his talents upon the newspaper problem looking toward the improvement of journalism. His preparation should enable him to do for news dissemination what the publishers have *not* done for the mechanics of printing and distribution. In other words, whether there is to be research by the newspaper industry or not, there certainly should be no neglect of the news problem. This is the challenge to the professional news writer, one for which he will not find the answers in a graduate reading course.

Today the editor is needed as never before. He alone can save the daily press from its failures and follies. The publisher's solutions of merger, suspension and monopoly simply won't do. The press must be rededicated to its high calling of news dissemination and intellectual leadership of an informed citizenry. Our parlous times cry out for the responsible editor. I don't mean the editorial job holder, the man with a title on his office door, but the man who has the ability to think and the courage to face his conclusions. In this day when mainly those things that can maintain themselves by propaganda are in the ascendancy I know of no remedy for purifying the stream of news except editorial integrity. This is the hour for the bold man, the free man. His name is editor! The press cannot be free without free editors. Let the editor be restored to his one-time authority and power; let him be revived. I am often skeptical when publishers view with alarm the staggering increase in costs. Perhaps they really are quite satisfied that the cost spiral is doing them a service. Do they

---

This is from the Buckland Memorial Lecture at Ryerson Institute of Technology, in Toronto, given Feb. 20 by Carl E. Lindstrom, former editor of the Hartford *Times*.

reason that the unreckonable cost of starting a newspaper is the best insurance in the world that newspapers will never again fall into the hands of editors?

Now not only publishers and owners, but editors as well, refer to newspapering as a business. This means that it has lost its character.

The holy obligation of disseminating news to democratic peoples cannot be merely a business. A business is concerned only with customer acceptance and if one is to consider only what the reader likes and will accept, then news will have lost its integrity. The two big wire services of the United States are competitive in high degree; both keep a weekly log for circulation among editors showing how many of its stories were printed by clients over against the box score of its competitor. This makes acceptance of the story a primary consideration over accuracy which must fall into second place. Frequently, the editorial policy of a paper may have some bearing upon this same acceptance, and objectivity is out the window.

Are editors to be trusted to run newspapers as once they did? If not, then journalism will continue to be merely a business, which is the thing fundamentally that is wrong with the daily press.

Let me not be misunderstood when I say that newspapers lack character. By character I do not mean integrity or honesty or scrupulousness. I mean that quality by which a person or a thing is identified—the hallmark, the fingerprint, the dog tag, or call it what you will—the trait, the complexion, the habit, the stance, the gait by which it or he is recognized. Newspapers once had this sort of character. Incidentally, it was the day of the editor.

I rather like the day when the grocer's establishment smelt of the pickel barrel, the coffee mill, the cheese wheel and the herring pail; the day when the daily paper smelt of news. I do not ask that a newspaper be virtuous but only that it have character. It has plenty of virtue; its virtue is almost embarrassingly conspicuous now—the service it renders to its community: the Red Cross drive, the campaigns it conducts for highway safety, for medical research in behalf of cancer, campaigns for church attendance, fluoridation, political sanitation through the city manager racket, back yard clean up, national newspaper week. It is unchallengeable in its service to the community, but sanctity begins to have an odor when its zeal crowds out the obligation to serve a community with the only excuse it has for being—the dissemination of news.

---

## Nieman Fellowship Committee

Harvard University appointed a committee of five to select Nieman Fellows for 1962-63.

The Selecting Committee members are: Edward Lindsay, Editor and Director, Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers, Decatur, Illinois; Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent, Cowles Publications; Arthur Smithies, Professor of Economics, Harvard; William M. Pinkerton, News Officer for Harvard; Louis M. Lyons, Curator of the Nieman Fellowships.

Their selection of Nieman Fellows for the academic year 1962-63 at Harvard, opening in September, will be made from applications received by the Nieman Foundation up to April 15. Awards are announced in June. The fellowships were started in 1938 under a bequest of Agnes Wahl Nieman in memory of her husband, Lucius W. Nieman, founder of the *Milwaukee Journal*.

The Committee will also select a science writer for the Arthur D. Little Fellowship, established last year by the ADL Foundation, and will receive applications for the Louis Stark Memorial Fellowship in the field of labor reporting.



# Documentation Without Charges

By A. Gayle Waldrop

To an extent far beyond the public's own realization, public opinion is shaped by the kind, the volume, and the quality of the news columns. . . . Everything, therefore, depends on what news is presented and how the news is presented.—Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter.

Too late for Friday afternoon newspapers, a Colorado state senator on January 26, "hurled claims" or "leveled charges"—it depends upon which Saturday afternoon AP lead is read—that the president of the University of Colorado was "doing an unsatisfactory administrative job."

The senator's charges, an AP reporter asking for comment told the Governor, were not documented. With no charges in it, this is a documented report on how Colorado daily newspapers handled the first story, and a folo story, the latter a statement by President Quigg Newton and a resolution adopted by the University regents, that were released late Saturday afternoon.

Seven of 23 dailies printed no stories. Alamosa, Leadville, Montrose, Rocky Ford, and Salida newspapers, which do not publish on Saturday or Sunday, had no story Monday. The six-day La Junta daily had no story Saturday or Monday. The Durango daily, which does not publish Saturday, had no story Sunday.

Ten newspapers printed one story: nine the senator's charges, Saturday afternoon; one, the Collins *Coloradoan*, with no Saturday edition, printed charges and folo in one story Sunday.

Six dailies, after printing the charges Saturday, had the folo story—four in Sunday editions, one Monday, one Tuesday.

In the nine dailies whose one story was on the senator's charges, page and play and headlines were:

Canon City *Record*, 15 of 18 inches on page 1, top of columns 3-5, had

Quigg Newton Declares:

**Senator's Blast On Moral Values  
At University Unfounded, Unfair**

Colorado Springs *Gazette Telegraph*, 7 of 17 inches, bottom of page 1, columns 3-4:

**Senator Reports Beards,  
Bare Feet at Colorado U.**

Gayle Waldrop is professor of journalism at the University of Colorado, author of *Editor and Editorial Writer*.

Fort Morgan *Times*, 10 of 19 inches on page 1, above fold, columns 2-3:

**Newton's CU Policies  
Strongly Denounced**

Greeley *Tribune*, 20 inches, page 1, top of columns 1-3:

**State Senator Blasts at  
CU President's Policies**

Lamar *Daily News*, 5 lines on page 1 (4 inches inside), story below fold, 6-column line:

**House Approves Appropriations  
Bill In 56-9 Vote**

Longmont *Times-Call*, 4 inch-story, page 1, column 7:

**Colorado U  
Poorly Run  
Says Solon**

Loveland *Reporter-Herald*, 12 inches on page 1, top of columns 1-2:

**Newton Policies  
At Colorado U  
Provoke Attack**

Sterling *Journal-Advocate*, 8 of 21 inches on page 1, below four-column (unrelated) cut, with cut of senator (his home town), in columns 1-4:

**Wolveston Rips Newton  
For Lax Standards at CU  
Regents to Hear Explosive Charges Today**

Trinidad *Chronicle-News*, 20 inches on page 2, top of columns 3-4:

**University Head Subject  
Of Tirade by Senator**

The Fort Collins *Coloradoan*, the tenth daily to print only one story, over an AP story of which 10 to 20 inches were on page 1, in column 3 below another story, had this head:

**Regents Back  
CU President  
Legislator's Blast  
At Newton Brings  
Retort By Board**

How did the morning dailies—they had folo story on Sunday—present the Saturday story? The tabloid *Rocky Mountain News* had 12 of 25 inches on page 5, in columns 1-4, under this line which was just above the fold:

### **Senator Raps Newton's Policies at CU**

The lead was: "A scathing attack on President Quigg Newton of the University of Colorado was delivered on the Senate floor Friday by Senator Earl A. Wolvington (R—Sterling). Wolvington combined his attack with charges of rampant immorality among CU students, which he attributed to lax administration."

In the seventh paragraph Newton was quoted: "This diatribe is not unexpected. It's really quite unfounded and unfair."

The Colorado Springs *Free Press*, over a 14-inch UPI story in columns 7-8, top of page 2, had:

#### **Administration Bad Senator Charges CU Defying Moral Values**

The lead was: "A state senator charged Friday, in a blistering attack on the floor of the General Assembly, that the University of Colorado seemed to be defying 'the moral values that are the basis of our society.'" In paragraphs 6-7 Newton was quoted, as above.

Over a 15-inch AP story, top of page 3, the Pueblo *Chieftain*, morning edition of the Pueblo *Star-Journal*, had in columns 1-3:

#### **Sterling Senator Assails Newton For Poor Administration at CU**

The Sunday folo in the *Rocky Mountain News* was on page 7, in columns 1-2, under:

#### **Newton Rejects Senator's Charges**

The lead paragraphs were: "A broadside of charges against the University of Colorado administration by a state senator was both rejected and ignored by CU officials. President Quigg Newton met the charges headon. He termed the charges . . . a compound of 'gossip and demagoguery.' The regents . . . did not say a word to indicate they knew Wolvington had made the charges. But they passed a resolution expressing their confidence in the president, administration, faculty and students of CU."

The Sunday folo in the Colorado Springs *Free Press* was on page 1, top of columns 2-3, had:

#### **A College Reputation Newton, Students Win CU Support**

The UPI lead was: "The University of Colorado Board of Regents voted unanimous support of President Quigg Newton, the university and the student body Saturday, apparently in reply to an attack on all three. . . ." The second paragraph was on the resolution, the fifth on "a personal statement" made by Newton.

The Sunday folo in the Pueblo *Star-Journal and Chieftain* was on page 9, below another story, in columns 1-2:

### **CU Regents Support Newton Against Wolvington Charges**

The AP story began: "Regents of the University of Colorado unanimously declared Saturday 'our complete confidence' in Quigg Newton, university president, and his administration. The regents' support followed a bitter attack by . . . Newton, in a statement, replying to . . . said 'There is no meaningful defense against such shotgun attacks other than the good judgment and common sense of the people they seek to deceive.'"

The afternoon Pueblo *Star-Journal*, Saturday, had printed at the bottom of page 1—12½ inches under a five-column head:

### **CU Board to Hear Newton On Wolvington Complaint**

The Denver *Post* had its 26-inch Saturday afternoon story and two Sunday morning stories—11 and 10 inch—on page 3 in columns 6-8, below stories with 8-column lines, the heads respectively:

#### **'Diatribes,' Says Educator Sen. Wolvington Lambastes Newton Regime, CU Morals**

#### **Quigg Newton Says Senator's CU Attack Based on Gossip**

#### **Head of CU Replies To Senator's Charges**

The Saturday lead was: "President Quigg Newton's administration of the University of Colorado—and the school's general moral tone—were attacked on the State Senate floor Friday afternoon by . . ." Newton was quoted in second paragraph.

The Sunday lead was: "President Quigg Newton denounced a state senator's attack on him and his school as 'unsupported generalities compounded of gossip and demagoguery.'" The fifth, sixth and seventh paragraphs were given to the Regents' resolution.

In the University's home town, the Boulder *Daily Camera*, Saturday, put 13 inches of a 23-inch story at the bottom of page 1, columns 4-8, had:

**Immorality, Waste, Beards, Bare Feet Criticized  
Senator Flays CU; Newton Calls Charges  
'Diatribes'**

The 15-inch folio story was printed Tuesday, at the top of page 4, columns 6-7.

**Gay C.U. Parties Cited By Legislator**

was the headline in columns 5-8, top of page 1, over a 17-inch story in the Grand Junction *Sentinel*. The 4½-inch folio story, Monday, was on page 14, the last, top of columns 5-6:

**Regents Declare  
Faith in Newton**

Found only in the *Rocky Mountain News* Saturday story (italics supplied) were: "never referred to him, by name, but always as 'the president'"; "Several senators said they would rise to Newton's defense at a future meeting of the Senate"; "Newton has been making speeches around the state asking for sacrifices to be made if necessary for education. 'What kind of sacrifices has the president himself made?'; "He said Newton has been engaged in a program of replacing administrative officers, originally appointed by former Presidents Robert L. Stearns and Ward Darley, with out-of-state men at . . . excessive and fantastic salaries"; "He also attacked Newton for hiring several distinguished professors at \$17,500 . . ."; "He said he did not question the president's right to fire a man 'but in this case (graduate dean) I question the propriety'; "Wolwington excoriated Newton for promoting . . . to professor of sociology . . . despite . . . 'his failure to meet the well-recognized standards for promotion to the highest rank.'"

Found only in the Saturday afternoon AP story were: identification in second paragraph of Newton as "a former mayor of Denver and later a vice-president of the Ford Foundation" and, in paragraphs 19 and 20, details on; "Only a portion of Wolwington's speech dealt with what he called defiance of moral values at the University."

Found only in the *Denver Post*, Saturday story, were: Wolwington identified as "a Republican generally associated with the party's right wing"; "That Newton has attempted to 'buy excellence' . . ."; "A number of influential Republican senators who are graduates of, or attended, the University were absent during most of Wolwington's remarks. They included Minority Leader . . . and GOP Caucus Chairman . . ."; "Although not personally associated with the university, Wolwington said he was speaking 'on behalf of many, many alumni'; "The bulk of his attack was devoted to administration decisions af-

fecting the faculty"; in parentheses, after mention of Newton's opposing 'controversial loyalty oath': "(The oath was also opposed by President Kennedy)": "CU president had created three such positions with money from a raise in out-of-state tuition fees after the Legislature had rejected funds for 17 such professorships"; "He said 60 per cent of the school's deans had been replaced"; "Let the record show that Senator (Edward J.) Bryne does not agree with him."

The AP and *Rocky Mountain News* stories quoted Newton's salary, \$24,000, as cited by the senator. The *Denver Post's* third from last paragraph was: "He was critical, too, of Newton's level of salary and 'fringe benefits.'"

Eighteen days after the attack, on February 13, Senator George Brown, D—Denver, "in a lengthy speech" rose to "Newton's defense." This was covered by the AP in a 13-inch story. This was used by five dailies as follows:

Boulder *Daily Camera*, top of page 9, 3-column head:

**Senator Brown Defends University  
Against Wolwington Criticism**

Greeley *Tribune*, top of page 6, columns 1-2:

**Colorado U. Defended  
In Senate Speech**

Loveland *Reporter-Herald*, page 1, part-way down column 1:

**Newton Is  
Defended By  
Lawmaker**

Pueblo *Star-Journal*, page 5, columns 4-5, just above fold:

**Denver Senator Defends  
University of Colorado**

Sterling *Journal-Advocate*, page 3, head at fold in columns 2-3:

**Denver Democrat  
Defends Colo. U.**

Over a February 14, UPI four-inch story, page 2, column 6, Colorado Springs *Free Press*, was:

**State Senators  
Clash Over CU  
Campus Charges**

In the *Rocky Mountain News* that morning the story was on page 16, top of columns 1-2:

**Sen. Brown Attacked  
For Defense of CU**

## Southern Exposure:

Three Nieman Fellows from Southern newspapers discussed segregation at a Leverett House seminar at Harvard. Their talks make the following three articles:

# The Northern Press on the South

By John H. Nelson

In the beginning let me make it clear that I offer nothing as a defense—or an excuse—for racial discrimination in the South.

There is no excuse—no freedom from blame—for discrimination in the South—or in the North for that matter. But there are some reasons. Reasons which I believe often are obscured or ignored by the Northern press and the national news media in their coverage of the South. I don't minimize the shortcomings of the Southern press, though it unquestionably has done a better job of news coverage in the South, if for no other reason than the fact that it is closer to the story and better equipped and prepared to handle it.

But my subject is the Northern press and the national news media, and I will attempt to be specific in my criticism.

In 1955 Marvin Griffin, who was governor of Georgia at the time, was making a national spectacle of himself by protesting that Georgia Tech's opponent in the Sugar Bowl, Pittsburgh, had a Negro player.

A Northern newspaper called Atlanta to request a profile on Griffin. Not an ordinary profile, mind you, but a calculated hatchet job. The editor's instructions were: "Put some biting in your writing."

Now the facts about Griffin, a demagogue who as a governor's executive secretary several years earlier had signed his own pardon, were biting enough. They required no embellishment to show him for what he was. But the point is that the newspaper wanted a slanted story.

Certainly this is not typical of the Northern newsman's approach to the segregation story in the South—but I have seen the slanted and sensational approach often enough to feel it is a legitimate point.

During the 1957 Little Rock crisis, a Chicago reporter boasted of a scoop that was so exclusive no one else was able to learn anything about it. He had the Arkansas National Guard ready to attack the federal troops in Little Rock.

A prominent New York newsman, ignoring the detachment required for objective reporting, taunted the white students at Little Rock Central High School, projecting himself into the story and stirring up racial feelings.

---

John H. Nelson is a staff reporter on the Atlanta *Constitution*.

Some news dispatches left Little Rock describing mobs when the only mobs around consisted of more than 300 newsmen.

During the Freedom Rides in Montgomery, Ala., a network newsman became so emotional describing that city's troubles that he stumbled over several words and was almost incoherent at times.

A New York reporter calling in a second edition story learned that the desk had changed his lead in the first edition to make it read, "I rode the freedom bus into Montgomery, etc. . . ." When he told them he merely followed the bus in a car, the desk pressed him: Did he get on the bus to look inside after it was parked? Did he even touch the bus? No. So they softened the lead, but only slightly. (This case and the one where the editor ordered "biting" in the writing indicate the problems involved when editors in Northern newsrooms try to direct coverage of a complex social revolution occurring many miles away.)

When violence erupted briefly during the integration of the University of Georgia last year two TV network cameramen reportedly posed several students shaking their fists at the camera.

After a Washington newspaper printed a story several years ago about a "reign of terror" in Dawson, Ga., the *Constitution* sent me to look into it. The Negroes the Washington paper had reported were "hiding behind drawn blinds and scared to speak to a stranger" had their blinds open and talked casually with me, a stranger. There was no "reign of terror."

A perennial is the Ku-Klux-Klan-rides-again story. Some times the Northern press even buries the Klan, but invariably the body is exhumed and brought to life—not by Southern segregationists, but by Northern reporters.

Not long ago a New York taxi driver who knew I was from Atlanta said, "Oh, yeah, that's the KKK headquarters, isn't it?" I tried to explain that the truth was that the Klan had no influence in the South. But he had seen a picture on page one of a New York newspaper of a Klansman picketing the Atlanta newspapers and he had read many stories reporting revival of the Klan.

Although Georgia has an anti-mask law, there is nothing to prevent some crackpot from wrapping himself in a sheet and parading down Peachtree Street. There is no law against making a fool of yourself.

The South should no more be indicted for the fact that



a handful of Klansmen live there than the North should be indicted for the fact that the John Birch Society's headquarters is in Belmont, Mass.

The Klan is dead. I think every Southern Nieman Fellow will tell you the same thing. But it lives on in the minds of some Northern newspapers and, of course, in the minds of their readers.

What this all boils down to is that in my opinion the Northern press and the national news media, as a general rule, have not done a competent, responsible job of covering racial stories in the South. (As I acknowledged earlier, neither has the Southern press, but my subject is the Northern press and the national news media.)

There have been exceptions, of course, the more prominent being the stories often carried by the *New York Times* and the *Christian Science Monitor*, and the occasional documentaries on network television.

For practical reasons the Northern press and the national news media, with few exceptions, rely on the wire services for most of their coverage in the South. This raises the question of why the wire services have failed to do a better reporting job. The logical answer, I believe, is that there has been little demand for a better job—and the wire services are responsive to a large degree to the demands of those they service.

The main interest of the Northern press seems to have been the mobs, bus burning, militant statements by irresponsible segregationists, daring statements by Freedom Riders. Unquestionably this is all news, much of it big news and so treated by Southern as well as Northern newspapers. But how many Northern newspapers have run definitive articles on some of the enormous problems underlying these various outbursts?

How many have pointed out that even the non-violent Negro movement, regardless of its admirable objectives, is not always without blame in racial troubles? The *New York Times* has pointed out that “. . . Non-violence that deliberately provokes violence is a logical contradiction.”

Recently J. Oliver Emmerich, editor and publisher of the *McComb Enterprise-Journal*, who was attacked by a white segregationist during McComb's recent racial troubles, told how he was informed that racial violence was EXPECTED in McComb. He got the word through the New Orleans AP, which had been tipped off by the *New York Post*, which had been tipped off by Negroes in the non-violent movement. The violence erupted as scheduled.

On the Atlanta *Constitution's* wire service teletypes I have seen many Northern newspaper queries about racial troubles in the South. They all concerned violence or threatened violence or some militant act.

The Atlanta school desegregation and the Albany mass arrests occurred after I left Georgia for Harvard so I asked the *Constitution* race relations reporter, Bruce Gal-

phin, to drop me a line on his views of the press coverage.

Galphin pointed out that in the case of Albany, the wire services and Northern press reported the more dramatic facts of the marches, arrests and hymn-singing, but little or nothing in the way of backgrounding the story, of explaining the months of negotiations that had been carried on by the Albany Negro community. (Recently the *Monitor* did put the story in better perspective, reporting the fact of the long negotiations and pointing out that at the turn of the century Negroes outnumbered whites five to one in Albany and that Negroes historically have played no role in the city's civic life.)

Galphin wrote that in the case of Atlanta school desegregation, “We did get pretty good background stories in the Northern press about the long efforts leading to peaceful desegregation, but we spoon-fed the press with an ‘instant reporting’ booklet on the subject. And interestingly, the number of outside reporters coming here for a peaceful but highly significant event was far short of estimates. Had there been a riot, I am sure the number would have doubled by the third day.”

It seems to me that to put race stories from the South in their proper perspective, such facts as the abject poverty and ignorance of Negroes (and many whites) in Mississippi farm territory, in South Georgia and in other areas, must be explored.

The fear of the outnumbered whites in some areas that the Negroes will wrest political control from them must be explained. While this is no excuse for suppressing voter rights, it is a vital part of the problem and should be taken into account.

And it is true and worth mentioning that there have been cases where Negroes who have been allowed to vote have been exploited by unscrupulous politicians who have contrived to deny them any real choice, making them vote as a bloc and corrupting the election process. And Negroes are not entirely without blame here for some of their own leaders sell them out, making deals with white politicians for their own personal gain.

Another real fear is that the high rates of crime and disease among Negroes will drag down the standards of the white community. In Atlanta Negroes, comprising a third of the population, commit about 10 times more murders. Regardless of the reasons for these high rates—the oppression of the Negro, the denial of equal opportunities and the lag in educational and cultural development—the fact remains and it does cause fear among many white Southerners.

I have only a few words to say about press coverage of racial troubles in the North because I know less about it.

Several weeks ago a race riot erupted following a high school football game in Boston. According to the *Boston Globe* hundreds of persons were involved. Several were

injured, including two who suffered serious stab wounds. The *Globe* bluntly called it a race riot and editorialized that there should be no sugar-coating of the fact.

The wire stories that reached Atlanta mentioned not one word of the race of any the participants. I dare say a similar event in Atlanta would have resulted in bulletin matter for wire service teletypes in the North.

More recently a riot broke out in Providence, R. I. Since the wire stories printed in the Boston papers made no mention of race, I had no way of knowing whether it was a race riot. But on the next day a follow-up story reported that the NAACP was complaining that policemen had mistreated Negroes at the scene. These stories apparently did not reach the Atlanta teletype. A similar story from Atlanta would have been transmitted to all Northern points.

There have been other racial incidents in the North which were skimpily reported or not reported at all by the wire services.

I've never seen a wire story in the South about the unsuccessful attempts by a group in Belmont, Mass., to have

that town of 28,000 accept its first Negro family. And only in special publications have I seen much mentioned about the policy of Dearborn, Mich. (pop. about 100,000) to deny residency to Negroes.

My concern is not for sympathy for the South. It is for a better understanding of the South's racial problems. Certainly the better the problem is understood, the better the chance for solution.

The South has its share of bigots—more than its share—but the potential for prejudice also is greater. Its racial problems are greatly complicated by the fact that it has an unusually large Negro population—a majority in some governmental regions.

While many white Southerners still preach defiance of Supreme Court desegregation orders, an increasing number advocate compliance. And while I offer no excuses for discrimination—for discrimination is inexcusable—I do believe there are reasons which should be better understood. Only the press and the national news media can bring about this understanding.

## The Moderation of North Carolina

By Gene Roberts, Jr.

The point is that the South is not one vast region of people who talk, think and react precisely alike to any given problem, even the problem of race.

You have only to look at the 1960 presidential election returns to see that the phrase "Solid South" has more alliteration than truth—even in politics. Of the eleven Confederate states, Virginia, Tennessee and Florida voted for the Republican candidate, Mr. Nixon. Mississippi voted for unpledged electors who in turn cast their electoral votes for Harry Byrd of Virginia. You could argue that the religious issue accounted for the Republican strength. And I, if I believe your thesis, could counter that this only proves that the Southern states do not think alike on the religious issue. I could also point to the 1956 and 1952 election returns, or the 1948 returns when some states voted Dixiecrat while others voted Democrat.

One state that has consistently shown its independence is North Carolina. This is not to say that the state is not Southern and proudly so. But it is Southern by its own definition—not by that of Virginia, South Carolina or Mississippi.

In Alabama, the Freedom Riders faced mobs; in Mississippi they filled jails. In North Carolina they gulped their coffee, sat a bit awkwardly in white waiting rooms and left North Carolina without having created enough news

to read for even a mile of their long, southward journey.

I know most about my native state, North Carolina, a little about Virginia, where I once worked; still less about South Carolina where I was a not-always-enthusiastic Army private. I think I know something of the appeal of the Longs—Earl and Huey—in Louisiana. For as a boy I saw hollow-cheeked farmers walk from musty general stores with their weekly jugs of molasses. I saw them drive in outrageous cars and wagons along still more outrageous roads to return to farms that required too much work for too little pay. But parts of the long story seem as remote to me as they must to the North. In North Carolina we've never had a true Long-type politician, or a Bilbo or a Talmadge.

I think I understand something of Mississippi. I have seen much of that peculiar blend of fear and hate, tradition and conformity, that transforms the race question into THE question. In Virginia for more than a year, I watched THE question grip the state, stifle all but a few courageous voices and dwarf all other problems and concerns, until the BOMB itself seemed a minor matter.

But through it all, Virginia seemed to me to be only momentarily a-teter and would—as it did—regain at least part of its equilibrium. Nothing in either the experience of Virginia or North Carolina fully equips me

to explain a state like Mississippi, which sometimes seems prepared to go on forever recognizing only one problem.

North Carolina I do know, and the climate there is very different from what you read about in Mississippi and Alabama. Last year, Raleigh—the State Capital—elected a Negro to its city council. This made interesting news in Raleigh. But it was not startling throughout the state. Several other cities had desegregated their governing boards—by way of the ballot—from months to years earlier.

Only a few months ago a national news magazine called my newspaper, the *News and Observer* in Raleigh, to get information on a Negro who had just been appointed to the State Employment Security Commission. This must be another racial breakthrough for North Carolina, the magazine correspondent said. He was surprised to learn that Negroes for several years had been serving on the State Recreation Commission, the Prisons Commission, the Board of Education, and the State Board of Higher Education. A few days after the correspondent called, a Negro was appointed to the State Board of Public Welfare.

North Carolina has a welfare official, a Negro, who is paid to make detailed studies of his race in North Carolina. He writes of Negro needs, frustrations and problems and has his writings published—at state expense—into neatly bound booklets. Not all of his recommendations are followed, or even read, by all of the state's political leaders. But they have been said; they have been tolerated.

Schools in our major cities have been desegregated without major incident. The Negro vote in the state is large enough to be an important factor in any statewide election. Negro sit-in demonstrations started in North Carolina, but they didn't become explosive until they had crossed the state lines.

When James Jackson Kilpatrick was filling his editorial pages in the Richmond *News-Leader* with pleas for interposition and Virginia's school closing laws, North Caro-

lina editors were making pleas of an entirely different sort. Jonathan Daniels, the editor of my paper, was saying during this period that the advocates of school closing machinery were proposing something beyond secession from the union. "What they urge," said Daniels, "is secession from civilization." About three years ago, many newspapers in the North as well as the South were talking of the school problem as if it were the only problem. Two North Carolina newspapers—the *Charlotte Observer* and the *Winston-Salem Journal*—reminded their readers that the Negro needed employment opportunity. And I think another North Carolina newspaper, the *Greensboro Daily News*, accurately summed up the reason why North Carolina did not vote for the total segregation candidate in the Democratic primaries two years ago. The moderate candidate cast the image of a young, energetic man yearning to lead an energetic and progressive state. The segregationist looked like "an undertaker come to bury North Carolina."

I hope I haven't given the impression that North Carolina has abandoned segregation, because such an impression would be wrong. Most of the school integration has been token. There are still "for whites only" signs in the state. Employment opportunity for Negroes is a major problem.

I also hope I haven't created the impression that North Carolina is completely different from other Southern states. That would also be false.

But I hope I have demonstrated that differences exist in the South; that these differences exist not only between states but within states; not only between cities but within cities. There is an Albany in Georgia, of course; but there is also an Atlanta; there were Mississippians who were slugging in McComb, but there was also an editor there who led with his chin.

---

**Gene Roberts** is the state capital correspondent of the *Raleigh News and Observer*.

# Prince Edward's 'Massive Resistance'

By John Alfred Hamilton

"Have you read the history of Prince Edward County?" belligerently demands the businessman in button-down collar. "Why, one of the bloodiest battles in the Civil war was fought right over here at Saylor's Creek." He motions over his shoulder with a pencil, but all the visitor can see is a modern wood-paneled wall. Then, in the sluggish way residents of Southside Virginia have of figuring the passage of time, he adds, "These people are only a couple generations away from it."

Down the street, John C. Steck, managing editor of the semi-weekly, segregationist Farmville *Herald*, checks some proofs brought to his desk. Steck represents Farmville on the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors which, back in 1959, cut off all funds for public schools when the county faced the threat of court-ordered integration. One of the original defendants in the set of cases which produced the 1954 desegregation decision, Prince Edward County today is the only county in the United States without any public schools.

Why was this desperate, last-resort action taken?

Listen to Steck:

"We're fighting for States' Rights," he explains softly. "We're opposing Federal usurpation of power and an illegal court decree."

Around the corner, in the shopping district of Farmville's Main Street, E. Louis Dahl swivel-hips between crowded tables and counters in his Army Goods Store, eagerly showing customers the latest in sporting goods, hardware and longjohns for early morning plowing. A copy of *The Citizens' Council*, the segregationist publication from Jackson, Mississippi, rests on a counter of sweat-shirts near a potbellied wood stove. Dahl serves as treasurer of the Prince Edward School Foundation, the group which has been providing private schooling for the white children since the shut-down of public schools.

From the start, the Foundation has been pressed for finances. Sometimes there have been enough pledges on hand—but hard coin?

"What do you want to know how much cash we have collected for?" Dahl asks, his eyes narrowing. "What kind of a story are you going to write?" And then, "I don't have to tell you how much money we have if I don't want to—and I don't want to." He turns quickly away and begins chatting with a customer.

This, tragically, is Prince Edward County, Virginia, a

---

**John A. Hamilton** is associate editor of the Lynchburg (Va.) *News*, where his editorials have been vigorously critical of the Prince Edward County school situation.

small rural, pine and tobacco county 65 miles southwest of Richmond, 50 miles east of Lynchburg, in the "black belt" with a population of about 18,000 divided roughly half white, half Negro.

Virginia's "massive resistance" as a *State* program of last-ditch, close-the-schools opposition to integration died in 1959 after adverse court decrees and a bitter special session of the General Assembly. But "massive resistance" still lives today as a *local option* program and Prince Edward County has exercised this option.

My topic is "massive resistance" and I am expected to tell the story of Prince Edward County. Should I tell you what you want to hear? Should I tell you what any national audience expects to hear? Should I don libertarian lace, pluck delicately at the Harvard Harp and chant about the inequities of a segregated society?

As a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, I have found too many others doing this sort of thing. The Lynchburg newspapers, with the Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*, were the only Virginia newspapers to oppose from the first Virginia's plunge into "massive resistance." And from my desk at Lynchburg I have written critical editorials on the Prince Edward situation.

This approach, however, does not appeal to me here.

Nor will I attempt, as some sensitive Southerners have attempted, to foist on you a "True Account," for most of what is said in condemnation of the South, of Ol' Virginny, is lamentably true.

But this brings me to my purpose, to my one complaint about Harvard, to the one tin slug that I have found amid a chestful of treasure. Let me examine it with you.

I do not object so much to what is said around Old Yard as to what is sometimes *not* said, not so much to what is charged as to *how* it is charged. More than this, I do not cringe so much at the criticism of the South which tumbles from some lecterns as at the response which this criticism invariably elicits. Progressive education seems to have replaced learning by rote with learning by reflex. Tell an anti-South joke and students automatically roll in the aisles; cite an uncomplimentary statistic and raise a chorus of condemning hisses.

Barry Goldwater asserts that he has found a groundswell of conservatism on the campuses. I have not. On the contrary, the gathering monolithic front of campus liberalism, threatening to become doctrinaire, blunting the sharp point of challenge, should concern us all. I fear that questions wilt in the mind when lips offer only an agreeing, supercilious snicker.



In a word, I think that Harvard's *response* to the deep problems of the South is wrong. And, for the purposes of this article, I think that this complaint can probably be expanded. I think that the Northern response, when it consists only of snickers and hateful epithets, is also wrong.

So, my plea is for understanding. Let me address myself now to my subject, to "massive resistance" and Prince Edward County; also, let me suggest the sort of response, or approach, that I think this topic should receive.

\* \* \*

I speak now of patriots, of Jefferson and Madison, Mason and Monroe and of Patrick Henry, and of military heroes, of Washington and Jackson, Stuart and Robert E. Lee. I ask you to listen, as Prince Edward County has listened, to chilling Indian yelps, to British drums and Yankee bugles. I ask you to feel, as residents of Prince Edward have felt, the surge of defiance which freed a loose bundle of colonies from the oppressive grip of a powerful empire—and a later surge which set an incredible Confederacy, stubbornly disunited, athwart the path of a nationalistic juggernaut and the rising tide of worldwide humanitarian history. Join Prince Edward's Phileman Holcombe in the French and Indian War. March off with Captain John Morton from Prince Edward Courthouse to engage Lord Dunmore's forces at Portsmouth, then to turn northward to join Washington's army for Trenton, Princeton, Brandywine, Germantown and Valley Forge.

Watch in horror as the Gray retreats; see the Blue come inexorably on. Realize that 14 miles from the Prince Edward County line, at Appomattox, the Confederacy crumbled. It was nearly a century ago, to be sure, but if you lived your life in Prince Edward County, you could climb to any hilltop, shut your eyes and still feel the terrible rumble of Sheridan's cavalry and still smell the stench of gunsmoke in the air.

I ask you to stand now, if you will, with Prince Edward County through a history both rich and grim, a history scarred by slavery, fired by a rebel spirit to a brave defense of a political anachronism, State Sovereignty.

To understand Prince Edward's feeling on the race question, one must go back to 1755 when a list of "tithables" (taxables) showed that Abraham Venable owned five slaves, Richard Wilson owned seven slaves and Colonel Randolph owned 27 slaves, and to November of 1768 when "a parcel of choice slaves, house carpenters, sawyers, house wenches and ground slaves" was offered for sale at public auction.

To understand the county's defiant spirit, one must listen to the most famous rebel in American history, Patrick Henry, who, as a resident of Prince Edward County, trav-

eled to Richmond to oppose ratification of the Federal Constitution by Virginia in 1788.

"Slavery," he observed solemnly, "is detested. We deplore it with all the pity of humanity."

But abolition? Henry made his prophetic stand clear: "Emancipation is a local matter not to be left to Congress."

To understand Prince Edward's feeling about State Sovereignty, one must attend the public rally held at the courthouse on March 9, 1861. As other communities were beginning reluctantly, almost timidly, to consider secession, this mass meeting voted overwhelmingly for it. Reports show that on a voice vote all shouted "aye" but one who voted "no" and an embarrassed county has not recorded his name.

"So," the Richmond *Enquirer* said of the meeting, "Prince Edward may be set down as perhaps the most unanimous county for immediate secession in the State."

Also, one must go back to a warm evening in early April of 1865 and ride wearily to the crest of a Prince Edward hill with General Robert E. Lee. Here he looked down on the losses he had suffered in the Battle of Saylor's Creek and said huskily: "My God! Has the army dissolved?" When his scattered troops saw him, astride his horse, carrying a battle flag, they came to him in what historians have called the last rally of the Army of Northern Virginia. Three days later, a few miles on, Lee surrendered.

To understand the temper of Prince Edward's resistance to school integration, one must also understand recent history. In 1951, before the NAACP filed its integration suit, the county went deeply in debt to begin construction of an ultra-modern \$900,000 school for Negroes which far surpasses any facility for whites. Negro students had spent a full year in it when the 1954 decree came down, discarding the separate-but-equal doctrine which had formed the foundation of the South's social structure.

In May of 1954 the high court announced its decision. In July the Prince Edward Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution of "unalterable opposition" to integration.

At this point the story becomes a blur of legal battles, battles still being fought, of mass meetings, affirmations and appeals. What is vital now is to understand that all public schools were shut down in 1959 when court delays ran out, that since this date white students have been attending classes, first in make-shift quarters including an old, abandoned blacksmith's shop, now in a newly-constructed private school, that Negro students have been attending no schools in Prince Edward, but have only participated in irregularly scheduled "morale building" sessions.

For the first year, the private school for whites operated on voluntary contributions; for the second year, it managed by charging tuition and inviting parents to apply for both local and State-backed tuition grants; now, in the

third year, a Federal court has enjoined the use of public funds and I have at hand a letter, dated December 2, 1961, which solicits contributions toward a goal of \$200,000 to keep the private school going until June. There is, moreover, a case now pending in Federal courts to determine whether, under the State constitution, Virginia must maintain public schools in Prince Edward County.

Tie these developments together and this is Saylor's Creek. Appomattox lies just over the hill.

And, briefly, this is the background for Virginia's "massive resistance" and the story of Prince Edward County. If I have dwelt more on the past than the present, it is because Virginians involved in this story dwell more on the past and because, if we read in the daily press of limbs and branches, the roots also lie in the past.

Make no mistake: I do not intend all this as a defense, simply as an explanation of a story unfolding in the old Southern, tragic tradition. In Prince Edward County, men today summon courage to defend false ramparts and hollow ideals; they swing swords for a parochical "sovereignty" which was surrendered with Lee's sword long ago; they hoist battle flags emblazoned with cries of patriots of an earlier day who would, if they had breath today, denounce the blasphemy.

How would a Jefferson, a Madison, Mason or Monroe, how would a Patrick Henry, how would a Washington, a Jackson, Stuart or Robert E. Lee greet their latter-day imitators?

Despite jet flights and nuclear energy, Cape Canaveral and Redstone Arsenal, the rural South remains pretty much a legend of gray legions and silver trumpets, of crinoline and gracious living, of beauty and chivalry, and lost causes. Its history is half romance and its secret god is James Branch Cabell's "demi-urge," the myth-maker, the dream-weaver.

The Romantic poet Lord Byron, once wrote of lovers parting:

"If I should meet thee  
 "After long years,  
 "How should I greet thee?—  
 "With silence and tears."

Who knows—we can all only surmise—but I suggest that the poet's answer would guide the patriots. Let me suggest, further, that the South's story today is more tragic than humorous, that it deserves serious, even sympathetic attention and—to my theme—that there is less historical justification for supercilious snickers than for poetic tears. As the South renews its struggle to enter the mainstream of American life, as men of good will grope for solutions to cataclysmic social problems, I would be less than true to my region if I did not urge, at least for occasional use, the poet's answer on you.

## Functions of the Press

By **Houstoun Waring**

For the past year I have been asking journalists on three continents about the functions of the press. Some responded quickly with well-thought-out ideas, but most newspapermen questioned had never given consideration to the matter.

A few declared: "The function of a newspaper is to print the the news." They let it go at that.

I recall the four functions that I learned in journalism school more than 35 years ago. They were (1) to inform, (2) to interpret, (3) to crusade, and (4) to entertain.

My inquiries have brought further suggested functions.

Among these are:

- The press, through advertising, makes the economy work. The enormous demand for the products of industry would dwindle if advertising did not move these goods (or services) to the consumer.

- Even in one-newspaper cities, the press generally presents cross-sections of public opinion by means of "Letters to the Editor" and interviews with people of all walks of life.

- All readers look to the press for information on how to live their daily lives. They value this function which tells them what is on at the movies, what hours the city dump is open, when to cease watering one's trees, and where to find a used car.

- The press provides communications among leaders. The mayor learns through his newspaper what the school superintendent is planning to do with a recreational area. The county commissioners discover that the city zoning is incompatible with the adjoining areas outside the municipal limits. The Homecoming Committee learns there is a conflict of dates with another civic affair.

- The newspaper not only helps the reader understand the world about him—his environment—but it assists him in changing this environment, generally for the better. This is the crusading so dear to the heart of aggressive journalists.

- The press is a sounding board for public policy. Newspapermen have often been embarrassed while carrying out this function, as the trial balloon is commonly disowned by the official who tossed it into the air—if the proposal is shot down by the public.

- The press strengthens the moral resolution of frail men and women, and all humans have their frailties. Because tempted men fear publicity, they are better able to

---

**Houstoun Waring** is editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1945.

resist temptation. Any reporter who has looked over the shoulders of public servants realizes that he has unwittingly become the town's chaperon.

- Through their sports pages the newspapers promote a moral equivalent of war. Men, at least in the English-speaking world, may now prove their manhood by boxing instead of dueling, by football rather than battlefield heroism. The press promotes peace by playing up new heroes.

- The press serves as the first rough draft of history.

- One journalist says that the newspaper preserves and strengthens the language. For most people it is the primary textbook on how to write intelligibly. Sloppy thinking and writing on newspapers have a much wider impact than in other sources of communication.

- All citizens expect the press to be the watchdog of their various levels of government. Less often, they believe that the press should pry into business, social conditions, and public health.

- The press must attempt to relate the community to the world, to bring meaning along with the week's events.

- The newspaper, even in a healthful, prosperous city, must enrich the lives of its people by raising cultural standards. The drabness that has marked hundreds of American cities can be corrected only by leadership of the press.

- It is a function of the newspaper to promote community harmony rather than discord. The Good Society depends on a community spirit and cohesiveness. This is especially true for the 50 million suburbanites who become integrated only if their community newspapers are alert to their obligation.

- It is a function of the press to provide "selectivity" for the people. Radio and television have their roles in our lives, but only the printed word can give selectivity to the busy man or woman. If a person has twenty minutes

free, he can glean more of the information that he wants from a newspaper, book, or magazine than two hours devoted to the electronic media.

- Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Robert K. Merton have pointed out the status-conferring function of the mass media. They "bestow prestige and enhance the authority of individuals and groups by legitimizing their status. Recognition by the press or radio or magazines or newsreels testifies that one has arrived, that one is important enough to have been singled out from the large, anonymous masses."

- Lazarsfeld and Merton declare that the mass media also "enforce social norms." They say that "many may have known privately of . . . deviations, such as political or business corruption, prostitution, gambling . . . but they will not have pressed for public action. But once the behavioral deviations are made simultaneously public for all, this sets in train tensions between the 'privately tolerable' and the 'publicly acknowledgeable.' Private toleration of deviations . . . can continue only so long as one is not in a situation where one must take a public stand for or against the norms. Publicity requires each individual to take a stand . . . prevents continued evasion of the issue. In a mass society, this function of the public exposure is institutionalized in the mass media of communication."

Lastly, the press must perform another function, and that is to give perspective. Twice a day readers are bombarded by facts; if they listen to radio newscasts they are bewildered by the hour. At week's end the conscientious citizen has come to no understanding of events. The news magazines and a few Sunday newspapers try to provide the needed perspective by printing a total picture of the seven days' happenings. This is a costly procedure, but unless this function is performed the readers are unable to act. They know a thousand bits of news, but they are immobilized as citizens unless the perspective is provided.

## Polling in Nicaragua

To the Editor:

Each January since 1956, I have sent in an article for *Nieman Reports* on Cuba. Alas, the Cuban situation is now such that neither newspapers nor magazines are delivered here from the sad isle. Nor can I count on visiting that dictatorship these days.

Enclosed, however, is a journalistic study about another dictatorship, that of Nicaragua. I directed the students of the School of Communications, which I organized during the summer of 1960, in the first and only statistically respectable public opinion survey ever held in Nicaragua. Permission was granted to carry out the interviews without getting my students jailed on several conditions, one of which was that results were not to be released for a year. It is now safe to publish the results without getting some nice little guys in the Somoza government jailed for giving the OK to the survey.

I will give the enclosed, in an extended form, as a paper at the forthcoming meeting of the Rocky Mountain Council on Latin American Studies, which will convene at the American Institute for Foreign Trade, April 12 and 13, on the Glendale, Arizona, campus. The information itself is very timely in terms of the Cold War raging throughout Latin America. What *do* the people think who live in a Latin American area without our freedoms? My students used up shoe-leather and found out.

MARVIN ALISKY  
Arizona State University

Prof. Alisky's article on the Nicaraguan Poll is in this issue.)

## Press Conference

To the Editor:

I still enjoy the *Nieman Reports*. Each month I am tempted to write a letter.

As to the January, 1962, issue there is comment on the Presidential Press Conferences. I wish the discussion had indicated that knowledge travels a two-way street. I am sure that no more than eight newspapers have *ever* run a Presidential Press Conference in toto. This

eight out of 1800. The balance run those portions that fit the right or wrong-headedness of the editor. Incidentally, have you seen any comment in the press about the resolution introduced by Senator Humphrey to incorporate press conferences in the Congressional record. How do you explain this?

I hope you don't feel as ignorant as I do living under a compulsion to take on a new continent—Africa. I would like to try out a question on the Nieman Fellows and the owners of newspapers. I would only ask a simple question like the percentage of literacy, per capita income and percentage of people who have not yet reached the stage of having a written language. Try it out in your own mind in relation to the nations of South America and Africa. Newspaper reports give our people no events to make comparative judgments as to population per square mile and comparative size of new nations. Without some such fundamental facts debate must be increasingly glib and reduced in value.

MORRIS L. ERNST

New York City

## Objectivity?

What is objectivity? Is it merely a matter of presenting both sides of a question in exactly equal terms? I think objectivity is something else. To me, objectivity is a fair, just, dispassionate and equitable grappling with the facts.

—Osborn Elliot,  
Editor of *Newsweek*.

## Press Mystery

The as yet unsolved mystery of the American press is partly whether it can serve the public interest in its coverage of American "bigness" without itself being corrupted by that bigness. Diffusion of power is the key to keeping our democracy or republic operating orderly. With only a few large American cities having the benefit of newspaper competition, can it be said that the power to create all-important public opinion is sufficiently diffused? In short, whose press freedom are we talking about?

—*Cervi's Journal*, Denver, Feb. 14.

## It Takes All Kinds —

The magnitude of what Col. Glenn had done exercised a sobering influence on other parts of the papers. In the sports pages of the *Daily News*, for instance, Jimmy Powers began his column:

"Up at dawn and watching every dramatic step to the blastoff, this writer suddenly realized how silly he was in the past, swooning in print over headlines in sports."

Over in the *Herald Tribune*, Red Smith, down in Florida, covering the Mets' training camp, had little appetite for his task that day.

"Another day perhaps the success or failure of this costly venture into big league baseball might seem a matter of importance. This day, children's games weren't even for children."

Of course sports writers are among the most honest of their craft. I didn't notice any gossip columnists or society writers suddenly becoming aware that in comparison with Glenn's exploit the celebrities they prattle about and the affairs they breathlessly describe are pathetically insipid. But then they are a different breed of cat.

—Charles Collingwood,  
WCBS Views the Press, Feb. 25.

## Awards

Since the last issue of *Nieman Reports*, the following awards for former Nieman Fellows have been reported:

**Clark R. Mollenhoff**, Washington correspondent of the Cowles Publications: John Peter Zenger Award, by the University of Arizona.

**Henry Shapiro**, UPI Moscow bureau chief: Distinguished Achievement Award, by the University of California, Los Angeles.

**Murrey Marder** and **Julius Duscha** of the *Washington Post*, Sigma Delta Chi Award for Washington correspondence.

**Ernest Linford**, chief editorial writer, *Salt Lake Tribune*, Conservation Award, by American Motors.

**John A. Hamilton**, associate editor, *Lynchburg News*, best editorial award, by Virginia Press Association. He is now on a Nieman Fellowship.



## Book Notes

### Guerrilla Warfare

GUERRILLAS IN THE 1960's. Peter Paret and John W. Shy. Frederick A. Praeger: N.Y. 82 pp.

This practical essay on guerrilla fighting will be disillusioning to those who have been led to think of it as a panacea for such conflicts as Vietnam. Success in guerrilla fighting depends first of all on popular support, this Princeton study shows. Without a friendly population for information, supplies and safe hiding, guerrillas fight at a greater risk than regular forces. Guerrillas succeed where the government or controlling authority is unpopular and the people share the guerrillas' demand for reform, revolution or resistance. In such conditions counter-guerrilla activity must reckon with the people as well as the guerrillas. Political reform and psychological persuasion become the first requirements.

Guerrillas are a symptom rather than a cause. Basically the problem is a political one. To attempt to understand it in purely military terms is the most dangerous kind of oversimplification. . . . Military defeat of guerrillas is extremely difficult if not impossible to achieve until they lose the supplies, information and security that popular support provides. . . . Most areas that are threatened by irregular warfare stand in need of profound social, economic and political reforms.

This quotation is the core of the lesson the authors draw from modern guerrilla activity.

They review the defensive role of guerrillas as in Spain against Napoleon, and in the World War II resistance movements. These illustrations they feel support Clausewitz's classic dicta on guerrilla warfare. His key point was that "the national character must support the war." Nothing in Algeria, Cuba, Cyprus or Vietnam experience gainsays this judgment. The authors feel it would be a mistake to expect to defeat guerrillas in their own country or in territory hospitable to them, by using counter-guerrillas. They see no cheap solution but say the best

military answer is conventional forces operating from a government base, but trained in irregular warfare. "There must be at least ten counter-guerrillas for every guerrilla in the field. Unfortunately there do not seem to be any short cuts."

A realistic and useful little book that can be read and digested at a sitting.

### China

CHINA'S POLITICS IN PERSPECTIVE. By Harold S. Quigley. University of Minnesota Press. \$4.50.

This survey of Chinese history is informing enough to make the inscrutable East less inscrutable. It fills in the background for understanding how the Communist regime came to power, what it stemmed from, what it is up to. It deals in organized and intelligible fashion with the large current questions of China's role, problems of recognition, the U. N., Formosa and the rest.

It goes into history enough to show the continuity and changes in Chinese politics. It tells the story of the Sun-yat-sen revolution of 1912 and carries forward through the Chiang Kai-shek period, the war and the Communists, to make a connected and understandable account of Chiang's failure and Mao's success. It has a scholar's objectivity, rare enough on this subject, and makes a useful book for anyone who wants to try to understand China.

### The Dixon-Yates Story

DIXON-YATES—A STUDY IN POWER POLITICS. By Aaron Wildavsky (Yale University Press). \$6.75.

This is a fascinating book. For any with the least interest in politics, it has everything: plot, intrigue, exposure, conflict, suspense and a surprise ending.

It is a tremendous job of research and weaving together the innumerable strands of a most complicated chapter in political history—Dixon-Yates—and written with sustained interest all the way.

Dixon-Yates proved a classic political controversy, and Wildavsky has missed none of it. Here is the great public-private power issue precipitated by the Eisen-

hower Administration's determination to clip the wings of TVA and turn public power back to private channels. It starts with the move to cut out a TVA project from the budget and proceeds through all the years of devious politics this launched, involving half a dozen Federal agencies, in elaborate contrivance to keep secret the inept machinations that exploded in a series of exposures leading to Republican disaster in 1954, and final frustration in the Supreme Court canceling the Dixon-Yates contract because of the conflict of interest of the administration's adviser, Adolphe Wenzel.

The author manages his political material with the detachment of an artist.

The extraordinary achievement of this book is its bringing of all the related developments of Dixon-Yates into their pattern, to make them not merely understandable, but a dramatic story.

### Long Road to Peace

PEACE AND OPINION. By Evan Luard. Oxford University Press. \$4.

Evan Luard has written a widely informed and deeply provocative book in a search for peace. He finds the possibility only in the gradual development of compelling opinion against the irrational behavior of nations (i.e. politicians) that make wars.

But it is his course to this discovery of the philosopher's stone that gives the book its value. He begins by disposing of the prospects of disarmament and of arms control, and in the process draws in enough of the long history of frustrations in these fields to make his points and supply the background for them.

He similarly analyzes the failure of the League of Nations and skeptically traces the course of the UN to show that it has not had effect in the hard cases and that its course must be determined by the power or balance of power of its chief constituents. Similarly for the World Court. But he suggests the power of opinion does have an effect within the UN and that this can develop, both within a nation and internationally, to become ultimately a decisive force.

This will come slowly. But he insists

## Drug Problem

there may be time. For he refuses to accept the terror of the bomb, holding to the contrary that its balance of terror is and will be a guaranteed deterrent.

To one reader, he is fairly arbitrary and unconvincing about this, and about a following point, that smaller wars are similarly due to become impossible. However, his discussion of these points is informed and fairly exciting. He wraps in an adequate amount of historical detail and manages this with a rare detachment as he cites his cases impartially from both sides of the Cold War, to show what conduct can be expected from governments that feel vital interests at stake.

His lack of illusion about the various mechanisms and formal organizations to produce a dependable peace seems to fail him when he comes finally to the power of opinion. But he is taking a long look here. The implication is that newspapers will become more responsible so that opinion can be adequately informed, and that political processes will make it impossible for warmongers to ignore rational opinion. As a philosophical treatise it is intriguing; as a critique of the instrumentalities in the field of war prevention it is candid and skeptical. It tends to stretch the mind on both counts, and so is useful.

**CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—A World View.** By James Avery Joyce. (Thomas Nelson & Sons), N.Y. 286 pp. \$5.

This is a treatise against capital punishment. It starts with the Chessman case, and makes its leading point on the travesty of this case. It then traces the long history of barbarous punishments.

Its central section concerns Britain, and the author is English. The sub-title, "A World View," is a key to its scope. Its chapter on the issue in the United States is necessarily very general and summary. Then it follows the issue into the United Nations and concludes with an argument against nuclear weapons.

This is a humanitarian essay and well written. It is not as ready a reference book for the state of capital punishment in the U.S. as a student of the subject might wish.

**DRUG ADDICTION: CRIME OR DISEASE?** Reports to the Joint Committee of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association on Narcotic Drugs. University of Indiana Press. 173 pp. \$2.95.

This appears to be a very practical survey of the narcotic problem and a scientific attempt to find more sane and effective ways of dealing with it. It provides useful information, both as to the laws, and the disease. It admits that medicine has not found the whole answer to drug addiction or cure. It is convinced that it is bad policy for the law to punish the drug peddler and his victim about the same. It has useful descriptions of the laws and conditions in other countries.

As a joint study by the American Bar and American Medical Associations it has authority. Its recommendations sound sensible.

It is written in plain shape, easy to read and understand. The only thing I can't understand about it is why, in paperback, it has to be \$2.95. But it would seem to be a valuable reference for anyone having to deal with the drug problem, and a sound discussion for all interested in it.

## The Liberty League

**THE REVOLT OF THE CONSERVATIVES—A History of the Liberty League, 1934-40.** By George Wolfskill (Houghton, Mifflin).

This is a very readable account of the Liberty League, how it got started, who was in it—mostly duPonts and Pews—and what it was up to—stop Roosevelt. It seems mild today, compared to the Birch dogmas. Actually there were more subversive and violent and colorful people around then—Huey Long, Gerald L. K. Smith, Father Coughlin and his third party—who are only mentioned here as the woolier backdrop for the respectable millionaires who got Al Smith to translate their bleating over taxes and unions into the death knell of the Republic. The brittle thinness of the movement was exposed in the 1936 election, when these boiled

shirts had probably little influence, even in carrying Maine and Vermont.

It's a little surprising that this study finds nothing behind the facade of vehemence and checks but stuffed shirts. It may suggest to some that the Birch-Goldwater business will prove as hollow. Otherwise it's a very minor chord.

## Pulitzer Jurors

Among the 31 editors serving on juries for Pulitzer 1962 awards in journalism are **Dwight Sargent**, editorial page editor, New York *Herald Tribune*, and **Victor O. Jones**, managing editor, Boston *Globe*. Jones was a Nieman Fellow in 1942, Sargent in 1950.

## Nieman Notes Postscript

1939

Starting in January, Chicago's *American* has been carrying a signed editorial column by **Irving Dilliard**, Sunday and Wednesday, which has spread to a number of other papers.

1942

The Institute of Architects in Portland, Oregon, gave their 1962 Citizen's Award to **Edward M. Miller**, assistant managing editor of the *Oregonian*, "for his tireless effort on behalf of our community." They cited particularly his help in achieving the new building for the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, and a new zoo for Portland.

1945

**Houston Waring**, editor of the Littleton (Colo.) *Independent*, appeared on NBC's White Paper program, March 25, on the impact of defense on his town's economy.

1959

The Nashville *Tennessean* called **John Seigenthaler** back from Washington to be its editor, March 21. He had been on leave from the news staff, as special assistant to Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy.

## The Security Dilemma

(Continued from page 2)

variety of statistical reports on our trade and production.

There are occasional suggestions that the government should stop or restrict many standard statistical publications. Even when the information is not of direct military importance, the argument is used that there should be no publication of budget details or statistics that might aid the Soviet Union or reflect unfavorably upon the United States. It is argued that we should make it as expensive and difficult as possible for the Soviet Union to obtain any information on the United States.

Even such an able man as Defense Secretary Robert McNamara momentarily lost his political equilibrium in his first months in office. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, McNamara said:

"Why should we tell Russia that the Zeus development may not be satisfactory? What we ought to be saying is that we have the most perfect anti-ICBM system that the human mind will ever devise. Instead the public domain is already full of statements that the Zeus may not be satisfactory, that it has deficiencies."

Representative John Moss declared that McNamara's "advocacy of a program of misinformation constitutes a grave disservice to the nation."

"To claim perfection in a weapon system, thereby creating a false sense of security, only results in complacency complained about by the very officials who would further feed it," Moss said.

Fortunately, McNamara revised his comments in the face of criticism. However, the fact that he uttered them was only one more bit of evidence of the panic that overcomes many men—even brilliant men—when they are first faced with the frustration of balancing security and democracy.

I can understand the concern of those who feel this way, but the suggested tight censorship is not consistent with democracy. It is not possible to shut the information door on the Communists without closing it for our own citizens. Such a move would change the whole concept of our democratic society. The solution to the seeming dilemma will not be found in tighter and tighter government censorship. On the other hand, we cannot expect abandonment of military security.

A way must be found to steer between the extremes. To accomplish this there must be a full understanding of all that is bound up in the problem. The nation's reporters, editors and government officials do not instinctively understand government information laws, rules and practices.

Understanding takes considerable study. Too many limit their interest in government information to their own problems on stories, with little thought given to the need for consistent principles.

First, it is necessary that editors and reporters recognize that balanced understanding of government information policies is a basic journalism skill. It is an essential skill, and it must be accomplished by a truly professional attitude.

I have heard some reporters go so far as to comment: "I don't care about freedom of information, except when it involves my stories."

Occasionally some of these comments may be facetious, but there must be an end to such cynical or irresponsible quips from the press corps. There are some principles upon which the press should present a united front.

What would we think of a lawyer who would quip that he didn't care about the rules of evidence applied in court as long as he managed to obtain verdicts for his clients?

We know that such comments and such an attitude would not reflect well on the lawyer involved or on the legal profession. It does not reflect well on the profession of journalism when newsmen comment that they have no interest in freedom of information principles, and boast that they have such "connections" or are such "operators" that they do not need the rules.

To me it seems rather like a lawyer boasting of his skill as an ambulance chaser or as a fixer, and then speaking scornfully of those who go to the trouble of learning the rules of evidence.

It is time for all editors and reporters to spend some time on concentrated study of government information problems if they are going to meet their responsibilities in a difficult time. This subject is no less important to the journalist than basic anatomy is to a doctor or the law of evidence is to a lawyer.

The dilemma of democracy that comes with our big military budgets calls for a full understanding of information policies if we are to draw the fine lines that must be drawn in the years ahead. It is necessary for editors and reporters to view the whole problem in a full and clear perspective.

The dilemma of democracy and military security must be studied and resolved in an unemotional and nonpolitical way. It is essential to avoid the sharpness, the partisanship, and the bitterness that so often distorts the issue.

Obviously the press cannot and should not be given direct responsibility for national security classifications. This task must be left in the hands of elected officials, their appointees and career information people. However, this does not mean that the press can relax and assume there will be proper administration by the government. The

press must serve as a vigilant critic, constantly alert to the fact that political figures find a great temptation to use security for political purposes.

This warning does not mean I am distrustful of federal information officials as a group. To the contrary, I find most federal information officials are competent and well informed on the operations in their own agency. Most of them are genuine advocates for the press.

However, it is necessary to be realistic about the power and persuasion of our professional federal information officials. They may give outstanding service on hundreds of routine problems involving legal interpretations, historic background, statistics, and biographical data on public officials. There is seldom any reluctance to pour out baskets of brochures and buckets of statistics when the information tends to build the prestige or the policies of those in power.

There are few problems on routine requests. The big problems develop only under circumstances involving administration policy, partisan politics, or national security. Let us examine all three of these areas:

First, there is an almost automatic reluctance to produce information that is inconsistent with administration policy. This is true whether the information sought deals with defense posture, foreign aid decisions, federal aid to education, labor-management relations or tax law administration. When the information requested might furnish a factual basis for opposition to a government policy, it is almost certain there will be barriers.

Second, it is rare when information is given freely when it is apparent that it may be politically embarrassing to the incumbent political party. Experienced and competent public information officials often freeze up when the information requested would tend to document fraud, mismanagement or incompetence. Information officials do not want to be vulnerable to the charge that they have been distributing information that was detrimental to the President or his party. They do not want to jeopardize their jobs.

Third are the national security classifications—"confidential," "secret" and "top secret." This is the major problem area. We all recognize the need for some such system. National security classifications become controversial largely because there is a lack of confidence that the system is fairly administered. One or two instances of sloppy or political administration destroys confidence in the entire system.

Few newspapers and few reporters would deliberately print information that they believed to be harmful to the security of the United States. However, it is quite possible that many might disregard a security classification or even a warning from a government official if experience indicated that partisan politics or incompetence were playing a large role in classification.

Our major goal today should be improvement of the administration of our security classification machinery. There is broad support for the basic system which authorizes the government to set standards for classification of papers, custody of the papers, and declassification. The law places the responsibility on the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and others to administer the system without regard for partisan politics or the shielding of bureaucratic bunglers.

It is the responsibility of the press to scrutinize the administration of the security classifications, and to criticize with vigor when there are indications that there is perversion of the system to serve political ends. There will be only a few incidents that will come to public attention; so it is vital that there be extreme vigilance to point these up as indicating poor administration.

We must accept the fact that every administration will include men who will tend to confuse national security and their own political security. This does not mean that they are venal, but it is certainly a common human trait to confuse national interest with self interest.

But while examining frailties in government it is wise to realize that competitive reporters sometimes tend to confuse public interest with their own interest in being first with a story. However, even the most competitive reporters and editors will make some effort to consult with responsible government officials if they realize national security might be involved.

I do not believe the press can be smug and self-satisfied with its record. In fact, there must be a constant self-examination process in every news room to lessen the possibility that the standards will slip.

In the last year we have had two fine examples of newspapers leaning over backwards to be responsible. The New York *Herald Tribune* gave up a clear beat on the release of the RB-47 fliers because news editors were told by the White House that it would not be in the national interest to break the story at that time.

The Miami *Herald* and a number of other papers had information on the training of troops for the Cuban invasion, but they killed the story when they were told it would not be in the national interest.

There are many other examples of our newspapers abandoning clear "beats" because of a belief that the interests of the United States were at stake. The New York *Times* has the occasion to make such decisions periodically. I know that there would be equally conscientious regard by the Des Moines *Register and Tribune*, the Minneapolis *Star and Tribune*, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, the Milwaukee *Journal* and many others.

I know that the men who make the decisions on these newspapers are as interested in the future of the United States as any of the political figures who may be given



temporary control of our governmental machinery. I know there are few regrets over killing a story when true national interest is involved. However, I know that editors and reporters do express concern when later developments indicate that partisan political considerations or public relations timing were involved in a government request to kill a story.

Once burned by a politically-motivated request to kill a story, there is a natural reluctance to bow to such requests in the future. Those in government who are tempted to be frivolous or political in the way they toss the "national security" term about should remind themselves that it is vital that the press have confidence in honest administration of the system.

I am sympathetic with government officials who are conscientiously struggling with the job of balancing national security and the need for a free flow of information in a democracy. At best, this is a difficult task.

However, I become irritated when a few—and I stress a few—government press officials lash out with scorn for the "ardent advocates of the people's right to know," or characterize press interest in freedom of information as being in a large measure motivated by "the publishing industry's interest in making a buck." No useful purpose is served by such a sweeping attack on the press. Certainly such comments are not helpful in achieving the understanding that is needed between the press and the government.

It is my view that those charged with responsibility for government information programs would do well to put their own house in order before engaging in broadsides against the press for such things as not spending enough money for reporters in Africa or not having a full-time correspondent at the State Department. It has always struck me that government information people should keep their noses out of the newsroom budgets and reporter assignments, and tend to the chore of making accurate information available on a fair and impartial basis.

There are adequate official reports pointing up real information problems that are within the government's jurisdiction. The Coolidge Committee, established under the Eisenhower administration, did a lengthy study on the administration of security classifications at the Defense Department. According to the report, too many people could stamp "confidential," "secret" or "top secret" on papers, and far too many papers were being classified. The whole system was extremely expensive because of the high cost for storing classified records. To top it all off, there was virtually no progress being made in declassifying the mountain of paper at the Pentagon.

The Moss Subcommittee on government information policies has kept pace with these problems since the

Coolidge Committee completed its work and has made it clear the problem isn't solved. This committee has charged that security designations were used to hide information during the 1960 political campaign.

The reports and the files of the Moss subcommittee are filled with dozens of instances where efforts were made to hide government records for political purposes. The records of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee, and the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee contain records showing how "executive privilege" was used to hide important records from the press and from committees of Congress.

The use of "executive privilege" as a device for arbitrary secrecy was a major problem in the Eisenhower administration. It was claimed that all records that included opinions, conclusions or recommendations were "internal working papers" of the executive branch and could not be examined by Congress or the General Accounting Office.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, on "Meet the Press" on September 24, stated that the Kennedy administration had not used this device of "executive privilege." He declared that he feels it is vital that Congress be permitted full information in its "check on what we are doing in the executive branch."

"In every instance that has been brought to our attention in the Department of Justice . . . we have suggested and recommended that they make the information available to Congress," Kennedy said. "We will continue to do that."

We can never be certain about the future, but we can hope that Robert Kennedy's comments will mean "executive privilege" will not be a major barrier to investigations in the Kennedy administration.

Certainly, the documented records of Senate and House committees demonstrate how "executive privilege" was used to hide mismanagement and fraud in the Defense Department and in the administration of foreign aid programs in such places as Laos and Peru.

It is our responsibility to know how much our ability to obtain records is contingent upon the power of Congress. It is our responsibility to realize how much we must depend on the General Accounting Office lawyers and accountants for a post audit of records that are shielded from the public and the press by national security.

---

**Clark R. Mollenhoff**, awarded the Pulitzer Prize for his Washington correspondence last year, gave this address on receiving the John Peter Zenger Award "for distinguished service in freedom of the press and the people's right to know" at the University of Arizona, Jan. 13. Correspondent of the Cowles publications, he was a Nieman Fellow in 1950.

# Canada Eyes Our Columnists

By Joseph Scanlon

When Franklin D. Roosevelt first became president, he dealt with such a small White House press corps that at budget time he could invite everyone interested to his own living room.

"There would be as few as 20 of us," recalls Ed Hadley, dean of the foreign correspondents here. "We would sit around, some on chairs, some on the floor, while the President would explain his budget in great detail.

"He would call everyone by his first name."

This intimate relationship between press and President made the Washington press corps an extremely knowledgeable group. All had access to the highest level of government; all could judge for themselves the strength of presidential power.

Today this intimacy is gone forever.

The Washington press corps has swelled well above the 1,000 mark. Upwards of 400 reporters now attend a Kennedy press conference.

## The Powerful Few

Numbers alone make it impossible now for those in high places to share their confidences with the press at large. Intimacy is confined to the few and it is to these few that one must turn to find what Richard Neustadt calls the "dominant tone . . . in Washington's appraisals of a president."

"If one wants echoes of that tone at any time," Neustadt writes in *Presidential Power*, "one reads Krock, Lippmann, Reston and Rovere and half a dozen others."

These men are the Washington columnists and they play a very important part in the U.S. system of government. Douglass Cater, in his thorough study of the Washington press, describes the columnist as "a formidable figure."

"He consorts with the mighty and keeps cabinet members in fear and trembling," writes Cater. "His arrogance is legendary . . . government programs have been altered to win his approval or avoid his wrath."

## Read By All

The columnist who is truly important is read not only by the public but by those in government and by others in his profession.

He may be, like Walter Lippmann, so well-informed that his special explanation is necessary for an understanding of what is going on.

He may be, like James Reston, a great reporter with access to those at the top. (Reston was one of two reporters favored by the late John Foster Dulles with regular private interviews.)

He may be, like Drew Pearson, a fearless and effective scandal monger—a man whose pointed finger sends others scurrying in the indicated direction.

He may be, like Joseph Alsop, an informed prophet of doom. But a prophet who often sheds new light on issues.

He may be any one of half a dozen others: A humorist like former Toronto *Star* man George Dixon; a vitriolic right-wing trumpeter like George Sokolsky; or a sombre, reliable reporter like Marquis Childs.

He may be one of so many here that it is impossible to cast him in a definite mould. Perhaps he can be better understood through a look at four of the better of his kind.

## Drew Pearson

Drew Pearson is perhaps the one of the four least understood by outsiders. His juicy, biting tidbits seem somewhat scandalous and less than accurate. But he is read by nearly everyone in Washington for he is often first with important news.

Mr. Pearson broke the first news of the Gouzenko spy case in Canada; the first report of the wartime U.S.-Britain lend-lease deal; the first report of FDR's court-packing plan. Four congressmen have gone to jail as a result of his exposes.

But his main attraction is that, perhaps because of his Quaker background, he is a fearless fighter for what he believes is right. He was one of the few to buck

the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy (Rep., Wisconsin).

Joseph Alsop is also a producer of scoops, but of a different kind. While Mr. Pearson depends more on leaks, Mr. Alsop depends on ceaseless reading and endless interviews. His stock in trade is his critical assessment of the U.S. defence posture.

Stewart Alsop once wrote that he was unable to match his brother's pessimism. "Joe can play the organ of doom better than I," he said.

Mr. Alsop's arrogance is indeed legendary. It was he that once told Lewis Strauss, then chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, "Admiral, you have wasted half an hour of my time."

## James Reston

It was he, too, that first presented conclusive evidence of Russia's atomic tests (evidence that caused President Truman to send the FBI scurrying after him). And it was he, in true Alsop style, that first revealed the great debate about fallout from thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. Alsop shares with James Reston, the chief of the New York *Times* bureau here, the driving feeling that the public has a right to know what is going on in government.

But Mr. Reston, who must be classified as a reporter's reporter, is clearly the top of the correspondent heap. (I can testify as can many others that so often I have worked for hours only to turn the next day to Scotty Reston's column and find that he has said it so much better than I have.)

Mr. Reston is probably the man who illustrates best the importance of contacts to a journalist. He was assigned by the *Times* to cover embassy row and he quickly built up a score of contacts who provided him with stories that others could not find. One of his oldest friends is Liberal Leader Lester Pearson, whom he met in prewar London.

Only Scotty Reston could have turned to an obscure Chinese delegate and come up with all the position papers at the Dumbarton Oaks conference. Only Reston could have easily dug up all the details of the Yalta conference to the point where the State Department decided the papers might as well be made public.

**Lippmann The Leader**

But if Mr. Reston is the leading reporter, Walter Lippmann is undoubtedly the leading columnist.

While other reporters go to their sources for information, Mr. Lippmann alone can command the sources to come to him for his wisdom. It is doubtful if any official in Washington would refuse an invitation to dinner at the Lippmann home.

Born in 1889, Mr. Lippmann attended Harvard with classmates like T. S. Eliot and Heywood Broun. He went from there to graduate work in philosophy under George Santayana and then as an assistant to journalist Lincoln Steffens.

Washington, however, was to prove an irresistible attraction to Lippmann. He was editor of the fledgling *New Republic*, then assistant to Secretary of War Newton Baker. While in the government, he

helped to draft President Woodrow Wilson's famous 14 points.

He joined the *Herald Tribune* in 1931 and now as columnist and author (his books include the classic *Public Opinion*) he holds a position second to none in American journalism.

Lippmann differs from his fellow columnists in that he is a lecturer or teacher rather than a maker of scoops. Small wonder that he is frightened by President Kennedy's failure—Lippmann's view—to become a teacher, too.

But if Lippmann differs from his colleagues in one way he resembles them in another. He, like them, is well educated. Mr. Alsop is a graduate of Harvard; Mr. Reston a journalism graduate from Illinois and Mr. Pearson has lectured at both Pennsylvania and Columbia universities. He, like them, is a hard worker with long years of experience behind him.

Someday perhaps U.S. journalists will build a memorial to the late Sen. McCarthy for McCarthy more than anyone else made clear the importance of the role of the interpretative reporter in modern journalism. As the master of the big lie, McCarthy taught the Washington press that a mere recital of the apparent fact (McCarthy said there are 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department) could actually be the grossest distortion of the truth.

But if McCarthy has illustrated the need for explanation and background it is columnists like Lippmann and Reston and Alsop and even Pearson who have fought to bring the background or that hidden truth into the public eye.

Someone once said that knowledge is power and it is as purveyors of knowledge that the Washington columnists really gain their power.—Toronto *Star*, Sept. 6, 1961.

# Nieman Notes

1939

The *Missouri Law Review*, Vol. 26, 1961, carries a 12-page article by Irving Dilliard on "Senator Thomas C. Hennings and the Supreme Court."

Participating in the Winter Conference of the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, Louis M. Lyons, with Mrs. Lyons, were guests of Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Leiterman and Mr. and Mrs. William French. French, an associate Nieman Fellow in 1955, is book editor of the Toronto *Globe* and *Mail*. Leiterman, an associate in 1954, is a producer of public affairs programs for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which broadcast two sessions of the conference.

1942-43

Frank Kelly, vice-president, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and Harry Ashmore, editor-in-chief of *Encyclopedia Britannica*, participated in

the seminars held in Quito, Ecuador by CIESPAL, the International Center for Advanced Studies in Journalism for Latin America. With UNESCO support, CIESPAL was started in 1959, under direction of Jorge Fernandez, editor of *El Comercio*, leading newspaper of Ecuador.

1946

Robert Manning has been appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Fifteen years ago he was covering the State Department for the United Press. Now on the opposite side of the news counter, he was greeted by an article in the *Washington Post*, Feb. 17, by Murrey Marder: "State Acts to Articulate Policy." Marder, a Nieman Fellow in 1950 and veteran State Department correspondent, spelled out "the cumbersome, creaking public relations machinery of the department, which," he wrote, "it will be Manning's job to correct." "The public voice

of United States foreign policy," Marder wrote, "is sometimes shrill, like a stuck whistle, sometimes it is mute when it should be audible. More often it is a steady dull groan. Hardly ever is it articulate, knowledgeable and convincing." Marder quotes a *Saturday Review* article of last May in which Manning, then fresh back from running *Time's* big London bureau, "set out penetratingly many deficiencies in the American [press relations] operation, which he now will be charged with trying to correct." But Marder adds "that Under Secretary Ball, backed by Secretary Rusk, is taking the lead in pushing the new operation, with active White House support."

1948

Justin McCarthy, editor of the *United Mine Workers' Journal*, was recently married to Mrs. LeVerne Fair, administrative assistant to the director of public relations of the National Association of

Home Builders. Address: 6016 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va.

**Robert Shaplen** is off to the Far East for a four to six months assignment for *The New Yorker*. This will take him back to his old beat. He was Far Eastern correspondent of *Newsweek* from 1943 to 1948.

## 1949

**Robert R. Brunn** went to Washington March 1 for the *Christian Science Monitor*, to cover the State Department, after ten years in the home office. He had been American News Editor.

**Christopher Rand**, *New Yorker* correspondent, took up residence in Cambridge this winter, to work on a novel.

## 1950

**Robert Fleming**, Washington news chief for American Broadcasting Company, has been installed as president of the Radio-Television Correspondents Association and chairman of the executive committee of the Radio-TV galleries of the Congress. "The current chore: to expand our medias' access to news at the Capital."

The University of Oregon has appointed **John Hulteng** director of the School of Journalism, effective Aug. 1. Hulteng has been a journalism professor at Oregon since 1955, after serving as chief editorial writer for the *Providence Journal*. Last year his University gave him its Ersted Award as the outstanding teacher of the year.

The Hutchinson (Kans.) *News* had a reorganization the first of the year that moved **John McCormally** up to executive editor and vice-president. He's also a new member of ASNE.

The New England chapter of Sigma Delta Chi gave a dinner for the Nieman Fellows in Cambridge March 12, and brought on **Dwight Sargent**, editorial page editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, as speaker. Other former Nieman Fellows who have spoken to Nieman sessions this season: **Edwin A. Lahey**, Washington correspondent, the Knight Papers; **Anthony Lewis**, Washington correspondent, New York *Times*; **Henry Shapiro**, Moscow bureau chief, UPI; **Robert J. Manning**, new Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

## 1951

**Simeon Booker**, Washington bureau chief for *Jet* and *Ebony*, has received a \$2,500 grant from Holt, Rinehart and Winston, to start work on a book, *The Negro's Future in America*, scheduled for publication next year, on the Emancipation Centennial.

The Secretary of the Army recognized the emphasis **Sylvan Meyer** has given to water resource development in his Gainesville (Ga.) *Times* with a Patriotic Civilian Service Award. Sylvan is a candidate for the board of directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in their April election.

The World Book *Yearbook* for 1962, (The Field Enterprises) publishes an article, "The South Goes to Town," by **Hoke Norris**, book editor of the Chicago *Sun-Times*, that describes the social and economic impact on Huntsville, Arkansas, from the location of the Redstone Arsenal there.

## 1953

**Robert E. Lee** left the Washington bureau of the Ridder Papers to become Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Liaison.

## 1954

**Henry Shapiro** is having a year's leave from his UPI bureau in Moscow on a Ford Foundation grant. He and Mrs. Shapiro are living in Berkeley, where Henry will give a seminar at the University of California.

Elizabeth and **Robert Bergenheim** had a son, Ronald Carlton, born January 10. Bergenheim, former city editor, is now assistant publisher, *Christian Science Monitor*.

## 1955

**Selig S. Harrison**, managing editor of the *New Republic*, devoted a large part of his March 5 issue to a comprehensive article he did himself, exploring the background and politics of George Romney.

## 1956

"Winners and Sinners" is a clinical sheet on New York *Times* stories, put out for

office attention by Ted Bernstein, assistant managing editor. In the Feb. 1 issue, **Richard Mooney** of the *Times* Washington bureau was a conspicuous Winner. His citation:

In the Washington bureau's superb coverage of the Kennedy budget (Jan. 19) Dick Mooney was a stand-out performer. In his lead story and in a sidebar, he explained carefully and clearly everything a reader would want to know, even including what a Federal budget really is. And he did it all without seeming to talk down to the reader.

**Richard Harwood** was appointed a Washington correspondent of the Louisville papers in February. He had been writing State politics for the Louisville *Times*.

## 1957

Linda and **Anthony Lewis** announced a new daughter, Martha, born January 11, in Washington, where Tony Lewis serves the New York *Times*.

## 1959

Back in Australia, after a lively two and a half years covering the Far East for the Melbourne *Age*, **Bruce Grant** reports "a great reunion with **John Seigenthaler** when he came through with Robert Kennedy."

## 1960

**Shen Shan** has moved up from city editor to assistant managing editor of the *China News* in Taiwan.

## 1961

The Louisville *Times* announced appointment of **Robert Clark** as managing editor in February. He had been science reporter on the *Courier-Journal*.

**John Pomfret** has joined the Washington bureau of the New York *Times*, a move from the editorial page of the Milwaukee *Journal*.

**Chanchal Sarkar** travelled all through India during its February election for a series of articles in *The Statesman* of New Delhi.