

standing pat—it “has no further proposals.” It has been bringing in supervisory personnel from outside its service area as strikebreakers. Were these supervisors superfluous in their regular jobs? And does the company intend to rehire the 38,000? What is this—a strike, or a strike that has been converted into a lockout?

AT&T, New York Telephone's parent company, is not directly involved in this quarrel, but it received New York Telephone's full normal dividend of \$1.60 per share in 1970 and since it owns all the shares, this income, which will presumably continue at the same level, is a substantial element in the AT&T rate structure. This is one factor among many which the FCC should investigate. The Congress should provide the Commission with the extra funds the President has requested, and the Commission should renew its investigation and bring out the facts with all possible diligence.

NAMING NO NAMES

Last September 12 and September 19, the Minneapolis *Tribune* carried full exposés by reporter Frank Wright of the dairy lobby's efforts to manipulate federal politicians through campaign contributions. (See *The Nation*, December 20, 1971.)

Washington, being the ingrown, parochial town that it is, took little notice of this excellent reportage until it appeared—in much the same form, though less complete—in *The Washington Post* and in *The Wall Street Journal* on September 27.

Unless a newspaper is circulated in Washington on the day of its publication, our federal politicians feel it's not worth reading. And the newspapers that do have day-of-publication circulation in the capital do nothing to change their minds.

In this case, neither the *Post* nor the *Journal* gave any credit to the *Tribune* for having planted the crop they harvested. And to complete the distortion, *The New York Times* on September 28 complimented *The Wall Street Journal*, not the *Tribune*, for having been first.

This sort of thing has been going on for years. Tom Ross, Washington bureau chief for the Chicago *Sun-Times*, recalls that “in the early days of the Kennedy administration, I had a once-in-a-lifetime leak out of the Pentagon. For a period of three or four weeks, maybe longer, I wrote almost a daily story—an exclusive daily story—that was practically the minutes of the Joint Chiefs' meetings. I was writing about McNamara decisions a day or two before he announced them. . . .

“*The New York Times* was picking up my stories but not crediting them to the *Sun-Times*. This infuriatingly went on day after day for weeks, until finally I produced a story that was impossible for them to pirate, so they wrote a long story, using my material, and down around the twenty-seventh paragraph they wrote ‘This story was first revealed in the Chicago *Sun-Times* by Tom Brown.’”

If *The New York Times* felt that the Chicago *Sun-Times* was a “competitor,” or if *The Washington Post* held the same view of the Minneapolis *Tribune*, and if the *Times*

‘Enlivened by His Skill’

The College Art Association of America has presented the 1971 Frank Jewett Mather Award for art and architecture criticism to Lawrence Alloway, art critic of *The Nation*. The award, which carries a \$500 prize, was presented to Mr. Alloway with the following citation:

Few art critics of our time have shown such breadth of interest, such variety of approach, and so profound a knowledge of the contemporary art scene as Lawrence Alloway. Few, also, have been so prolific. There is almost no aspect of contemporary art that has not been illuminated by his insight, enriched by his breadth of knowledge, and enlivened by his skill.

Mr. Alloway is professor of art at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, and the author most recently of *Violent America: The Movies 1946-1964*.

ROBERT SHERRILL

and the *Post* were afraid that by building up the other newspapers they might lose some of their own advertisements and subscriptions to them—that would, to put it gently, be absurd. The people who run the *Times* and *Post* have better sense.

More likely they withhold credit from their colleagues out of some antique jealousy harking back to the childish days of the industry when newsmen were imbued with the notion that it was somehow shameful to be “scooped.”

Similarly, *Business Week*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *Newsweek* need hardly fear the competition of *The Nation* for advertising and mass readership. Yet these three publications “poached” on Timothy Ingram's story of the underground corporate press which appeared in *The Nation* of September 13, 1971, without attribution. In fact, two of these publications interviewed Ingram for further details and one of them managed to quote from the article without mentioning Ingram or *The Nation*.

Rewriting major news breaks without giving credit is bad enough, but an even more dangerous result of this misplaced pride is that the *Times* and the *Post*, certainly the most influential newspapers in America, sometimes simply ignore significant revelations that appear first in other periodicals.

Jack Nelson of the *Los Angeles Times* was the first to report that J. Edgar Hoover had fired Special Agent Jack Shaw. He did a 4,000-word article on this latest manifestation of Hoover's paranoia, and the story went out over the *Los Angeles Times*'s wire service. The *Detroit News* bannered it. The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* gave it page-1 treatment. So did the *San Jose Mercury News* and the *Charleston Gazette-Mail*, and other newspapers around the country. But *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* did not give the story any attention for weeks.

Orr Kelly, the *Washington Star*'s Pentagon reporter, was the first to learn that the Russians had either slowed down or stopped deployment of their SS9 missiles. The significance of Kelly's story came to this: if the Russians were still deploying them, then there would be a better argument

for our building the ABM; if they weren't, then the pro-ABM argument was weakened. It was extremely important that Kelly's story be given wide circulation and attention, but neither the *Post* nor the *Times* printed anything about it until the Pentagon acknowledged the accuracy of his findings a couple of weeks later.

In the early days of the Penn-Central Railroad scandal, Fred Zimmerman of *The Wall Street Journal* came up with a number of blockbuster stories about such things as insider trading by Penn-Central executives. The wire services picked him up bountifully and credited his newspaper, but *The New York Times* ignored the Zimmerman disclosures.

The harm implicit in all this is that for many people at the top of the power structure in this country, a happening isn't real until it is reported in the *Post* or the *Times*. Tom Ross speaks for many fine but frustrated Washington newsmen when he says, "Frankly, even in this Administration,

which supposedly is having a blood feud with the Eastern Establishment press, that's the only press they read and that's the only press they seem to think exists. You go around this town and see what papers are on the desks of the bureaucrats: *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. Their sense of reality is wrong. I mean, politicians aren't elected by *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. In fact, both papers are fairly marginal. But they think those are the two most important papers. . . ."

When newsmen of the quality of Ross feel compelled to admit publicly the handicap, the nation's press is in real trouble. It's obvious that the concentration of press prestige on two or three newspapers has begun to suffocate talent elsewhere. The remedy seems as clear as it is simple: those newspapers most favored with prestige must take keener notice of the good reporting done for other journals and help develop it by giving credit. □