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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

During the late 1960's, as protests against American involvement in the Vietnam war became louder and louder, there evolved, especially among the young, a reexamination of the entire value system of American society. American newspapers, as well as other forms of news media, came under close scrutiny and not a little criticism. The most serious criticism was that American newspapers did not tell the whole truth about what was happening in the war and, by transference, in other areas of American society, failed to print stories that would be offensive or undesirable to the establishment. This situation fed the disillusionment of dedicated young reporters and resulted in the formation of journalism reviews in a number of American cities. These reviews were published by journalists to fill out the truth of stories that either were not printed by the local papers.
or were watered down in the editing process. The purpose of the reviews was to get out the truth as the newsmen saw it and to embarrass the publishers and editors who were involved in the suppression of the full truth.

As a result of this rising consciousness among reporters, there was a corresponding demand for more of a say in how stories were run and what stories the papers should be covering in order to fulfill their public trust of keeping the people fully informed.

During World War II, there was a parallel situation in that the freedom of the press had been stifled under the Nazi regime not only in Germany but in all of conquered Europe. The upshot of this wartime suppression of the truth in Europe was that newspapers were reorganized under true patriots, and Nazis and their collaborationists were removed from control of the channels of news. Today, reporters in many parts of Europe, excluding those in Spain and Portugal and in the Communist-dominated countries, enjoy an enviable situation in the influence they share with the publishers and editors of the news organs for which they work.
Importance of the Study

Members of the working press are asking for more of a say in the news operations of their papers. Why would one undertake a study of this developing phenomenon in our society? Surely no one would decry the importance of a free and independent press in any democratic society. Our founding fathers saw fit to include freedom of the press in the first amendment to the Constitution. But a growing number of newspapermen today claim that freedom of the press is nothing unless the newspapers are free from bias and the control of owners and publishers who are willing to suppress the truth to serve their own selfish ends. It is vitally important, newspapermen point out, for citizens of a democracy to know whether they are indeed being told the truth about their political, social and financial institutions. Without this kind of information, how else can they make those important decisions which affect their daily lives? This study examines a trend, however muted, for more of a voice by newspapermen in the product they produce every day of the week. And while it is impossible at this point in time to prognosticate the future expansion of this movement, it is safe to say that newspaper staffs free to cast the
spotlight of truth into all corners of society would bring about some changes in the conduct of our daily lives.

Whether the push for a greater voice in the product newspapermen create will continue or abate with the changing economic and social situations in American and European society is difficult to say. Certainly there is a pendulum which swings back and forth between the various extremes of the social spectrum, but each time the pendulum swings to the left, it seems to retain some of the liberalism as it swings back to the right. It is important that society be aware of the possibilities of change so that some kind of accommodation can be made to accept the impact of that change. If the move by journalists toward more of a voice in the product they produce continues and gains increasing acceptance, many of our institutions will be openly examined in a less kindly light than was the case in the past. With new revelations hitherto unavailable to the public, a multitude of preconceptions about various aspects of society will have to be reevaluated by a large segment of the population. How these reevaluations are made and in what context this change is placed could very well have a profound impact on our institutions as we know them today.
Scope and Limitations

The scope of this thesis encompasses activism by newspapermen for participation in newsroom management in the United States and Europe, concentrating on major city dailies in the United States and selected countries in Europe, notably France, Germany and Italy, with brief references to the situation in other parts of the world.

Activism only by newspapermen is examined because of other different circumstances associated with the electronic news. Radio news is immediate and requires no visual support in its presentation. In the main, radio news is culled from the morning newspapers. News staffs are usually very small, with the exception of major market all-news-radio, and it is usually impossible for small or medium size radio stations to afford a really effective news team. While major market all-news-radio stations have a full complement of news reporters, they still get many of their leads from the morning dailies and other local publications. The same can be said for major market television news organizations and, for that matter, for the network television news organizations.
Electronic news, too, is immediate and then it is mostly, if not completely, forgotten. Electronic news is also restricted by time and such a restriction limits this form of information presentation to what amounts to little more than the "top" of a news story. The daily newspaper with its news columns, opinion columns, editorials, bylines and signed columns, forms the daily record which remains as the historical document of the period. And so this paper is restricted to the activity in print journalism as opposed to electronic journalism.

The study is limited to the activity of newspapermen to have some say in whether or not a story will be printed, how much of a story will be edited to still retain the complete truth, how a story will be displayed (a story of the embezzlement of public funds by a major political figure should not be buried among the want ads), what the paper should be investigating for possible news stories, and who will be named to the various editorial posts which control the assignment and flow of news.

The, so called, new journalism, which encompasses both advocacy journalism and the journalistic novel, if you
will, by such writers as Truman Capote, Tom Wolfe, Norman Mailer, et al., is not considered in this thesis. While such writing by what are essentially novelists seeks new freedoms of expression, the journalistic novel is something that is created quite apart from any news organization and has no bearing on the subject of this thesis. Advocacy journalism implies total freedom for the reporter to advocate what he deems to be a proper action for the solution of a problem or the betterment of existing conditions. This form of journalism still is pretty much restricted to the writing of columnists and editorial writers, although some of this exists in the European press. This thesis, however, is limited to that movement in the press that is concerned with the assurance of the presentation of the truth in news stories rather than any movement that calls for a journalism that persuades or advises the public to take a particular course of action or to accept a certain point of view.

In Chapter II of this paper, the background and history of the development of the American newspaper is examined. It looks at the historical development of the newsroom and then presents some of the recent situations in American print journalism which gave rise to the newsman's
discontent and his disenchantment with straight objective reporting.

Chapter III examines the situation in the United States, how far it has progressed and the attitudes of the editors of some of America's leading newspapers toward the movement of activist newsmen to have a share of newsroom management.

Chapter IV focuses attention on the situation in Europe, particularly France, Germany and Italy, where journalists have considerable say in newsroom management. A brief historical background is presented and then the situation on newsroom activism is brought up to date.

In Chapter V, a summing up of the previous research is made and some conclusions drawn as to the present state of affairs here in the United States and among the several democracies in Europe.

**Methodology**

This thesis is essentially a field study supported by a search of pertinent literature dealing with newspapers,
journalism, and mass communications. The field study was conducted by correspondence with editors of the major daily newspapers in the United States and by telephone interviews with a good number of correspondents from French, German and Italian news organs. This direct contact with working journalists supported by a search of the pertinent literature in such sources as the Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin; the Social Sciences and Humanities Index and the offshoots of this publication, the Social Sciences Index and the Humanities Index; The Comprehensive Dissertation Index and its accompanying Dissertation Abstracts; The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, Journalism Abstracts, and other information supplied by the Freedom of Information Center at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Related Research

A thorough search of the literature in the various pertinent indices and bibliographies in the University of Delaware Morris Library and in the Annenberg and Van Pelt libraries at the University of Pennsylvania reveals that previous research in the area of newspapermen's participating in newsroom management is scant. The most valuable
pieces of research for this thesis were found in the *Columbia Journalism Review* summer issue of 1970, which contained two articles, one dealing with newsroom democracy in the United States, by Diamond, the other, with newsroom democracy in Europe, by Schwoebel. 1 Also extremely valuable were two reports, by Kenyon and Erb, provided by the Freedom of Information Center at the University of Missouri School of Journalism. 2 Another helpful source of information is an article entitled "Stronger Voice for Reporters," in the *Time* magazine issue of May 25, 1970, which deals with activism among reporters for a voice in how their papers are run and concerns activity in Denver, Minneapolis, New York City and Rochester, New York. 3 An earlier *Time* article in the January 19, 1970 issue deals with the movement in Europe, particularly in France and Germany. 4 It is possible that these *Time* articles inspired the more detailed reports which appeared in the Summer, 1970 issue of the *Columbia Journalism Review*.

Good background information on *Le Monde* is found in the masters thesis of Gailluly, which provides a history of the establishment of that paper and the internal struggles leading to its present situation of shared management by
Another thesis, by Chain, is interesting for its comparison of news coverage by Le Monde with news treatment by the New York Times, La Prensa of Argentina, and Jornal do Brasil of Brazil. The four papers' issues of September 13-30, 1973, are examined for treatment of the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile. Chain concludes,

Le Monde, unlike the other three papers, devoted a great deal of space to interpretations and world reactions, emphasizing the larger worldwide significance of the coup.6

An article in The Economist is instructive. It reports on the Le Figaro strike of May, 1969 in which newsmen of that paper walked out claiming the producer's right of control of what he produces. The editorial team built by M. Brisson wanted guarantees from M. Prouvost, who gained controlling interest in the paper, that he would not interfere with the way they ran the paper.7 Another enlightening report is found in the April 18, 1970 number of The Economist. It deals with the mass movement by Italian journalists to share management of their papers and electronic news outlets for which they work.8

Flannery's dissertation on the Chicago newspapers' coverage of the 1968 demonstrations supports the report in
the Chicago Journalism Review, cited in this thesis, which takes to task the fact that the papers played down the true extent of the brutality of Chicago police.⁹

Deeper background information on the Wilmington (Delaware) News-Journal Company is provided in two earlier reports by Bagdikian. They are, "Case History: Wilmington's 'Independent' Newspapers," and "The Temporary Independent Newspapers of Wilmington."¹⁰

Obviously, the trend for news management participation by journalists in the papers for which they work will continue, or conditions could come about which would make this trend subside. Whichever is the case, time alone can tell. In either case, this area of research should prove fertile ground for future scholars.
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The main thrust of this thesis deals with the freedom of working newsmen to have some say in how the information they gather is edited and displayed and in what their papers should be covering.

The old form of objective reporting in which reporters simply present the facts of an event and leave it to the reader to draw his own conclusions, is coming under attack. Today's journalist believes that this form of reporting is insufficient, that such news reporting is superficial and fails to discharge a paper's responsibility to its readers. Today's reporters point out that readers need to have the significance of news interpreted for them and the implications for its impact on society analyzed. And so, more and more, the voices of journalistic discontent are being heard.
Early American newspapers were published as a by-product of a printery. They carried commercial news and advertisements and news from Britain, procedures of the legislatures, letters to the editor about political, economic and social matters, literary and moral essays, and occasional verse. The printer was the editor and he had to be wary of the government censor lest he print anything displeasing to the crown. 1

Prior to the Revolution a number of papers were closed and their editors sent to jail. Among those imprisoned were James Franklin, Benjamin's older brother, and John Peter Zenger. 2 Franklin was imprisoned for criticizing the government's lack of defense against pirates, and Zenger for criticizing the tyrannical Governor Cosby of New York.

After the Revolution there developed a bipartite press system, with some in favor of the Constitution, others opposing its adoption. This bitter partisanship evolved into too much scurrility in editorial writing and too much one-sided reporting. 3 Obviously objective reporting was not a serious concern. John Ward Fenno, editor of the Gazette of the United States, published in Philadelphia, called the
papers of the day "the most base, false, servile and venal publications that ever polluted society." 4

This partisanship subsided with the advent of the penny press of the 1830's, noted for their ribaldry, the exploitation of stories dealing with crime and illicit sex, and sensational reports of news that was fabricated, and interviews that were blown out of proportion to their real importance. 5

There was obviously a great deal of reportorial freedom, however unsavory, during this period in which circulation wars were the order of the day. However this period brought about a cry for a new level of professionalism among journalists. By the middle of the 19th century there were sufficient men of high calling in journalism to bring the profession to a new level of respectability. A good many of the newsmen in New York were college graduates. 6

During this period, the reorganization of the news staff took place, with reporters reporting to a city editor, another group responsible to the telegraph desk and the
eventual decided shift of emphasis and importance from the old editor-in-chief and his editorial quill pen to the well-organized group of hustling young reporters and desk men trained in eye-witness reporting.\(^7\)

Frank Gilbert, a Chicago newspaperman writing in the August 1872 *Lakeside Monthly*, said,

> A radical change has been, and still more is being, wrought. Men think for themselves. They want no ready-made opinions. They demand the data for forming independent conclusions, and they get them, too. Both sides get a hearing in the news department, which is now the great department of any journal worthy to be called a newspaper.\(^8\)

By the turn of the century, journalism courses were becoming more and more common in college curriculums and with this came the development of honest, objective reporting.

Frank Luther Mott, the late Pulitzer Prize-winning historian of journalism, defines objective journalism in the United States as "the exact reporting of observed facts without bias, so far as humanly possible."\(^9\) But Mott points out:
With the increasing complexity of economic, political, and scientific matters in this contemporary era, the bald and exact facts need explaining if the ordinary reader is going to understand the news. In order to inform the people fully, it is therefore necessary to point out causes of actions, backgrounds, chains of effect, situations and relationships that serve to interpret the news. This is the news behind the news, and digging it out and presenting it fairly calls for skill and honesty. There are dangers in this interpretive reporting, chief of which is that involved in the play of prejudice for or against issues and persons. But in American newspapers by and large, news columns (outside of signed columns and the editorial pages) are remarkably free of biased reporting.10

Philip L. Geyelin, Pulitzer prize-winning editorial page editor of the Washington Post, concedes that newsmen suffer from the normal human frailties, yet he feels that media people perform better especially in regard to "prejudice, lack of objectivity, or tilt (bias)." And he adds that a newsman probably can apply the test of fairness to his own material better than his reader. He says,

The average newspaperman moves freely, and to a far greater extent than most people, in all camps, those of the right, those of the left, those of the middle, those at the wildest extremes.
Geyelin admits that newsmen may be more at home in one camp than another, but suggests that a correspondent's built-in gyroscope still is able to deal better with the tilt than most.

Herbert Brucker, former editor of the Hartford Courant, once wrote,

This exceedingly powerful tradition of objective reporting now keeps the vast majority of American news reports free from bias . . . it is beyond question the most important development in journalism since the Anglo-Saxon press became free from authority. 12

Some examples of situations which cause disillusionment among newsmen and newswomen will serve to describe what is making American journalists more and more impatient with objective reporting and the way their stories are handled by their editors.

Charles Mohr, a Time magazine newsman who had reported on the Vietnam war for some time, quit that magazine because of its slanted news policies which favored the war and administration policies in the conduct of the war. He later joined the New York Times. 13
Sarah McClendon, a correspondent for a string of radio stations and newspapers in the South and for the North American Newspaper Alliance (NANA), in 1972 wrote a story about questionable government contract dealings by U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond, Republican of South Carolina, and Harry Dent, a White House aide and former Thurmond assistant. Dent "made such loud and horrible threats" that NANA killed her story and stopped running her articles on other matters. Although McClendon hung on with NANA, a better established reporter might have left to go with another news organization.

Richard Reeves, the New York magazine political reporter and a former New York Times reporter, left "Mother Times," as he called that paper, to do freelance magazine work so he'd be free "to write with a sweeping authoritativeness that the Times had never allowed." During the 1972 presidential campaign, a good number of reporters from the major papers and wire services did sidebar news analysis pieces. Jules Witcover, of the Los Angeles Times, attempted to insert some news analysis into his dispatches but found that his editors weren't
The straw that broke the camel's back was the Times refusal to use an analysis piece he had written on Nixon's refusal to campaign. Pointing out the dangers of a lopsided campaign, Witcover said that the public deserved the opportunity to have both candidates questioned on the issues. This time Witcover made up his mind to leave the Times, particularly in view of the fact that David Broder of the Washington Post came out with the same subject in a piece several days after Witcover had written his. After the election, Witcover left the Times and joined the staff of the Washington Post. As one reporter pointed out, there was little difference in the pay.

But the Post is a reporter's paper. They give you freedom there, they give you leeway, and Jules would have been a fool not to move.17

As Herbert Brucker said, objective journalism is an American tradition. In Europe, however, the idea of objective journalism never existed. As Leo Sauvage said,

In France, the reporter is not a recording machine. The idea of objective news reporting as practiced in the U.S. would seem incredible to a European reader. In Europe the reporter explains the circumstances leading up to the event, what might come out of an event. This doesn't mean that the reporter is biased. He should report both sides of any story. But
he would never report the bare facts of the situation without any explanation of events leading up to or causing the development of a situation. 18

In his book on the world's great newspapers, John C. Merrill, professor of journalism at the University of Missouri, describes the situation at Le Monde (Paris).

Writers have great freedom; copy is not changed to fit policy. Staff members can be found on both the political left and right, with perhaps most on the left.

A close look at Le Monde will show, as at least one writer has pointed out, that this wide range of opinion leads to an "uneveness" in the paper's editorial stance. This may be true, Merrill agrees, "but it is this 'uneveness' which sets Le Monde apart from other papers with rigid political stances." 19 Interpretive reporting and news analysis is the rule rather than the exception on all European news organs.

In his book, The Information War, Dale Minor writes, regarding objective news reporting,

The hard facts of developing events often have little meaning to the average reader ... until arranged in some context--related, interpreted, if you will--by the reporter filing the story. 20
In 1967, when the Federal Communications Commission approved a merger of the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) and International Telephone and Telegraph Company (I.T.T.), I.T.T. promised there would be no interference with the ABC news. Yet three reporters covering the merger proceedings, Eileen Shanahan of the New York Times, Jed Stout of United Press International, and Stephen M. Aug of the Associated Press, testified that I.T.T. had pressured them and their superiors in an attempt to influence their reportage of events. Fortunately, the Justice Department intervened and I.T.T. subsequently dropped the merger plans. Here is an example of a prospective owner of a news broadcasting organization showing evidence of an absolute willingness to pervert the integrity of working journalists while promising not to interfere with the news of the company it was attempting to acquire.

Another problem in the press, is the assimilation and incorporation by subordinates of the attitudes and predelictions of the publisher. While this is a case of unethical reporters willing to write stories the way they feel the editor or publisher wants to see them, the
situation will not arise on a paper that is free of owner influence.

In the matter of reporters complaining that their papers do not always cover those stories that need to be covered, Minor writes,

A number of critics of current press practices have contended, quite rightly, that lack of public interest in many important local and national issues . . . is to be ascribed to the failure of the press to make the relevance and importance of those issues manifest. 23

Another common failing of the press is the making of editorial decisions based on civic loyalty and parochial pride. This weakness is responsible for much repression, distortion and general news management. 24 The press also has demonstrated a notably poor record in independent investigative reporting. It has failed to sufficiently investigate the agencies of government and too easily accepts the press handouts and verbal information given by the administration and other government agencies without seriously questioning the validity of the information. 25

There is one phenomenon that should be mentioned in any coverage of freedom in the press, and that is the
A product of the 1960's, the underground press came about as a result of student disillusionment with the U.S. participation in the Vietnam war. These news organs of protest supplied the radical youth with the opinions they wanted to hear, the condemnation of the ills in the technical, political and cultural sectors of American society. There was, in a sense, total freedom in the underground press, but this was because all of the writers and editors had essentially the same point of view. Robert Lessing, an instructor of journalism at Cañada College who has chronicled the rise and development of the underground press, feels that this form of journalism will remain on the American scene. Indeed, he writes,

The modern American underground press—with all its cultural and political faces—has provided the only consistent radical critique of fundamental American institutions. It has been a watchdog press. And it will not go to sleep.26

A number of former underground newspapers in recent years have "surfaced" and can be found on neighborhood drugstore newsstands. Among these are Rolling Stone (New York), originally a radical youth-oriented sheet concentrating on rock music and the drug culture, and The Village Voice, a
radical left paper published in New York's Greenwich Village. Both have become more respectable. Rolling Stone has gained a certain measure of approval among intellectuals in recent years with its competent, hard-hitting coverage of the national scene, while The Village Voice has been purchased by Clay Felker, owner of the highly regarded New York magazine. Also, as recently as the summer of 1974, The Great Speckled Bird, an antiestablishment paper, could be bought on the newsstands in Atlanta.

There can be no discussion of freedom in the press without a consideration of journalistic ethics.

While there are a number of published ethical codes, canons and principles, they are vague and even unenforceable. And, few reporters have ever read one. A sample of one that journalism students at Missouri had to memorize appears at the end of this paper as Exhibit A.

When considering the ethics of journalism, the kinds of questions reporters ask themselves include: Is the story true? Fair? Biased? Why are we sometimes so rude to public figures or callous of grieving people?
I. W. Cole, dean of journalism at Northwestern University, suggested that

Ethical codes are not built in the abstract. Starting from the first stories you write in journalism school, you have to make a whole bunch of value judgments in a situational context. And eventually you discover, "I've got a whole list of things that are my do's and don'ts." And those are your ethics.

James Peneff, the former Chicago Sun-Times city editor, now heads the City News Bureau of Chicago, a subscriber news service for newspapers, radio and television.

The most important thing we teach our reporters is first of all accuracy and the importance of checking and rechecking everything they get from various sources. You're not to suppose that when you get an account of something from a policeman or some other public official that it's the end of the story. It has to be rechecked. Call the person involved. Refer to the phone book.

Howard Ziff, who teaches journalism at the University of Massachusetts, says,

In my judgment, the biggest ethical fault of newspapers is the invasion of privacy. If Murphy went down in the cellar and shot his head off, that's not a story, that's an invasion of the privacy of the Murphy family. But you've got to keep the cops honest. You check it out. Maybe Murphy was a numbers runner; maybe a lot of things. You make sure
the police are telling the truth. But if that's all there is (a simple suicide), you don't make a big thing out of it.

Mike Royko, the columnist, says he isn't interested in what public officials do in their private lives, but when they break the public trust, he "nails" them for it.

As a rationale for the use of phantom reliable sources, such notable reporters as Hal Bruno, of Newsweek, and Dick Stout, a former Newsweek political reporter now freelancing, point out that when you query public officials on the record, you get the party line, when you let them talk not for attribution, they tell the truth. Hal Bruno notes further that when a man keeps denying that he's a candidate while "he's got people out and he's building an organization," you must report that or you're deceiving your readers.

The view of a group of newsmen interviewed on ethics boiled down to "report the facts but don't neglect the deeper 'truth.'" 28

And a final footnote to all of the above:
At a recent conference of the International Press Institute in Lagos, Nigeria, conferees concluded that "government ownership of the press is potentially dangerous to the survival of its freedom." They agreed, however, that freedom could be attained in government-owned newspapers "if they were commercially run and professionally controlled."\textsuperscript{29} Such a conclusion seems to be a highly optimistic one, even given the spirit of control of the papers by the journalists.
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CHAPTER III

NEWSROOM DEMOCRACY, U.S.A.

First off, there is no comparison between that brand of newsroom democracy practiced in Europe and that in the United States. While some U.S. newspaper publishers hold regular meetings with newsmen to discuss problems and news coverage, there are few which permit anything approaching the liberty enjoyed by journalists in Western Europe.

In the summer of 1974, John G. Craig Jr., executive editor of the Wilmington News-Journal Company, publishers of the major daily newspapers in Delaware, drew a picture that rather paralleled the situation at many other papers across the country. The people in the newsroom had no say in the appointment of their editorial superiors or about what areas of society the paper should be covering, and nothing to say about the business side of the paper.
Craig said he did hold an annual luncheon or dinner meeting with the members of each of the editorial sections of the two papers, the Morning News and the Evening Journal. At these meetings, the management explained to the editorial staff the whole operation of the publishing company, both as a business operation and as a news organ, and how the editorial goals and the business goals of the papers complement each other. Also, he said, there were impromptu meetings in the newsroom to discuss news coverage and other matters of mutual concern to the staff.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the paper held monthly seminars which were organized by the people in the news department. The seminars were held Saturday mornings and the paper provided food and beverage. Occasionally the staff heard outside speakers, such as Ben Bagdikian, national correspondent of the Columbia Journalism Review and a former assistant managing editor of the Washington Post, and David Broder, a syndicated columnist of the Washington Post. The purpose of the seminars was to give working reporters a broader view of the journalist's craft. Craig also noted that reporters were free to speak with editors about any
complaints, problems or news matters at any time they felt it necessary.

Ironically, freedom in the press at the News-Journal Company would take a crucial turn between the summer of 1974 and January of the following year. An internal conflict between the paper's board of directors and the editors led to what has been labeled "The Thursday Night Massacre" of January 2, 1975. Before the day was over, Craig; John K. Baker, the metropolitan editor, in line for promotion to managing editor of both papers; Robert Hodierne, an assistant metropolitan editor, in line for metropolitan editor; and Curtis C. Wilkie, associate editor and Craig's top assistant, were either fired or resigned. Reasons for the upheaval, according to the chairman of the board of directors of the papers, were: a proposed reorganization of the editorial management that advanced newcomers over employees of longer service, that those to be promoted were not familiar enough with the interests of the community, and that the editorial management did not edit closely enough the stories of investigative reporters. However, the departing editors, to a man, cited interference by the
owners with the news content of the papers, particularly those stories which contained information that was displeasing or embarrassing to the owners. On January 20, the board of directors hired Norman E. Issacs, editor-in-residence at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and chairman of its newspaper division, to take over the newspapers as president and publisher. Richard P. Sanger, president and editor-in-chief of the papers since 1970, stepped down from the presidency and was given the title of editor. He was also elected a vice chairman of the board. Not long afterward, however, Sanger announced his own resignation, effective June 1, 1975.

Nearby at the Philadelphia Bulletin, the situation is different, according to George R. Packard, executive editor. He said,

In the current atmosphere at the Bulletin there is no need for a formal organization of journalists to meet with the editors or management about journalistic standards. Any reporter may go to any editor at any level without going through channels to register complaints, make a suggestion or otherwise express an opinion on professional matters.

The Bulletin, Mr. Packard noted, uses the team approach to produce a quality newspaper based on the highest journalis-
tic standards. He said,

We have an "Excellence Committee" which meets every two weeks. Sandwiches and coffee are served and we discuss problems and ideas and usually have a speaker. At our most recent meeting we heard three leading women reporters speak on what's wrong with our coverage of women's news. We have had speakers from national organizations, some with national reputations in the field of journalism.4

The impetus for the meetings came from grumblings among staff members which were overheard by Packard, then managing editor, around March of 1970. Staffers complained that story suggestions and opinions about news coverage were not getting to the top. At that time, Packard inaugurated weekly seminars for the younger reporters in which a senior editor explains his operation--news desk, photo assignments, copy desk--and equal time is afforded reporters to respond and ask questions.5

Early in 1975, B. Dale Davis succeeded George Packard as executive editor at the Bulletin when Packard resigned to work on a book. Davis concurred with Packard's earlier description of the situation at the paper and added:
Today if a reporter has a gripe, he may go straight to the publisher if he chooses. Also, we hold daily news meetings in which we hold a critique of the day's paper, in terms of content and format, and plan for the next paper, based on the news budget for that day. There's a lot of give and take in these meetings which deal not only with what will be covered but which editor will have authority on coverage, and which stories will receive prominent display in the paper. Anyone from a copyboy on up is welcome to attend these meetings and to offer suggestions and opinions.

Reporters at the Philadelphia Inquirer, who organized the Philadelphia Journalism Review to protest the Inquirer's coverage of news and lack of professional treatment of reporters, were not well received by the management of that paper. Two were fired, one quit under pressure, one resigned under pressure, and another was demoted. Don Drake, a prize-winning science writer, was demoted to general assignment after criticizing coverage of the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meeting. Demonstrations by activist scientists were given more coverage than the issues of the meeting, he complained. (Drake was reinstated when Gene Roberts, former national editor of the New York Times, came to the Inquirer as executive editor.) Meanwhile, the Philadelphia Journalism
Review continues to be published.

Just up the line from the City of Brotherly Love are the Allentown Call-Chronicle newspapers. For many years under family ownership, the Call-Chronicle papers began in 1970 to permit the company's 450 full-time employees to buy shares in the papers. Eventually the employees could control more than half the equity. Donald P. Miller, quoted in the February, 1970, ANPA Press, said,

The future strength of the Call-Chronicle lies in local control and working ownership. We have no intention of joining a national newspaper group. We believe strong community newspapers should not be subject to outside control. We also believe that everyone working at the newspaper should be part owner, sharing in the profits and the risks. 

(Each week any employee may have a specified amount taken from his pay to invest in company shares. When the employee leaves the paper before retirement, he must turn back his shares to the fund and he is paid for the shares he has accumulated. The same practice is followed on many European newspapers.)

Beyond the environs of the Delaware Valley, there have been a series of movements among reporters to gain
more of a say in news coverage, story treatment and placement, and professional treatment of members of the Fourth Estate.

In the fall of 1973, the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review was hit with mass resignations when a new owner became heavy handed in his determination to "make" the news instead of reporting it. The ultraconservative Richard Mellon Scaife, of the billionaire Mellon family of nearby Pittsburgh, after taking over the Greensburg paper, killed or buried stories about people or events that did not conform to his conservative point of view. He once had his managing editor rewrite a story when he thought Vice President Spiro Agnew would attack U.S. Sen. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, who had been critical of the Nixon administration. Scaife had contributed a substantial sum to the Nixon campaign coffers. Agnew, however, expressed the opinion that there was room for more than one shade of opinion in the Republican ranks. Later, when Agnew resigned, a young reporter reading this news on the AP wire remarked, "One down and one to go." Unfortunately Scaife heard the remark and fired the young journalist "for the good of the paper."
When Scaife put the managing editor on what amounted to terminal leave for reporting a favorable story about a family he did not like, half the staff resigned at a meeting he called at the posh Greensburg Country Club.  

In the nation's two news capitals, New York and Washington, working newsmen are being heard from. Edwin Diamond, writing in the May, 1970, *New York* magazine, calls attention to the so-called cabal at the *New York Times* in which some 20 *Times* newsmen met in small groups to "exchange expressions of their concern about the current political and journalistic direction of the *Times*." Diamond lists as complainants play reviewer Clive Barnes, displeased with blue-penciling of his review of the play, "Inquest," which deals with the Rosenberg atom spy case; Tony Lukas' unhappiness over editorial restrictions in his reportage of the Chicago 7 trial--he reportedly was told to "lay off" Judge Hoffman; other unattributed complaints included *Times* coverage of the Pentagon, NASA and city politicians (too soft), concern that the paper was softening its voice under pressure from the Nixon administration, etc. One evening, managing editor Abe Rosenthal listened to the complaints of a number of the
reporters at a dinner party at the home of Peter Millones, his assistant. Diamond notes that Rosenthal is reported to have given as much as he took at this meeting. 10

The meeting aside, Rosenthal is quoted as saying that revolutions usually occur not when things are at their worst but when changes produce rising expectations.

The Times has changed, perhaps more than any other paper in the country in the last ten years. Our concept of the news has expanded. No subject is taboo. Internally, we've broken the seniority system and opened up opportunities for younger men. But at the Times we are introspective and tough on ourselves; we don't judge our performance by the standards of the last ten years but by current standards.

Noting that he appreciates staff discussions, Rosenthal explains,

We've opened up the decisionmaking process. Where two or three people used to make up the front page, ten may participate now. But decisionmaking authority can't be transferred.

He is firm on two matters: private political opinions do not belong in cultural reviews--otherwise there would be a glut of political commentary in the paper, and the news columns cannot become a political broadsheet. 11
Those statements, made in 1970, about sum up the situation at the Times today. There is no say by reporters in how stories are edited or displayed or in the election of their editors. George Palmer, an assistant to Mr. Rosenthal, answered a query as follows:

While our editors and reporters always discuss news handling, there is no such movement at the New York Times as the one you describe. There was a piece in New York magazine several years ago suggesting that there was, but it was not true then; it is not true now.12

A welling of discontent at the New York Post in 1969 compelled Dorothy Schiff, publisher of that paper, to hold a series of meetings in her suite. The meetings were arranged by William Woodward III, a reporter, who became the publisher of (MORE), the New York journalism review. One of the main complaints was the fact that the Post had cut its Washington staff from five to one person. Other complaints included the need for more specialists, appointment of a black or Puerto Rican to editor, more travel money, and more coverage of nonwhite news. According to a report by Ron Dorfman, one of the founders of the Chicago Journalism Review, Mrs. Shiff discontinued the meetings after a few weeks.13
In another New York incident, some 100 editorial employees of the *Daily News*, unhappy with their paper’s coverage of and political stand on the Vietnam War, decided to place a full-page ad opposing the war in their own paper. When the publishers refused to run the ad, the reporters took it to the *Times*, where the ad was accepted and run.¹⁴

In Washington, the *Post*, by reason of its unstinting investigative reporting into the Watergate matter, has gained predominance. We are afforded a particularly graphic view of the editorial operations of that paper in the book on the Watergate coverage by Woodward and Bernstein. The story depicts reasonable editors meeting with hard-working reporters to evaluate information and to determine what will be printed, what held in abeyance, and what new avenues of investigation to pursue. ¹⁵ There is at the *Post*, however, no movement for reporters to have a say in how their stories are run or to participate in election of editors. In reply to a query, Ben Bradlee, executive editor, writes:

There is no such movement here, and I trust there won’t be. This said, we believe in—and practice—the broadest delegation of authority and assignment. This gives reporters, in fact, great say in their copy. Their right to appeal is respected.¹⁶
Across the country there have been complaints and agitation by reporters over a number of concerns, but the reporters in Chicago seem to be the most vocal. The discontent in Chicago apparently was ignited by coverage of and subsequent events following the 1968 Democratic convention in that city. During the convention, working reporters covered the convention and the confrontation of police in the streets by radical elements that had come to Chicago to protest Vietnam war policies and to try to influence the nominating process. After the convention was over, the local media turned to a defense of the City of Chicago and of Mayor Daley. "What had happened that week, suddenly hadn't happened," writes Ron Dorfman. As a result, a group of reporters got together and formed the Chicago Journalism Review to set the record straight on the sins of commission and omission of the Chicago media.17

The next step came when Windy City reporters on the Daily News and the Sun-Times climaxed a 10-month crusade by getting the Chicago Newspaper Guild to include a voice-in-the-product (VIP) clause in the contract. The Guild membership, at a mass meeting in late 1971, approved among
contract demands the following VIP demands: (1) An employees' veto of the appointment of new department heads; (2) A 90-day option to buy either paper if it was offered for sale; (3) A say in the direction of the news coverage by the papers as determined at regular staff-management meetings; (4) Equal space on the editorial page to air the staff's democratically determined disagreement with management opinions. When negotiations got underway, the management offered an attractive pension package which drove a wedge between the old hands and younger staffers. By August of 1972, the VIP proposal had been reduced to a request for regular news conferences between management and staff; protection against disclosure of notes or sources; notification of "substantive" changes in stories; and the right to reply to nasty letters to the editor. In the end, reporters gained only the right of notification of "substantive" changes to copy. 18

The next time the Guild met with publishers the main concern among the working press was money. The last go-round they had settled for President Nixon's Phase II guidelines, and as a result, they felt they were hurting
financially. And so this time only two VIP proposals entered the contract negotiations: one permitting Guild representation in editorial conferences or boards by members of its own choosing; the other would provide for monthly meetings with management and the right to make recommendations on all areas of editorial operation.19

Once again, however, reporters aspirations for some voice-in-the-product were not to be. According to Robert W. McAllister, vice president for industrial relations at the Chicago News, the final contract contained no mention of VIP and dealt essentially with wages and benefits.20

So it is safe to say that in Chicago there will be no immediate voice-in-the-product and the election of editors, at best, appears to be in the distant future. In fact, it is unlikely that anything approaching a significant VIP or even election of assistant editors is in the immediate offing for most American newspapers. Perhaps there is some of these two democratic factors in the only two employee-owned newspapers in the country, the Kansas City (Mo.) Star and the Milwaukee Journal.
Here is how Tom Eblen, managing editor of the *Kansas City Star*, describes the situation at his newspaper.

(1) The staff has no say regarding the appointment of junior or senior editors. Staff members no doubt would like to have a voice in the selection, but I haven't heard rumblings about it.

(2) Reporters certainly have a significant voice in the coverage of social issues. Each reporter on our afternoon city desk has a basic beat area of responsibility such as housing, education, mental health, crime and punishment, environment, inner city, etc. Some categories obviously cross into other jurisdictions. Within the basic framework of those categories, but not limited to those categories, we expect reporters to suggest and receive approval for stories on any appropriate issues. The question becomes one of priorities; more than 20 reporters compete aggressively for detached time, and obviously not all of them can be detached at the same time. Editors set the priorities. Anarchy would reign otherwise.

(3) Do papers still write puff pieces supporting the advertising department? We have no real problems relating to city desk coverage, and rarely receive requests from advertising for coverage. Requests usually are legitimate and each is considered on its merits, but they are requests, not demands. We use special sections on openings of shopping centers, for example, but try to limit the copy within to legitimate news. Since we don't write puff pieces to support the ad department, I don't think there is a problem.
There is, it appears, the beginning of some real democracy in the newsroom of the Denver Post and the Minneapolis Tribune. In Denver, employee ownership through a trust has been instituted. As in the case of many European newspapers, employee ownership shares give no financial title to the paper but the right to be in on policy decisions. According to this report from Publishers Auxiliary of September 19, 1970, similar trusts exist at the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel and the Kansas City (Mo.) Star-Times.

Denver Post staffers have established an ethics and human rights committee to meet with management on hiring practices and editorial content. Under a Guild contract, three Post newsmen meet monthly in committee with three members of management to discuss questions of publishing ethics.

In answer to a query to the Post about democracy in the newsroom, Assistant Managing Editor Jim Powers writes in part:

Certainly, we have the usual amount of "post-game" analysis by reporters, particularly when they feel their best efforts have been underplayed. But so far, no organized palace revolution has materialized.
As for the choice of editors, management's right to make such decisions remains unchallenged. Perhaps a conflict in this area has been avoided because top newsroom executives make it a practice to seek the advice and counsel of junior-level personnel in advance of such promotions, rather than to drop surprise bombshells onto the newsroom. Also, the managing editor's office is always open to any newsroom employee, from the lowest copyperson to the highest reporter or departmental editor, and many take advantage of this to air problems, discuss situations, offer suggestions or ask policy questions.

As a consequence, there hardly has been a need for the Guild steward, appointed two years ago for the purpose of conferring with management on the questions you raised. In fact, we have yet to hold the first meeting.

Looking far ahead, the day may come when employees of the Post will assume more of a role in management responsibilities. This is because of our employee stock trust plan, designed to lead to employee ownership of the newspaper. 24

Reporters at the Minneapolis Star and Tribune have banded together to promote "quality in journalism." They meet and exchange ideas with President John Cowles Jr. and the papers' top editors. 25 Mr. Cowles kindly referred a query to the editors of the respective papers. Bob King of the Star replies:

The "freedom movement," as you define it, is not in full bloom at the Star.
One reason, I believe, is that reporters here, for years, have had the opportunity to influence their own work and the manner in which their work appears in the newspaper. This is not because the editors have abdicated any of their authority, but because our reporters are recognized as professional journalists, taking professional interest in their work.

In addition, our Guild contract includes provision for a "Guild/Management Committee" designed to bring input from Guild members to the editor, on "any subject which relates to the relationship of the employer and employee." One of the functions of this group is to "consult" with Management regarding the appointment of newsroom supervisors at the level of Assistant City Editor and Assistant News Editor. At this point, both Guild and Management agree that final decisions are a prerogative of Management.26

King's counterpart on the "Trib," Charles Bailey, answers much the same way. He says, in part:

There is a movement among journalists to achieve "more of a say" in both news policies and the selection of editors. We are working cooperatively with our reporters to provide them with a greater opportunity to express their views on news policies, handling of stories, etc. I view their concern as a legitimate one, and I think the interaction of reporters and editors can improve our published product. We have established a joint union-management committee in the newsroom to facilitate this kind of exchange. It has been in existence for nearly two years and has functioned well. I do not look with favor on the idea of journalists "electing" editors. We do not follow that practice here and I do not foresee
it occurring. 27

The situations at the Kansas City (Mo.) Star-Times, Denver Post, and Minneapolis Star-Tribune and the enlightened attitudes of a number of editors across the country point to the signs that democracy in the newsroom may be slow in coming to America, but the frequency of agitation among working reporters for more of a voice in the product they create augurs well for a change in the way most newsrooms are run today.

That cries for more of a voice in the way journalism is practiced has not fallen on deaf ears is perhaps best demonstrated by this observation of young activist journalists by Norman Cherniss, an editor of the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise and visiting professor at the Columbia School of Journalism:

On the whole, remembering that they've got problems and pressures, they're not bad. The best of them are very good, in both the professional and personal sense. And most of them give a damn.

Because they do, they complain a lot. Those with great interest in newspapers... complain about them. They complain of their irrelevancy, their blandness, their lack of courage, their lack of compassion, their bad writing,
resistance to change, crisis reporting, superficiality, preoccupation with trivia, failure
to tell about people as distinct from institutions, failure to effect social change,
failure sometimes even to recognize it. Since these happen to include many of my own com-
plaints, maybe I am hearing what I want to hear. 28

Lest anyone be deceived that the stirrings for news
management participation are limited to big city newsrooms,
consider this example. Staff members of the Burlington
(Iowa) Hawk Eye were given veto power over the selection of
a new managing editor by the publisher. Although a majority
of the staff felt that the publisher's mind was made up be-
fore the seconding vote was taken and that the chosen
managing editor would have been forced on them, the publisher
said he was committed to the newsmen's decision on his
nomination. This situation happened in June of 1972. 29
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CHAPTER IV

DEMOCRACY IN THE FOREIGN PRESS

The real freedom in the press, as opposed to freedom of the press, exists in Western Europe. The origins of this freedom in the press are found in France, where in Paris after World War II, the news organs which had collaborated with the German occupation forces were turned over to journalists and businessmen for reorganization to ensure freedom of the press from government and financial control. Le Monde, in Paris, became the model from which spread the plan for working journalists to participate in the policy decisions and management of newspapers. Today Le Monde is controlled by its newsmen organized under the Corporation of Journalists of Le Monde (CJM). The CJM holds 40 percent of the ownership of the paper, which now is operated as a non-profit organization for the dissemination of information.¹ (The three points of the 1968 agreement giving CJM control of the paper are found at the back of this paper as Appendix
A.) The CJM now controls such decisions as the nomination of a new "managing director" (who must be a journalist), raising capital, and structural changes in the company. The managing director may hire, fire, determine salaries, and set editorial policy, but can be dismissed on demand of the CJM.²

A 1971 agreement at Le Figaro, in Paris, divided that paper's organizations into two companies, the owners and management (the journalists). The management of the company is run by a five-member directorate made up of three owner's representatives and two journalists. The chairman is always a journalist. The directorate is elected and supervised by the 12-member supervisory board. The supervisory board is made up of seven owner's representatives, four journalists, and a member of the executive staff. The two journalists on the directorate are elected by a three-fourths majority of the supervisory board. The editorial staff thus holds a minority veto whereby basic decisions—such as appointment or dismissal of the chairman of the directorate or amendments to the bylaws—cannot be made without the votes of the editorial staff representatives on
the directorate. This procedure ensures that the chairman of the directorate has the widest powers to preserve the editorial independence of the newspaper. 3

A similar arrangement was made at Paris-Normandie, in Rouen, in 1972. There two journalists serve on the supervisory board in a consultative capacity and an editorial board assists the chief editorial director to see that editorial policies and newspaper standards are maintained. The board also advises on staff strength and assignments, and other matters. The board consists exclusively of elected journalists, and the nonprofit corporation of journalists is recognized by management. 4

The situation at Le Figaro and Paris-Normandie, with the purchase of those news organs by Robert Hersant, has taken a turn for the worse. Hersant, a collaborationist during World War II and owner of 10 other newspapers in the provinces, operates his chain with a pronounced right-wing editorial direction. When Hersant took control of Le Figaro, newsmen there promptly called a 24-hour strike against the new owner. Hersant's wartime record, which includes forming a right-wing neo-Nazi youth organization
under the Vichy regime, plus his reactionary editorial leaning, does not bode well for good journalist-management relations. 5

According to Leo Sauvage, New York correspondent for *Le Figaro*, his colleagues at *Paris-Normandie* have told him that Hersant has already gone back on some of his promises not to violate existing agreements between the journalists and management. Sauvage said he expects Hersant to agree not to interfere with journalist-management agreements existing at *Le Figaro*, but he does not expect him to keep his promise. M. Sauvage points out that,

There are ways to achieve management's goals. And the answer is money. He may just say, "I no longer feel we can afford a Washington correspondent," if he doesn't like what the Washington correspondent is writing, and the Washington correspondent is out of a job. As far as freedom in the press is concerned, that freedom exists under the editorial director. After he is appointed, the owner may exert financial pressures on him to see that the editorial director agrees with his way of looking at things. So while the owner cannot prevent you from writing what you feel is the truth, he is able to exert financial influence which can make a man with a family think twice before he writes his story. 6

In France today there are about 30 corporations of journalists in Paris and in the provinces, and the idea has
spread to Belgium, Austria and Spain.  

In 1969, seven staffers of the German magazine Der Stern, in Hamburg, got publishers to agree to a guarantee that writers wouldn't be forced to write about those matters in which they did not believe and that they would be permitted to overrule by a two-thirds vote changes in lead editorial personnel and management. Also, Rudolf Augstien, publisher of the news magazine Der Spiegel, in Hamburg, offered employees 50 percent ownership and a vote in the selection of business managers and editors-in-chief, but would not allow interference in day-to-day management and editorial decisions. 

The International Federation of Journalists' (IFJ) executive committee in 1971 reviewed the status of newsroom democracy around the world and found that:

In case of sharp disagreement between editor and publisher over basic policy, the editor would have to go. In nearly all countries, except in Finland where it is prohibited by law, publishers have the possibility of directly influencing editorial work.

The IFJ executive committee, however, concluded that freedom of the press cannot be guaranteed without internal
freedom for journalists, and at its 1972 meeting in Istanbul passed the following 5-point resolution:

1. There should be regular consultation with employees on editorial operations. Staff's interests must be represented by elected editorial committees or delegates. Amendment of policy should require agreement between the publisher and the editorial staff. If such agreement is not reached, employees should have the right to resign with notice-pay and severance pay of at least a month's salary for each year of service. The publisher's right to set basic policy is acknowledged, but policy should be included in collective bargaining or personal contracts between the company and its editorial employees.

2. The staff should have veto power over appointments to "leading positions," such as editor, if three-fourths of the permanent employees with at least a year's service are opposed.
3. In the case of a merger or ownership change, the editorial staff should have the right to veto new owners.

4. There should be assurances that a journalist will not be compelled to publish or abstain from publishing something which is in contradiction to his journalistic duties or to his responsibilities. He should not be required to express an opinion in contradiction to his convictions.

5. Employees must be "informed and consulted" by management on "all decisions presenting editorial, technical, administrative, economic and financial implications" to their work. 10

Italian newspapers were founded a century ago by young, growing industrial firms to influence government. Other papers representing religious or political factions were formed for the same reason, to express the opinions of the owners and to participate in the game of national power politics. Editors were fired and hired at the pleasure of the owners.
In the fall of 1970, a major press strike sprang up from situations growing out of the autumn labor demonstrations. Journalists, who were witnesses to or actually involved in the police action against the strikers, were forced to stand by and watch their own papers manipulate or suppress news about the strikes and demonstrations. As a result some 400 journalists organized a "movement of democratic journalists for freedom of the press." The group held its first meeting in March of 1970.

Their demands included a charter for journalists defining the right to free and full reporting and participation in the editorial management of the newspapers, in the choice of editors, in the recruiting and dismissing of staff, and changes in the financial structure of newspaper ownership on lines being experimented with in other countries. Among those who came to address the group was M. Hubert Beuve-Mery, founder of *Le Monde*. The journalists' action was part of a widespread revolt against the authoritarianism and paternalism of the Italian system. 11

One very real concern of journalists in Italy is the fact that most newspaper owners attempt to use their papers
to achieve not only ideological and political aims but to promoted their business enterprises quite apart from their publishing interests. Journalists often feel forced to betray their convictions and to suppress information to serve the aims of the publisher. Other factors, such as the fact that most Italian papers are money-losing operations, help to complicate matters.

In 1973, the Italian Union of Journalists was engaged in a struggle to try to wrest control of Rome's biggest daily, *Il Messaggero*, from the publishers. The journalists wanted the right to approval of junior and senior editorial appointments as well as some say in the paper's policy lines. The editor of the paper (who owns 50 percent of the publishing company) and the editorial staff opposed the appointment of the new editor by the new purchaser of 50 percent of the publishing company. The new owner was also believed to want to move the policy line to the right of the present mildly liberal stance of *Il Messaggero*. 12

In Turin, Italy, the employees of *Gazetta del Popolo* took over the paper and published an edition of their
own when the publisher closed the paper for financial reasons. At La Stampa, Turin's largest paper, a new editor went to the staff and obtained their consent before assuming his post. These two instances indicate some extent of reporter power in Italy. In Italy, each paper has a committee of journalists (Comitato di Redazione) which is elected each year. The committee mainly tries to assert the power of advise and consent on the selection of managing editors and changes of ownership. The committee also watches to see that the publisher follows the contract with the journalists. If the publisher should fire the managing editor, the journalists can call a strike. Some papers, such as L'Espresso, in Rome, have rotating editors, with staff members assuming an editorship and after a period of service, turning the post to another staff member and returning to the newsroom.

A case in point regarding change in ownership is exemplified by the recent purchase of Corriere della Sera, in Milan, by the Rizzoli Editore Corporation. The staff, unhappy with the concentration of ownership of newspaper mastheads, threatened a court fight to invalidate the sale.
The journalists committee is suing the management of the paper with breach of contract in the sale of the paper without consulting the committee. Mr. Rizzoli, himself, went to the journalists and pledged that he would not fire the managing editor and that the policy line of the paper would remain unchallenged.

Until two or three years ago, _Corriere della Sera_ had been a conservative paper read by the well-to-do upper-middle-classes of Milan. The paper in recent years changed to a more moderate political stance. The old readers complained that the paper was drifting too far left. However the journalists on the paper have no desire to return to the old conservative journalism and fear that the new owners might attempt such a change.

The so-called concentration of mastheads is of particular concern to journalists because they fear a major national conspiracy to control the media. They are concerned that Rizzoli doesn't have the kind of money required to buy control of _Corriere della Sera_. It is doubtful that that fear was much allayed when he explained to them that he was able to borrow money from a number of bankers who
trust his skills as a successful publisher.

Italian journalists picture the conspiracy like this: A group of very rich persons or combines are trying to gain control of a large number of newspapers. The background maneuvers for this takeover of the press are orchestrated by Eugenio Cefis, president of the government-owned Montedison, a giant chemicals and plastics conglomerate. The domination of the newspapers and, through them, the control of public opinion, journalists believe, is part of a plan to return Amintore Fanfani to power. Fanfani, it is said, has the dream but not the political skill or personal qualities to bring a DeGaulle-like regime to power in Italy. 16

In summing up the Italian situation: The Italian Union of Journalists (Federazione Nationale Della Stampa, literally National Press Federation) is making some inroads in their attempt to gain control of the editorial side of newspapers. They are claiming that the selection of editors and any changes in policy line or ownership should be subjected to and approved by the newspaper's editorial support, not only from leftist political organizations and trade
unions but from the bulk of liberal opinion.

Already under their national employment contract, Italian journalists are the world's best paid, with beginners making more than $9,000 per year and top journalists of the major papers making up to $50,000 annually. Also, those who hold the rank of news editor cannot be dismissed unless the paper goes into bankruptcy and at retirement they are given a month's pay for every year served plus a flat payment of 13 months' salary for editors and 10 months' pay for senior staff members. This is in addition to their pension. 17

In Germany there is considerable activity among journalists to gain equal footing with their French colleagues in the control of their newspapers. In 1969, the journalists at the West German picture magazine Der Stern prevented a major stockholder from selling his share of the publication to a mass magazine chain. When the staff threatened to resign, the shareholder sold out to his partners. Also the journalists committee was granted rights to approve or disapprove by a two-thirds majority the hiring or firing of a chief editor or dismissal of editorial
employees; changes among deputy editors, heads of departments, or the political staff may be vetoed by a two-thirds vote; and no staffer or contributor may be forced to write anything which goes counter to his convictions. Der Speigel, and L'Express, in Paris, have similar plans. 

On February 1, 1974, Der Stern ratified a new set of bylaws with its staff, and on July 1 of that same year, in Hamburg, Die Zeit journalists also ratified a new set of bylaws to govern editorial operations for the immediate future. The Der Stern bylaws appear at the end of this paper as Appendix B, the Die Zeit bylaws as Appendix C.

The question of the relationship between newspaper publishers and journalists was considered at the 1973 meeting of the International Federation of Newspaper Editors. In the October 1973 issue of the fiej-bulletin, Dr. Binkowski, publisher of the Schwabische Post and president of the Bundsverband Deutscher Zeitungsverleger (National Association of German Newspaper Publishers), in West Germany, is quoted as expressing deep concern over the trend in West Germany as journalists exert more and more pressure for control of newspapers. He complains that publishers are
to be reduced to mere bookkeepers, while journalists appoint the editors-in-chief and subordinate editors and interpret policy of the paper. He warns that this control of the press by the journalists is a Marxist trend. And, in his final summation he poses the following questions to his colleagues:

1. Are there any efforts made in the free world to restrict, either by law or collective contract, the rights of the publisher and thereby the liberty of the press in any way whatsoever?

2. How are relations between publishers and editors regulated in general -- by stipulations of the Labour Law, by Press Laws, by collective or individual contracts?

3. Who determines, maintains and interprets the fundamental attitude of the people?

4. Who decides on the newspaper's attitude with regard to newly arising questions of fundamental importance, reaching beyond the day-to-day topicality?

5. Does the editor have the authority to decide details, even if a wrong decision makes the publisher suffer substantial economic loss, for example a considerable decline in circulation or the payment of high indemnities?

6. Is there any participation of journalists in the appointment or dismissal of the editor-in-chief and the heads of desks?
7. Are there noticeable efforts aimed at narrowing directly or indirectly the activity of opposition newspapers in order to make them comply?

Representatives of nine countries responded to Dr. Binkowski's questions of concern. Their condensed replies follow.

H. Sassmann of Austria reported:

The publisher's prerogatives are seriously questioned. While he continues to lay down the basic line of the newspaper, his authority to interpret this line, and to make detailed decisions, is being questioned. At the request of the journalists' union, a draft charter applying to editorial staff is being drawn up. Among other demands, journalists are calling for:

a) the exercise of the right to intervene, and a veto, as regards appointment of the editor and changes in the distribution of editorial positions; and

b) being kept informed of the general position of the firm.

Since the publisher assumes legal liability, it is absurd to try and remove all or any of his responsibilities.

Although favorable toward consultation with editorial staff, Dr. Sassmann considers that the final decision must be taken by the person assuming the risks, namely the
For France, P. Archambault had this to say:

French publishers have not yet come directly up against these problems, but there is a considerable tendency to exert pressure on the part of journalists. Since, according to the country's laws, the publisher assumes all liabilities, he must also be able to exercise the right to make decisions concerning the main questions involving the editorial framework. It is an attack on the freedom of the press not to take the guiding idea behind the newspaper into account. A journalist applying for a job on a newspaper is fully aware of the newspaper's line of conduct; as soon as he accepts employment, he must conform. Democracy must not be confused with license.

Furthermore, readers are more interested in finding their opinion in their newspaper than objectivity. Accordingly, great impartiality must be shown, and the individual's responsibility respected, but the line of conduct of the newspaper must also be respected. The newspaper manager, who assumes liabilities, and is subject to financial and moral penalties, must ensure that his editorial staff respect this line.

The response from the United Kingdom was given by Eric Cheadle:

There is no press legislation for the moment, and nothing to suggest it in the near future.

The publisher, who is responsible for publishing the newspaper, is expected to ensure that it appears under all circumstances. The editor
assumes responsibility for the contents. Relations between publishers and journalists raise no problems, although participation in running the newspaper, suggested by journalists' unions, has been refused to editorial staff. On the other hand, journalists are frequently consulted on various matters.

S. Himelfarb of Israel pointed out that:

Most newspapers in the country are party newspapers. So far there has never been any real conflict between publishers and journalists.

(However, Mr. Himelfarb does not rule out the possibility of future difficulties.)

The Italian situation, A. Mazzara reported, was as follows:

A Press Act defines the editor's responsibilities. The latest collective bargaining for journalists, in December, 1972, confirms the existence of editorial committees. As regards its rights, this committee has no right to intervene in matters of the newspaper's political and economic policies. On the other hand, it has a consultative capacity in all matters to do with journalists, involving recruitment and dismissal, lengths of duty, job or qualification changes, and observance of general contract clauses.

The editor is responsible for distributing editorial tasks and instructions.

An exceptional event recently took place, when a large newspaper in Northern Italy appointed a new editor, and before he accepted, he wished
to have his appointment ratified by the editorial committee.

A quieter situation existed in Japan, according to S. Ejiri:

Relations between publishers and journalists are carefully balanced, and are not at present governed by any law. Nothing suggests that will change. The publisher, who determines the newspaper's basic policy, is also responsible for its contents. Journalists' efforts to influence the editorial policy of publications have so far not met with success. However, publishers are remaining watchful, to avoid having to face the problems arising in many European countries, as far as possible.

Mrs. Sijthoff of Norway noted that:

It was in Norway that the first agreement between publishers and journalists was reached (in 1959). There has never been any disagreement about rights.

The basic policies of the newspaper are determined by the publisher and accepted by the editor who, in the event of disagreement, may resign.

Powers concerning policy directives have never been clearly defined, but detailed decisions are taken by the editor, who is also legally responsible for the publication.

Reporting conditions similar to West Germany and Austria was W. van Norden of the Netherlands:
Conflicts in the Netherlands, although less acute, are similar to those in West Germany and Austria.

There is no specific press law governing relations between publishers and journalists; such relations are determined by general business regulations instituting work committees. Journalists, either within these committees or through their union, have a consultative vote, but no decisionmaking power. According to the terms of their collective agreement, they are entitled to be informed and to collaborate, and there is a conscience clause allowing for considerable compensation in the event of resignation for ideological reasons. The editor is responsible for the newspaper's contents. A request has recently been made for a special position for editors, who belong to the journalists' union, where they have set up their own section. The union has rejected an offer from publishers (appointment of the editor by a newspaper management committee), and there has been disagreement and division within the journalists' union.

In a new draft charter, journalists are asking for a full meeting of editorial staff to be entitled to decide on the appointment of the editor, as well as to intervene in the newspaper's political attitudes in the event of mergers.

A. Kuhn reported for the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland:

On the whole, conflicts are the same as in West Germany, and in fact seem to take their inspiration from them.
There is no press legislation, except for certain specific provisions (in the penal code, etc.).

By tradition, detailed decisions are made by the editor, while the publisher remains responsible for determining and interpreting basic policies. In the event of new publications, publisher and editor unite to define the newspaper's line of policy.

A request for joint management and participation, put forward by the journalists' union, has so far been rejected. Relations between publishers and journalists are governed by the terms of a collective agreement. The latest such agreement stipulates, among other things, the following points:

a) the newspaper's lines of policy and organization, statistical data on circulation and areas of distribution, as well as the publisher's functions, are to be put down in writing;

b) the editorial staff, which is entitled to be kept informed, is to receive a report on the firm's financial position once yearly; and

c) journalists' rights are to be defined in writing.

Finally, journalists can resort to the conscience clause; they are also to be informed and consulted, if directly concerned, in the event of major changes involving recruitment or redistribution of jobs within the editorial department.
For French-speaking Switzerland, M. Wolfrath summarized as follows:

The collective bargain differs from the one in German-speaking cantons of the country.

A declaration of principles, the "newspaper charter," in which the policy line is laid down, is drawn up by the publisher and submitted to journalists for approval. Journalists may discuss the articles of the charter and ask for certain changes, but the final decision lies with the publisher. 20

One final note -- The Indian Federation of Working Journalists urged Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to form trusts for the control of newspaper chains. Journalists and other newspaper workers would share in management through the trusts. Also, employees of the Mainichi newspapers of Japan own 32.8 percent of the stock and participate in the management of the papers. 21
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The best among American newspapermen are becoming more and more disenchanted with straight objective reporting. In the final analysis, for the American reporter, freedom of expression gives him the right to include in his story background material and other facts impinging on the circumstances surrounding the story to bring out for the reader as much of the truth as possible, and to see his story in print without its unwarranted emasculation by a prejudiced editor or publisher.

The early American press was decidedly partisan and remained so well into the 19th century. And although partisanship in news columns has never completely disappeared, the growth of news reporting as a profession continued to develop from the late 1830's. With the advent of more and more journalism courses and schools at the turn of the
century, journalism assumed the status of a true professional calling and has continued to improve through the years.

As the profession of journalism improved, practitioners of the profession became increasingly uncomfortable living within the constraints of straight objective reporting. They felt that the old "Who? What? When? Where?" format did not fulfill the responsibilities of a newspaper to the public unless the story contained enough of the "Why?" and "How?" of the situation to make the story thoroughly meaningful.

While today's newsmen call for more freedom in what they write and cover and what is printed, they are also cognizant that a high standard of ethics must be maintained if a paper and a reporter are to maintain credibility. Although there are a number of published canons and principles of journalism ethics, not many reporters are ever exposed to them. Perhaps a condensation of what journalists feel an ethical standard to be is best summed up in the call "to report the facts but not neglect the deeper 'truth.'"
There does not appear to be any hope in the immediate future, however, for a drastic change in the way American newspapers are operated or in the relationship between the reporters and their editors and publishers. There is obviously, however, a concern among newsmen, particularly the new breed of journalist, that has not gone unnoticed by editors and publishers. This concern is manifested in open complaints against the management. Reporters express concern over outright suppression of the news. They complain that publishers and their editors dilute the impact of a story by slanting the facts or by not allowing reporters to cover those aspects of business or government where the facts would be embarrassing or displeasing to management or to their friends in high places. Today's best reporters believe in no sacred cows, no favored class, no special interests and insist that all sectors of society be treated alike.

American newspaper publishers and editors today are aware that times are changing. Reporters are no longer content to wait for their assignment editors to send them off to cover the local Kiwanis club luncheon. They want to
make sure that those affairs of government and society that have special and lasting impact on the lives of their readers are adequately covered by their papers.

Editors and publishers, in an effort to meet this new challenge, are holding regular meetings with the editorial staffs to make sure that a rapport is maintained between newsmen and management. While there is no indication that American publishers and editors are willing to give newsmen any more of a share of news management than is absolutely necessary, obviously newsmen on some papers are gaining some say over what will be covered and how newspapers must discharge their responsibilities to the public.

It is too early now to say how quickly this quest for new liberty will spread, but it is not likely that news gathering and editing will return to what today is considered an outmoded and oftentimes irresponsible way of fulfilling a public trust.

Obviously, democracy in the newsroom or reporter power by any other name is having its effects in the U.S. and abroad. The main concerns of all working journalists
apparently stem from what they feel is interference with accuracy and truth by newspaper owners and publishers.

While the concentration of ownership of media outlets of any one city is a growing concern in America, it is a very real concern to European journalists, who feel that such concentration of mastheads poses a direct threat to freedom of the press through the control of what a newspaper prints.

The best American journalists complain not only about the treatment of their own reports but about how their respective newspapers function as organs of information and enlightenment. At the same time, European journalists, in particular, are pressing for more economic control of newspapers in order to gain veto power over appointments of editors-in-chief as well as junior editors, variations from policy line (political stance), and changes in ownership of the journals and magazines for which they work. In this quest for control of the news, they are a giant step ahead of their American colleagues.
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The Journalist's Creed

I believe in the profession of journalism.

I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust.

I believe that clear thinking and clear statement, accuracy and fairness, are fundamental to good journalism.

I believe that a journalist should write only what he holds in his heart to be true.

I believe that suppression of the news, for any consideration other than the welfare of society, is indefensible.

I believe that no one should write as a journalist what he would not say as a gentleman; that bribery by one's own pocketbook is as much to be avoided as bribery by the pocketbook of another; that individual responsibility may not be escaped by pleading another's instructions or another's dividends.

I believe that advertising, news and editorial columns should alike serve the best interests of readers; that a single standard of helpful truth and cleanliness should prevail for all; that the supreme test of good journalism is the measure of its public service.

I believe that the journalism which succeeds best—and best deserves success—fears God and honors man; is stoutly independent, unmoved by pride of opinion or greed of power, constructive, tolerant but never careless, self-controlled, patient, always respectful of its readers but always unafraid; is quickly indignant at injustice; is unswayed by the appeal of privilege or the clamor of the mob; seeks to give every man a chance, and, as far as law and honest wage and recognition of human brotherhood can make it so, an equal chance; is profoundly patriotic while sincerely promoting international good will and cementing world-comradeship; is a journalism of humanity, of and for today's world.

Walter Williams
APPENDIX A

LE MONDE
1968 Agreements

1. Redistribution of Le Monde's capital. This capital was henceforth to be made up of 1,000 "shares" distributed as follows:

   Corporation of Journalists: 400 shares (40 percent of the capital);
   Corporation of Executive Staff: 50 shares (5 percent of the capital);
   Corporation of General Staff: 40 shares (4 percent of the capital) founding and co-opted associate members: 400 shares (40 percent of the capital);
   Directors: 110 shares (11 percent of the capital) divided up so that the editorial director holds 70 "shares" and the administrative director 40.

2. Creation of a "supervisory board" whose principal task is to advise the management on the company's financial
policy. The committee is composed of former managing directors (who are automatically elected), legal representatives of the corporations representing the staff (journalists, executive and general staff) and one representative from the individual associates. The committee is presided over by the chairman of the CJM.

3. Creation of an editorial committee. This committee, half of whose members are drawn from the senior executives of the editorial staff, and the other half from the administrative council of the CJM, is presided over by the editorial director. It meets every two months and is a purely consultative body, its competence extending to all questions affecting journalists.
APPENDIX B

DER STERN
Bylaws

1. Der Stern is a politically oriented, independent newspaper, not influenced by any political party, financial or any other interests; it strives to inform and entertain the reader. The editors of Der STERN support liberal-democratic ideals and liberal-progressive principles. The editors of Der STERN vow to uphold these principles.

2. None of the editors or workers of Der STERN can be forced to do, to write or to defend anything which is against what they believe. Their refusal to do so cannot be held against them.

3. Every year, the editorial staff elects a committee consisting of seven members by means of a secret ballot. This committee represents the interests of the editors of Der STERN and safeguards the journalistic indepen-
dence of Der STERN. It can serve to mediate conflicts among the editors. The committee can call a meeting of the editors. A meeting has to be called at the request of 30 voting members of the editorial staff. The committee has to give an annual report of its activities. New elections of committee members have to be held if 30 editors with voting rights request it. Any editorial member who has been with the STERN for longer than one year has either passive or active voting rights. Executive editorial staff members cannot be elected to the committee if they are on the board of directors.

4. The editorial staff has helped to create the ideals, as well as brought about the financial success of the STERN. Any change of ownership has to be brought to the attention of the editorial committee prior to its taking effect, and suggestions of the committee should be taken into consideration.

5. The publisher picks the executive editor. The hiring or the dismissal of the executive editor has to be brought to the committee's attention before the contract is signed or terminated. As the executive editor, accord-
ing to Article I, has to have the trust of the editorial staff, he has to be chosen with the consent of the editorial committee. The publisher cannot pick an executive editor if 2/3 of the editorial committee do not agree with that choice. The committee has to state its reasons for vetoing the choice. The publisher is not bound by the veto if he calls for a vote by the editorial assembly and a majority to support the veto is not forthcoming within a week.

6. The executive editor makes decisions concerning personnel within the editorial staff. Changes in personnel which concern the deputy executive editors and the departmental heads cannot go into effect if 2/3 of the editorial committee vote against the changes. The committee must, in case of a veto, only use Article I as a reason for the negative vote.

7. There is agreement between the publisher and the editors on the point that shortening of articles will only take place if financial reasons make it absolutely necessary. In such cases, the editorial committee has to be informed of this beforehand.
8. These bylaws shall be part of any contract between the publisher and the members of the STERN editorial staff.

9. These bylaws shall be in effect indefinitely. It can be cancelled any time after a waiting period of one year, but not before December 31, 1978. The editorial committee can be given the right, by means of a majority vote of the complete editorial staff, to cancel this agreement. If the publisher wishes to cancel this agreement, the board of directors has to approve it.

Hamburg, 1 February 1974
1. Die Zeit is an independent weekly newspaper. The publisher and the editors stand for liberal, democratic principles and favor special progress. The title rights to Die Zeit were given to the Zeit-Foundation. The Board of the Foundation appoints the executive editor and the associate editor. The editors of Die Zeit are represented on the Board of the Foundation by two representatives. If the executive editor is not a member of the Board of the Foundation, he sits in on its meetings without voting rights.

2. The editors are responsible for the content of the newspaper. Their relationship to the publisher is based on the following regulations:

   a. The hiring and dismissal of the executive editor and the associate editors is the
prerogative of the publisher. However, the publisher cannot act against the wishes of the absolute majority of editors who have held their position for longer than two years. The editors must act within two weeks after notice of a dismissal is given.

b. Major changes of the structure of the newspaper or of the editorial organization by the publisher must be discussed in a meeting of the editors. When strong financial grounds for the changes can be proven to the executive editor and editors, the changes must be approved.

3. a. The hiring and dismissal of the departmental editors (politics, social news, finance, Modern Living, travel, magazine) is the responsibility of the executive editor, with the consent of the publisher. He (the executive editor) has to inform the editor involved, and the department, of his decision, and has to take their opinion into
consideration. In case a majority rejects his decision, a committee of editors will take the matter into consideration. If a majority of the editors rejects the dismissal, they can veto the decision for a 6-week period. At the end of this period, the executive editor can again make a decision.

b. The hiring and dismissal of editors is the responsibility of the executive editor; he has to act in consultation with the departmental editors.

4. The representative bodies of the editors are the editorial assembly and the editorial committee.

a. All editors belong to the editorial assembly. An editor is one who has a contract. The editorial assembly may meet at the request of the executive editor, or after prior notification of the editorial committee, or at the request of 1/4 of the combined number of editors.
b. (1) The editorial committee consists of five members. In order to reach an agreement, at least three members have to be present. The committee members are chosen by a secret ballot by the editorial assembly. Any editor of standing can vote.

Only the editors who work in Hamburg and who have been editors for at least two years are eligible to be elected to the committee; the executive editor, his representatives, the department heads, members of business or of the Board of the Foundation are not eligible.

(2) The editorial committee's term lasts one year. A reelection of more than two members of the committee is not permitted. No one can be a member of the committee for longer than two consecutive years.

(3) In the case of dissension among the editors, the committee can be called on by any editor and may try to mediate the dispute.
(4) The editorial committee has the right to be informed by the executive editor and the publisher concerning any plans regarding the newspaper and the editors, as well as to discuss the wishes and complaints of individual editors at the assembly of the editors.

(5) The editorial committee has the responsibility to see to it that information which is not secret and which concerns all editors, be made available to all as soon as possible and in as much detail as possible.

5. This agreement can be cancelled by all parties involved after a waiting period of one year, but not before 1976. A cancellation by the editors has to have a majority vote favoring it by the assembly of the editors.

6. This agreement was reached between the publisher—as the partner of the Zeit-publisher Gerd Bucerius KG—and the Zeit-Foundation, as far as the selling rights are concerned, and the total number of editors. For this
reason, these bylaws will be part of any contract with an editor. Legal heirs of the company are bound by them. They will become part of any contract with a new editor.

Hamburg, 1 July 1974