

How Some Journalists Will Keep

New York

There is a group of journalists in New York who have founded a new monthly journalism review called (More) to watchdog the way the news is presented (or omitted) by newspapers, news magazines, radio and television stations.

(More) is what a reporter puts at the end of his copy paper to signify that the story has not yet ended, and there is "more" coming. It is also, in its pilot issue, a 24-page publication of tabloid size whose goal is to cover the New York area press "with the kind of tough-mindedness we think the press should apply to its coverage of the world."

There is some question, however, as to what kind of reception the review will receive in the head offices of the organizations which employ many of its contributors. In an editorial, (More) says it hopes "common sense" will prevail (perhaps it forgot what happened to Thomas Paine) in allowing a journalist free rein to express his views without putting his job in jeopardy. But in two instances, the group was jolted.

EDITOR

One Associated Press editor wanted to do an analysis of the "A" wire — the wire service's main wire for important news — and was told by his boss to keep his complaints within the organization and not publish them in (More). Another reporter resigned from AP and planned to print this letter of resignation in (More) but was informed it would jeopardize a new job in the offing at the New York Post.

Reaction in the hierarchy at the New York Times, which comes in for some criticism in the first issue, is reportedly favorable, but managing editor A. H. Rosenthal says he is withholding comment until he takes a look at the produce.

ISSUE

"I think there are some enlightened people who are going to grin and bear it," says Richard Pollak, a former associate editor at Newsweek who is editor of the Review. "Just because we're critical of the press doesn't mean that we think there's no good in it." Those singled out for merit may win "rosebud" awards, a reference to the name on Citizen Kane's boyhood sled.

In the first issue (after the

pilot issue full publication will not begin until September), the review assembled some outstanding contributors, among them J. Anthony Lukas, a Pulitzer prize-winning staff writer for the Times Sunday Magazine and one of the organizers; Paul Cowan of the Village Voice; David Halberstam, formerly of the Times and Harper's Magazine; Charlotte Curtis, women's editor at the Times, and former Presiden-

tial Press Secretary George Reedy.

Halberstam, in a moving requiem to the late Mert Perry, who covered the Vietnam War for Time and Newsweek, criticizes the new magazine's mentality, Perry, he says was "victimized by good old-fashioned snobbery" because he "lacked those particular graces of playing the game." Miss Curtis does a full takeout on the recent debacle at Harper's in which

former editor Willie Morris does not come off as free of blame in the dispute with management as first appeared in news stories (and in some subsequent analyses), Lukas criticizes Reader's Digest for disguising what is essentially an advertising supplement as a great tract on what American business is doing about pollution. Cowan accuses the media, including the Times, of acting as a PR outfit for the oil in-

Watch on the N.Y. Press

dusty, and Stuart Loory of the Los Angeles Times charges that the press has allowed President Nixon to make a public relations football of the prisoner of war issue.

PUBLISHER

The Review's Publisher, William Woodward III, a New York Post reporter on leave of absence, said 13,000 copies of the Pilot issue were printed and are being distributed to newsstands in the

greater New York area. The publication hopes to survive on subscriptions (\$7.50 a year) and advertising, but has gotten an initial boost from the Stern Fund for Investigative Reporting, a Washington outfit, and private donations. Unintentionally, the first issue dealt mainly with the print media, but future issues will tackle the all-news radio stations and television news programs.

One main criticism by the group is that the press fails to cover such institutions as banking, which it regards as "sacrosanct," said Pollak, the editor. Also, the "notion of objectivity" can be expected to be examined in the future. When it was pointed out that the Columbia Journalism Review has been critiquing the media, Polak said, "there's room enough for both of us."

Associated Press